

8 Nissan, 5779  
April 13, 2019

News Reports and Commentary  
*Israel and the Jewish World*  
Published by the TORONTO ZIONIST COUNCIL  
Tel: 416 781-3571 e-mail: tzc@torzc.org  
More news: [www.aftershabbat.com](http://www.aftershabbat.com) Founding Editor: Yossi Winter

ב"ה שבת שלום  
פרשת מצורע

## Moving Forward

### Netanyahu Delivers for Israel,

**Israel Delivers for Netanyahu**  
Dovid Efuné  
After general elections in Israel on Tuesday, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is now headed for a historic fifth term.

It's a strong victory for Netanyahu in more ways than one. The veteran leader is now set to govern the Jewish state for longer than any other previous prime minister, including Israel's founding father David Ben-Gurion.

While Netanyahu's Likud party came in only one seat ahead of rival Benny Gantz's Blue and White party with 36 seats in Israel's 120 seat Knesset, the result marks a 6 seat increase from the 30 seats he held in the outgoing government. Together with his traditional allies in the right-religious bloc, he's set to form a ruling coalition with a comfortable 65 seat majority.

Also to Netanyahu's advantage is the failure of two of his leading rivals on his right flank to pass the electoral threshold of 3.25% of the vote. The first, Moshe Feiglin of the Zehut party, once challenged Netanyahu for leadership of Likud. His strong performance in polls had pundits expecting him to play the role of kingmaker in coalition politics.

More surprising is the collapse of the New Right party headed by Education Minister Naftali Bennett and Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked. Both are previous Netanyahu aides who often served as vocal critics, even while sitting in the prime minister's third and fourth governments.

Netanyahu's ploy to bring the ultra-nationalist Otzma Yehudit party and its voters into the fold via a merger with the religious-right Jewish Home party also paid off. The combined Union of Right-Wing Parties won 5 seats in the election. His traditional allies in the Shas and Yahadut HaTorah religious parties also increased their Knesset representation to 8 and 7 seats respectively.

For Netanyahu's critics, the results, and the likely makeup of the new government, will be presented as affirmation of what they have long suspected or at least claimed, that Israel's rapid descent into authoritarianism is gaining pace. Even on the heels of a hard fought democratic election, one Ha'aretz columnist went so far as to call Netanyahu's Israel a "dictatorship."

What the results really affirm, however, is that in Israel's vibrant democracy the power remains firmly in the hands of the people. No amount of handwringing from media pundits or US Democratic presidential candidates could get the Israeli public to drop either Netanyahu or their elevation of national security above all other issues.

Netanyahu's opponents attacked his character, highlighted the alleged but thin graft cases against him, accused him of divisiveness and even racism. They said it was time for change, but ultimately Netanyahu's years of steadily navigating through a slew of complex security challenges as well as notable diplomatic achievements proved decisive.

He's long spoken of the dangers of territorial concessions in exchange for peace. The land-for-peace formula is one many Israelis today see as simply impractical. He anticipated the long cold "winter" that has followed the Arab spring. He's kept awareness of the Iranian nuclear threat at the fore, advocating uncompromising policies on the word stage. He's revolutionized Israel's cyber security sector, and added F-35s and Dolphin-class nuclear powered submarines to Israel's military portfolio.

Above all have been Netanyahu's diplomatic achievements. He's shepherded Israel into the community of nations as a valued and respected partner, with the Jewish state's ties blossoming on

every continent. He's expanded ties with India, China, Brazil and Japan. He's made historic visits to Australia, Singapore, South America and Africa. In Eastern Europe, Hungary, Romania, Poland, Austria and the Czech Republic have all sought stronger ties with Jerusalem. With Vladimir Putin's Russia he's established a respectful dialogue and a practical operational alignment.



### The Silent Intifada

*Rocks and other objects were thrown at Israeli vehicles in 84 incidents in the last 14 days. In one incident a hammer smashed the car's front window breaking the driver's hand.*

*14 firebombs, 2 stabbing attempts and 2 shooting incidents took place against Jews of Judea and Samaria in 2 weeks' time, making it a total of 603 terror attacks from the beginning of 2019.*

[boomerangfight.com](http://boomerangfight.com)

*Is misery and wretchedness the only explanation for the Arab Palestinian's terrorism?*

*Is Israel the guilty partner that should be held accountable for .... for what?*

*Take a tour on the ground, drive the roads and visit the town of Judea and Samaria with BoomerangFight.*

BoomerangFight video for March 29- April 11

[www.AfterShabbat.com](http://www.AfterShabbat.com)

then scroll down for the March 21 – 28 report

After years of holding President Obama's designs for the Jewish state at bay, Netanyahu has delivered a slew of concrete victories for Israeli diplomacy through the warm ties he's developed with President Trump. These include US recognition of the Golan Heights as Israeli territory and Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. There's the diminished US funding for UNRWA and the Palestinian Authority, vocal opposition to Palestinian terror payments and the forthright advocacy for Israel at the United Nations.

