



ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

Commentary...

Like the Left, the Conservative Big Tent won't Exclude Antisemites

By Jonathan S. Tobin

Perhaps at a different moment in time, the headlines about Vice President JD Vance's concluding speech at the Turning Point USA AmericaFest conference last weekend in Phoenix, Ariz., would have centered on his avowal that "We have been, and by the grace of God, we always will be, a Christian nation."

But that wasn't the case.

Not even the most critical liberal outlets like The New York Times or The Washington Post, both of which could be expected to trash anything he said, led their coverage with reporting about that aspect of his remarks. Perhaps readers were outraged about him using the phrase "Christian nation"; still, however off-putting it may be for many Jews, I don't feel that's a threat to minority religious groups. Either way, the media outlets were right to highlight something else.

That's because the truly significant aspect of the vice president's address wasn't about elements of its core, in which he spoke about his beliefs on conservative, religious and family values, and the flawed, amoral vision of the political left that he opposes. Important though that was, the headlines got it right. The most newsworthy aspect concerned his belief that the conservative coalition that he and President Donald Trump lead is one that should draw no lines in the sand about antisemitism or any other form of pathological extremism.

And that is something that should worry not just Jewish Republicans or conservatives, but everyone who cares about the future of America.

The context was crucial. Until Vance's remarks closed out the conference, the TPUSA event was, as columnist Jim Geraghty put it, "WrestleMania with podcasters."

Rather than a fake show with cartoonish good guys and villains, it was a contest in which advocates, like commentator Ben Shapiro, for a conservative movement that set boundaries to exclude hate-mongers and Jew-baiters, were arrayed against their opponents. Shapiro was given his say in one session. But the following day, former Fox News host Tucker Carlson, who now articulates ideas and platforms even worse than internet stars like the neo-Nazi "groyper" Nick Fuentes and other Holocaust deniers, was allowed to answer him.

Political commentator Megyn Kelly also had her time in the spotlight when she, too, criticized Shapiro. Kelly refused to go along with any approach that might set some limits or boundaries on discourse within mainstream conservatism, such as those that might consign mad conspiracy theorists and antisemites like Candace Owens to the fever swamps of either the far right or far left. She seemed genuinely outraged by the notion that thought leaders should be judgmental about such voices, rather than treating them as having just as much validity as those of less insane people.

That opposition to "gatekeeping" under any circumstances was in no small measure a reaction to efforts of leftists to silence any opposition to radical ideas about race. That includes those in the Black Lives Matter movement, as well as the Biden administration's effort to collude with Silicon Valley oligarchs to censor critics of its COVID-19 practices and other policies.

Nor are confrontations new at TPUSA since its late founder, Charlie Kirk, was assassinated in September. That loss cast a pall on a conservative movement that often convened debates about the issues, including those concerning Israel.

But in the months since his death, Kirk's belief in giving a hearing to divergent views and opposing censorship has been twisted into something else entirely. Largely because of the furor that followed

Carlson's hosting of Fuentes, the right is now expected to accept a new standard. Open racism, antisemitism and Holocaust denial, as well as even the most maniacal conspiracy theories about Kirk's death, mixed in

with traditional tropes of Jew-hatred, are now considered open for debate. The vilest ideas are being presented as something conservatives should agree to disagree about rather than reject out of hand.

If scoring was involved in this set-to—as if it were a debate between serious persons—Shapiro won hands down. His evisceration of both Carlson and Kelly was masterly. He termed the former's chummy interview of Fuentes as "an act of moral imbecility" and called out the latter's hypocrisy and cynicism. Moreover, Carlson's decision not merely to feebly answer Shapiro's critique but to harp on his belief that conservatives are too harsh on Islamists, like his pals in Qatar and other Muslim Brotherhood-based supporters of Hamas terrorists, went over like a lead balloon to the live audience, which responded with silence.

Any thoughts that Shapiro's rational point of view might prevail on the right were dispelled by Vance's speech.

Faced with a serious, growing breach within the coalition that elected Trump last year and which he hopes will enable him to succeed to the presidency in 2028, Vance picked a side. And it did not seek to establish any limits that might exclude those who have articulated antisemitism or are at war with the idea of a Judeo-Christian heritage, which is the foundation of political conservatism.

Directly addressing the issue spoken about by Shapiro and Carlson, Vance made it clear that he stood on the side of the latter.

