

עש"ק פרשת ואתחנן
10 Av 5786
July 24, 2026
Issue number 1626



Jerusalem 7:01
Toronto 8:31

ISRAEL NEWS

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

Commentary...

What a Grenade in Bint Jbeil can Teach us About the Jewish State

By Ruthie Blum

During the 2006 Second Lebanon War, Israel Defense Forces deputy battalion commander Maj. Roi Klein threw himself on a grenade in the Southern Lebanese town of Bint Jbeil, absorbing the blast with his own body so that his soldiers would live. As he did, he cried out the words that Jews have uttered morning and night for millennia: "Shema Yisrael, adonai eloheinu, adonai echad" ("Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one.")

Rabbi Yigal Levinstein, co-founder of the Bnei David pre-military yeshivah academy in the Samaria community of Eli, recounted this story of Israeli heroism during his keynote address on July 16 at Tekuma's third "Right-Wing Summit" at Expo Tel Aviv.

The conference, organized by political strategist and communications consultant Berale Crombie, brought together public figures and thought leaders to discuss Israel's future in the wake of the Hamas massacre of Oct. 7, 2023, and the seven-front war that's been going on since then.

"Twenty years ago, one man changed the face of young Israeli fighters," Levinstein said of Klein. But the rabbi wasn't merely conveying a moving anecdote; he was laying the groundwork for a broader argument about what a Jewish state ought to demand of itself.

"For 20 years, [Klein] was singular in his invoking of the 'Shema,'" Levinstein clarified. "In the current war, every battalion, before entering Gaza and Lebanon, stands together and [recites it]."

He noted that the ritual wasn't universally embraced. One commander who attempted to formalize it, he said in reference to Brig. Gen. Ofer Winter, was pushed out of the army.

However, he stressed, the phenomenon can no longer be stopped. In other words, according to Levinstein, Klein's final appeal to God didn't remain in Bint Jbeil; it's become a normal part of the troops' routine.

This, he said, is evidence of something far bigger than a battlefield custom. Among many other things, it illustrates the blossoming of a grassroots Jewish and national awakening among Israel's younger generation, emerging simultaneously from two very different directions.

On one side are secular Israelis gravitating toward their Jewish identity, stirred not by external coercion, he explained, but by an internal search.

On the other side are the Haredim, members of what some dub the "ultra-Orthodox," whose shift Levinstein described as an equally remarkable development: a growing nationalist and Zionist consciousness within a sector long ambivalent about, even suspicious of, both. Eight Haredi yeshivahs, he said, sent rabbis and students to his mechina (preparatory school) over the past two years to study "how Zionism, nationalism and Torah connect."

He cited the commander of a company in the Hasmonean Brigade, one of the mechina's own rabbis, who took a two-year leave of absence to lead a battalion of Haredi soldiers in Lebanon. Levinstein recalled the officer's words before deployment: "In this Haredi battalion, there's no reason we can't carry out any mission in Lebanon in the best possible way."

Compulsion to serve in the IDF, he argued, would only alienate such young men; what's drawing them forward is something they've chosen freely.

Levinstein sees this societal change from very different directions as an "authentic life movement driving the Jewish people to its identity, its purpose, its Jewishness."

Here he raised the issue of what it means for a state, not an individual, to be Jewish. Since, as he pointed out, a state doesn't lay tefillin (phylacteries) or wear tzitzit (ritual fringe), what does Jewish statecraft actually look like?

His answer was that Israel currently functions almost exclusively according to two principles—individual rights and equality—while neglecting a third: nationhood.

"If those are the only two values governing decisions," Levinstein said, "then any decision made for the sake of other values will be rejected."

A country, he contended, must also weigh collective and national interests, even when they conflict with individual ones. His examples ranged from settlement policy to the way the war has been fought.

He maintained that measures Jewish law would readily permit were abandoned out of concern for the civil rights of the enemy, at the expense of Israeli men and women in uniform.

"In the IDF Code of Ethics ['The Spirit of the Israel Defense Forces'], the individual rights of the enemy outweigh the value of victory, to the point where there were even efforts to remove [victory], to erase it, from the code entirely," Levinstein stated. "[Yet] the value of victory should be at the top of the military's ethical code."

He rooted his assertion in the Rambam's (Maimonides's) "Laws of Kings," which identifies the state's foremost obligation as providing external and internal security—harshly put by the 12th-century scholar as "breaking the arm of the wicked."

