



## Events...

**May 21-28**

2017 marks the 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem and to mark this extraordinary year the BAYT Brotherhood is running a second mission – in addition to its annual mission in December – to celebrate Yom Yerushalayim. The **BAYT Yom Yerushalayim Mission to Israel** will incorporate the World Mizrachi mission, plus add additional touring and Shabbat in Jerusalem. For information email Larry Zeifman at [LWZ@Zeifmans.ca](mailto:LWZ@Zeifmans.ca)

## Commentary...

### Anti-Semitism is the New Social Justice      By Nadiya Al-Noor

Hating Israel is the thing to do today on university campuses. It makes you seem “progressive.” It means you’re “woke” and socially aware. It means you’re fighting against a tyrannical regime. It is supporting the struggle of an oppressed people at the hands of White colonialist supremacy. Zionism is racism. Israel is evil, end of story.

Except that's complete nonsense.

Zionism is the support for and affirmation of the Jewish right to self-determination in their indigenous homeland of Israel. It's the Jewish Civil Rights Movement. It is the struggle of a native people who have been oppressed for thousands of years, expelled from their land, killed and persecuted wherever in the world they went. It is the celebration of victory, of the return home after millennia of diaspora, of surviving and flourishing against all odds.

That sounds like something the Left would wholeheartedly support, right? Not anymore. The dominant narrative on campuses is that Israel is Nazi Germany 2.0, that Israelis are White Europeans who colonized the land of Palestine after WWII. The screams of “apartheid” and “genocide” go unquestioned. Israel is evil, end of story.

Nobody talks about the 850,000+ Jewish refugees expelled from Arab lands. Nobody mentions that the majority of Israelis are these refugees or descended from these refugees, not from Europe (not that European Jews are White). Nobody clarifies that Israeli Arabs have all the same rights as Jews in Israel, or that Arabs hold seats in Israeli Parliament, serve in the military, and are doctors and celebrities and shopkeepers and lawyers and teachers. Nobody mentions the thousands of Palestinians treated at Israeli hospitals and employed at Israeli businesses. Israel is evil, end of story.

So what should students do? There are many things students can do to show their hate for Israel. There's the Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions movement, which supports labeling and boycotting Israeli products and cutting off ties with Israeli universities. Just pretend that these boycotts aren't hurting Palestinian workers who make Israeli products. Just forget about academic integrity. There's holding an Israeli Apartheid Week, which spreads vicious lies about the Jewish State to unsuspecting students. There's supporting literal terrorists, as Students for Justice in Palestine does so very proudly. There's targeting and harassing Jewish students. There's screaming and shutting down events based on a speaker's nationality and religion. There's demanding an event be cancelled because it's being hosted by a Jewish organization. And then, there's protesting Holocaust Education Week in the name of Social Justice.

At Ryerson University in Toronto on November 29th, 2016, students from the Muslim Student Association and Students for Justice in Palestine held a walkout at a student meeting proposing Holocaust Education Week. They degraded and intimidated Jewish students. They said they did it because there are other genocides that need awareness. That's like protesting against breast cancer research because there are other cancers. The real reason is simply anti-Semitism.

Anti-Semitism is the acceptable form of bigotry on the Left. It's thinly

veiled as “anti-Zionism,” which really is just anti-Semitism with a fancy name, as it opposes the Jewish Indigenous Rights movement. Students are expected to hate Israel in the name of being progressive. Jewish students are painted as privileged racists, unless they disavow Israel and

abandon their indigenous struggle in order to assimilate. My people (Muslims) are portrayed as helpless victims of ruthless Jewish aggression. Palestinians become pawns in the game of Jew hatred. The world falls for it. Israel is evil, end of story.

Studies show that a campus with an active Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) chapter is more likely to have anti-Semitic incidents (no surprise there). My university, Binghamton University in New York, is unique in that the pro-Israel voice is the most dominant narrative. We used to have an SJP problem, but to my knowledge, they disbanded after the administration cracked down on their anti-Semitic harassment. Now our Muslim Student Association partners with our Hillel for mosque-synagogue interfaith trips. The Jewish and Muslim communities here are on good terms, because we see each other as people. We don't allow the Israeli-Palestinian conflict to define us.

