



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*

"leading anti-Semite in America." Farrakhan once called Adolf Hitler "a great man," and recently, he compared Jews to "termites." In August 2016, Hill uploaded onto Instagram a picture of the two smiling together. His caption read, "Been blessed to spend the day with Minister Louis Farrakhan. An amazing time of

Events...

Thursday January 17 at 6:30pm

University of Toronto presents **Professor Efraim Karsh** speaking on "**Back to Basics: Rethinking the Arab-Israeli Conflict**" at **Trinity College's Seeley Hall, 6 Hoskin Avenue, Toronto**. Professor Karsh is Director of the **Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies, Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University and Emeritus Professor of Middle East & Mediterranean Studies of King's College London**.

Commentary...

When Hating Jews Becomes Acceptable By the Far Left

By Robert Horenstein

Talk of anti-Semitism moving from the margins of American society into the mainstream often centers on white nationalism, that is, Jew hatred from the right. One need look no further than the November elections, in which two Holocaust deniers received 56,000 and 43,000 votes in bids to win Congressional seats in Illinois and California, respectively.

Presumably, many registered Republicans who voted for these anti-Semitic candidates were ignorant of their extremism and reflexively chose the candidate with an "R" next to their name.

And at least the Jewish community could take comfort in the fact that from the outset, the Republican Party categorically rejected both candidates, each of whom lost by wide margins.

White nationalists, it would seem for now, are still universally denounced and abhorred by all people of conscience.

On the other hand, there's far too much tolerance for antisemitism on the left, which often masquerades under the cover of anti-Zionism. To make matters worse, it's sometimes abetted by Jews themselves. All of which brings me to the case of Marc Lamont Hill, a professor of media studies and urban education at Temple University in Philadelphia and former CNN political commentator.

In November, Hill was fired by CNN after appearing at a UN event during which he endorsed a political slogan associated with Palestinian extremists calling for Israel's destruction. Speaking at the UN's annual "International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People," Hill called for "action" to "give us what justice requires... a free Palestine from the river to the sea [emphasis added]." He also stated that Palestinians have a right to "resistance" against Israel without specifically ruling out acts of violence and terrorism.

The question isn't whether CNN should have fired Hill; rather, it's this: Why did it take CNN so long to part ways with a contributor with a long history of antisemitism and vitriolic anti-Israel rhetoric?

For years, Hill used his appearances on CNN to portray Israel as a contemptible Apartheid state guilty of committing "ethnic cleansing," a claim he repeated during his UN diatribe. Not surprisingly, he's a staunch supporter of the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement and considers BDS founder Omar Barghouti, who rejects Israel's right to exist, someone "we must stand behind."

In 2015, merely weeks after he tweeted about fighting antisemitism, Hill traveled to the Israeli Arab city of Nazareth, which he insisted was in "Palestine." During the visit, he declared that he had come to a land "stolen by greed," thus reinforcing the ugly anti-Semitic stereotype of greedy Jews.

In October of that year, Hill wrote an opinion piece in the Huffington Post entitled, "Why Every Black Activist Should Stand with Rasmea Odeh." In it, he referred to Odeh, a convicted Palestinian terrorist, as a "venerable woman" and "freedom fighter." As far as Hill is concerned, the murder of two young Israeli Jews in a 1969 bombing planned by Odeh wasn't a horrific crime – it was an act of "justice."

None of these troubling issues was enough for CNN (let alone Temple) to fire Hill. Nor, shockingly, was his close association with Louis Farrakhan, the Nation of Islam founder whom the ADL has called the

learning, listening, laughing."

We Jews aren't laughing. That CNN, which claims to be "the most trusted name in news," could keep Hill under contract for so many years is indicative of a much larger problem.

Whether it's university professors declining to write letters of recommendation for Jewish students applying to study in Israel, progressive social movements barring Jews who refuse to disavow Israel, or a major news network's indulgence toward a contributor's toxic views, left-wing antisemitism has seeped into the mainstream, especially because it can hide behind "acceptable" progressive ideas like anti-Zionism.