He went on to posit that Judaism operates on two separate planes, one private and the other public. The former involves an individual's level of observance of mitzvot (commandments), which is and must remain a matter of personal choice. The latter encompasses the values that guide national decision-making.

Confusing the two, he said, reflects a fundamental misunderstanding and ignorance of the Jewish religion.

"The secret of Judaism," he emphasized, "is freedom for the individual in Jewish practice, while the state should adopt and internalize Jewish values in its national decisions. That's the meaning of a Jewish state."

As such, Levinstein argued, the state shouldn't hesitate to incorporate Jewish and national values into its decision-making process alongside—and, at times, above—the individual-rights framework that currently dominates public policy, including that governing warfare.

Professor Asa Kasher, who headed the committee that crafted the IDF Code of Ethics—famously known as Israel's "purity of arms" doctrine—should have been in the audience to receive a sorely needed education on the damage that he and his ilk have wrought on what is already the world's most moral army.

But he's been too busy vilifying the government to listen to reason, let alone pearls of wisdom, certainly not from a respected rabbi.

At a rally during the height of the war in Gaza, for instance, he bemoaned the death of a soldier who had fought bravely against Hamas by asserting that young man had fallen "in vain."

As if that weren't sufficiently outrageous, not to mention false and deeply hurtful to the boy's family, he turned on Jewish national hero Joseph Trumpeldor. Killed in 1920 while defending the settlement of Tel Hai, Trumpeldor allegedly announced, before succumbing to his wounds, "It's good to die for our homeland [country]."

Kasher called the legendary statement "stupid," declaring that it's actually "bad to die for our country." This shouldn't have come as a surprise, given his comments several years ago about none other than Roi Klein himself.

Interviewed on a podcast in 2016, a decade after Klein's memorable act of selfless courage, Kasher cast aspersions on the event and its aftermath.

Was jumping on the grenade “the right reaction to the circumstances?” Kasher asked rhetorically. His reply was even worse.

“It cost him his life, and it raises a lot of emotions and thoughts,” he opined. “[But] perhaps there was something else he could have done that would have served as a better example? There is a tendency to gravitate toward the extreme in public discourse, to describe things as extremely positive or extremely negative. We only have part of the full picture but that is enough for people to crown heroes.”

If Levinstein is correct in his assessment about a renaissance of Jewish identity and patriotism, which he clearly is, Kasher and his ilk have an anachronistic view of Israel and its animating principles. Indeed, from now on, it should be the likes of Levinstein, not Kasher (whose name, ironically, is Hebrew for “kosher”), charged with formulating the IDF’s rules of engagement. (JNS Jul 20)

Mamdani Walked Right Through Our Broken Windows

By Naya Lekht

New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani is once again making news, this time for going back on his campaign promise to arrest Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu if he comes to New York.

Jewish advocates are aghast. American patriots point out that this is yet another example of the Mamdani-supporting Democratic Socialists of America’s total rejection of American ideals.

But what did they expect?

What you are witnessing here is the broken windows theory in action because Jewish legacy and mainstream organizations have, for the most part, never dealt with anti-Zionism. It is what JNS columnist Benjamin Kerstein calls “the most racist ideology in the world ... the logic of which is genocide.”

Indeed, Mamdani is not really the problem. He is the result of decades of avoiding the fight against anti-Zionism for fear of alienating progressive allies, terror of giving offense and wanting to be loved. It is the result of an American Jewish community locked into a single, outdated way of interpreting Jew-hatred and unwilling to confront, or simply not knowing how to confront, its most lethal contemporary form: anti-Zionism.

When the Russian-speaking Jewish community in America sent emails to the Anti-Defamation League in the early 2000s ringing the alarm bells, they were ignored. When Jews mobilized against the anti-Zionist ethnic-studies curriculum in California in 2017, they were vilified as “right-wingers” by the Jewish Community Relations Council. And when many begged Jewish leaders to walk away from their venerated “seat at the table,” they promised that staying at the table would give us a voice.

It was all left for the taking. And taken it has been.

The first window broke in 1993, when Students for Justice in Palestine was founded at the University of California, Berkeley. Almost no one heard the glass shatter.

At that time, SJP was decentralized, marginal and operating on the periphery of campus political life. Zionism was not yet treated as a moral crime in academia. The libels of apartheid, settler-colonialism and intersectionality were being seeded, but they had not yet taken root as orthodoxy. In 1996, Jewish Voice for Peace emerged to provide the movement with cover as the self-described “Jewish wing” of the Palestinian solidarity movement.