It was these achievements that served as a central theme to Netanyahu's reelection campaign. Giant billboards and flashy ad segments featured Netanyahu alongside other leading international figures with the slogan, "Netanyahu. In another league."

For a nation that has so often stood alone, the prospect of continued momentum for Israel in the strongest diplomatic trajectory in its history proved just too alluring for voters to pass up on a fifth Netanyahu term.

Netanyahu's challenge in his next term will be managing expectations when the US rolls out its long awaited peace initiative. Perhaps he'll be tempted to return the favor to President Trump, facing his own re-election, and try to somehow make a breakthrough peace deal work.

It will, however, be important for US negotiators to

be cognizant of the new political reality. Israel has moved on from the failed old paradigms for peace discussions and its prime minister will be in a stronger position having the electoral backing of the voters — a rare distinction for any Middle East leader.

Dovid Efuné is the editor-in-chief and CEO of The Algemeiner

### Netanyahu's Fifth Mandate:

#### Boaz Bismuth A Condemnation of Elitism

And it's happening again: the pundits and the pollsters predict an end to the era of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu; the exit polls come out; and his rivals rush to make victory speeches, which a few hours later become history (how embarrassing.) And then, as former England soccer player Gary Lineker once said, "22 men chase a ball for 90 minutes and at the end, the Germans always win." That's how our Israeli politics operate: once every few years, parties run in an election, and in the end, Netanyahu always wins.

Israel is a flourishing Jewish, democratic state that aspires to make it to the moon. But strangely, the same people who are concerned about its democratic character repeatedly find it difficult to accept the will of the people. Need we remember the words of Laborite Yitzhak Ben-Aharon, after the upheaval of 1977? By the way, what happened this week for the umpteenth time also happened in the U.S. in the 2016 presidential election, which proves that sometimes we can do things before the Americans do.

The Israeli people are not masochists. They aren't stupid, and they certainly aren't a nation of primitives, as a formerly close friend, a doctor, wrote me a few days before the election. Her message made me very sad, because it proved that we haven't learned anything and that elitism is still widespread in our society. Those same elites find it hard, even in 2019, to accept the fact that they have lost power and cling to investigations and Israel's imaginary racism to excuse their entrenched opposition to Netanyahu. And how their hypocrisy has grown since the last election — all of a sudden, they miss Menachem Begin. I was a kid then, but I remember very well what they did to Begin back in the day.

The Left woke up battered and bruised, and that's a shame. The Labor party, which when I was a child was bigger than any other party, turned into a footnote, whereas Meretz barely made it over the minimum electoral threshold. They are both important parties in Israeli politics, which contributed a thing or two to the state and to the public discourse. But these Zionist parties went astray. And here's the problem: when the 20th Knesset passed the important nation-state law, which had the support of the vast majority of the people, the Left objected to it, arguing that it was racist because it did not include a clause spelling out equality for all citizens. It was obvious to most of the public that equality had no place in the law because this is not a country for all its citizens, but rather the Jewish state.

That is how the Left gave the Right another great boon, which is exactly what happens when the Left is frightened of every kippa it sees within five minutes of Jerusalem or Bnei Brak and labels it as proof of dangerous "religionification."

It's very hard not to see what underlies left-wing voting, or maybe what doesn't. While the Right presents many great achievements along with a consistent, well-ordered platform, the Left gets swept up in protest-voting for a party that has intentionally kept its policies obfuscated. The only clear message was "Anyone but Bibi." But in a difficult and complicated reality like ours, that hasn't been enough for quite some time.

No one in Israel has a monopoly on either peace or security and defense. Israel Hayom journalist Aviad Pohoryles grew up on the same floor in the same building I did on Kedoshei Kahir Street in Holon. He admired Shimon Peres, whereas I admired Begin.

Who would have believed that the “Arab-loving” Peres would be remembered as the man responsible for Israel’s Dimona reactor, and Begin the “warmonger” would be remembered for making peace with Egypt? Right and Left, Left and Right – both have contributed much to our wonderful country. I’m not sure that the Right is the one who veered off its path. Sovereignty in Judea and Samaria isn’t a four-letter word, and most of the people are excited to visit united Jerusalem. The Israeli public doesn’t hate Arabs; it hates enemies. And that’s natural.

While radio and TV programs never stop telling us how bad things are here, how difficult and extremist, the citizens of Israel have to pinch themselves to believe that they have the privilege of living in the land of their ancestors under Jewish sovereignty. The Left fails to grasp that basic fact, as does the media. There are days when we can be thankful that our status in the world has reached an all-time high, and that those who oppose us – like the European Union or the Arab world – are recalculating.

In a little more than three months, Benjamin Netanyahu will surpass David Ben-Gurion to become Israel’s longest-serving prime minister. A reminder – from the first day he was elected, for over 20 years, the Israeli media has held him in contempt, turned his life inside out, and persecuted him daily.

The Tehran-like media, like priests during the Inquisition, decides what is good and right for all of us.

