

ערב סוכות
14 Tishrei 5787
September 25, 2026
Issue number 1634



Jerusalem 6:01
Toronto 7:04;

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*

**Canadians Must not
Shrug Off Yet
Another Violent Attack on our
Jewish Neighbours**
By Andrew Bennett

Two years ago on a sultry, mid-July day in Ottawa with Parliament in recess and the public service engaging in the

day-to-day running of government at a more glacial pace, I sat down over a long lunch with a friend. Our focus of discussion, so typical of midsummer Ottawa somnolence, was crystal-ball gazing and considering what political moves the autumn would bring.

My friend asked me what I thought was the greatest problem facing the country. My response was "whatever," by which I meant Canadian complacency. Whether it is our failure to boost economic development, to tackle the rising cost of living, or to address our challenges with defence procurement so as to renew our military, the response from so many of us ends up being a shrugged "whatever."

We accept things just as they are and, in so doing, fail to fully take any responsibility as citizens to care for our country, to demand better accountability from our leaders, or to speak out against those ideas and those individuals that seek to violently disrupt the peace.

The scourge of antisemitism was on full display this week in Belleville, Ontario, when a gunman opened fire outside a synagogue on Yom Kippur, the holiest day on the Jewish calendar—the day of atonement.

A very clear manifestation of the "whatever" syndrome is our country's attitude in the wake of these awful but all-too-frequent events. Our leaders proffer nice words but little else.

On Oct. 8, 2023, the day after the attacks against innocent Israelis by Hamas terrorists, then-prime minister Justin Trudeau said we stand with "our Israeli friends."

Eight days later, when appointing an envoy on antisemitism, Trudeau called antisemitism "a daily reality experienced by Jewish communities here in Canada and around the world" and noted: "Antisemitism is not a problem for the Jewish community to

confront alone." (Amen!)

Later that same day, in the House of Commons, he noted a rise in "instances of antisemitism and Islamophobia."

Subsequent Trudeau statements, 21 in all, would highlight the "disturbing," "sharp," "disgusting," "vile," "terrifying," and "alarming" rise. Another 11 statements would be issued by Mark Carney in the time since he became prime minister, where the thesaurus once again got a workout—"reprehensible," "intolerable," "devastating," and "unacceptable" were the adjectives chosen.

If words could win the war on antisemitism, Canadian prime ministers would be world leaders. Yet, unfortunately, we're losing battle after battle and have become a leader in antisemitism.

In 2015, Canada recorded 178 instances of hate crimes directed at Jewish Canadians. By 2025, that number had more than quadrupled to 788. That number actually represents an improvement over 2023 and 2024's numbers, and yet there's no comfort to be had in those numbers when synagogues are being shot at, including in Belleville. We thank God that what could have been a massacre was thwarted by a courageous veteran of the Belleville Police Service, Const. Jeff Smith.

Words clearly are not enough. How do we better support him and his fellow peace officers to ensure that such incidents fail to materialize at all?

Crown prosecutors can pursue hate-motivated offences with the urgency they warrant, and attorneys general must clearly direct police forces to intervene in violent protests and ensure those accused of hate crimes are fully investigated. Universities can discipline students, faculty, and staff who mistreat Jewish classmates and colleagues. Public institutions can make continued funding contingent on maintaining environments in which Jewish Canadians can participate safely.

Political leaders also need to speak with greater precision. Antisemitism should not routinely be folded into broader statements

Commentary...

Unfortunate Sons By Amit Segal

Less than a day after Macron explained to Israelis that Hamas is not active in Judea and Samaria, and three days since a Hamas gunman murdered Netanel Shukrun, a terrorist rammed a checkpoint, seriously wounding a reserve soldier, Neria Leiter, son of Israel's ambassador to the United States, Yechiel Leiter.