Still no repair.

The second window broke in 2004, with the launch of the BDS campaign, the academic and cultural boycott of Israel. This was no longer a student club tabling in the quad. It was an organized international campaign to recode the Jewish state as a pariah, modeled explicitly on the delegitimization of apartheid South Africa.

The third window broke in 2005, when Israel Apartheid Week was launched. It broke every single year afterward in an annual ritual of shattering, institutionalized on campuses across North America by SJP.

And how did the anchor institution of Jewish campus life respond to an event dedicated to the apartheid libel? With “parallel programming.” Hillels, which were never designed as advocacy or rapid-response bodies (their mission was solely to be a Jewish “home

away from home”), hosted alternative events fostering positive Jewish expression.

The first window broke in 1993, when Students for Justice in Palestine was founded at the University of California, Berkeley. Almost no one heard the glass shatter.

Tellingly, it was the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights—a federal, non-Jewish body—that noted in 2006 that campuses have an anti-Zionism problem. A government commission saw the shattered glass before the Jewish legacy organizations whose entire purpose was to see it.

Windows kept on breaking over the next two decades, as SJP chapters brought their yearly demands that universities sever ties with Israeli universities. The chapters pushed their divestment resolutions, boycott votes and campaigns to end study-abroad programs and research partnerships with ruthless persistence.

And what guidance did administrators receive from Jewish leadership? When the ADL began tracking “anti-Israel” activism in 2010, it framed anti-Zionism as something that may “cross the line into antisemitism” when it demonizes, delegitimizes or applies double standards to Israel. But that is precisely what anti-Zionism, by definition, does. There was and is no line to cross.

Yet because major Jewish organizations adopted this language, administrators who looked to them for guidance understood anti-Zionism as something that might become bigoted under certain conditions rather than as something inherently directed at Jewish collective identity.

Indeed, in 2019, even those who crafted the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance’s (IHRA) working definition of antisemitism, which was, by design, meant to include demonization of Israel, never named the hateful ideology at the heart of this demonization: anti-Zionism.

The fifth window broke inside the faculty lounge. This one mattered more than all the student activism combined, because professors conferred intellectual legitimacy on the movement.

Anti-Zionist events came to be routinely sponsored by academic departments. AMCHA Initiative studies from 2015 and 2016 found that campuses with even one faculty boycotter were at least four times more likely to suffer incidents of anti-Jewish hostility. The escalation culminated in the founding of the Institute for the Critical Study of Zionism at the University of California, Santa Cruz in 2021, an academic body whose very premise is that Zionism and Jewish identity are an object fit for “critical study” the way one studies white supremacy.

The window-breakers no longer needed to break in. They had faculty offices, department budgets, and now, an institute.

Then came the broken door. In 2023, Faculty for Justice in Palestine was created, growing to more than 80 chapters and giving professors an organized national vehicle for the movement, followed by the encampments—the seizure of the physical campus itself. FJP and SJP chapters called for “Zionists” to be removed from campuses, the banning of Hillel and Chabad, and the harassment and vandalization of “Zionist” institutions.

The vandals had kicked in the door and occupied the house.

Even then, staring at the smashed-in door, our institutions could not name what had broken it. Even the ADL’s 2022 statement that “Anti-Zionism is antisemitic, in intent or effect” pivoted almost immediately to a discussion of political criticism, rather than defining anti-Zionism or naming its core libels.

Here lies the confusion behind every unrepaired window: The American Jewish community persistently conflates anti-Zionism with policy disagreement, debates over borders, government decisions or dissatisfaction with an Israeli leader. That is not what anti-Zionism is. Its political vocabulary is not accidental. It is a totalizing hate of the Jewish people embodied in the Jewish state.

It was all left for the taking. And taken it has been—in city halls, schools, medicine, Hollywood and the arts, media rooms.

Mamdani did not break the windows. He walked through the shattered panes because those who were supposed to protect Jews against defamation remained silent about anti-Zionism. (JNS Jul 23)

Did Carlson Inadvertently Encourage Iran to Assassinate Trump, Make Vance President? By Duvi Honig

Tucker Carlson says that if JD Vance were president, the United States would not be at war with Iran.

He missed the most critical point: We might instead be facing a nuclear Iran.