Universities need to address anti-Semitism on campuses. If there was an Islamophobic incident at a university, you can bet the administration would deal with it much more swiftly. Anti-Semitism is tolerated because of Leftist hypocrisy. Because of the rampant anti-Semitism on university campuses and the racial diversity of students participating in Jew hatred, anti-Semitism is often excused or justified.

Jewish students, you need to be proactive. Don't wait for an anti-Semitic incident to happen. Don't wait for an SJP to emerge and fester. Hold an Israel Peace Week or Hebrew Liberation Week. Educate your fellow students. If you don't speak up, anti-Semites will.

Anti-Semitism is unacceptable, even if it's trendy.

The writer, a young Muslim interfaith activist with a focus on Jewish and Muslim communities, is a graduate student at Binghamton University in New York, studying Public Administration and Student Affairs Administration. (Times of Israel Feb 22)

### Win Wars, Not Trials      By Boaz Bismuth

The lenient sentence handed down by the military court in Tel Aviv Tuesday did not sign and seal the case of the “Hebron shooter.” Only a pardon for IDF soldier Elor Azaria -- if and when it is given -- will bring about an end to this dramatic tragedy before us.

Still, we can sum this up and say that the “Hebron shooter” case is far from being the watershed case of the IDF's morality, as they tried to convince us. Rather, it was an unfortunate incident in a hostile setting, after a terrorist attack (with warnings of additional attacks), wherein an IDF soldier shot an injured terrorist who was lying on the ground, and was filmed doing so -- making all the difference -- by a camera belonging to the left-wing B'Tselem organization.

Were it not for the age of the importance of public mindset in which we live -- the same mindset to which the judges refer in the 56th paragraph of the sentencing -- it is very possible that we would've been spared from all of this. Azaria would have stood trial for what he did, not in court but in an internal IDF disciplinary hearing. But it seems that the chain of events was blown well out of proportion. The choice to move forward with legal proceedings rather than disciplinary proceedings did damage in the “battle for the public mindset,” and, as was written in the judgement, “a failure in this field does great damage.”

In the name of that very “mindset” that we must save, we ended up with an unnecessary trial that led to a loss of control, interference from politicians and interested parties, and an online frenzy. They sought to make an example of Azaria's trial. Instead of this, we received a confusing trial wherein values got mixed up inside citizens' heads, as though we tried to win over the minds of the world but lost in the battle for the mindset of the Israeli public.

By the way, the lenient sentence, which did not align with the harsh ruling, only increased the public embarrassment: Is the IDF Israel's defense force or the defense force of public mindset? Any citizen would tell you that the role of the military is first and foremost to win and only after that to preach. Even the judges who sent Azaria to prison determined

Readers are requested to please mail contributions to: BAYT - re: *Israel News*, 613 Clark Avenue West, Thornhill, Ontario. L4J 5V3

Annual Rates: Friend - \$36, Supporter - \$50, Benefactor - \$180. Dedications are welcome at \$120/week. Call (905) 886-3810 for further info.

See *Israel News* on the internet at [www.bayt.ca](http://www.bayt.ca) and [www.frumtoronto.com](http://www.frumtoronto.com) or email [LWZ@Zeifmans.ca](mailto:LWZ@Zeifmans.ca) to request to be added to the weekly email.

Opinions expressed do not necessarily represent the views of BAYT.

that senior officials, at the beginning of the military police investigation, did not await conclusions regarding the incident: "Labeling Azaria's action as harmful to IDF values [as IDF Chief of Staff Gadi Eizenkot and former Defense Minister Moshe Ya'alon, among others, did] before the investigation was over could have harmed investigative efforts, even if ultimately no such harm was caused." But, for whatever reason, there was a desire to burden the young soldier who made a mistake with all the ills brought upon us by the situation.