But it turns out that the Israeli people have their own solid base of ideology and values, and they won’t give them up easily. The fact that Netanyahu is about to break the record for time as prime minister – writing his fifth symphony despite everything, and maybe because of everything – is an outstanding, inconceivable achievement that goes against all reason. That says something about the Israeli media, but also about us.

You wanted a Jewish, democratic country? A Jewish, democratic country is what you got!

## “Everyone Knows”...

### but Everyone’s Wrong

Victor Rosenthal

I don’t know how many times I’ve seen Judea and Samaria referred to as “occupied Palestinian territories,” and Jewish settlements there called “illegal under international law.” But the territories are not “Palestinian,” they are not “occupied,” Jewish communities there are not illegal, and Israel is not oppressing millions of Palestinians who also live there.

PM Netanyahu’s promise to extend Israeli sovereignty to the settlements – and not, by the way, “to annex the West Bank” as so many headlines have it – has re-ignited debate about these issues. But nothing’s changed. Here are some popular but false statements about Judea/Samaria and the Jewish communities that have been established there:

The “West Bank” is “Palestinian land” which Israel is occupying

Judea and Samaria, like the rest of Israel and Jordan, were part of the Ottoman Empire from the 16th Century until the end of WWI. After the war, the League of Nations agreed to set aside this portion of the former Ottoman territory to be held in trust by Britain to become a national home for the Jewish people. Britain gave the eastern portion to Abdullah bin Hussein as a reward for his help and that of his father, Sharif Hussein of Hejaz, in the war; this would ultimately become Jordan. The land between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean, including what would become the State of Israel and Judea/Samaria and Gaza became the Mandate for Palestine.

The Arabs living in the Mandate were strongly opposed to Jewish sovereignty, and the British, from a combination of the desire to appease the Arabs to reduce their violence (which expressed itself against both Jews and the British rulers), the desire to keep “Palestine” under their control for strategic purposes, and sheer antisemitism, abandoned their responsibility to the Jewish people and tried to throttle Jewish immigration, while allowing Arabs from surrounding areas to enter.

In November 1947, the UN – which had assumed the obligations of the League of Nations – passed a resolution (UNGA 181) recommending the partition of the Mandate into a Jewish and Arab state. The Palestinian Jews were prepared to accept a truncated state (it would be the second truncation of the land

originally set aside for the Jews), but the Palestinian Arabs and the Arab nations wanted all the territory to be under Arab sovereignty, and rejected the resolution.

It is important to note two things: first, the resolution, because it was passed by the General Assembly and not by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, was advisory, not mandatory. And second, because the recommendations were never implemented, they became moot.

The British, exhausted after WWII and tired of the attacks against their occupation forces by both Jews and Arabs, ended the Mandate in May, 1948, and went home. The Jews, who had used the Mandate period to build all the institutions required for a state – an army, an educational system, a labor federation, various state enterprises, and more – declared the State of Israel in the area assigned to them by the partition resolution. The Arabs, who could have done the same, did not do so. They redoubled their violent attacks on Jews. At the same time, the armies of five Arab nations invaded the area, intending to destroy the new state of Israel and take the land for themselves (and not to establish a state for the Palestinian Arabs!)

The war that followed ended with a cease-fire in 1949. The Arab nations would not agree to make a permanent peace or recognize the Jewish state, but they signed cease-fire agreements that demarcated the positions of their troops. These agreements explicitly stipulated that the cease-fire lines were not national borders. The areas of Judea/Samaria and Gaza were occupied by Jordan and Egypt respectively, and in 1950 Jordan formally annexed the territory it had occupied and named it the “West Bank.” This is the first time that name was used to refer to what had previously been called “Judea and Samaria.”

The Arab invasion clearly violated the UN Charter, being a “use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence” of the State of Israel, and therefore the annexation of Judea and Samaria was also illegal. Only Britain (and possibly Pakistan) recognized it. During the war and afterwards, Jordan regularly committed war crimes, violating the Geneva Conventions by ethnically cleansing the Jewish population from the territories they occupied, destroying Jewish synagogues and cemeteries, and not allowing access to Jewish and Christian holy sites during the entire 19-year occupation.

In 1967 the Arabs again planned to destroy Israel, and some Arab leaders even made genocidal statements. Although it is true that Israel fired the first shots, it is generally accepted that this was a case of legitimate military preemption of an imminent attack, and that Israel’s actions were justified self-defense. The war ended with Israel in possession of Judea and Samaria, as well as Gaza.

The argument is made that the UN charter forbids acquisition of territory by force. That is not correct. It says that

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations. (Art. 2, Sec. 4)

But it also says that.

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. ... (Art. 51)

If Israel’s actions in 1967 were legal, what is the status of Judea and Samaria? Many people say that it is a “belligerent occupation.” If so, it would still be entirely legal, just as the allied occupation of Germany after WWII was legal. But if it is an occupation, whose territory is being occupied? Not Jordan’s, whose possession of it was illegal from the start!