"I didn't bring a list of conservatives to denounce or to deplatform, and I don't really care if some people out there—I'm sure we'll have the fake news media—denounce me after this speech," he said. "But let me just say, the best way to honor Charlie is that none of us here should be doing something after Charlie's death that he himself refused to do in life. He invited all of us here. Charlie invited all of us here for a reason. Because he believed that each of us—all of us—had something worth saying, and he trusted all of you to make your own judgment. And we have far more important work to do than canceling each other."

Though he didn't say so explicitly, his vision of a conservative big tent is obviously one that seems to include the "groypers" who follow Fuentes and think that his neo-Nazi beliefs are normative. It seems to also include those who, like Carlson and Owens, are "just asking questions" when they spew blood libels and other lies about Israel and the Jews.

While he pre-emptively put down any criticism of this stand as the product of the "fake news media," you don't have to be a critic of Vance or Trump to see the problem here.

I've cheered Vance's ability to articulate and push for a "national conservative" agenda that offered an alternative to both an out-of-touch GOP establishment and to the left, as I did when he was first tapped for the vice presidency. I did so again in February when he defended democratic values. In a controversial speech, he rightly took European nations to task for their efforts to shut down criticism of open-border immigration policies that are destroying the national identities of those nations and allowing Islamists to mainstream antisemitism there.

In Phoenix, he had a chance to distinguish his national conservative vision from the views of Fuentes and Carlson, who seem to have a lot more in common with left-wing antisemites and anti-Zionists like New York City mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani than with Trump or other conservatives these days.

It wouldn't have taken much to do so.

He could have easily added a throwaway line about opposing Jew-hatred in all forms without changing any other element in the address. In his list of the administration's core agenda and

accomplishments, he could have also merely mentioned the importance of the U.S.-Israel alliance to the president's "America First" foreign policy, as he did in a speech last year, even if it was only in the context of boasting of its success in dealing a blow to Iran's nuclear threat in June.

But he didn't. And there's no avoiding the conclusion that such language was deliberately omitted.

That reflects a belief on his part about who should be inside the GOP's big tent. It seems to include those on the far right who cheer Carlson's cheerful platforming of anyone willing to bash or lie about Israel or deny the Holocaust, regard mad theories put forth by Owens as catnip to their conspiratorial appetites or even regard Fuentes's neo-Nazi bad boy act as mirroring their own insecurities and prejudices.

Such people may not reflect Vance's own personal beliefs, which revolve around a vision of faith and identity that contains some serious truths about the need for America to reject the toxic vision of the political left. But by passing on a golden opportunity to draw a line in the sand between his ideas and those of right-wingers who share the left's hatred for Jews, he's telling us that he wants their votes.

Let's be clear that the braying of Carlson and Kelly about the evils of gatekeeping is patently insincere. Neither one of them—and Vance, for that matter—would welcome anyone into the conservative tent who supported the woke catechism of diversity, equity and inclusion. Nor would they be comfortable with advocates of gender ideology that would allow biological males to use women's bathrooms, compete against girls in sports, or permit the chemical castration or life-altering surgeries on children and teenagers. Nor would they cheerfully line up alongside supporters of abortion, open borders or the policies of criminal-friendly prosecutors who have been elected with the help of leftist philanthropist George Soros.

Those are boundaries that they believe in. They just don't think the same sort of lines should be drawn to exclude Jew-haters and people who support the elimination of the one Jewish state on the planet or the genocide of its people.

And that's a Republican coalition in which no Jewish or non-Jewish conservative who opposes antisemitism can ever truly feel at home.

The same cannot be said for his rhetoric about America as a "Christian nation." As he explained in his TPUSA speech, acknowledging that America's secular political tradition has its roots in the country's religious faith does not exclude non-Christians. Western civilization is under assault from the political left, and defending it means standing up for the Judeo-Christian heritage that is its foundation.

While secular Jewish liberals feel threatened by any public expression of faith, they are wrong to see it as a danger to Jewish life. To the contrary, it is the left's new secular woke religion—as we have seen in the two years since the Hamas-led terrorist attacks in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023—that is the primary contemporary engine of antisemitism.

But by not seeking to exclude those on the right that are mimicking the Jew-hatred of the left, Vance is failing not just the Jews but the cause of the West that is so dear to him.

Will there be political consequences for taking such a position?

