

ערב ראש השנה
29 Elul 5786
September 11, 2026
Issue number 1633



Jerusalem 6:11
Toronto 7:17

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...

Israel Keeps Europe's Homeland Safe By Lawrence Solomon

Greece signed a 3-billion-euro (\$3.5 billion) air-defense deal with Israel on Monday. On Sunday, the Finnish press reported that Finland, the first foreign customer for the David's Sling missile defense system, had extended its defense-industrial pact with Jerusalem through 2034. Both governments did this because they need defense systems that work.

"Modern conflicts have already altered the parameters of military defense and deterrence," said Greek Defense Minister Nikos Dendias. "Technology, ballistic missiles, satellite communications, unmanned systems, cyber threats, hybrid forms of warfare and the interconnection of fields of operations have long rendered preexisting defense doctrines completely unrealistic."

Greece is buying David's Sling, Barak MX and SPYDER plus Israeli radars and a national command system. It thus becomes the first E.U. country, Dendias noted, to adopt a multilayer shield comparable to Israel's. A separate 26-million-euro Drone Dome contract was signed the same day.

In 2023, Finland purchased David's Sling in a deal worth 317 million euros. Despite accusations of "historical shame" from the Green League opposition party, Finland unapologetically defended the extension of its defense cooperation agreement with Israel, saying, "At this stage, we have only made sure that Finland gets the best air defense system in the world, and the best technology related to it."

These deals represent a contradiction in European politics. In public opinion, on campuses and among a growing number of parties, Israel is falsely seen as a genocidal state; BDS campaigns are a fixture; and Israel is faulted for its defensive posture, accused of imagining threats from neighbors that have spent years firing rockets, missiles and drones at its cities.

But when the subject is the defense of European homelands, those same countries—or their neighbors—buy the systems Israel builds because those threats are not imagined.

Germany has already fielded the Arrow 3 defense system, first sold for about 4 billion euros and then expanded by another \$3.1 billion for a combined package of roughly \$6.5 billion—the largest Israeli defense export in history. The Czech Republic is integrating four SPYDER batteries at a cost of nearly 14 billion crowns. Slovakia bought the Barak MX for about \$583 million. Romania signed a 2- to 2.3-billion-euro SPYDER framework. Cyprus has already deployed the Barak MX.

Israel Missile Defense Organization director Moshe Patel, whose duties include exports for Israel's missile-defense programs, reports "huge interest from Europe." Most of the countries involved are NATO members focused on missile and drone threats from Russia and the Middle East—and on the cost of being unprepared.

Britain has been confronting the cost of a boycott of Israeli technology. Sky Sabre, the U.K. army's medium-range air-defense system, runs on Rafael's MIC4AD command-and-control software—the same architecture used in Iron Dome.

Last year, ministers were reported to be weighing a switch to a Norwegian alternative to appease Labour Party backbenchers demanding a harder line on Israel. Lord Austin, then the government's trade envoy to Israel, warned that "the RAF would not be able to get its planes off the ground without Israeli technology" and that British troops in Iraq and Afghanistan would have taken heavier casualties without it. Lord Walney called it "inexcusable" to drop tried and true Israeli components "simply for politically convenient reasons."

This week, the confrontation acquired a sharper edge, with London

weighing a ban on trade with Israeli settlements. A senior Israeli official told The Telegraph that "countries that act against Israel are exposing themselves to counteractions." The immediate threat was expulsion from a Gaza coordination hub. The

larger point needs no translation: a relationship Britain still uses for air defense, tank protection, drones and intelligence is not a one-way street. Boycott the supplier and the supplier can turn off the faucet.

Earlier this year, Spain decided to ban Israeli defense exports and then quietly walked part of it back. It formalized an embargo, canceled a Spike deal, a rocket-launcher contract and a Litening deal, and described Israel's war in the Gaza Strip as genocide.