Carlson speaks as though the only choice was war or peace. It was not. The choice was whether America would confront Iran's nuclear program before it became unstoppable – or leave Israel, the United States, and the entire Middle East to live under the shadow of a nuclear-armed Iranian regime.

Saying that if Vance were president would have kept us out of the war sounds attractive. Nobody wants war. But what would he have done about Iran's nuclear program? What would have replaced military action? Another agreement? Another inspection process? Another deadline? Another warning that Iran would ignore?

Carlson does not say.

"We would not be at war" is a slogan. It is not an answer.

But there is an even more disturbing part of Carlson's statement, and I cannot understand why more Americans are not talking about it.

President Donald Trump has publicly said that he left instructions for an overwhelming American attack if Iran assassinates him. He said 1,000 missiles were "locked and loaded," with more prepared to follow.

The legal reality is that a successor president would ultimately make the decision, but Trump's purpose was unmistakable: Iran must believe that murdering an American president would bring destruction – not a political reward.

That warning did not come out of nowhere.

Iran and Iran-aligned forces have repeatedly threatened Trump, and Iranian propaganda has openly discussed killing him, displayed threatening imagery and circulated material focusing on his movements and possible security vulnerabilities.

There has also been reporting of a multi-million-dollar bounty attributed to an Iran-backed Iraqi group for his assassination, although the exact sponsorship and amount must be treated carefully until confirmed by authoritative sources.

This is the environment in which Carlson chose to announce that if JD Vance were president, America would not be at war with Iran.

Carlson is not an unknown commentator sitting on the sidelines. He is widely viewed as close to Vance and as an important voice within the political movement surrounding him. When Carlson declares that Vance would have taken an entirely different path, Iran is not hearing only a debate about past decisions.

Iran may also hear a message about what would happen next.

Trump is telling Tehran: If you assassinate me, the United States will strike Iran with overwhelming force.

Carlson is effectively telling the same regime: The man who would replace Trump does not support this war and would not have taken these actions.

What conclusion does he expect Iran to draw from that?

Is Carlson suggesting that Trump's standing warning would not be carried by Vance if he were president? Is he telling Tehran that Vance would seek to de-escalate rather than follow Trump's order? Is he publicly denouncing the very threat that was designed to keep Trump alive?

Most dangerously, is this an indirect encouragement for Iran to believe that assassinating Trump could change American policy in Iran's favor?

I am not saying that Carlson wants Trump harmed. I am saying that his words create a dangerous message, and he should be held responsible for explaining it.

Intent is not the only thing that matters in national security. The message received by the enemy matters just as much.

Iran does not need Carlson's permission to hate Trump. It already does. It does not need encouragement to threaten him. It already has. What Iran's leaders are searching for is doubt that America would retaliate, doubt that Trump's successor would carry out his warning, and doubt that killing one president would bring the full weight of the United States down upon them.

Why would Carlson give them that doubt?

The constitutional issue makes this even more serious. Trump may leave instructions, but if he were assassinated, JD Vance would become president and commander in chief. The final decision would belong to him. That means Carlson's public portrayal of Vance's position is not theoretical. It directly affects how Iran may calculate the consequences of attacking the president.

Vice President Vance should now make his position unmistakably clear.

He should tell Iran publicly that regardless of any differences over how the war began, any Iranian assassination or attempted assassination of Trump would bring the overwhelming response the president promised.

There can be no daylight on that question.

Carlson's argument fails twice.

First, he says a Vance presidency would have avoided the war without admitting that the likely price could have been a nuclear Iran.

Second, he says it at the very moment Iran is threatening Trump's life, and Trump is trying to convince Tehran that assassinating him would be suicidal.

Carlson may think he is attacking the war. But he may also be undermining the warning intended to protect the president of the United States.

That is not a minor mistake. It endangers Trump, weakens America, and potentially tells Iran that the unthinkable could work. (Jerusalem Post Jul 22)

JD Vance's Big Crashout By Lee Smith

JD Vance's main priority in public life is JD Vance. The vice president's 2028 campaign for the presidency began well before the January 2025 inauguration. Donald Trump had four years and no political future, and any young Republican who wanted to build a career in Washington had to stay close to Vance for the handouts and the access to power the vice president was quickly consolidating with appointments throughout the Trump administration who often crossed the president's policies to lock in Vance's preferences.