The last entity in legitimate possession of Judea/Samaria was the British Mandate, which no longer exists. But the only national entity that could reasonably have been considered the inheritor of the Mandate’s boundaries is the State of Israel. Given also that the Mandate was intended for the purpose of establishing a national home for the Jewish people, and considering the well-documented claim of the Jewish people to be the aboriginal inhabitants of the

land, it is reasonable to see the events of 1967 as the liberation of territory that was illegally occupied, and its return to the legitimate owner, Israel.

In 1988, King Hussein of Jordan relinquished his claim to Judea and Samaria, in favor of the PLO. But since Jordan had no legitimate rights to the territory to begin with, the gesture was meaningless.

It is true that the Palestinian Arabs wish to possess Judea and Samaria (not to mention Haifa and Tel Aviv), and there are numerous members of the UN that agree with them for religious, cultural, economic, and yes – antisemitic – reasons. But wishing will not make the 1949 armistice lines a border, and wishing will not make Palestinian Arabs the legitimate heirs of the British Mandate, nor – despite their creative approach to history – the aboriginal inhabitants of the Land of Israel.

Settlements are illegal under international law

This is a favorite of many news media and European governments, who feel a compulsion to add “which are illegal under international law” after any mention of Israeli settlements. But even if you accept (as I do not) that Israel’s possession of Judea and Samaria constitutes belligerent occupation, the usual argument that settlements constitute a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention provision against population transfer into an occupied territory is very weak. This protocol was established after WWII with the intent of criminalizing actions such as Germany’s deportation of its Jewish residents to occupied Poland, and not to prohibit voluntary settlement on public lands (a more complete treatment of this subject is here). It should be noted that there have been additions made (e.g., the 1977 “Additional Protocol I”) to the Geneva convention specifically aimed at Israeli policy, but Israel and other nations, including the US, have not ratified them.

Israel is oppressing millions of Palestinians in Judea and Samaria

When Israel and the PLO signed the Oslo Accords in 1993-5, they agreed to divide Judea and Samaria into Areas A, B and C. Area A was under Palestinian security control and civil control, Area B (much smaller) under Palestinian civil control and Israeli security control, and Area C under full Israeli control. Area C contains all Jewish settlements. More than 95% of the Palestinian population lives in areas A and B, where they are governed by the Palestinian Authority (PA). While it is true that Israel’s security forces reserve the right to enter area A to arrest wanted terrorists, Palestinians have civil and political rights granted by the Palestinian Authority to vote and hold political office. There are Palestinian courts and Palestinian police, Palestinian ministries of health, finance, labor, etc. It’s hardly fair to blame Israel for the fact that the PA is corrupt and dictatorial, and hasn’t held an election for years.

Conclusion

PM Netanyahu’s decision to extend Israeli law to the settlements in Area C would not have any effect whatever on Palestinians living under the control of the Palestinian authority, and it does not change the status of the territories in which they are located. Israel will never abandon Judea and Samaria entirely, although it is possible that some part of them could become an autonomous Palestinian entity. But – for security, if for no other reason – Israel could never agree to a sovereign Arab state west of the Jordan, nor could it agree to the kind of massive withdrawal and dismantling of settlements that was envisioned in the Obama period. So the idea that “Netanyahu has killed the two-state solution” is silly. The two-state solution was never alive because of simple geostrategic facts.

Isn’t it nice that international law agrees.

abuyehuda.com

## Restoring Jewish Sovereignty

Martin Sherman

*I am going to extend sovereignty and I don’t distinguish between settlement blocs and the isolated settlements...From my perspective, any point of settlement is Israeli, and we have responsibility, as the Israeli government. I will not uproot anyone, and I will not transfer sovereignty to the Palestinians.*

- Benjamin Netanyahu, Channel 12, April 6, 2019.

In a significant departure from his usual ambivalent and non-committal policy formulation regarding the final status of the territories of Judea-Samaria (a.k.a. “West Bank”), Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu came out with an unexpectedly robust and

unequivocal statement of intent just a few days prior to the April 9 election.

Last Saturday, Channel 12 interviewer, Rina Matzliah, fired an almost taunting question at Netanyahu, asking him why, given the fact that he had a largely compliant government domestically, and a firmly supportive administration in Washington, he had not done more to extend Israeli sovereignty over Judea-Samaria. In response, the Prime Minister announced that that was precisely what he intended to—if reelected in the elections that were due to be held the following Tuesday.

### **Two-states increasingly unfeasible**

Since the interview, the election results have come in, making it almost certain that Netanyahu will continue as prime minister and be tasked by the president to form the next government—putting him in a position to fulfill his pledge.

Nonetheless, while the election results gave an unambiguous victory to Netanyahu and the “Right-wing” block, it is still anyone’s guess as to how sincere he was in his statement of intention and how serious he will be about implementing it in practice.

Be that as it may, even at this early stage several issues are already clear.

The prospect of any measure entailing the transfer of large tracts of Judea-Samaria to Palestinian-Arab control is becoming increasingly unfeasible. Indeed, as Netanyahu pointed out in his interview, the likely outcome of such an initiative would be the creation of a mega-Gaza—twenty times the scale of what has developed in the South.