The Azaria case revealed the extremists among us: Although the media emphasis was on the problematic behavior of the radical right-wing Beitar soccer fans dubbed "La Familia," there were also those on the other side who lost their wits. There was an article in the left-wing Haaretz newspaper on Tuesday that drew a comparison between the terrorist in the case, Abdel Fattah al-Sharif, and figures "from Eleazar Maccabeus to the Partisans," leaving us to take comfort in the fact that most of the Israeli public and IDF soldiers are zealots about the "purity of arms," but would rather see a dead terrorist than a soldier in handcuffs.

It would have been better if Azaria had not shot, and it would have been even better if the terrorist hadn't attacked -- and it would be best of all if there were no war, but it is possible that the next round of fighting in Gaza is on the horizon. We must hope that by then, the IDF will think about just one thing throughout the conflict -- winning the war, and not winning in court.

Regarding the parallel drawn between Eleazar Maccabeus and Sharif: Eleazar fought for freedom and to defend his people. Sharif and those like him fight for the destruction of another people. Not even B'Tselem's cameras can change the truth. (Israel Hayom Feb 22)

## Hope For A Real Solution? No Wonder Europe's Dismayed

By Melanie Phillips

President Trump's comments to Israel's Prime Minister Netanyahu about the solution to the Israel-Arab impasse produced consternation and contempt in equal measure.

At the press conference after their meeting at the White House, Trump said: "So I'm looking at two state and one state, and I like the one that both parties like. I can live with either one. I thought for a while the two-state looked like it may be the easier of the two. But honestly, if Bibi and if the Palestinians, if Israel and the Palestinians are happy, I'm happy with the one they like the best."

Uproar then ensued. Trump had single-handedly destroyed decades of American commitment to the two-state solution and therefore peace. Apparently. At the same time, by raising the spectre of a one-state solution Trump had single-handedly destroyed Israel's future as a democratic Jewish state. Apparently.

According to one British commentator, he displayed "the know-nothing insouciance of a man who is not even aware of the extent to which he is out of his depth", with "absurd" remarks that showed "he knew nothing at all about the problems of the region". Apparently.

As usual, people fail to understand both the style and substance of this President's statements. This is a man who doesn't do detail, nor does he take care with the words he uses. He thinks with his gut and speaks from pretty well the same place. And what his gut is telling him about the Arab-Israel conflict is that, first, the US has too often done the wrong thing there and second, that it had no business being involved there at all.

On both matters, his gut instinct is correct. On both matters, however, it runs directly counter to a consensus which has been overwhelming for decades but which has been no less overwhelmingly wrong for decades.

In his remarks with Netanyahu, Trump was not withdrawing support for a state of Palestine alongside the state of Israel. He was neither espousing nor disavowing a two-state or any other solution. He was simply standing back and saying it was not for the US to create or impose any solution. It was instead for Israel and the Arabs to agree a solution between them.

This is, or should be, blindingly obvious. The fact that it is not, and that it has now caused such uproar, indicates the extent of the error the west has committed over the Israel-Arab impasse.

Since well before the rebirth of the State of Israel in 1948, the west has responded to the Arab war of extermination against the Jewish homeland by attempting to impose a division of the land which rewarded and incentivised genocidal Arab aggression and punished its Jewish victims. Getting this catastrophically wrong from the start, the west has made precisely the same mistake over and over again. That is why the Arab-Israel impasse has continued without end.

Ripping up that consensus now potentially opens the way to fresh thinking which might therefore produce a real solution. No longer is a Palestine state to be considered an essential precondition for peace. That is a crucial and long overdue corrective. If such a state were ever a solution to the Arab-Israel conflict, it would have brought it to an end as long ago as 1936 when an Arab state alongside a Jewish state to be carved out of

Palestine was first proposed.

It cannot be a solution for the simple reason that, having been repeatedly offered it, the Arabs have consistently rejected it and continued instead to murder Israelis and try to destroy Israel. The idea that it was ever central to a solution was always ludicrous. It only took centre stage because western progressives adopted the Palestinians and their fake narrative as their cause of causes.