The decree itself, however, reserved excepciones puntuales ("one-off exceptions") if they are in the national interest. The cabinet then granted an exemption to keep Airbus using Israeli technology in Spanish plants, citing jobs and export potential.

Defense sources had already conceded that a clean break would be "complicated and difficult" because Spanish cybersecurity, AI and existing platforms still run on Israeli components. That is cutting off one's nose to spite one's face, then asking for a prosthetic. The ban makes a political statement; the carve-outs admit the statement cannot be implemented without harming Spain.

Europe can afford the luxury of street politics and parliamentary resolutions. It cannot afford the luxury of an undefended sky. Israel remains an armory for democracies that prefer not to advertise the fact.

The protesters will keep marching. The contracts—3 billion euros here, \$6.5 billion there—will keep being signed. The missile defense that keeps European countries intact will keep coming from the state they publicly shun and privately embrace. (JNS Sep 8)

כתיבה וחתימה טובה

Far from Britain's Finest Hour

By Amit Segal

Remember when Europe recognized a Palestinian state, and it expedited the end of the war, the return of the hostages, and the emergence of a moderate Palestinian leadership? Neither do I. Yet the lesson the new British foreign secretary Ed Miliband took from that diplomatic dud was that moderation and a future for peace were only ever one "comprehensive reset" in relations with Israel away—with impending sanctions on settlements in Judea and Samaria among its first instalments.

The ostensible justification is Israeli construction in the E1 corridor, connecting Jerusalem to Ma'ale Adumim and bisecting a Palestinian entity in the process. Miliband declared he would "not acquiesce in the destruction of the two-state solution."

He chose to discuss the new policy with, of all people, the Emir of Qatar—one would think he might have spared the British taxpayer international charges, given how many jihadists and terror-supporters he can call locally.

They could, of course, address the problem of radicalization at home. If they were truly internationally inclined, they might begin by ensuring they can actually deploy a force when a war breaks out, rather than it taking a week and furious negotiations for their dock to outfit a single ship. They might consider answering Argentina, which spent this week threatening British sovereignty over the Falklands—I would suggest starting by not giving away their military base at Diego Garcia for no reason in particular. But this is the same party whose last defense secretary, John Healey, resigned due to a lack of seriousness in funding the military—the true bone and sinew of geopolitics.

Easier, always, than confronting a problem foreign or domestic is to blame the Jews—because naturally it is not the failure of British integration, but Israel's actions in Gaza, that have clogged their streets and defaced their national monuments. After all, if not for the war, the UAE might still be willing to send its students to British

universities without fear of their being radicalized by the Muslim Brotherhood.

But the true absurdity of the policy is that the two-state solution is not dying because of a 12-kilometre stretch of land outside Jerusalem. Its death was a suicide—perpetrated by a Palestinian Authority that time after time eschewed moderation and reform, enabled by an international community that entertained and sponsored its endless incitement. Were two states ever to be revived, it would not be by holding territory in trust in the hope that Palestinians will grow moderate enough to manage it, but by imposing consequences for their intransigence. I should think it obvious that sanctioning literal terror sponsors and celebrators would do significantly more for peace than sanctioning Jewish residents of East Jerusalem. Then again, Keir Starmer's insistence when recognizing Palestine that it was "not a reward for Hamas" attests to the fact that British policy no longer understands the obvious.

Yet it is sadly predictable. If Israel could forget the lessons of the Yom Kippur War before October 7, it is only natural that the British, after so much longer, have forgotten the consequences of appeasement. (It's Noon in Israel Sep 8)

'As a Jew' Jews—Shut Up! By Thane Rosenbaum

For a people with an earned reputation for academic excellence and street seichel, Jews nowadays are establishing an entirely different tribal stereotype: a people chock-full of morons; a confederacy of Jewish stupidity.

Perhaps wisdom is still there, but it's being misdirected, aimed not at moral clarity but superficial cachet; self-directed not toward noble deeds and Nobel Prizes but social acceptance and abject surrender.