What makes this problem even more challenging is the fact that anti-Semites on the left, in contrast to white nationalists, are often defended by radical Jewish groups. The latter flaunt their Jewish identity to shield people like Hill from allegations of antisemitism. Both Jewish Voices for Peace and IfNotNow posted online petitions demanding that CNN reinstate Hill: "Tell CNN that advocating for Palestinian rights isn't anti-Semitic."

True, it isn't. But advocating for the dismantling of the Jewish state, standing in solidarity with a murderer of Jews and supporting Louis Farrakhan all qualify as vile antisemitism. It's irrelevant whether the anti-Semite holds otherwise progressive views. We must make it clear: Anti-Semitism, no matter what form it takes, has no place in civil society.

The writer is Director of Community Relations and Public Affairs at the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland. (Jerusalem Report Jan 4)

The Right Must Unite Before History Repeats Itself

By Boaz Bismuth

Many people attribute what Republicans call "The Eleventh Commandment" to the late U.S. President Ronald Reagan. During his campaign for the governorship of California in 1966, seeking to unify the party ranks, he said: "Thou shalt not speak ill of any fellow Republican."

Two years prior to that statement, Reagan, who would go on to serve as the 40th president of the United States, saw the party's moderate faction lend a hand to the conservative camp's downfall, culminating in Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater losing soundly to Democrat Lyndon Johnson in 1964.

The Republican crash that year also gave the Democrats a two-thirds majority in both houses of Congress. Reagan, who had already set his sights on the White House at the time, followed that election closely and concluded that friendly fire within the party was a primary culprit in Goldwater's trouncing.

During the gubernatorial race, Reagan himself was widely criticized by moderate Republicans in California but he chose, per his custom, to respond with a smile. Beyond his economic and diplomatic legacies, Reagan also left behind a bevy of clever and humorous quotes; among them, as stated, the Eleventh Commandment.

But why go all the way back to the U.S. of the 1960s to see what political infighting can cause. The Israeli lesson from 1992 should be enough. The splinter on the Right that year triggered a seismic political shift and ushered the Oslo Accords into the Middle East. It's safe to assume that former Prime Minister Menachem Begin would have said "Never Again" about this as well.

I was reminded of Reagan and his Eleventh Commandment on Saturday night last week when the two stars of Habayit Hayehudi, ministers Naftali Bennett and Ayelet Shaked, announced the formation of their new party, the New Right. Some believed their press conference was the end of Habayit Hayehudi, while others saw it as a clear expression of intent from the Bennett-Shaked duo about the day after Netanyahu. Still others, meanwhile, were left even more confused by these elections, in which apparently there's more than meets eye; in just the first week since they were declared, two new parties have been established and two others have disintegrated. And this is just the beginning. We must also consider, of course, the attorney general's impending decision on whether to indict the prime minister. Beyond our interest in the timing of his decision and

whether he makes it before or after the elections, there is the decision itself. And the decision itself – one way or another – is extremely significant. Does the attorney general believe the judicial system should be an active player in a people's democratic elections? I doubt it.

I, on the other hand, saw in the Bennett-Shaked press conference the potential damage to the conservative-right camp, which represents the majority of Israelis. (Those who disagree with me can look at the election results in Israel since 1977, and how four years ago the two-state paradigm was no longer part of the elections to the 20th Knesset. You can also read a report published by the Israel Democracy Institute determining that in 2018 people who defined themselves as right-wing accounted for 52% of the voting population. Centrist voters comprised 22% and left-leaning citizens accounted for just 20% of the voting population.)

The last thing right-wing voters want today is division. Bennett sounds like someone who wants a joining of forces on the Right.

Without question, the 2019 election season is off to a confused and confusing start. Existing factions have already fallen apart and others will come together by February 22, when the parties officially submit their lists of candidates. Some things, however, we can already say for certain: The majority of the Israeli public has adopted the conservative, right-leaning ideology. For precisely this reason, the various leaders on the Right must not allow their fight for seats to foment a crisis of ideology. Similar to 1992, history will not forgive us.

Benjamin Netanyahu, like many other Likudniks, wasn't a fan of the move by Bennett and Shaked. He justifiably voiced his concern from Brazil that the New Right would hurt the entire right-wing camp by possibly preventing the national-religious party (Habayit Hayehudi) from reaching the Knesset threshold – effectively flushing good votes down the drain.