So White House aides, House and Senate staffers, think-tank presidents, political operatives, and others don't care what Vance stands for, or if he stands for anything. But when you criticize him, implying that his rise to the presidency is anything but inevitable, you're threatening their jobs, their status, their future. It's an updated version of the Swamp, for 20-somethings on the right.

Unfair? Let's take Vance's public appearances this week as an example. Instead of advancing the administration's agenda on Capitol Hill, the vice president went on Joe Rogan's podcast to promote his new memoir. Like Barack Obama, Vance sees his personal story as a springboard to the White House. And like Obama, he has already written two memoirs by the age of 45 without a single legislative or practical political accomplishment of any kind aside from being elected to public office.

During his grievance-fueled performance on Rogan's podcast, Vance lashed out once again at the Jews, alleging, among other things, that there's an Israeli-funded plot to undermine his negotiations with Iran; some Israelis want war indefinitely for the sake of endless war; and the U.S. government has probably destroyed evidence that Jeffrey Epstein was a Mossad operative.

Vance blames others for his blunders because that's the emotional content of his 2028 presidential campaign: grievance and self-pity.

"There is a story there," he told Rogan about Epstein, "and I will go to my deathbed believing there's a story there, but I can't prove it, and I promise you there's not some document that at least I'm hiding that allows us to prove exactly what was going on and how." And "by the way," he wanted to make clear, "I've never seen a single piece of credible evidence that the president of the United States engaged in wrongdoing with minors."

Why did the vice president tailor his wording to suggest that maybe his boss engaged in wrongdoing with minors? For the same reason that he attacked Jews and spread baseless rumors, for which

he admits to having zero evidence, about some kind of dark plot involving Jeffrey Epstein. Now that the Iran deal that Vance favored has blown up and he's taking heat for it, he's showing that no one puts baby in a corner. So, he resurrects Epsteingate, predictably inspiring the dumbest people in America, and around the world, to flood social media with details from an information operation targeting Trump.

Epsteingate is a reboot of Russiagate, a conspiracy-theory template holding that Trump is controlled by a foreign power. During Trump's first term, that power was Russia. Now, in the second term, it's Israel. Epstein became crucial to the narrative because his supposed role in running a pedophile blackmail ring at the behest of the Mossad provided a mechanism by which Israel could extort Trump and other high American officials into doing its bidding.

For his part, Trump has dismissed the Epstein narrative as a Democrat hoax as dumb as Russiagate, and he seems to be right. Epstein was charged in June 2019 in the Southern District of New York (SDNY) by the same U.S. attorney, Geoffrey Berman, who got a warrant to spy on Trump's lawyer Rudolph Giuliani after he was hired to defend the president during Robert Mueller's special counsel investigation. Maurene Comey, the daughter of former FBI director and Trump nemesis James Comey, was a lead attorney on the Epstein case.

Was SDNY planning to squeeze Epstein to make up stories about Trump? It's sure possible—it pressured another Trump lawyer, Michael Cohen, to turn on the president and help sharpen Mueller's theory that his former client was guilty of obstruction.

The rumor that Epstein was a high-level global intelligence asset—as opposed to a rich pervert and con man—seems to have started with Steve Bannon, who left the first Trump White House in disgrace after leaking to the press. Bannon has ignored calls to release the 15 hours of interviews he reportedly taped with Epstein, presumably because they show Epstein was not a spy—or, at the very least, because Bannon failed to press the late sex offender to address a rumor he continues to popularize. The idea the Jewish financier pimped out underage American girls to compromise liberal elites for the purpose of advancing Israeli interests was most ardently promoted by Vance's political patron, Tucker Carlson.

According to Maggie Haberman and Jonathan Swan's recent book, *Regime Change*, chronicling the first year of the second Trump term, Vance had originally volunteered to appear on Rogan's podcast to put down the speculation that Trump was protecting Epstein after the narrative threatened to derail Trump 47. But now he's mad at Trump, so the second-highest elected official in the country, described by White House Chief of Staff Susie Wiles as a conspiracy theorist, chummed the part of the American electorate that believes a key role of the U.S. government is to disclose the nature of the laser technology gifted to us by aliens and publish Elvis' current coordinates in the jungles of the Amazon.

And to explain why his memorandum of understanding failed, Vance sourced the reading at a supermarket checkout counter. "There's a literal foreign influence campaign being funded to tank the very deal that I was pursuing," said Vance, pointing to a recent article in *Time* magazine. In fact, the story is about a former Trump deputy paid by Israel to pay pro-Israel influencers to post pro-Israel content, to combat the rising tide of campaigners on the right targeting Israel and paid for by Qatar.