One would think that a Republican Party that can't appeal to the political center, which abhors extremism, would be hard put to repeat Trump's 2024 success in 2028. Conservatives thrived in the past when they came together behind a creed that was called "fusionism," in which disparate factions that reflected diverse ideas about economics and foreign policy rallied behind whoever was, in William F. Buckley's classic take, "the most electable conservative" available. But that approach clearly excluded extremists and antisemites—something that Buckley, the writer and publisher who more or less founded modern American conservatism, made sure of.

Clearly, Vance sees a greater danger to his ambitions if he were to distance himself from his friend Carlson or tell the groypers to go back into the holes from which they have emerged.

Nor should he be underestimated. As he showed in his Phoenix speech, he is someone who can combine Trump's populist instincts

with intellectual depth the president lacks, along with a polished orator's skill in rallying the voters to his side. The process by which the GOP field will be cleared for him may have already begun, with U.S. Secretary of State Marco Rubio already indicating that he won't oppose Vance and with Kirk's widow, Erika Kirk, already endorsing him.

But if Vance is prepared to proceed in the coming years as the leader of a conservative coalition that welcomes the groypers that sends a chilling signal to Jews and the majority of American voters who support Israel and oppose such bigotry. A similar message has already been sent to the country by the Democratic Party, whose intersectional base has embraced toxic left-wing ideas that specifically embrace hatred for Israel and grant a permission slip for antisemitism.

Given the Trump administration's principled fight against antisemitism in American education and its historic support for Israel, many Jews were coming to see the GOP as their natural ally. But if Vance's message, in which the administration sees no enemies on the right, truly reflects the future of the Republican Party—and it may well—that potentially leaves those who care about halting the post Oct. 7 surge in antisemitism and reaffirming the alliance with Jerusalem without a political home in 2028. (JNS Dec 23)

Gaza Famine Debunked By Amit Segal

It's Monday, December 22, and imagine you are given a set of data, and you ask yourself: How do I make up a famine? This is the question I imagine the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification Famine Review Committee asked themselves in August when they declared that there was famine in the Gaza Strip.

According to two mathematicians who released a letter yesterday, here's how they did it:

Method one: count more deaths as starvation.

A famine, by definition, requires more than two non-trauma deaths attributable to hunger per 10,000 people per day. To estimate Gaza's death rate, the IPC relied on a study that explicitly distinguished between violent deaths (from combat) and non-violent ones. The IPC then blurred that line, folding violent deaths into the non-trauma mortality baseline, inflating a reported rate of 0.18 to about 1 per 10,000 people per day—a small sleight of hand that made the numbers more than five times worse than they actually were.

To put it another way, in order to qualify for famine 400 people would have to die from non-violent potentially hunger related causes in Gaza per day. The real number at its peak was closer to 18. According to the IPC's method, if you were a Hamas fighter killed in battle, congratulations—your death was hunger related.

But even including the more explosive deaths of starvation, the IPC still couldn't meet the threshold.

So, they resorted to method two: wild speculation. To meet the famine threshold—increasing from one non-violent death per 10,000 to two (ten times the actual number)—the IPC simply estimated an exponential surge in starvation. Never mind that rates of malnutrition and hunger-related deaths held steady in August and even declined by mid-September; the IPC mathematically insisted that a huge increase in deaths was just around the corner.

While the IPC was preaching famine, reality didn't meet politically biased projections. The rate of nonviolent deaths kept declining—from an average high of six per day in August to fewer than one by early October.

That may sound like a lot—and any death of this kind is tragic—but in a population of two million during a time of war, lack of access to medication, vaccines and reliable sources of food will lead to deaths outside of combat scenarios. Add to that natural deaths (which the Gaza Health Ministry includes) and a terrorist group intentionally causing more suffering by, for example, hoarding baby formula, and nonviolent deaths were inevitable.

Bottom line: No, there isn't, nor was there ever, a famine in Gaza. They couldn't find the numbers, so they made them up. (It's Noon in Israel Dec 22)

Calls for Global Intifada Must End By Morton A. Klein

Jews worldwide and their supporters on the last day of the Chanukah holiday are still reeling with pain and horror from the terrorist attack on Bondi Beach during the first night of Chanukah.

In Australia on Dec. 14, two Muslim father-and-son terrorists shouting Allahu Akbar! shot dead 15 people, including two rabbis, a couple soon to celebrate their 35th anniversary, an 87-year-old Holocaust survivor and a 10-year-old girl. The Muslim terrorists wounded another 42 innocent Jews, many seriously, including human-rights attorney Arsen Ostrovsky, who is a friend of mine. Twenty-five injured people remain in the hospital a week later, as my heart breaks for all the victims of this latest Islamist horror.