Either way, every poll indicates that Israeli citizens see Netanyahu as the most experienced and preferred candidate. Most Israelis also agree with the positions of the right-wing parties, which not only consider Jerusalem the eternal capital of Israel but also refuse to view the two-state solution as a magical remedy to the ills of the Middle East. Polls also indicate that Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked is the most popular among Israelis, and we can assume the reforms she has pushed forward in her ministry have greatly contributed to her approval ratings. What this tells us is that right-leaning voters want to shift the scales of national sovereignty from the judicial branch to the legislative branch.

While the Left today seems more reliant on archaeology than ideology as it seeks to forge something out of nothing, it's imperative for the Right to present a united, common front. Bennett and Shaked's proper place is in the Likud. Likud ministers lambasted them, wondering why they didn't want early elections. Is it possible that someone blocked them from joining the Likud? Regardless, this shouldn't legitimize their attacks on it. Quite the opposite. As Israel Hayom columnist Dror Eydor wrote last week: "The evil spirit of 1992 is seeing a resurgence" ... "which led to a loss of tens of thousands of votes and put the government that passed the Oslo Accords into power." A poll conducted by Israel Hayom last Friday shows that up to 15 mandates on the Right (which also applies to former Defense Minister Avigdor Lieberman's Yisrael Beytenu party) are up in the air because of this splinter.

We have a very heated and unclear election campaign ahead of us. (Almost) nothing should surprise us. Let's hope for a pleasant surprise, such as a merger between the old Right (Likud) and the New Right. And let's also hope to see Habayit Hayehudi accept into its ranks the deep, radical Right.

What Reagan identified in the 1960s, Israel experienced first-hand in the 1990s. If Netanyahu, Bennett and Shaked decide to unite, there's a good chance the bloc will benefit. This isn't a sure thing. But even if they choose otherwise, please, do right by right-wing voters and remember the Eleventh Commandment: "Don't speak ill of your brothers and sisters on the Right." (Israel Hayom Jan 6)

A Window of Opportunity By Uri Heitner

Immediately after the Six-Day War, then-minister Yigal Allon proposed annexing the Golan Heights. A year later, he officially recommended doing so in a letter to the prime minister, seeking to bring the matter to a government vote. Then-Prime Minister Levi Eshkol refused to even discuss the matter.

Eshkol was a champion of settling the Golan Heights. One-third of the communities that have been established on the Golan in the 52 years since its liberation were founded in the first year and a half between the war's end and Eshkol's death, and he was the main driving force behind them. He believed settlement was the correct path to true annexation and worried that just discussing the issue of declaring Israeli sovereignty would turn the United States and the world against us and hurt the settlement effort. The people who went to live on the Golan also believed in this approach. They didn't waste energy over questions about sovereignty; they believed in practical Zionism, in one acre at a time, one plowed furrow after another.

The Camp David Accords served as a wake-up call, when for the first

time in Zionist history Israel's leaders decided to uproot and give back part of the land – the Sinai Peninsula. The new reality hit them in the face. This crisis of ideology impelled the Golan Heights Law of 1981, which applies Israel's government and laws to the territory. Residents of the Golan understood that practical Zionism was not enough and that it needed to be complemented by diplomatic Zionism. Zionism, after all, from its inception, stood on these two pillars.

They launched a public campaign to apply Israeli sovereignty on the Golan; a national campaign culminating in hundreds of thousands of Israeli citizens signing a petition calling for annexation. The two-and-a-half-year struggle bore fruit. On December 14, 1981, then-Prime Minister Menachem Begin presented the Golan Heights Law to the Knesset for approval. From that moment, the Golan Heights became an inseparable part of Israel, for all intents and purposes.

Despite all this, however, five Israeli prime ministers have since negotiated withdrawing from the Golan. The public campaign spearheaded by the communities and supported by the Israeli masses on one hand, and Assad's refusal on the other hand, helped us avert this national calamity. And while the Golan Heights Law wasn't able to prevent negotiations, it did lead to Basic Law: Referendum, which requires popular approval for any withdrawal from Israeli territory.