Either way, it's not a good look and can lead to disastrous consequences. Vocal self-hating outliers are serving as unofficial spokesmen, aiding and abetting in the resurrection of pernicious Jewish stereotypes—all for their own narcissistic benefit.

Have they learned absolutely nothing from the entirety of Jewish history: pariah status everywhere, first to be expelled, massacred in every epoch?

Let's start with the most mindboggling doozy of all—the words of a Jewish Democratic state attorney general demonstrating what tikkun olam looks like on crack!

Dana Nessel was addressing Michigan's Democratic Jewish Caucus, where she was being honored for choosing not to attend the state's Democratic Convention because she knew she would be pelted by antisemites—from her own party! So, she proved her moral mettle by invoking Queen Esther of Persia: "We have a moral imperative to place the needs of the world above even our own self-interest and, yes, even our own survival."

What did she say? Yes, you heard right: A Jewish elected official took the stage at a room full of Jews and told them to sacrifice themselves for the greater good of the people who despise them.

She urged Michigan's Jews to "sacrifice the comfort, safety and security and even the very future of our own people in exchange for the opportunity to save the rest of humanity. . . . What good is defending the historic homeland of our ancestors and demanding that candidates acknowledge its right to exist if the planet upon which it rests is no longer inhabitable?"

Finally, she patronized Jewish Democrats by telling them that Republicans are "focused on transgender girls playing JV volleyball" and not on the important stuff, like "wealth inequality and artificial intelligence."

Where to begin with this bonehead? First, Queen Esther is most certainly not your inspiration if you believe she was prepared to silence herself and accept the sacrifice of the Jewish people. That's what Jewish Democrats have been doing for years now. But it was not the modus operandi of the Jewish Queen of Persia, who took great risks to persuade the king to spare her people and punish their enemy, instead.

The Persian Queen chose her people over her self-interest and didn't ask them to embrace collective suicide. Send Nessel back to Hebrew School and keep her out of public office.

She is a tragic example of Reform Judaism's obsession with social

justice over Jewish survival. She has breathlessly adopted the New Testament's tribal workout of "turning the other cheek," rhetorically asking: "What would Jesus—the original revisionist Jew—do?"

We've been here many times before. During the Enlightenment, Jews were emancipated on the condition that they trade in their Jewish particularity for full European integration. The Dreyfus Affair and the Holocaust eventually put the lie to those illusory guarantees. During the Stalinist days of the Soviet Union, Jews were told that if there was any hope of ushering in a worldly utopia, they must ignore the antisemitic purges, erase all tribal commitments, and march in solidarity with the proletariat.

Now Jewish political leaders are reciting the very same suicidal script! Which people, exactly, do Sanders, Schumer, Schiff, Slotkin, Ossoff and Raskin belong to? Surely not the Jewish people.

In Nessel's case, she was apparently riding sidecar beside the number one ranked Jew-hater in all of Michigan—Senate candidate Abdul El-Sayed. He addressed the Jewish Caucus, too, apologizing for an unforgivable snafu earlier in the campaign when he minimized, and justified, an Islamist attack at Temple Israel in West Bloomfield Township, by stating: "Hurt people hurt people." The assailant, apparently, was related to Hezbollah commanders who the IDF had just killed.

El-Sayed addressed Jewish Michiganders by lamenting, "To anyone who feels like my comments might have been hurtful, I'm really sorry."

That's not an apology. El-Sayed blamed Jews for being overly sensitive, as if he was merely delivering the right message but innocently, at the wrong moment. Yet another example of one of today's widely accepted slippery tactics in passing the buck: insert "context" to override the content of what was actually said.

El-Sayed then crossed the line into extreme Jewish pandering: declaring the "value of tikkun olam, to repair the world."

Give me a break. Say what you actually mean, El-Sayed: "To 'repair the world,' bring on the next Caliphate!"