This is the Islamist global intifada in action—the Nazi-like call to murder Jews everywhere—that New York City mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani refuses to condemn and that supporters of Hamas on campuses and in the streets around the world keep calling for.

This horrific massacre is on top of so many others. World leaders and Jewish, Christian and Muslim leaders need to make major speeches and condemn vile calls and language like “Globalize the intifada,” “From the river to the sea” and “Death to America and Israel.” These phrases have become a clear and present danger to every Jewish community—indeed, to every community around the world.

As Egyptian President Fattah Abdul el-Sisi said at a lecture urging reforming Islam at Al-Azhar University in Cairo, Islam’s premier university: “Is it possible that 2 billion Muslims should want to kill the rest of the world’s inhabitants? We need a religious revolution. You imams are responsible before Allah. The world is waiting.” Imams in every mosque must call for an end to jihad and violence against Jews and other non-Muslims.”

In the great show “South Pacific,” there is a song on the danger of prejudice that won the Pulitzer Prize titled “You’ve Got to Be Carefully Taught.” There needs to be international pressure to transform the education in Arab/Muslim schools in Arab/Muslim countries, and to change the textbooks and the teachings and sermons at too many mosques that promote hatred and violence against Israel, Jews and other non-Muslims. This is absolutely critical. A revolution in these areas is needed. We should also begin the process of stopping and not allowing terror-promoting countries from providing major funding to our most important universities, which then skew the beliefs they teach.

This is not Islamophobia. This is a rational fear stemming from the disproportionate number of terrorist attacks perpetrated by radical Islamists.

Sadly, we need to support proposals for extreme vetting and for restrictions on immigration and student visas from various countries, especially Muslim countries, where Jew-hatred is endemic. Hungary and Poland have had virtually no terrorism due to restrictions on Muslim immigration, while European countries with large influxes of Muslim immigrants have experienced major jihadist terror attacks, including at recent Christmas celebrations.

The world can no longer afford to have leaders who fan the flames of Jew-hatred or ignore its horrors. In the United States, it is high time for leaders of the left, such as the incoming mayor, along with Reps. Ilhan Omar (D-Minn.), Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.) and other leaders with political power to embrace humanity, as well as condemn the use of the hateful phrases and blood libels that too often incite murder.

We also need to demand that Muslim Brotherhood branches, including its branches in Turkey and Qatar, be designated as foreign terrorist organizations, and oppose recent efforts to soften relevant legislation.

The Muslim Brotherhood and the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), whose executive director proclaimed that he was happy that the events of Oct. 7 occurred, also need to be placed on a foreign terrorist organization list, as Texas Gov Greg Abbott and Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis have done.

Furthermore, we urge U.S. President Donald Trump to urge Qatar, Turkey and the leader of Syria to publicly condemn these dangerous phrases and rallies and the resultant catastrophic murders. And let’s finally fight to end Iran, Qatar and other rogue states from funding terrorist groups that endanger us all. (JNS Dec 22)

Israel Prepares for Phase 2 Trap in Gaza as Hamas Resumes Regime of Terror By Yaakov Lappin

As the Trump administration intensifies pressure to transition to “Phase 2” of the Gaza ceasefire agreement, potentially as early as January, observers in Israel see no sign of Hamas disarming as the terror organization reestablishes its fundamentalist, murderous regime over the 47% of Gaza that it controls.

Despite multiple reports of international stabilization force preparations and Palestinian technocratic governments, the reality inside the Gaza Strip could not be more starkly different.

Hamas is actively rebuilding its regime of terror, refusing disarmament, and testing the IDF’s forward positions along the Yellow Line, which demarcates the areas of Gaza currently under Israeli control, leading to targeted Israeli airstrikes to enforce the terms of the truce.

The dissonance between the diplomatic vision in Washington and the security reality in Gaza was exposed in recent multiple incidents where terrorists breached the Yellow Line. One recent case was on Dec. 20, when Israel Defense Forces troops identified two terrorists crossing the line and approaching forces, posing an immediate threat.

The Israeli Air Force eliminated them. The following day, three separate incidents occurred where suspects crossed the line, causing the IAF to strike again to remove the threats.

According to an IDF official, Hamas is now focused on aggressively reasserting its sovereignty. The official, speaking to JNS, detailed how Hamas is exploiting the current pause to cement its control over the population, even as Hamas’s military-terrorist chain of command remains fractured.