Trump has provoked unease in hawkish Israeli circles by saying more than once that he thought settlement expansion was unhelpful. But he has also said that the settlements themselves are not the main obstacle to a solution to the conflict. It appears that he simply views further expansion as an unnecessary further complication at this stage.

Whether or not one agrees with that view, given the significance of his overall policy shift this would seem a small price to pay. For he is essentially sending the Palestinians right back to their own miserable drawing board. He has made it clear he will no longer fund their incitement to the mass murder of Jews. No less important, he has also made it clear he will hold the UN's feet to the fire and will no longer stand by while it uses American money to sanitise and incentivise the demonisation and delegitimisation of Israel.

The Palestinians' strategy therefore lies in ruins. In Gaza, an even harder Hamas hard man has now come to power who doubtless will redouble efforts to rain down missiles upon Israeli citizens. Mahmoud Abbas's Palestinian Authority thought it was so clever in pretending, by contrast, to have clean hands by adopting the diplomatic route to destroy Israel – courtesy of the UN and with a nod and a wink from the Obama administration. Now they are staring at a UN which itself is suddenly all too aware that its own hate-mongering, extermination-conniving party may finally be over.

Moreover, developments in the region mean that the Palestinians suddenly find themselves friendless in the Arab world. Their usefulness as the devilish threat to be cynically brandished in order to protect Arab rulers against the fury of their own enslaved populations has come to an abrupt end. Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states, now engaged in a fight to the death against Iran, are building an alliance with none other than the State of Israel; and now also with America.

Saudi Arabia's foreign minister, Adel al Jubeir, today accused Iran of being "the single main sponsor of terrorism in the world". He went on: "We look forward to working with the Trump administration on all issues. I believe progress can be made in the Arab Israel conflict, if there is a will to do so. We know what the settlement looks like, if there is just the political will to do so. And my country stands ready with other Arab countries to work to see how we can promote that."

Of course there can be no illusions about Saudi Arabia, the primary source of Sunni Islamic radicalisation and the principal exporter of jihadi Islamism around the world. And the previous Saudi peace initiative was an elephant trap. Nevertheless, between these tectonic regional shifts and the hurricane in the White House, the Middle East log-jam has been smashed. There is accordingly now more hope for a just and realistic solution to the Arab war against Israel than there has ever been.

No wonder Europe is so dismayed. (MelaniePhillips.com Feb 19)

## In the Name of Political Correctness By Eyal Levin

A new language was created not too long ago, in which what is good is actually bad, what is bad is not really that bad, and the basic values on which we were raised are blasted as outdated. That is the language of political correctness, by which Israeli society can be segmented: Those who are fluent in this language are good and worthy, while those who are not are simply riffraff.

In the language of political correctness, the Judaization of the Galilee is racist; flying the Palestinian flag in an Arab village is an expression of the collective feeling of certain citizens; and a house built illegally must be immediately razed, even if it was built under the auspices of the very principles upon which the State of Israel was founded.

In a world based on political correctness, soldiers who run to the media with tales of "war crimes" by the Israeli military but have no intention of alerting authorities to said "crimes" are doing their civic duty, and professors at a public university who call on their colleagues abroad to boycott Israel are doing so as an expression of ethics and morals.

It is this politically correct atmosphere that saw IDF soldier Elor Azaria led to court in handcuffs. In this world, a telephone call by the prime minister to the soldier's father is an unredeemable sin, widely denounced by the media; and any expression of support by public officials interferes with due process.

In the 1950s, the IDF was busy mounting reprisal operations against terrorists' nests. The most infamous operation was carried out in 1953 in the village of Qibya, where 69 Palestinians were killed. In the 1960s, the IDF was busy with wide-scale counterterrorism operations across Judea

and Samaria, and protecting human rights was not part of their orders of battle. Israel's long arm eradicated archterrorists in the 1980s; and in the 1990s, when Israeli forces were battling Hezbollah terrorists, we learned the term "dead checking." But that world was not based on political correctness.