The U.S. response to the Golan Heights Law was harsh. Then-President Ronald Reagan strongly condemned it and froze the Strategic Cooperation Agreement between the two countries – which Begin, in retaliation, completely annulled. The U.S. initiated a condemnation of Israel in the United Nations Security Council. No country in the world recognized Israeli law on the matter.

In all the years since, Israel has never asked the United States to recognize its sovereignty on the Golan, because such a request never had a chance. The disintegration of Syria changed the picture. In Israel, despite a tiny handful of rejectionists, consensus over the Golan has never been stronger, and even the world has started to understand that an Israeli withdrawal would invite Iran or Islamic State to the shores of the Sea of Galilee. U.S. President Donald Trump, untethered by the dogmas of the Washington establishment, is open to innovative diplomatic initiatives. For the first time, a window of opportunity has opened for American recognition of Israeli sovereignty on the Golan Heights.

(Israel Hayom Jan 9)

The Unreliable Sunni Alliance By Ofir Haivry

In recent weeks, officials in Israel, the United States and the Arab world have been more outspoken about an emerging alliance between Israel and Sunni-Arab countries, welcomed and encouraged by the Americans. Such an alliance is supposedly a counterweight to Iranian expansion; in reality it is a dangerous development with ephemeral, meager benefits at the cost of tangible drawbacks.

Indeed, the Iranian threat toward Israel is growing as Tehran continues spreading its tentacles in Iraq, Syria, Gaza, Lebanon and Yemen. Turkey's Islamism turn under President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has negated it as a potential partner against Iran. As an alternative, officials in Israel and the U.S. are trying to forge an alliance with Sunni-Arab countries, chief among them Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Jordan. But these are weak, unstable regimes, who invest most of their resources in suppressing domestic opposition. An alliance with them is being sold to us as a counterbalance against Iran, but the vision of joining the Sunnis is fundamentally unrealistic. The confluence of interests with them is limited and temporary, not worth the price they will demand, and regardless these Sunni states aren't capable of providing the goods. Even though Israel and the Sunnis agree on the Iranian threat, they have almost no other interests in common. From an economic or military standpoint, they have little to offer us; and from their end, any overt cooperation with Israel is always met with immense public blowback.

Will the Sunnis fight alongside us in a war with Iran, or at the very least openly support us in any way? Of course not; it's far more plausible that under pressure from their "streets" they will converge with our enemy, even if only in appearance. After all, even the "moderate" Sunni regimes still adhere to a pan-Arab ideology that considers Israel a foreign element. They recognize our presence and cooperate in specific areas, but true and full normalization with Israel would controvert the basis of their existence.

Even when Sunni leaders want a relationship with Israel and derive actual benefits from it, they are essentially incapable of openly saying or doing anything on behalf of the "Zionist entity." The Saudi crown prince sees us a lifeline against the Iranian threat, but saying so in Arabic will undermine his rule. In a recent interview, the Egyptian president blurted out a couple sentences about tight security cooperation with Israel and immediately backtracked fearing public backlash. The Jordanian king, who relies heavily on Israel to prop up his weak regime, not to mention stave off a mass water crisis, comes out against us in rhetoric and diplomatic measures whenever the opposition in his country gets stronger.

So if they won't or can't help us, maybe they can avoid actively

hurting us? Here, too, the answer is negative. A Sunni alliance with Israel, even covert and delicate, would exact a hefty price from us in diplomatic concessions, and handcuff us when we need to act militarily in Syria or Gaza – which has already happened. During the Gulf War in 1990, Israel didn't retaliate after Iraqi Scud missiles hit Tel Aviv because it had to preserve Arab support for the United States. The prize we received for this restraint was the Madrid Conference of 1991, where unprecedented pressure was applied against us to make diplomatic concessions. Now, too, there are those who say we must accept the dangerous Saudi peace initiative or make other concessions for the sake of a Sunni alliance.

It's critical that we realize we must contend with the threats around us on our own, and make it clear to our American friends that the Sunni alliance isn't just ineffective but also entirely unreliable. Putting stock in this alliance will only end in buyer's remorse. (Israel Hayom Jan 9)

The Kaubar Murder Chronicles By Nadav Shragai

"The village of Kaubar is shaping its own glory," the PA daily Al-Hayat al-Jadida crowed a year and a half ago after the slaughter of the Salomon family in their home in Halamish. "During the Palestinian people's intifada, Kaubar has produced 15 shahids [martyrs], along with dozens of wounded and hundreds of prisoners."