“Most of what we are seeing regarding [Hamas] strengthening, improving, and preserving capabilities is mainly in the political,” the IDF official stated. “That is to say, they are trying very hard to strengthen and maintain their status vis-à-vis the Palestinian population, to show that they are still the sovereign and that they can still provide them with food and make donations to the needy and collect taxes.”

The military official explained that this effort is a calculated message to both the local population and the international community. “They are trying to tell the Palestinians, ‘You will not have anything better than us,’ even though the truth is clear to all of us,” he said. “And probably also to the international community, they are trying to signal, ‘We don’t need an international force; we can do it alone.’”

This effort by Hamas includes seizing control of aid distribution, creating headquarters for its men and appointing members to political roles, while the terror group’s military recovery is still in early stages.

“There is no one really holding the organization together right now militarily, but in the political world, they are trying hard,” the official assessed.

The IDF official stressed that Israel retains and acts upon the right to disrupt Hamas’s military reconstruction efforts and truce violations. “According to the ceasefire agreement, we are permitted to attack any attempt at military rehabilitation that we see,” the official said. “Incidentally, that is the reason that [Hamas’s head of weapons production, Raad] Saad was eliminated. They are living in a problematic state where they try to connect these two worlds—the political and the military—but we have the right to neutralize that and thwart that, and that is what we are doing.”

The official confirmed reports that Hamas is actively levying taxes on the population, adding that it is fair to assume that Hamas is trying to restore arms production. However, it cannot freely smuggle anymore from Sinai due to Israel’s control of the Philadelphi Corridor and Egyptian counter-trafficking measures.

The IDF is engaged in complex preparations to clear the territory it controls—53% of Gaza—of dangers. “We need to ensure that all the unexploded ordnance ... needs to return to us and that it does not remain as enemy loot,” the official explained.

Additionally, the IDF is clearing infrastructure to pave the way for what is termed the “Alternative Security Community.”

“These are basically the alternative cities that we are ultimately

supposed to provide to the international community ... in the area of the Khan Yunis/Rafah Mawasi,” the official said. “We are preparing the ground there ... removing all the half-ruined houses, all the infrastructure ... so that someone can come and rebuild.”

Simultaneously, he confirmed, the IDF is preparing for the scenario of the truce collapsing and for multiple enemy courses of action.

“At the moment, everything is stuck because Hamas is stalling it,” the official added. “That is to say, Hamas is the one not willing to disarm, and therefore the international force is not entering, and therefore the solution for Gaza does not yet exist because there is no state willing to risk its soldiers for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.”

Meir Ben Shabbat, head of the Misgav Institute for National Security and Zionist Strategy and Israel’s former National Security Advisor (2017-21), told JNS in recent days that proceeding to Phase 2 under these conditions would be a strategic calamity. He warns that Hamas has regained its confidence and has no intention of fading away.

“First, it must be said that Hamas today no longer conducts itself out of a sense of danger to its existence,” Ben Shabbat stated. “It is fighting for the conditions that will ensure its status and the continuation of its influence as a significant power factor in the Palestinian arena and the regional system.”

Ben Shabbat dismissed the notion that Hamas would voluntarily disarm. “One should listen well to what its senior officials say regarding the matter of disarmament and the demilitarization of the Strip. From their perspective, this is not going to happen,” he said. “At most, they speak of a ‘hudna’ [temporary truce] within the framework of which there will be a holding of fire and preservation of weapons without disarming... or all kinds of other delusional and deceptive ideas.”

Ben Shabbat argued that Hamas is eager to transition to Phase 2 (also called Phase B) precisely because it entails an IDF retreat. “Currently in Hamas, they are very interested in moving to Stage B and are acting to convince the mediating countries and through them, the United States, to pressure Israel to do this,” he noted.

“This is the stage that is supposed to provide them with one of the most important achievements from their perspective, after the war: A significant Israeli withdrawal from Gaza territories, including the southern, northern, and eastern areas under current IDF control, except for a narrow security strip [the security perimeter]. This stage is supposed to pave the path to a full withdrawal in stage C.”

For Israel, Ben Shabbat contended, the primary goal remains disarmament of Hamas and demilitarization of Gaza, not a ceasefire. “The transition to the second stage, without a practical plan for demilitarization, is not an Israeli interest. The opposite is true!” he asserted. “IDF control in the areas from which it is supposed to evacuate not only improves security preparedness for multiple scenarios, it also leaves in Israel’s hands a significant pressure lever on Hamas and on the mediating countries.”