If there was one saving grace in the Azaria case, it was evident during the sentencing phase, when the court opted for the relatively light sentence of 18 months.

After lambasting Azaria during the verdict, the sentencing hearing leveled criticism at IDF Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Gadi Eizenkot and former Defense Minister Moshe Ya'alon, who chose to condemn Azaria while the investigation was still in its early stages.

The court's choice reflects the fact that it did not remain oblivious to public sentiment in this case.

The relatively light sentence imposed on the soldier can perhaps make up for the fact that his reputation has been trampled upon, and that he and his family have been wronged.

One can only hope that this small saving grace finds its way to the wider public sphere, where support for Azaria is a foreign language.

(Israel Hayom Feb 22)

*The writer is the head of the Multidisciplinary Department at Ariel University's Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities.*

### Nikki Haley's First Hurrah By Ruthie Blum

Four months ago, when South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley was nominated by the president-elect as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, I wrote that there was reason to hope she would live up to the legacies of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Jeanne Kirkpatrick and John Bolton as "shining beacons in the Midtown Manhattan snake pit."

Though at the time I could not judge whether she was the right person for the job, it appeared that she possessed the kind of moral clarity and tough skin required in an arena filled with people whose key purpose is to cloud the distinction between good and evil. Indeed, it takes a special kind of envoy to maneuver the Orwellian universe in which the international body operates, where Western values are on a lower hierarchical rung than third-world culture, and where a mockery is made of the concept of human rights, the championing and upholding of which the organization was originally established to safeguard.

One indicator that Haley seemed to fit the bill was that she, the daughter of Indian immigrants who went through legal channels to become Americans, signed a law to crack down on illegal immigration. Another was her introduction of legislation to outlaw boycotts, divestment and sanctions "based on race, color, religion, gender, or national origin of the targeted person or entity." Since Israel has been the focus of BDS campaigns everywhere, it was clear what she had in mind. No wonder her appointment caused Permanent Observer of Palestine to the United Nations Riyad Mansour to flinch.

Mansour was right to be worried, just as I now believe my high hopes were well-founded when Haley was confirmed.

On Thursday, after her first encounter with the U.N. Security Council, Haley told reporters that she had asked its members to help her understand "when we have so much going on in the world, why is it that every single month we're going to sit down and have a hearing where all they do is obsess over Israel."

Haley went on to describe the meeting, which she called "a bit strange," as exactly what it was: a forum for bashing the Jewish state.

"The discussion was not about Hezbollah's illegal build-up of rockets in Lebanon," she said. "It was not about the money and weapons Iran provides to terrorists. It was not about how we defeat ISIS [Islamic State]. It was not about how we hold [Syrian President] Bashar al-Assad accountable for the slaughter of hundreds and thousands of civilians. No, instead, the meeting focused on criticizing Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East."

Asserting that the U.S. "will not turn a blind eye to this anymore," Haley underscored America's "ironclad support for Israel" and intolerance for the "U.N.'s anti-Israel bias."

She pointed out that, "incredibly, the U.N. Department of Political Affairs has an entire division devoted to Palestinian affairs," while it has "no division devoted to illegal missile launches from North Korea ... no division devoted to the world's number one state-sponsor of terror, Iran."

The double standards, she said, "are breathtaking," especially as "Israel exists in a region where others call for its complete destruction, and in a world where anti-Semitism is on the rise."

This ongoing stance at the U.N. "is long overdue for change," she said. "The United States will not hesitate to speak out against these biases in defense of our friend and ally, Israel."

If this was Haley's first hurrah, it won't take long for her to take her rightful place alongside, if not surpass the achievements of, a handful of predecessors whose marks were indelible. (Israel Hayom Feb 21)

### Settlement Obsession Loses Focus By Richard Baehr

Most reporters for mainstream American news organizations were loathe to describe the obvious improvement in the atmosphere when Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Donald Trump held their joint press conference on Wednesday, compared to the frigid and tense poses when Netanyahu and former President Barack Obama held joint appearances in the preceding eight years.