The capture of Assam Barghouti, who murdered two soldiers in a shooting attack at the Givat Asaf outpost in Samaria, adds another name to the list of killers Kaubar has produced. Barghouti's brother Salah, who wounded seven Israelis in a shooting attack near Ofra in December and was killed in a shootout with Israeli security forces who were trying to arrest him, is also a native of Kaubar. The Ofra shooting wounded, among others, Avichai and Shira Ish-Ran, who was 30 weeks pregnant. Their son, Amiad Yisrael, was delivered in an emergency cesarean section but succumbed to his in-utero injuries a few days later.

Some three weeks ago, Israel Hayom published a long article about Kaubar as a hotbed of terrorism. As far back as October 2011, Kaubar saw great celebrations when four of its native sons were released from prison as part of the exchange deal for captive soldier Gilad Shalit. The prisoners included cousins Nael and Fahri Barghouti, who had served over 30 years in prison. In 1978, they stabbed bus driver Moti Yakuel to death as he was driving Palestinian workers home to Kaubar and other local villages. The cousins were welcomed by Omar Barghouti, Nael's brother, who was also convicted for the murder but had been released as part of the 1985 Jibril Agreement, in which Israel freed over 1,150 security prisoners for three Israelis captured in the First Lebanon War.

Nael Barghouti is Salah and Assam Barghouti's uncle. Another uncle, Jasser Barghouti, also from Kaubar, was given nine life sentences for killing Israeli soldiers. He was released in exchange for Shalit, and he is suspected of having used his familiarity with the people of Kaubar to direct – from the Gaza Strip – the cell responsible for the Ofra and Givat Asaf attacks.

Palestinian leader and murderer Marwan Barghouti, who is currently serving five life sentences in Israel, is also a native of Kaubar, as is Omar al-Abed, who murdered Yossi, Chaya, and Elad Salomon in Halamish in the summer of 2017. So is Muhammad Tarek, who murdered Yotam Ovadia in the Adam settlement.

Kaubar, home to some 4,500 residents, is located in Area B, which is under Israeli security control but Palestinian civil control. The village fields lie next to Area C, which is under full Israeli control. Kaubar has a few schools and four mosques, one of which was built with a donation from the Walsall Kaubar Friendship Association. Walsall is a city of 270,000 that lies northwest of Birmingham, England. In 2007, Walsall and Kaubar became twin cities. Kaubar's sister city doesn't seem particularly bothered by the long list of killers generated by its evil twin. (Israel Hayom Jan 9)

In their Wildest Fantasies By Reuven Berko

The High Court of Justice is set to deliberate in the coming days whether the nation-state law should be changed so that "the right of return" will serve as a counterweight to the Law of Return, thereby allowing the Palestinians to drown Israel in hordes of "refugees" with knowledge of murder and rape that will "return" from the killing fields in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq to realize a peaceful state from the river to the sea. Funnily enough, that river of which they speak is located right here in Israel. While Arab countries maintain a partnership of interests with us against Iran and abandon the Palestinians' illusions of a "return and a Palestinian capital in Jerusalem," the Palestinians can take comfort in the Israel hatred popular in those countries of peace, where they stomp on our flag and defiantly oppose their dictatorial governments.

In the meantime, the Palestinians continue to engage in a collective battle against Israel's survival. In the racist trial of Issam Akel, sentenced to life in prison and heavy labor, the Palestinians declared it forbidden to sell land to Jews.

This is absurd. All the man did was sell the land back to its legal owners. These are properties the Muslims conquered from the Byzantines in 638 C.E. and which were returned to their Jewish owners in 1967. But from the Islamists' point of view, the rights of the owners of these forcibly conquered lands have expired. Now the Palestinian raiders pretend to be the landowners in our country.

Did the descendants of the Arab feudalists from Lebanon, who sold lands to Jews in the 19th century, also put their parents on trial?