The flippancy with words these days is truly atrocious. There is no shame in self-deception if it serves to manipulate the unwary. Taking advantage of public ignorance, Islamists invoke tikkun olam. "Scholars" misapply "genocide" to describe "casualties of war" in asymmetric warzones where terrorists deploy children as shields. The LGBTQ community proudly marches to "Queers for Palestine." Feminists wear hijabs. Progressives ceaselessly make reference to a mythical Palestine as if such a nation had ever once existed.

And my new favorite: Self-hating, nominally affiliated Jews condemning the Jewish state, and global Jewry, by foreshadowing their false accusations with the preamble, "Speaking as a Jew, . . ."

Under whose authority are they speaking? Have they ever been to Israel? Have they, or anyone they know, ever been victims of murderous antisemitism? Have they read widely and traveled broadly to Jewish communities in distress?

The "speaking as a Jew" Jews should not be speaking for anyone—especially not their people. They are not authorized spokespersons. The task was never delegated to them. They would be the last to be chosen. Their self-absorbed narcissism is dangerous to Jews and should be of no interest to any sensitive, rational, clear-thinking person.

It's time for real Jews to drown out the treachery of those taking liberties without true entitlements. And repeat after me:

"As a Jew, Israel, like every other nation, has the right to protect its people from indiscriminate rocket fire and beheadings, its girls from mass rapes, its infants from being torched in ovens, and its elderly from being taken hostage. In fighting wars it does not initiate, Israel should be expected to defend itself with all military means available, especially when its methods do not violate the laws of armed combat and are not disproportionate under international humanitarian law. The words 'genocide,' 'mass starvation,' and 'human rights violations' apply to its enemies, and not to the Jewish state."

Say that, and you'll be speaking, undeniably, as a Jew. (Jewish Journal Sep 6)

Kushner Has it Backward on Israel and Gaza By Avi Abelow

Jared Kushner recently called Israelis “a little irrational” on Gaza. This and everything else he said points to a troubling conclusion: It is Washington, not Israel, that fails to grasp the reality of Gaza.

Speaking in Kyiv, the White House adviser on the Middle East and son-in-law of the president explained why the Trump administration is struggling to advance its Gaza plan: “We are now starting to understand the scope of the militarization of Gaza. It is beyond your comprehension, and so demilitarizing it is not going to be easy.”

That is a remarkable admission nearly three years into a war during which Israeli soldiers uncovered tunnel networks, weapons depots and terrorist infrastructure throughout Gaza, much of it built beneath hospitals and schools run by the Palestinian refugee agency UNRWA. That the American team shaping Gaza’s future is only now grasping the scale of Hamas’s militarization of Gaza calls into question the foundation of their entire plan.

Kushner then made a second admission. “We worked with Hamas for over four months,” he said, describing an agreement in which Hamas committed to demilitarize. Yet he turned his criticism toward Israel. “I think we agree with them on the end state,” he stated. “They just have a crazy election, and that makes them a little irrational in certain regards.”

With genuine respect for U.S. President Donald Trump and everything his administration has done for Israel, Kushner has it backward. Israelis are not the irrational ones. That position belongs to a team that only now acknowledges the problematic militarization of Gaza after months of talks with Hamas, yet faults Israelis for refusing to gamble their children’s lives on a plan the team formulated in such ignorance.

Hamas is not a conventional adversary. It is the armed wing of a 1,400-year-old jihadist ideology whose stated aim is the persecution of non-Muslims worldwide. It carried out a massacre of 1,200 people on Oct. 7, 2023, and its charter calls for Israel’s destruction. Kushner’s team spent four months negotiating with it and now points to a signed document as proof Hamas can be trusted to disarm.

Kushner himself undercut that confidence weeks earlier, acknowledging that Hamas may not honor its commitment and that it is “very, very hard to trust” a group responsible for such atrocities.

That assessment is correct. The question was never whether Hamas would sign a document, but what happens on the ground: who removes the weapons, who destroys the tunnels, who finds the hidden arms caches, and whether Gaza remains capable of another attack once this war ends.