It was not hard to understand why the Israeli prime minister was smiling during his interview with Sean Hannity on Fox News the next day. One reason is that both Trump and Netanyahu are aware they help their own political positions by strengthening the ties between the two countries.

But the reality is deeper: The two men get along because they actually see the world the same way. Obama had a very different world view. Although he saw a link between Israel and the United States, this was mainly as colonialist bullies. No American president before Obama, and hopefully none in the future, will ever be so equivocal about his own country's history and values.

The improved special relationship between Israel and the United States is not entirely new. President George W. Bush had solid ties with Israel's leaders and endorsed a 2004 letter ahead of Israel's withdrawal from Gaza acknowledging that the 1949 borders were not permanent and that facts on the ground made it inevitable that many Jewish communities beyond the Green Line would not be uprooted in a future peace agreement. Obama ignored this letter, refused to give it any authority, and, along with others in the White House and State Department, attacked Israel after each and every bit of news of new Jewish housing in the West Bank, as if those were crimes against humanity. No supposed foe of the United States received such scorn and rebuke over eight years as Israel. And there was the coup de grace in Obama's final months, the American abstention at the United Nations on Security Council Resolution 2334, which effectively resulted in awarding the entire territory to the Palestinians and treating any Israeli activity in the area as illegal.

American officials argued they needed to make it clear to Israel they were unhappy about the "stepped-up" pace of settlement activity, which represents an obstacle to achieving the two-state solution. The Obama action, forcefully defended by Secretary of State John Kerry (who seems to be contemplating a run for president in 2020), ignored pretty much all the other reasons for the failure. The Palestinians themselves are divided into two political entities, one run by Hamas, the other by the Palestinian Authority. Elections for PA president and parliament have not been held in over a decade. No Palestinian leader has ever been willing to acknowledge that Israel is a Jewish state and that there will be no "right of return" for Palestinians who never lived in or who left Israel and are falsely classified as refugees -- more than 98% of the so-called Palestinian refugees. Only among Palestinians is refugee status conferred to endless descendants of the original refugees. The refugee issue was one of five mentioned by Max Singer in a Wall Street Journal column calling for telling the truth about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The good news for both Israel and the United States is that both leaders and their teams do not have to be schooled on the basics revealed in the article: that Palestinians have never demonstrated a readiness for a real two-state solution, that Israel and the Jewish people have a long unbroken history in the region, including in Jerusalem, where competing claims are hardly equal, and that the West Bank territories are disputed and never belonged to any independent Palestinian government.

Anxious to find some disagreement between the two leaders this week, the major media focused on two things: that the leaders did not agree on settlements, and that Trump had abandoned the commitment to the two-state solution. Trump commented several times that constructing new settlements might make achieving peace more difficult. Netanyahu responded that the two leaders would discuss settlements in private and come to an understanding. Such an understanding is not difficult to contemplate. At its strictest, it would differentiate existing settlements from new ones, and between building housing within existing settlement boundaries and expanding the boundaries to construct new units. If Israel chose to go beyond this, it would be unlikely that America would turn on the venom machine oiled to perfection by the Obama team.

Most importantly, the Trump team made it clear that they do not regard the existence of settlements as an obstacle to peace. This is similar to the policy revealed in the Bush letter, but arguably went further, since while the 2004 letter seemed to refer to settlements close to the Green Line, Trump's statement made no such demarcation. So too the commitment to discuss the issue privately and not to air differences in public was an important step that one would expect among real allies. In the Obama White House, the only thing that seemed to exceed their joy at being able to publicly attack Israel was the anger they could reveal in the condemnation.

The walkaway from the solemn and holy commitment to the two-state solution was the earthquake moment from the joint press conference. After motherhood, apple pie, and steroid-free baseball, the two-state solution is simply something everyone has to endorse, lest they be viewed as giving up on peace, justice for the Palestinians, and the security for Israel as a Jewish majority democratic state. Endorsing this belief system requires ignoring the changing demographics (the now much higher Jewish birthrate and declining Arab birthrate in Israel and the West Bank) and somehow believing that a few touches by some skilled peacemaker are all that is needed to get two states for two people, since everyone knows the contours of the final deal.