The Palestinians are trampling on the verses of the Quran that hold that the Jewish people are the chosen people, the inheritors of the land, who will return from all corners of the earth to their promised land. If the Jewish people have disappeared, as they claim to be the case, was the Prophet Muhammad anything more than a historian? They also trample on Christianity. At the same time as they pride themselves on being the "defenders of Christian sites," they claim the story of the First Temple in Jerusalem is a lie and that it was in fact built by our patriarch Abraham in Yemen. Well, if that is the case, where do they think Jesus, "the first Palestinian victim," spent his time? If there was no Jewish temple in Jerusalem, Jesus must necessarily be a legend.

Against the background of the upcoming elections, the former secretary general of the Balad party, Awad Abdul-Fatah, called on Israeli Arabs not to vote. He said the Israeli Left had been weakened and that the dream of turning Israel into a Palestinian state from the river to the sea through political means had expired. Describing Arab lawmakers in the Knesset as "fig leaves" to an "apartheid state," he called for the creation of a "popular alternative for the liberation of Palestine through the strengthening of the Arab street."

In the morning, the Palestinians contemplate the use of terror, and at night they plot to incite Arab citizens of Israel against the regimes of "betrayal and peace." Their activists, the members of the Joint Arab List, work to sow division and "popular resistance," meaning a mass violent revolt to leverage a Western boycott of Israel, use Israel's autoimmune justice system to weaken the country and enlist its supporters on the Left as agents of influence for the idea of national suicide through the creation of a "Palestinian state from the river to the sea."

The Palestinians repeatedly whisper in the Left's ears that our existence here is only temporary and that the Arab street now rising up will yet have its say. Indeed, the demographics and Palestinian schemes unite our ranks, but only the nation-state law will regulate the threat. The trends of incitement in Israel and Jordan are a warning sign of the illusions that "wolves and sheep will live together in peace" (Isaiah 11:6) and instead lead us to the desired solution, which is that the Gaza Strip should go to Egypt and the current demilitarized Palestinian enclave in Judea and Samaria to Jordan. This will result in a unity of language – Arabic, faith – Islam, a flag – four colors, demographics – mostly Palestinian, and history, as it would be another false invention straight out of the 1916 Sykes-Picot Agreement between France and Britain. Those Israeli Arabs interested in joining them would be more than welcome to do so.

The Palestinians are selling a combination of illusions, historical fiction and Israel hatred. Among Arab states, there are those who are now waking up from the brainwashing they've endured. It is only here in Israel that we continue to cooperate with the fraudulent ploy. (Israel Hayom Jan 6)

BDS Bill Debate is About Anti-Semitism, not Speech

By Jonathan S. Tobin

Is the effort to combat the BDS movement much ado about nothing? Given the abject failure of the campaign to boycott, divest and sanction Israel to harm the economy of the Jewish state or even to get American universities to endorse their efforts, there are those who consider all the fuss made about the issue a mistake. Much of the organized Jewish community has been treating the battle against BDS as a priority. That includes an effort geared towards lobbying state legislatures and now the U.S. Congress to pass laws that prevent those complying with such boycotts from doing business with the government.

Critics see this as a waste of time that gives the BDS camp too much credit and far too much attention. Even worse, some see the push against BDS as doing real damage to the pro-Israel cause since they believe that support for measures that are viewed by some liberals as an attack on free speech is bound to not only fail, but will also help alienate younger Jews. They argue that the focus on BDS is likely to help convince this demographic group, where support for Israel is already faltering, that being pro-Israel is incompatible with being a progressive.

Yet the answer as to why BDS matters is being provided by one of its most prominent advocates: Rep. Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.). Tlaib has been in the news of late as a rookie congresswoman who has been making quite a splash in her first weeks in Washington.

She became a hero to the anti-Trump "resistance" by saying in a speech that she promised, "We're gonna impeach the motherf*%&#*er" when referring to the president. The comment earned her rebukes from

even some mainstream voices for language that lost her party the high ground in the debate about civility. But it endeared her to her party's base, which is hungry for politicians who will wage war on Trump and the Republicans.