Tom Cotton, chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, told the media he is "not aware of any intelligence about a secret information operation to try to change American public opinion on negotiating under the memorandum of understanding." Also, no one prevented Vance from negotiating the MOU, because it got signed. Yes, there was plenty of criticism on social media, but as Cotton said, it was the Iranians who blew up Vance's deal by continuing to blow up ships in the Strait of Hormuz, which they declared to be their own private waterway—contrary to long-standing treaties that guarantee freedom of the seas.

But Vance insists it's on Israel. "There are some people within their system, we know beyond a shadow of a doubt, who are manipulating and trying to change American public opinion to keep the war going on indefinitely," he told Rogan. "Not toward any

objective, but just indefinitely."

Vance challenges anyone to show how he's antisemitic. But claiming that Israelis want war for the sake of war, indefinitely, toward no specific objective, is a pretty good place to start. Vance's denials are part of the act: I didn't say something recognizably antisemitic; it's on you to prove that the classic antisemitic conceit I used is antisemitic, you paranoid freak. My point is clearly just that Israelis simply kill people for no reason or purpose because they enjoy spilling blood, and they will continue doing so forever, to satisfy their perverted, inhuman lusts.

Blaming Jews for his failure is also evidence of a more organic problem with Vance: namely, his character. It's a bad sign when elected officials evade responsibility for their own mistakes when the point of the job is to take on responsibility for the well-being of others—in his case, 350 million others.

NFL coaches and players typically spend Mondays reviewing footage of the weekend's game to ensure they don't make the same mistakes next Sunday. The VP should watch the game reel: What did you, JD, get wrong about the MOU? Well, maybe I shouldn't have laid into all the Trump supporters who criticized my Iran deal, and probably I should have kept my validators from threatening American Jews by saying that if they didn't like my moderate stance on Israel, wait till they got a dose of "real antisemitism."

Then there's my choice of outside mediators, like Asim Munir, the Pakistani field marshal. I talk a lot about how our interests diverge from Israel's, but the same military Munir leads hid Osama bin Laden for five years. Maybe Pakistan's interests don't always sync with America's? Was I wrong to take policy guidance from Trita Parsi, the Iranian-born think-tank expert whose work, said a U.S. district court judge, was "not inconsistent with the idea that he was first and foremost an advocate for the regime"? Maybe the whole idea of trying to make a deal with Iran was wrongheaded. After all, the people who most vocally supported my efforts had worked for Barack Obama and Joe Biden, and those guys have been trying to put the boss in jail for a decade.

Vance blames others for his blunders because that's the emotional content of his 2028 presidential campaign: grievance and self-pity. He has to keep performing it for the young middle-class white men he hopes to attract, based on the theory that America has been waiting for a political movement for white kids who believe the country betrayed them because they had to settle for their safety school. In truth, it's going to be hard to convince enough of the young white men at, for instance, Ole Miss—where Vance famously boasted that "this president isn't controlled by Israel"—that they have it worse off than their fathers and grandfathers when they're at a famous school with an SEC football team and a 97% acceptance rate where three-quarters of the student body is white and most of them are girls, which gives the boys a big and eager dating pool.

Shouldn't someone tell Vance that privileged grievance is a losing message and that to win the imaginations of young white guys, he should draw from his biography? Hey, fellas, time to bear down, as I did. Go to school, work hard, there are lots of fantastic opportunities out there for smart, ambitious guys, especially now with the rise of artificial intelligence. It truly is a brave, new world! Don't be a resentful loser. Respect women, meet a nice girl, start a family. And don't smoke dope. My first book is about what substance abuse does to families. That's why I won't go on Rogan anymore—he's a good guy, but a pothead. I don't want any of you guys thinking he's a role model, so I'm not going back on that show until he dumps his bong.

In the end, of course, all this is on the president. He can sideline Vance, who has been undermining him from day one on Iran and other matters, but he hasn't. The fact is that it's not just Trump's problem but also a problem for 77 million other Americans who went out to the polls for him, and now time is running out. If he can't get the job done, which includes disciplining his number two, odds are ever increasing that in two and a half years, millions of illegal aliens will be gathered at our southern border, waiting for the next far-left Democrat to be sworn in. (Tablet Jul 17)