The real break is that Trump says the two parties have to make a deal themselves, not agree to one provided to them and pushed down their throats by outsiders. Since they have not done this before, then maybe some options outside the two-state solution may be needed. Maybe what all these outsiders think is wrong, because they are not one of the two parties, and because they are basically lazy about considering options not endorsed by "the international community" and the large fraternity of peace processors. Expecting people who have been paid to say the same thing for decades to actually come up with something original would be an even larger step up.

The Trump team says it is comfortable with something that brings peace. But something short of peace that is not war, something like the current situation, may be all there is for now. That is not because Israel is uninterested in peace. One focus of the talks between the two leaders was pushing back against Iranian aggression in the region, an effort that has united Israel with some Sunni Arab countries. Neither Netanyahu nor Trump spoke at length about this, but broader cooperation between Israel and Arab states could also be positive for Israeli-Palestinian relations. Maybe the Arabs will no longer give a blank check to Palestinian intransigence and terror.

America is beginning to read the riot act to the PA, telling it that it will not get American money while inciting violence against Israel's Jews and using the United Nations as a vehicle for anti-Semitic, anti-Israel poison. At some point, the PA leadership may have to decide if the only purpose of its existence is the elimination of the Jewish state, the position in which it has been stuck for a hundred years. If it is, then Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, will not be able to facilitate peacemaking between the parties.

But this time, the failure would not lead to the predictable condemnations of Israeli settlement activity as preventing peace and the two-state solution, as it has in the past. Unlike those who always blame Israel, the Trump team is not stupid. (Israel Hayom Feb 20)

*The writer is the co-founder and chief political correspondent for the American Thinker and a fellow at the Jewish Policy Center.*

## The Hypocrisy of Jewish Liberals Regarding Antisemitism

By Oriel T. Einhorn

Last week's editorial ("Trump in denial over rising American antisemitism," The Jerusalem Post, February 19) blasted US President Donald Trump for not answering questions regarding antisemitism in America. It claimed that Trump's campaign "Was perceived as a dog whistle for the so-called alt-right and its fellow traveling, dyed-in-the-wool antisemites," raised the fact that Trump omitted specific mention of the six million Jewish victims of the Nazis on International Holocaust Remembrance Day and implied that he is paving the way for the growth of antisemitism in America.

It is trivial, however, to establish that the rise of antisemitism in the US is not attributable to Trump. He has been in office for less than a month now, and even if we factor in his campaign the fact is that antisemitism in the US has been on the rise for many years.

Interestingly, almost by-the-way the editorial gives us a different cause for the rise of antisemitism, without even noticing it:

"Anti-Defamation League CEO Jonathan Greenblatt was one of many who were appalled by the president's response. He told the 'Never Is Now' Summit on Anti-Semitism on Friday that 'over the past few years, we have seen the growth of ugly campaigns on our college campuses, efforts that seek to delegitimize Israel and to reduce the Jewish state into some kind of taboo. This virus has spread and made some of greatest universities hostile to Jewish students and those who support them.'"

So here is Greenblatt saying young Jews are not safe to express their views on campus, that there is hostility toward Jewish students at US universities and this is going on for years. What could have caused this hostility? Is it the alt-right? Is it neo-Nazis protesting against the Jews and Israel? Is it Breitbart or Steve Bannon calling out for the boycott of Jews and their goods? Who is intimidating Jews on US campuses?

The answer is clear: the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement and its Muslim counterparts have raised antisemitism in the US to levels we have not seen since 1930 (ADL's stats).

BDS shuts down debate, boycotts Jewish goods and services in Israel

and is responsible for academic boycotts against Jewish academics living in Israel and Israelis abroad.