Accordingly, there appears to be growing awareness of the dangers entailed in any such policy—especially over time. After all, even if some “genuine Palestinian-Arab peace partner” could be identified as having sufficient pliancy to accommodate Israel’s minimal security concerns, and sufficient authority to enforce an agreement acceptable to Israel on a recalcitrant public, there is no guarantee that his hold on power could be ensured for long. Clearly, once Israel relinquishes control over territory, it cannot determine who will seize the reins of power—as the 2007 Islamist take-over of Gaza starkly underscores—and the pliant peace partner could be replaced—by the ballot or the bullet—by a more inimical successor...precisely because of the “perfidious” deal he cut with the infidel “Zionist entity”.

### **Lethargic support for sovereignty in new coalition?**

But the election results also embody another message for the advocates of Jewish sovereignty. For they underscore just how tenuous relying on elected politicians to promote and implement any initiative for the extension of Jewish sovereignty across the 1967 Green Line can be.

For despite an ostensibly robust showing by the “Right”, when one examines the composition of the emerging coalition, the only strong advocate for extending sovereignty is the “United Right”, an amalgam of three factions, widely considered to be “ultra-right” religious Zionist parties, with four parliamentary seats. At the time of submitting this piece, neither the New Right (advocating extending Israeli sovereignty to Area C), nor Zehut (advocating Israeli sovereignty over all of Judea-Samaria) passed the minimal thresholds for election to the Knesset. So whatever the overall reason was for their poor performance, both these parties clearly failed utterly in rallying wide-spread popular support for the idea of extended sovereignty—whether partial or otherwise.

Moreover, none of the other prospective coalition partners can be said to be avid advocates of sovereignty—whether the ultra-Orthodox parties, Shas and United Torah; the Kulanu faction, headed by former Finance Minister, Moshe Kahlon; or even Yisrael Beiteinu headed by former Defense Minister, Avigdor Liberman—who despite his bellicose rhetoric towards both the Palestinian and Israeli-Arabs has in fact expressed support for the two-state principle.

### **The need to generate greater public support**

Accordingly, if the call for extending Israeli sovereignty over Judea-Samaria is not to be seen as a concept that is embraced almost exclusively by the religious right, strenuous efforts must be made to advance its legitimacy in the non-observant quarters of Israeli society.

For if this is not accomplished, it is likely to be dismissed as no more than a tenet of a radical

religious credo, with little chance of it being adopted as a legitimate political objective by wider circles with the Israeli polity or society at large, beyond the ranks of the religious Zionist sector.

This is a consideration of utmost importance for sovereignty advocates. For given Netanyahu’s hitherto reticence in advancing the principle, it is not implausible to surmise that unless considerable pressure is exerted on him, he may, despite his impressive electoral success, be loathe to advance the issue of extended sovereignty with sufficient vigor to take full advantage of the clement climes in Washington—which cannot be counted on indefinitely.

There are three potential sources of pressure on Netanyahu.

The first is from within the Likud itself—where a good number of Knesset members and ministers support extending sovereignty to some degree or other. However, given Netanyahu’s intra-party dominance, it is unlikely that pressures from within the Likud will be sufficient to compel him to undertake far-reaching initiatives, which he is reluctant to adopt.

### **The need to generate greater public support (cont.)**

The second is from his coalition partners, but as pointed out previously, apart from the United Right with only 4 seats, sovereignty has not been a central issue for the remainder of the coalition members, who are unlikely to make this a cardinal condition for their continued support of Netanyahu, should he balk at honoring his pledge.

The third—and most important, but sadly, the most neglected—source of pressure is from the public. It is here that “Right-wing” benefactors in general, and sovereignty supporters in particular, have been especially remiss.

In previous INTO THE FRAY columns, I have been at pains to point out that whoever controls the political discourse controls the political decision makers’ perception of the possible alternatives open to them and the unavoidable constraints confronting them. Accordingly, by controlling these perceptions, whoever controls the political discourse controls the political decision making process.

It is precisely here that “Right-wing” benefactors have misread the ideo-political battlefield—see Failed Philanthropy; and Like a Man in a Bucket: Failed Philanthropy (Cont.) . For as I have pointed out in these and other columns, whereas “Left-wing” benefactors have funded frameworks and mechanisms to advance political agendas, “Right-wing” benefactors have channeled support largely to causes more concrete and tangible in nature.

Accordingly, by focusing on the concrete rather than on the conceptual, “Right-wing” benefactors have allowed the “Left-wing” to hijack the discourse and acquire influence on the political decision making process—and hence on policy formulation—far beyond its electoral success at the polls – see The Limousine Theory: Understanding Politics in Israel-How It Works And Why It Doesn’t .

### **Learning the “Oslo Lesson”**

Indeed, the “Right-wing” can learn much from the modus operandi of the “Left”.