Ben Shabbat suggested that a lack of reconstruction is preferable to a flawed and doomed ‘solution,’ adding, “From Israel’s perspective, it is preferable to leave the Gaza Strip in its ruins, without a future, without hope, and without rehabilitation, than to compromise on solutions for the sake of appearances regarding the issue of weapons and demilitarization.”

Ben Shabbat outlined a rigorous six-point plan for Israel, which includes maintaining strict firepower control over terrorist movements, preventing smuggling, and continuing targeted assassinations.

“It is inconceivable that they [Hamas commanders] will enjoy a feeling of immunity because of the ceasefire, at an hour when their trend is to rehabilitate their military capabilities,” he warned.

At the same time, the former national security advisor noted that the top current U.S. priority is to stabilize the truce, adding that the joint military headquarters in Kiryat Gat fulfills an unclear goal.

Ben Shabbat urged the Israeli government to harness the support

of U.S. President Donald Trump. “We are not on an adversarial path with him; everything said here are things that he himself is interested in achieving,” he said. (JNS Dec 24)

Vance’s Friends Without Benefits By Abe Greenwald

At Turning Point USA’s AmericaFest over the weekend, the right’s internal battlelines became yet more clear. Although it’s almost impossible to describe the fight as being within the American right because one side is indistinguishable from the left.

That side, led by Tucker Carlson, praised by Megyn Kelly, supported by Steve Bannon, and attached at the hip to JD Vance, is swimming in conspiracy theory, Anti-Americanism, Jew-hatred, and identitarian grievance. The other side, whose most vocal champion is Ben Shapiro, believes in America’s Founding ideals, the Constitution, and conservatism.

Over the weekend, to paraphrase Midge Decter, everyone chose the side they were already on. Which is to say, each dropped the pretense of being able to work with the other. Shapiro, who opened the conference, called Carlson, Bannon, and Candace Owens “grifters.” Bannon called Shapiro a cancer.

The only one still grasping onto the crumbling façade of a “coalition” is, naturally, a politician. JD Vance closed out the conference with a speech decrying “purity tests” and said, “I didn’t bring a list of conservatives to denounce or to de-platform.” But he brought plenty of praise for the Tucker-led faction. And TPUSA CEO Erika Kirk endorsed Vance for president in 2028.

The anti-American side is now nakedly hypocritical in its attacks on non-nativists, Zionists, and Jews. Kelly said she’s no longer friends with Shapiro, while also praising herself for not turning on friends over politics. And all the neo-leftists tried to make the case that Shapiro has no place on the right because he dared to assert that America-hating anti-Semites have no place on the right.

This camp has also settled on an overarching lie to defend the inclusion of anti-American Jew-haters in their tent. Vance aired the lie in an interview with Sohrab Ahmari published yesterday at UnHerd. It goes like this: Those raising the alarm about rising anti-Semitism on the right are trying to distract you from the necessary conversation we need to have about the U.S.-Israel-relationship.

The problem for Vance here is that the right’s anti-Semites are rejecting the cover story he’s crafted for them. Candace Owens spent the weekend promoting the 1871 libelous, anti-Semitic tract *The Talmudic Jew* and telling black people to recognize once and for all that the Jews are their real enemy. Since the cease-fire in Gaza, Tucker Carlson has had to shift his focus from alleged Israeli war crimes to the supposed hidden hand of Jews such as Bill Ackman and Bari Weiss. Kelly has spent far more time claiming Zionist suppression of Israel’s critics than she has criticizing Israel. And Nick Fuentes, as is well known, recommended the extermination of American Jews long ago.

Jews and other Zionists aren’t exaggerating the rise of right-wing anti-Semitism, and they’re not trying to avoid a debate about U.S.-Israel policy. The real sleight of hand here is intended to work in the other direction. Those on the right who see Jew-haters as allies and political supporters are downplaying their significance by trying to draw your attention to a supposedly forbidden policy discussion.

In the end, the only ones avoiding serious discussion are on or near the grifter right. Carlson refused to discuss Fuentes’s love of Joseph Stalin; Kelly refused to discuss Owens’s paranoid anti-Semitic assertions; and our vice president, citing the dangers of litmus tests and de-platforming, refuses to discuss the obvious and growing anti-American, anti-Jewish propaganda efforts of his most avid supporters. I suppose there are worse ways for a Republican to unofficially kick off a presidential run, but it’s hard to imagine them. (Commentary.org Dec 22)