In the beginning some people were fooled into thinking BDS was a human rights organization promoting peace in the Middle East, but it quickly became apparent to all that this movement is blatantly antisemitic and has poisoned millennials all over the US.

President of the World Jewish Congress Ron S. Lauder wrote a piece in the Post about BDS ("BDS is the modern form of antisemitism," March 28, 2016) in which he states clearly: "What is BDS? BDS is nothing more than a dangerous new strain of an age-old disease. And that disease is antisemitism"

Rabbi Jonathan Sacks, former chief rabbi of the UK, said: "Antisemitism is a virus that survives by mutating. In the Middle Ages, Jews were hated because of their religion. In the 19th and 20th centuries they were hated because of their race. Today they are hated because of their nation state, Israel. Anti-Zionism is the new anti-Semitism."

The writing was on the wall: demonization of the State of Israel by antisemitic movements masquerading as anti-Zionist, pro-Palestinian groups would give rise to a hydra endangering Jews all over the world.

But the greatest hypocrisy is that it is the Jewish movements that sided with BDS in the beginning and were warned about their affiliation with pro-Palestinian anti-Israel movements that are now crying about the supposed increase in antisemitism under Trump.

J Street claims not to be affiliated with BDS, but at the same time it promotes boycotting specific Jews: "It is critical to maintain the distinction between boycott and divestment efforts which work against the interests of Israel, and initiatives which are limited to opposing the occupation" (J Street website).

There are no halfway measures in the eyes of antisemites. They do not differentiate. Once the anti-Semitic beast is out of the box it does not stop at any red line.

The same J Street is crying about the rise of antisemitism in the US and attributing it to Trump. The hypocrisy is overwhelming.

The Reform Movement, too, is in bed with the anti-settlement movement. Although it opposes BDS entirely and is a strong ally of Israel, what the Reform Movement doesn't understand is that in dealing with antisemitism there is no room for error. Criticizing Israel and the Jews that live in Judea and Samaria will add fuel to the racist fire lit by BDS.

Reform Movement President Rabbi Rick Jacobs sums up his view on the subject: "Many Jewish students on campus believe, as do we, that their love for Israel not only justifies rebutting BDS, but requires them to challenge troubling Israeli policies that fail to live up to the Jewish tradition's highest ideals, and which alienate many who otherwise would more assertively support Israel."

Now let us ask this: when an old-fashioned antisemite sees the condemnation of Jews that arises from the BDS movement, whether out of hate of Israel or, in the case of the Reform Movement, love of Israel, do you think he cares about the distinction? The result is the same: more fuel on the antisemitic fire.

The same Reform Movement is wondering why there has been a rise of antisemitism on campuses; it has the chutzpah to attribute it to Trump and the alt-right, writes a letter banning the appointment of David Friedman as US ambassador to Israel. The antisemites are having a field day. Dear Reform Movement: stop complaining about the rise in antisemitism – you have helped prepare this dish, now you have to eat it.

And to the "alt-left" Jewish movements: don't be surprised about a rise in antisemitism. If you go to bed with dogs you wake up with fleas.

The first response of the alt-left to this article will be "how dare you blame the victim," but in their hearts they understand that they have to recalculate their course. The majority of Americans love Israel as the natural homeland of the Jewish people. It has always been a bipartisan notion hardwired into the character of the great nation of America. The alt-left should stop inciting, sanctioning and targeting Jews of any sort in Israel because it will always come back to haunt Jews in their own country.

Therefore the proper response for the president of the United States is that there is zero tolerance for BDS and other movements on university campuses that single out Jews and their sovereign Jewish state. Any action against the Jews in their homeland will be considered antisemitic and will be dealt harshly, including alt-left Jewish movements that incite boycotts and sanctions. Israel and Jews living there will always be supported by both sides of the aisle. (Jerusalem Post Feb 20)

*The writer is an educator, writer and political commentator who has served as spiritual leader and educator in Israel, Russia, South Africa and Hong Kong. Today he works to educate toward a better future between secular and religious Jews in Israel. He is currently the spiritual leader of the Kfar Shmaryahu community.*