After all, at the beginning of the 1990s, advancing the notion of Palestinian statehood was considered borderline sedition. Contacts with Yasser Arafat’s PLO were an offense punishable—and punished—by imprisonment. Yet, undeterred, the Left persisted—and because it was resolute in its aim, resourceful in its pursuit, and successful in raising resources, it managed to convert an idea, that was not only marginal and marginalized, not only illegitimate, but illegal, into the principle political paradigm that dominated the discourse for decades.

Indeed, in this regard, it is important to recall that the Oslo Accords, which essentially catapulted the pursuit of Palestinian statehood from being an act of treason to the internationally acclaimed centerpiece of Israeli foreign policy, were not born in the political system or created by incumbent politicians. They were born in Israel’s civil society and created by unselected civil society elites, who then imposed their agenda on the—often reluctant—elected incumbents.

There is an important lesson here for the advocates of extended sovereignty.

The key to implementing Netanyahu’s pledge to extend Israeli sovereignty to Judea-Samaria may not lie in direct efforts to persuade elected politicians to embrace it, but by investing resources in dominating

the public discourse so as to mold decision-makers’ perceptions of what can be done and what must be avoided.

This then, should be the most urgent post-election priority for sovereignty advocates and their benefactors—especially in light of the looming specter of the Trump “deal of the century”, rumored to include demands for significant Israeli concessions:

Intensive investment of resources in civil society ideo-intellectual frameworks and mechanisms, that can not only draw the idea of extended Israeli sovereignty into the mainstream discourse as a legitimate political objective, and as one with the potential to dominate that discourse.

That is the most reliable, hands-on approach to restoring Jewish sovereignty to the heart of the Jewish homeland.

Martin Sherman is the founder and executive director of the Israel Institute for Strategic Studies.

[As we read above, many arguments have been made since June 1967 for Israel retaining territories originally designated to be part of the Jewish State and not under Israeli rule until The Six Day War. Similarly, much ink has been expended to discuss Israeli sovereignty in the Golan in the context of the Trump administrations “special” relationship with Israel. That is probably the last reason for recognition of Israeli sovereignty in the Golan. Most of these discussions ignore the most likely reason the US needs to recognize Israeli sovereignty in the Golan – Iran in Syria, just as Israeli presence in Judea and Samaria addresses the violent nature of elements in that society and serves US, Jordanian (big time), Egyptian, even Syrian interests through stability. This is a factor most Israelis and Jews forget as they stress over who will be most upset if Israel deigns to do what is right. Iran understands that well .... -ed]

## **Iran Tries to Make IRGC Terrorist Designation About Israel**

Seth Frantzman

The media experts who help assist Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif decided that the best narrative for Iran, in the wake of the US designating the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization, was to blame Israel. Blaming Israel and Netanyahu specifically for the listing has now been Zarif’s main talking point within the last day.

This is part of a larger Iranian regime narrative that sought to link the IRGC listing to US support for Israel, trying to play into western criticism of Israel by pretending that the IRGC issue is solely an Israel issue, as opposed to linking it to the wider US-Iran tensions in the region.

Zarif tweeted that the IRGC listing announced on Monday was “another misguided election-eve gift to Netanyahu. Another dangerous US misadventure in the region.” This seeks to paint the US administration as not only beholden to Israel, but particularly to Netanyahu. Zarif and his advisors know that in the US and the West there is criticism of Netanyahu and especially the Trump-Netanyahu relationship. This seeks to tap into recent controversies in the US painting the US policies or officials as being “loyal” to a foreign power and doing Israel’s bidding. This kind of undercurrent of antisemitism has sought to imply that US policy is guided by Israel. This whisper campaign has gone on for decades, but it gained strength during the Bush era when the US was accused of going to war in Iraq to help Israel.

Even though these conspiracies are inaccurate, they have a hold over commentators and even some policymakers and former officials in the US and West. For instance Valerie Plame, a former CIA agent, tweeted a link to an article from September 2017 titled ‘America’s Jews are driving America’s wars.’ More recently Congresswoman Ilhan Omar has come under criticism for arguing that some think it is “okay to push for allegiance to a foreign country,” implying that some in the US have allegiance to Israel. Other commentaries seek to paint the Trump administration as particularly beholden to Netanyahu, even claiming the decision to recognize the Golan was timed to coincide with Israel’s elections.

The Iran regime narrative today seeks to fuel this debate in the US and the West by spreading these stories in English language tweets and media. For instance in Farsi on Iranian media websites such as

Tasnim, there is no mention of Israel on April 9. But Press TV, the English language Iranian channel, has two articles focusing on Israel and the IRGC decision. One looks at Palestinian groups slamming the IRGC decision while the other argues that the designation "stems from the US and Israeli regime's anger over the elite military force's power and success in foiling their plots in the region."

Following in Zarif's footsteps, Defense Minister Amir Hatami praised the IRGC and condemned the US and "the Zionist regime." Ayatollah Khamenei, speaking in Farsi and less interested in messaging to a western audience, made a more clear argument in favor of the IRGC, noting that it had aided in the fight in Syria to support the Syrian government and that for this reason the US holds a "grudge." Khamenei's argument was more reasonable, linking US opposition to the IRGC to a regional struggle between the US and Iran and their proxies and allies.