Neria is also the brother of Moshe Leiter, a father of six and a medical student, who fell alongside three other reservists in northern Gaza in November 2023. Despite losing a brother, Neria was standing in reserve uniform when the attack occurred. "The decision to return to reserve duty was not simple at all," he wrote, but he couldn't stand on the sidelines while his friends kept serving, adding that he felt "an enormous privilege... to defend our home." Like so many others, he served hundreds of days.

Neria's father was at his post when word reached him. En route back to Israel, he asked the country to pray for a miracle. Thankfully, after hours of intensive surgery, Neria's condition stabilized—though he remains in critical condition.

The Leiter family's story sits at the beating heart of this country. Parents who heard Israel's call and left the comfort of the United States to build a home in the Jewish state. Yechiel has spent his entire life in public service before rising to the country's most critical diplomatic post—but Israel has no senators' sons. His children served in the army; one lost his life doing so, another now lies in critical condition. Even as that son fights for his life in the ICU, his sister lies barely 40 meters down the corridor, having given birth the day before the attack. One hallway, holding a family's grief and its future at once. No image captures more sharply the Israeli condition the Leiters chose, in all its triumph and tragedy.

All of Israel is praying for Neria's recovery. (It's Noon in Israel Sep 24)

שבת שלום וחג שמח

After Belleville Attack, CIJA Warns Government Foreign Policy Double Standards have Consequences at Home

Following Prime Minister Carney's co-chairing of a UN meeting on the two-state solution, and inflammatory comments by Foreign Affairs Minister Anita Anand at the United Nations, the Centre for Israel and Jewish Affairs (CIJA) issued the following statement:

"We share the objective of a peaceful and secure future for Israelis and Palestinians. But Canada's one-sided punitive approach diminishes Canada's influence and its ability to contribute meaningfully to peace on the ground.

"Canada recognized a Palestinian state over a year ago. Yet there has been no accountability for the Palestinian Authority to deliver on the commitments Prime Minister Carney himself set out, including fundamental governance reform, elections in which Hamas can play no part, and demilitarization.

"Today, Foreign Minister Anand went even further, entertaining potential action against an Israeli aircraft travelling to the United Nations. It is another outrageous example of the extraordinary double standard at the heart of Canada's approach to Israel.

"Following the attack on a Belleville synagogue on Yom Kippur, Canadian leaders have a responsibility to protect Jewish Canadians from the domestic consequences of a dangerous double standard toward Israel that gives extremists a green light to target Canadians." (CIJA Sep 23)

about hatred whenever Jewish Canadians are the specific targets of an attack—indeed, many of those statements by Carney and Trudeau were dual-purpose “antisemitism and Islamophobia” statements. Naming the offence clearly helps the public understand its character, its history, and the unique danger it poses.

This week, it was not only the shooting at Belleville’s lone synagogue, it was also police arresting a man in Whitby, Ontario, who was planning a similar attack. In June, it was a shooting in downtown Montreal. Jewish Torontonians are sadly used to a regular pattern of attacks on schools, daycares, businesses, and synagogues. Years of escalating hostility met with harsh language and harsher indifference have brought us here.

Prime ministers have found many ways to describe this crisis. This time, Carney’s speechwriters decided to forgo the adjectives and simply said the government would “do everything in our power to support law enforcement in ensuring that the perpetrator is held accountable to the fullest extent of the law.” With the Belleville shooter’s death in the hospital, there will be no civil accountability, only divine accountability now. Yet our leaders in government, business, academic institutions, and cultural industries must be held accountable by all of us. They have a duty before God to uphold not simply the peace, order, and good government of this dominion, but the inherent human dignity of its Jewish citizens.

Will we as their fellow citizens demand that this duty be upheld, or become complicit in our failure to demand better? Will we ourselves act? Or will we fall back to “whatever”? That is no longer an option. Indeed, it never was. (MacDonald Laurier Institute Sep 23)

Challenging the One-Sided Boycott of ‘West Bank’ Exports

By Mike Holmes and Walter E. Block

Numerous facts have been ignored regarding the one-sided European boycott of “West Bank” exports. But first, two important terminological issues should be mentioned.