The Palestinian American from suburban Detroit also got publicity for the map in her new office that was altered to label Israel as "Palestine." Given her statements opposing a two-state solution to the Middle East conflict, it was hardly a surprise to learn that she favors wiping the Jewish state off the map, literally and figuratively. But her contribution to the debate about anti-BDS laws illustrated the link between BDS and anti-Semitism.

Responding to a tweet by Sen. Bernie Sanders (D-Vt.) opposing the anti-BDS bill on free-speech grounds and because Democrats are against considering any measures not related to ending the current government shutdown, Tlaib unleashed her vitriol on the bill's supporters.

"They forgot what country they represent. This is the U.S. where boycotting is a right & part of our historical fight for freedom & equality. Maybe a refresher on our U.S. Constitution is in order, then get back to opening up our government instead of taking our rights away."

Of course, it's legal to boycott anything you don't like. Just as no one can or should be prevented from speaking out against Israel. Even the most vicious anti-Semitic labels are legally protected when it comes to free speech, provided they aren't linked to violence. But organized commercial boycotts rooted in bias are illegal. BDS is a campaign of discrimination against the one Jewish state on the planet and therefore anti-Semitic by definition.

But in case the obvious link between anti-Semitism and BDS went unnoticed, Tlaib reminded us of this with her dual-loyalty smear by talking about "what country" supporters of the bill are representing.

This invocation of a traditional meme of Jew-hatred—that Jews are not loyal citizens of the countries in which they live—was too much even for some who share her antipathy for Trump. The Jewish Democratic Coalition condemned it as "offensive." The Anti-Defamation League agreed. So did the American Jewish Committee, which rightly pointed out the hypocrisy of someone who has more or less wrapped herself in the Palestinian flag, criticizing supporters of Israel.

The point here is that Tlaib's comments matter for the same reason that BDS is important. BDS is a flop with respect to isolating Israel—a nation with a booming First World economy, and growing ties even in the Arab and Muslim world, as well as in Africa and Asia, places where it was once shunned. But in spite of its lack of success, BDS has lent a measure of false legitimacy to those who would engage in anti-Semitic rhetoric. BDS is worth fighting because its real target isn't Israel, but American Jews and their right to stand up for their beliefs without fear of insult and intimidation.

As we've seen on college campuses, wherever the BDS movement raises its banners, acts of anti-Semitism follow. So it should surprise no one that in a debate about banning discriminatory commercial conduct aimed at Jews and their state, opponents would choose to play the "dual-loyalty" card.

The question now is not the future of the anti-BDS bill. Passage may be stalled by the standoff on the government shutdown. But once that is resolved (something that may not happen for a long time given the unwillingness of Trump and his opponents to compromise), it's likely that the bill may pass with bipartisan support since many Democrats, as well as the Republicans, support it. Indeed, Tlaib may have pushed some Democrats who were wavering into supporting it.

The ensuing issue is whether Tlaib pays any sort of price for her use of anti-Semitic invective. It remains to be seen whether her status, along with her fellow pro-BDS colleague, Somali American Rep. Ilhan Omar (D-Minn.), as a young Democratic rock star and a symbol of the fight against the president is so strong that not even open anti-Semitism will cause the party to avoid censuring and abandoning her. If not, the country will have taken another step towards a partisan abyss of hate that should be deplored, no matter what you think about Trump. (JNS Jan 8)

The Story of Israel and Abbas: Security Cooperation (and Terrorism)

By Hillel Frisch

At one and the same time, the Palestinian Authority (PA) indirectly encourages terrorism while pursuing extensive security cooperation with Israel to quell it. Israel accepts this contradictory framework and will probably continue to do so, even during the succession crisis that is likely to follow PA President Mahmoud Abbas' demise.

Obviously, the Palestinian message praising Majd Jammal Matir's "martyrdom" in a knifing attack that wounded two Israeli border policemen in Jerusalem's Old City on December 13 was little different from many Palestinian messages of condolence and praise for perpetrators of terrorism in the area.

But it contained two crucial details that highlight the tortuous relationship between Mahmoud Abbas, who rules over the PA — with the

help of over 170,000 employees and a budget of \$4.9 billion — and Israel.