It is clear that Iran has sought out English media to single out Israel after the IRGC decision. For instance Zarif tweeted a second time with a screenshot of Israeli elections and a headline claiming that Trump labeled the IRGC a terrorist group at Netanyahu's request. "QED," tweeted Zarif, initials of a Latin phrase that are used to show that something you argued was correct. Zarif is trying to show off. He has also called the push for the designation a role of the "Netanyahu Firsters" who pushed for this regardless of "consequences for US forces in the region. They seek to drag US into a quagmire in his [Netanyahu's] behalf."

Zarif is being smart and tactful here, trying to create daylight between Netanyahu, Trump and Americans, by asserting that a conspiracy guides US foreign policy, as opposed to the IRGC listing being in US interests. For instance there is no recognition that Iran has targeted US troops in Iraq over the last two decades or that the IRGC has engaged in other activities. Instead, it is positioned as solely an Israel issue.

Hamas also thinks it is an Israel issue, phoning Zarif, according to Hamas statements, to "commiserate" with Iran. Zarif, of course, did not mention that he received this Hamas phone call, nor that Iran has been deeply involved in supporting Hamas and other Palestinian groups.

Seth Frantzman is The Jerusalem Post's op-ed editor, a Writing Fellow at the Middle East Forum, and a founder of the Middle East Center for Reporting and Analysis.

## Thank You Nitsana

Ronn Torossian

Airbnb has reversed their biased decision to not allow Jewish listings in Judea & Samaria.

This didn't happen in a vacuum. It happened because Shurat HaDin – The Israel Law Center – headed by Nitsana Darshan Leitner once again took action. The legal team there brought legal action and then negotiated a settlement agreement to repeal the discriminatory policy, thereby resolving the civil action in favor of her clients.

While I don't know anything about the back and forth or the legalities, a group of American Jews filed a civil rights lawsuit against Airbnb in the United States Federal District Court – and the huge company bent and gave in. As a result, the property owners (Jewish Israelis) don't suffer any losses due to this discriminatory policy.

As the American attorney for the organization said, "Imagine if Airbnb had decided not to service Muslim homes in Oakland because they opposed growth of the Muslim community there. Nobody would tolerate that for a minute. Yet that is exactly what Airbnb's policy was for Jews in the Judea and Samaria region. As a provider of a service to the public, Airbnb is not permitted to refuse to provide services to selected religious group to engineer who it thinks should be allowed to live where. We are gratified that the legal process has worked and that as a result of the case we filed Airbnb came to recognize the mistake it had made and changed their policy."

Airbnb made a decision to boycott Jewish homeowners and only gave in because they were threatened with the long hand of Jewish justice.

Awesome and thanks are due to Nitsana and her team at Shurat Hadin.

As she told the New York Times a few years ago, "there is a price for Jewish blood." The organization

she heads has long worked to ensure that those who harm Jewish and Israeli interests pay a price – whether it be terrorists (she has won \$1.6 billion in judgments against defendants including Iran, Syria, North Korea and Hamas), filing war-crime charges against Palestinian officials in the International Criminal Court at The Hague, or other court cases worldwide.

Airbnb reversed their policies – and thanks are due, once again to Nitsana Darshan Leitner and the Israel Law Center staff.

## In Other (Bad) News.....

### 3 Plots, 3 Synagogues, 3 Months No idea that they might have been killed this year.

Daniel Greenfield

On Wednesday, April 3, FBI agents converged on a Bozeman shooting range and took Fabjan Alameiti into custody.

Alameiti, an Albanian Muslim, had traveled from New York to Montana. "When the time will come for us to hunt them down, I will stand over them while I piece their bodies with hollow tips," the Islamic terrorist had boasted in February. "Inshallah, we take as many kuffars (non-Muslims) with us."

He had told a government informant back in January that his potential targets included military and government targets, as well as a "Jewish temple".

Alameiti's terror plot back in January was the second such Islamic terror plot that month.

On December 14, 2018, Hasher Jallal Taheb was discussing some of the targets he had scouted in Washington D.C. They included the White House, the Lincoln Memorial, and a specific synagogue.

In the middle of January, Taheb was arrested over in Georgia.

Taheb and Alameiti had a number of similarities. Both men were twenty-one years old. Their terror plots were violent but scattershot. The range began with government building and ended with a synagogue.

Theirs were the second and third Islamic terror plots targeting Jewish synagogues in three months.

The trend began with Damon Joseph, a Muslim convert, who was arrested in December for a number of plots including one targeting a synagogue. Joseph's inspiration was the Tree of Life Shooting.

"I admire what the guy did with the shooting, actually," Joseph said, according to the FBI. "I can see myself carrying out this type of operations inshallah."

"We would pick a synagogue or place Jews gather, scope it out, find all exits and entrances," the Ohio terrorist said of his plans.

He was also twenty-one years old.