This question has not been answered. Neither has the deeper question of what changes a centuries-old religious and educational culture that still chants Khaybar, Khaybar ya Yahud, celebrating a seventh-century massacre of Jews.

Declining to repeat the Gaza experiment is not irrational. It has cost too much already.

Israelis ask these questions because we have lived through the consequences of getting the answers wrong. In 2005, Israel withdrew completely from Gaza, forcibly removing 10,000 Jews and destroying 21 thriving communities. Hamas seized control and turned Gaza into the staging ground for Oct. 7. Declining to repeat that experiment is not irrational. It has cost too much already.

Kushner’s comments also help explain a shift now visible in Israel’s election campaign. A growing number of Israelis believe demilitarizing Gaza is not enough, and that the entire premise guiding Israel’s approach has failed.

National Security Minister Itamar Ben-Gvir’s Otzma Yehudit Party has unveiled its “Disengagement 7/10” plan, calling for a ministry to facilitate voluntary emigration from Gaza. Former Israeli Defense Forces Maj. Gen. Ofer Winter and politician Moshe Feiglin have built platforms around the same idea. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu appointed Minister of Science and Technology Gila Gamliel to lead efforts to encourage Gazan emigration following Trump’s call for that approach in January 2025.

These are not fringe positions. The politicians advancing them represent a majority of Israelis, responding to something real that has taken hold since Oct. 7.

One of the clearest voices making this case is not a politician. Avida Bechar survived the massacre at Kibbutz Be’eri, where Hamas terrorists murdered his wife and son in their safe room. He does not come from Israel’s ideological right but from the peace-oriented world

along the Gaza border, and he once believed in coexistence. Since Oct. 7, he has argued that Israel will not be secure until Gaza is emptied of its population.

This growing debate inside Israel deserves to be understood, not dismissed as irrational. It comes from the survivors of Be’eri, Kfar Aza, Nir Oz and the Nova massacre, as well as from soldiers who fought tunnel-to-tunnel against infrastructure Kushner himself now calls “beyond comprehension.”

For decades, Israel and the West assumed economic opportunity would moderate Gaza. Billions flowed into the territory. Then came Oct. 7. The lesson was not that Gaza needed better monitoring. It was that the entire premise had failed.

Trump has been one of Israel’s strongest allies in the White House, and Kushner’s effort to develop a plan that brings lasting peace and stability to the region is genuine. But friendship requires candor when a friend misreads the situation. If Kushner is only now grasping Gaza’s militarization, the real question is not why Israelis appear irrational, but why they no longer trust Washington’s assumptions.

Any Gaza plan that allows jihadist forces to survive, reorganize and rebuild is destined to fail—whether the reckoning comes in five or 20 years—forcing Israel to send its children to confront a jihadi enemy it has the chance to eliminate now. That has nothing to do with the local election. It is what Oct. 7 taught millions of Israelis about a population educated for 14 centuries in jihad that cannot simply be deradicalized overnight.

If Washington is only now grasping that Gaza’s militarization is “beyond comprehension,” then perhaps it is Washington, and not Israel, that has the harder lesson to learn. (JNS Sep 9)

From Yavneh to Jerusalem By Rabbi Yehoshua Pfeffer

Kiddush Hashem is an eternal obligation. But what it demands of us may change with the circumstances of Jewish history.

For decades, we grew accustomed to hearing that voting for a Charedi party was itself an act of Kiddush Hashem. And we understood why.

A community that had survived destruction, risen from the ashes, and rebuilt a world of Torah sought to declare: We are here. Torah is here. The Jewish people remain faithful to their inheritance. We cast our votes for Haredi parties with pride.

But today we are compelled to ask: What is the Kiddush Hashem of our generation? Does Charedi politics, as currently practiced, truly sanctify the Name of Heaven?