First, there is no such thing as the “West Bank.” It has been common parlance for a long time, but the term is incorrect. The proper appellation for this neck of the woods is “Judea and Samaria.” Second, Jewish people living in Judea and Samaria are residents, not “settlers,” even though most pundits write as if this were true. In their understanding, “settlers” are people who “settle” and stake claims on land belonging to others.

But Jews occupied and homesteaded these disputed areas some 3,500 years ago. The Arabs are the interlopers. They are the Johnnies-come-lately, who arrived a scant few centuries ago.

Why is this important? First, the BDS movement in England and elsewhere wishes to boycott exports from Judea and Samaria because the Jewish occupants have supposedly been brutalizing their Palestinian neighbors.

Two things are wrong with this. First, the boycotters have it backwards. It is not the Jewish occupants who have been brutalizing their Palestinian neighbors. It is exactly the other way around.

What’s the evidence for this claim?

Political scientist and writer Bob Goldberg provides it. He notes, “Some or all of the incidents of settler violence were responses to provocation, or acts of retaliation.” That is, in virtually all of the cases involved, it was the Arabs who started the fighting, and the Jews who were defensively reacting to these provocations.

He continues, “When Israelis are killed, Israeli lethal responses rise. Palestinian killings of Israelis were not similarly predicted by prior Israeli killings of Palestinians. Palestinian violence, in other words, drives the cycle; Israeli violence responds to it.”

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that we could successfully quarrel with the statistical analysis underlying these claims. After all, it is difficult, not to say impossible, to say which came first: the chicken or the egg. Assume, then, that the boycotters got it right. The direction of causation was exactly the opposite of what we say: The Jews were guilty of initiating the hostilities, and the Palestinians merely responded.

Can the actions of the Israeli “settlers” still be defended? According to philosopher John Locke, they are the rightful owners of the disputed property if we consider that legitimate ownership arises from homesteading. Jews cultivated the land long before the

Palestinians arrived. The Al-Aqsa mosque is situated above the Jewish Second Temple. Archeological evidence supports this pattern throughout the Middle East.

News of British and European boycotts of products made or grown by Jewish settlers in the “West Bank” would at first seem to be mere feel-good virtue signaling. But it is worse than that. Why is only one group of “West Bank” inhabitants singled out for exclusion? What objective body decides “whoever lives here is bad” (Jew) and “whoever lives there is good” (Arab)?

Violence between these two groups has been endemic for decades. As the facts demonstrate, this violence is not a one-sided history of aggression by Jews. Rather, facts show that Jewish violence is usually (if not always) in retaliation for Arab attacks upon Jews. Why are Palestinian attackers given a free pass?

Don’t Palestinians located in Judea and Samaria have export products that can be similarly “boycotted”? A one-sided boycott appears to be based on emotional media accusations, not fair judgments based on “facts on the ground.” Some might say that violence and counter-violence are both bad. But if violence is being punished by European boycotts, then everyone involved should be included. If not, then neither side should be punished.

This situation resembles the one-sided narratives about the war in Gaza. Ignoring the terrorist actions of Hamas makes the conflict appear one-sided. However, if you consider the initial Hamas invasion of Israel, the IDF’s efforts to rescue citizens and hold war criminals accountable are clearly justified by ethics and international law.

What is driving this unprecedented boycott of exports produced solely by Jews? Is it the troubling influence of Israel Derangement Syndrome? It is particularly concerning that this action is being taken by ruling left-wing political parties, rather than the often-criticized “right-wing” elements. When did leftists begin leading the charge for antisemitic and anti-Israel movements? Will Jewish “West Bank” products have to be labeled with the Star of David?

The real insult is not just one-sided reporting and legally biased boycotts, but the smug attitude of the British and European political establishment, which believes we are too naive to see through its actions. Not this time. Not by a long shot. (JNS Sep 20)

Israel Just Killed Hamas’s Money Man. Now Follow the Money...