All three Muslim terrorists were ISIS supporters. They were the same age and scattered around the country, from Montana to Georgia to Ohio. They origins lay in different cultures and parts of the world. And yet their terror plots all targeted Jews.

What was it that created this cluster of three Islamic terror plots against synagogues? No specifics are given in the complaints. Even the names of the synagogues remain anonymous. The phenomenon was not noted by any media outlet. The same outlets that eagerly publish statistical compilations of attacks on Muslims, real or imaginary, once again turned a blind eye to this cluster.

Around the same time that these synagogue plots were being hatched, the ADL released a report that ignored Muslim violence against Jews. "Right-Wing Extremist Violence is Our Biggest Threat. The Numbers Don't Lie," ADL boss Jonathan Greenbatt had declared.

Three synagogue terror plots in three months would suggest that Greenblatt's numbers are lying.

Last year, there was a similar cluster, not of attack plots, but of incitement to violence.

In December 2017, an Imam in New Jersey had been caught preaching of the Jews, "Count them one by one, and kill them down to the very last one. Do not leave a single one on the face of the Earth."

In February 2018, an Imam in Texas had urged fighting the Jews and a Syrian refugee Imam in North Carolina had recited a hadith calling for the extermination of the Jews, "We will fight those Jews until the rocks and the trees will speak: 'Oh Muslim, this is a Jew behind me.'"

The geographic diversity of these calls to violence in mosques from New Jersey to North Carolina to Texas, echoed the diversity of the latest Islamic terror plots in Montana, Georgia and Ohio. There is no particular reason to think that the three terrorists were influenced by imams from other states. What these numbers reveal is the incredible scope and range of Islamic anti-Semitism and violence in America.

In recent weeks, the conversation around Islamic anti-Semitism has involved Rep. Ilhan Omar. Like the various imams and terrorists, the newly elected politician reveals the diversity of Islamic anti-Semitism. What unites Muslim anti-Semites in America isn't geography or culture. It isn't a local Jewish population. Instead, as we saw in last year's rash of mosque anti-Semitism, it's the religious teachings of Islam.

Only last fall, a Philly mosque had uploaded videos of an imam spewing anti-Semitism and reciting a hadith depicting the murder of Jews.

It would be implausible to contend that rhetoric like this doesn't influence anyone.

Apologists like to claim that there is a sharp dividing line between ISIS and Islam. The synagogue plot cluster and the mosque anti-Semitism cluster show that when it comes to the Jews, not to mention slavery and genocide, ISIS just turns Islamic theory into practice. That, after all, is what Islamism is.

To the three Muslim synagogue terror plotters, anti-Semitism was a fundamental component of their religious and political values. Killing Jews was as natural to them as attacking government buildings.

Last year, in the UK, Husnain Rashid was sent to prison for threats against everyone from Prince George to soccer stadiums, supermarkets, the British Army and Jewish institutions. The details fluctuate, but the Jews remain a consistent target of Islamic terrorism in Europe, America and the Middle East.

Even as the media emphasizes Islamophobia, Islamic anti-Semitism continues to be a rising problem. And the media suppresses coverage of the problem by not reporting on it and by changing the subject.

The media met Jewish protests over Rep. Omar's anti-Semitism by depicting her as a victim of Islamophobia. Similarly, the media blacklists the story of a cluster of Islamic anti-Semitic terror plots by shifting the focus to Islamophobia. The accusation of Islamophobia not only suppresses critics of Islamist bigotry and violence, it also suppresses coverage of the victims of Islamic bigotry and violence.

Jewish organizations have failed to address Islamic anti-Semitism. And that betrayal has left American Jews defenseless, not only against the anti-Semitic rhetoric of Rep. Omar or of Islamic religious leaders in mosques across the country, but before a new wave of Islamic terrorist plots across America.

Few American Jews have any idea or have ever been told that they might have been killed this year.

The names of the synagogues targeted by the Islamic terrorists have been kept secret. This conspiracy of secrecy may prevent copycat plots by other Islamic terrorists, but it shelters congregants at synagogues and temples across the country from the knowledge of how close they came. Information like that might have caused them to rethink their politics, their support for Islamic migration, and their collaboration with Islamist groups that undermine law enforcement's role in breaking up similar Islamic terror plots.

The names of the target synagogues have conveniently remained buried and their congregants have been kept in the dark. Men and women who might have died this year will go on supporting the policies of their killers. And the fact that three Islamic terror plots targeting synagogues emerged in the space of a few months will never reach their ears, their eyes, their minds, or their hearts.

The climactic period of Islam requires that Muslims exterminate the Jews. And that even the rocks and the trees join in this genocide. Muslim clerics often refer to this hadith. And in Montana, Georgia and Ohio, a new generation of Muslim terrorists isn't waiting for the rocks and trees to speak to them.

They are readying to kill the Jews now.

Daniel Greenfield, a Shillman Journalism Fellow at the Freedom Center, is an investigative journalist and writer focusing on the radical Left and Islamic terrorism.