Many outside Charedi society—including religious Jews and serious bnei Torah who only yesterday looked upon us with respect and even admiration—now feel anger and estrangement. They see a community unwilling to share responsibility for the country in which we all live.

That hurts. When the name of Torah becomes associated with evading responsibility, dependence on others, and taking without giving, we are duty-bound to ask whether something precious has been lost along the way.

Tens of thousands of Charedim, perhaps hundreds of thousands, are asking the same question. They are searching for an alternative.

Since October 7, the issue of military service has stood at the center of the relationship between Charedi society and the broader Israeli public. Rightly so. Other questions—economics, education, employment, and more—are all important, but the question of military service clearly carries a prior moral and national claim.

Torah study is the central value of Charedi society. Precisely for that reason, it cannot be turned into a convenient excuse. Those whose Torah is genuinely their full-time vocation must be supported, and their ability to learn must be protected. The Jewish people need great talmidei chachamim.

But one who is not learning cannot hide behind one who is.

Blanket opposition to all military service has produced an untenable reality: tens of thousands of young Charedi men are now classified as draft evaders. And this policy harms precisely the yeshiva students we seek to protect. If everyone is defined as a Torah scholar—serious learners and idlers alike—how can we ask the wider public to recognize the unique standing of those who truly devote themselves, body and soul, to Torah study?

We need the courage to say something different.

No longer only “no,” but “yes.”

Yes to service. Yes to responsibility. Yes—under the appropriate conditions, with full protection for the religious identity and way of life of the Charedi young man.

The role of Charedi politics should be to fight for frameworks that are proper, serious, and protected.

To build solutions, not sabotage them.

The same transformation is required in the economic sphere.

After the destruction of European Jewry, we were a small community struggling for its very existence. We built something akin to Noah’s Ark. Outside, the flood raged; inside, we had to preserve our children, our Torah, and our way of life. That Ark succeeded beyond anything its builders could have dreamed.

But we are no longer a small remnant. We are a large and rapidly growing community with enormous influence over Israel’s cities, its economy, its politics, and its future.

A small community can turn inward and allow others to carry the economic burden. A vast community cannot. Dependence on others is not a viable program for a society that seeks to flourish. It is neither dignified nor sustainable.

A person should aspire to stand on his own feet. As the Gemara teaches, “An adult who remains dependent upon his father’s table is called a minor.” A family should aspire to stand on its own feet. And a community should aspire to stand on its own feet.

Accordingly, our measure of political success must change. The question should not be how many allowances we managed to secure, but how many opportunities we created: How many Charedi men received the tools to support their families with dignity? How many families escaped the cycle of poverty? How many young people gained the skills to participate in the economy without surrendering Torah and Yiras Shamayim?

Instead of speaking about subsidies, we should speak about opportunities.

Not dependence, but independence.

Not survival, but flourishing.

Another painful question concerns our moral and ethical condition: integrity, righteousness, charity, and justice.

“The daughters of Israel are beautiful,” the Mishnah tells us, “but poverty disfigures them.”

Charedi society is beautiful. It contains Torah, family, extraordinary chesed, and remarkable mutual responsibility. But there are also things that cast shadows over that beauty.

Scandals of corruption involving Charedi institutions, public or private, no longer surprise us. Providing false information in order to obtain benefits fraudulently, or registering as a student merely to secure a public-transport discount, have in some quarters become socially accepted practices. In the face of these and similar phenomena, we must say unequivocally: This is not what a Torah society is supposed to look like.

Excuses are plentiful. We can say that everybody does it, that the state discriminated against us, that our institutions desperately need the money.

But more is demanded of us.

In recent years, extremism has also intensified. Distinguished rabbis and Rebbes have been assaulted in Charedi streets, with scarcely a response and often no meaningful condemnation. The verse comes painfully to mind: “Do not gaze upon me because I am dark, because the sun has scorched me” (Shir Hashirim 1:6). It is difficult to look honestly at ourselves in our present condition.