The first is that it was the Fatah Movement, over which Abbas presides, that conveyed the message mourning Matir's "martyrdom." The second is that in the expression of condolence, Matir was linked to another "martyr" from the Qalandia refugee camp: General Bashir Nafi. Nafi was a former senior officer in the PA's Military Intelligence unit, one of the many security services that existed under the late Yasser Arafat at the time of his death.

Why make that particular link? After all, the Qalandia refugee camp — a no-man's land between Israeli Jerusalem and the PA — has been home to the highest number of terrorists since the end of Arafat's war of terror. Why single out Nafi among the dozens of terrorists from the Qalandia camp who have been killed since then? It is a particularly curious choice given that Nafi was killed by chance in the Hyatt Hotel bombing in Amman in 2005, an attack committed by an Islamist group that had no connection to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The answer is clear: Fatah, Abbas' political party, wanted to emphasize the link between the PA, Fatah, and its president with "martyrdom" for the Palestinian cause. That relationship will be cemented by the ample funds that will flow to the terrorist's family in the coming years. The PA expends \$300 million annually on terrorists imprisoned in Israel, their families, and the families of dead terrorists like Matir.

Simultaneously, the same PA that encourages "martyrdom" on behalf of the Palestinian cause maintains an almost unprecedented level of security cooperation with Israel to quell the very terrorism that it is encouraging. The PA pursues Hamas and Islamic Jihad terrorists, common enemies to both Abbas and Israel, and disrupts and destroys their front organizations with the same seriousness of purpose as does Israel.

Its 6,000 officers make sure to remain in their barracks and at their stations when the IDF pursues terrorists on the run or makes preventive arrests against those planning terrorist acts. Intelligence flows freely in meetings between senior IDF officers and their Palestinian counterparts in Abbas' security services. Often, such meetings embarrassingly show up in Hamas media, prompting condemnation and derision.

Israelis who mistakenly find themselves in PA-controlled territory, or who intentionally defy the prohibition on doing business in those areas and then find themselves attacked, are often rescued by PA security forces — acts that Hamas propagandists readily exploit to deride the "Dayton" forces, so named to emphasize that they were recreated and retrained by a US army general of that name after they were pummeled in the war the PA waged against Israel in 2000.

Yet the two sides, despite the painful contradictions entailed by the relationship — for Israel, the loss of innocent lives; for the PA, the loss of legitimacy — continue to maintain their close security cooperation, as well as considerable political and functional cooperation.

For Israel, as painful as the ongoing terrorism may be, the situation in Jerusalem and the West Bank over the past decade has been and remains many times better than the standoff between Israel and Hamas-controlled Gaza.

In Gaza, Israel has been involved with Hamas not for security cooperation, but to engage in bouts of war. In the West Bank, Israel is able to go after terrorists and either apprehend or kill them. In Gaza, most of those who launch missiles either run for cover in tunnels, take refuge in nearby apartment buildings, or launch the missiles from underground silos. In the West Bank, a company (100 men) is usually the highest number of soldiers required to chase terrorists or make preventive arrests. In the last bout in Gaza, Israel called up tens of thousands of reserves, and deployed hundreds of tanks and dozens of F-16s. That massed firepower inflicted some deterrent pain, but hardly made more than a dent in the Hamas infrastructure.

For the PA, the stakes of not playing ball with Israel are high. Israel carries by far the heavier burden in terms of draining the large Hamas swamp in PA territory. Without Israeli bayonets, the PA could face defeat, as it did in 2007 when it lost Gaza, or even a prolonged civil war. It needs Israel.

Only one event — an inevitable one — will change the status quo: the death of Abbas.

A minority of voices among Israel's decision-makers say that Israel should not intervene in the succession crisis. They argue that the costs of possible chaos or disintegration into warlord areas will be offset by the benefits of such a major blow to the Palestinian political cause of achieving statehood, either alongside Israel or as its replacement.

The more bureaucratic-oriented majority favors intervening to help the PA continue to exist, despite the contradictions. Better the devil we know, they reason.

One thing is for sure: The campaign that Israel's left wages "to separate from the Palestinians" is a pipe dream. A Labor-led government will face the same dilemmas and act scarcely any differently from the present government. (Algemeiner Jan 8)