By Nitsana Darshan-Leitner

Israel eliminated Muhammad Abu Alwan, identified as Hamas’s finance chief, in an airstrike this week in Khan Yunis in the southern Gaza Strip. While the death of another senior Hamas operative in Gaza is an important achievement in the campaign against the terrorist organization, there is a much larger story contained in the announcement by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Israel Katz.

They did not merely promise to continue hunting Hamas commanders and operatives; they specifically pledged to “target [Hamas’s] sources of funding” and destroy its terrorist infrastructure.

That language should receive far more attention than it has. After more than two decades of representing victims of terrorism and pursuing terrorist organizations and their financial enablers through the courts, I have learned that the most important terrorist is not always the man carrying the weapon or issuing the order. Sometimes, it is the person sitting behind a desk moving the money, because he makes the entire operation possible.

Hamas can replace a finance chief, just as it can replace a military commander, a rocket engineer or a terrorist killed on the battlefield. But replacing an entire financial infrastructure is considerably more difficult when banks, money changers, front companies, charities, cryptocurrency channels and other intermediaries that move the money are identified and forced to confront the legal and financial consequences of facilitating terrorism.

This is a lesson Israel understood years ago.

During the tenure of the legendary Mossad Director Meir Dagan in the early 2000s, Israel developed an aggressive approach to terrorist financing that became associated with the Harpoon unit. Its mission was to identify and disrupt the financial networks sustaining terrorist organizations and their supporters, because Israeli

intelligence understood that eliminating individual terrorists without attacking the infrastructure that recruits, equips and finances them could never be sufficient to defeat the organizations themselves. Harpoon's motto was: "Follow the money, target the money, kill the money."

I have spent much of my career fighting that same war on a different battlefield.

At our Shurat HaDin Law Center, we have taken terrorist organizations, their financiers and financial facilitators to court, because terrorism does not exist in a vacuum. It depends upon an economic infrastructure that allows terrorists to pay salaries, purchase weapons, construct tunnels, move operatives, maintain communications, recruit supporters and rebuild after military losses.

The courtroom therefore can become another battlefield in the war against terrorism, particularly when the objective is not merely to punish someone after an attack but to identify the financial system that allowed the attack to happen in the first place.

That is why today's announcement should prompt a much larger set of questions than simply who Abu Alwan was and how he was eliminated: Who financed him, and who financed the people who financed him? Which banks processed the transactions, which money changers moved the funds, which companies concealed their origins, which intermediaries transferred Iranian money into Hamas's network, and which individuals knowingly provided the financial infrastructure that allowed Hamas to continue operating?

Those questions are critical because terrorist financing is rarely as simple as a suitcase of cash being handed from one terrorist to another. Modern terrorist organizations operate sophisticated financial networks that can stretch across borders and exploit legitimate businesses, charitable organizations, banking relationships, informal financial systems and increasingly sophisticated methods of moving money without immediately revealing the ultimate beneficiary.

Iran has spent years building precisely such networks for Hamas, Hezbollah and other terror proxies, and Washington has increasingly recognized that confronting those networks requires more than traditional diplomacy or military pressure.

U.S. Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent's campaign against Iranian financial networks reflects an understanding that America's extraordinary influence over the international monetary system can be used as a weapon against the infrastructure that generates revenue for the Iranian regime and supports its terrorist proxies. This is particularly true when sanctions and financial enforcement are directed not simply at a government in Tehran but at the companies, vessels, intermediaries and facilitators that actually move the money.

This is the natural evolution of the war on terror-financing that the State of Israel began years ago.

The United States possesses financial leverage on a scale that no other country can match, while Israel possesses extraordinary intelligence capabilities and a long history of identifying the people and networks behind terrorist financing. Organizations like Shurat HaDin bring another indispensable weapon to the fight by using civil litigation to pursue terrorist financiers and those who knowingly enable them.

These tools should not operate independently; they should reinforce one another.