Truth, righteousness and justice, dignity, self-respect, and the willingness to bear responsibility—these are Torah values.

Restoring them to the center of our public life is itself Kiddush Hashem.

Perhaps no phrase has shaped Charedi consciousness more deeply than Rabbi Yochanan ben Zakkai’s request: “Give me Yavneh and its sages.”

There are times when turning inward is the height of wisdom. When the world outside is collapsing, one saves the Beit Midrash. One preserves the flame and builds Yavneh.

But time does its work. History does its work.

Today we do not merely live in the State of Israel. Increasingly, we are the State of Israel. And one cannot withdraw from oneself.

We have ministers in government and members of the security cabinet making decisions about war, life, and death—while at the very

same time continuing to speak the language of “they will run the country, while we take care of ourselves.”

Who exactly are “they”? And who are “we”?

The simple facts can no longer be denied. Israel’s economy is our economy. Its healthcare system is our healthcare system. Its security challenges are our challenges. Israel’s successes are ours, and its failures are ours as well.

Whether we intended it or not, the State of Israel has become, in the eyes of the world, the public representative of Jews everywhere. The enemies of the Jewish people are Israel’s enemies; Israel’s friends are the friends of the Jewish people. We all understand that the future of the state is the future of our children.

There will be profound disagreements. We are Charedim. We have commitments and red lines, and a worldview that will sometimes place us in sharp disagreement with others.

But disagreement does not negate partnership, and difference does not absolve us of responsibility.

The language must change from “them and us” to a collective “we.”

From “their problem” to “our problem.”

From “what can we receive?” to “what can we contribute?”

This also demands a different educational posture. Our children need Torah, yirat Shamayim, and a strong identity. But a strong identity need not entail helplessness.

Many of them will enter the world beyond the walls of the Beit Midrash. We must give them the tools to earn, create, lead, and serve—to enter a complex world without fear and to carry Torah with them wherever they go.

This brings us back to Noah’s Ark. The Ark was necessary. Without it, there would have been no future for Torah Judaism.

But no one dreams of living forever inside an Ark. When the waters recede, the door must be opened.

For generations we built a magnificent Ark. The time has come to move to the next stage.

Not only an Ark. A lighthouse. A lighthouse of Torah.

We must become a society sufficiently confident in its Torah to cast its light far beyond itself. A society whose Torah has something to say about economics and security, technology and welfare, morality and government, family and community, and the proper character of a Jewish state.

We need to stop asking only how the State of Israel can adapt itself to Charedim, and begin asking what Torah—the magnificent Torah studied throughout the Charedi world—can give to the State of Israel.

We did not preserve Torah for generations so that it could remain forever sealed within an enclave. We preserved it because the Jewish people need it. And they need it now.

That is why we need a new Charedi politics.

A politics that knows how to say yes.

Yes to Torah. Yes to livelihood. Yes to service and shared responsibility. Yes to integrity. Yes to education. Yes to opportunity. Yes to partnership.

Not because the state is perfect, and not because our disagreements have ended. But because we can no longer evade responsibility for the broader public.

The people of Israel are our brothers and sisters, and our shared Jewish future lies here.

This is not a repudiation of the Charedi project.

It is its next chapter.

The first chapter was survival. The next must be flourishing.

The first chapter was Yavneh. The next must be Jerusalem.

The first chapter was Noah’s Ark. The next must be a lighthouse.

And the Kiddush Hashem of yesterday—the demonstration that Torah could survive—must become the Kiddush Hashem of today: the demonstration of what a Torah society is capable of giving.

The State of Israel, and the Jewish people as a whole, are waiting for us.

That is the challenge—and the responsibility—of our generation. (Tzarich Iyum August 31)

The writer is a community rabbi in Jerusalem, head of the Iyun Institute and editor-in-chief of Tzarich Iyun. This piece is an adaptation of an address he gave at the launch of the Tzibur HaCharedi party which took place in Beit Shemesh on August 23.