When intelligence identifies a financial intermediary, sanctions should follow where legally justified, banks should know the risk they are being asked to assume, law enforcement should investigate the network and victims should have the ability to use the courts to pursue those responsible and seek recovery from assets connected to terrorism.

This is especially important because terrorist organizations are extraordinarily resilient when their financial infrastructure remains intact.

Kill one commander and another can take his place; destroy one weapons depot and another can be constructed; eliminate one finance chief and Hamas can appoint a successor; but if the financial institutions, companies, intermediaries and assets that sustain the organization are systematically identified and attacked through every available legal and financial mechanism, rebuilding becomes exponentially more difficult.

That is why I have always believed that the war against terrorism

cannot end when the shooting stops, because the financial networks that sustain terrorism do not disappear when a battlefield operation is over.

The ultimate measure of success should not simply be how many terrorists are eliminated, but how effectively terrorist organizations are prevented from regenerating themselves. And that requires following the money long after the smoke has cleared.

The killing of Abu Alwan may have removed an important Hamas financier from the battlefield, but the more important question is what happens to the financial network he leaves behind. If we identify that network, expose its participants, freeze its assets and pursue those who knowingly enabled it, his death can become more than the elimination of another terrorist commander. It can become an opportunity to dismantle an entire financial ecosystem.

That is the real lesson of the war against Hamas. It is the lesson that Israel's experience with Harpoon, Shurat HaDin's decades of litigation and America's growing campaign against Iranian financial networks should teach us.

Terrorist organizations do not live on ideology alone. They require money, and as long as the money continues to flow, there will always be someone willing and able to pick up the weapon left behind by the terrorist who was killed yesterday.

If we want to end the cycle rather than simply win the next battle, we have to attack the financial infrastructure that makes terrorism possible, because the only way to cut off the oxygen of terrorism is to cut off the money that sustains it. (JNS Sep 24)

Avi Lewis's Foolish Statement on 'Jewish People' should be Disqualifying By Robyn Urback

The statement that NDP Leader Avi Lewis posted on X on the Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur deserves to be reproduced in its entirety, in order to fully appreciate its malignancy and reckless stupidity.

"Tonight Yom Kippur begins, the most sombre moment of the Jewish calendar," Mr. Lewis wrote. "It's a time of atonement – a time to grieve those who have been lost, a time to acknowledge and take responsibility for harms we have caused, individually and collectively. For Jewish people, the personal has always been political and the political always personal. This year I'm reflecting on the fact that we failed to do our part to stop an ongoing genocide committed in our name. There are many other fronts where I have to do the work of repair. But nothing on this scale."

In this statement, Mr. Lewis is not criticizing Israel, or even "Zionists" (which has become the appropriate way of saying "Jews" in polite company). Instead, the leader of Canada's progressive mainstream is explicit: a genocide is happening in the name of Jews everywhere. And those Jews have failed to do their part to stop it.

This type of odious bigotry would have been resoundingly condemned if Mr. Lewis didn't happen to be Jewish himself, which has the practical effect of inoculating him against most charges of antisemitism. But because no shot is 100-per-cent effective, I feel confident in declaring that what he wrote is, in fact, textbook antisemitism: the sort of abominable, insidious rhetoric that fuels acts of hatred against Jews in Canada and throughout the rest of the diaspora.

Indeed, it's even more pernicious coming from someone who himself is Jewish, because Mr. Lewis lends this belief a legitimacy it wouldn't have had otherwise, and in effect he offers permission for non-Jews to say the same thing. Because if a Jewish man is saying that Jewish people have "failed to do our part to stop an ongoing genocide committed in our name," how is anyone else to say otherwise?

I will admit to not being familiar enough with Mr. Lewis' history to know if he is indeed a simple man, or just pretending to be one. But anyone with even a rudimentary understanding of leadership would recognize the dangers of assigning blame for a specific action from one government on an entire group of people; of calling out harms caused by Jewish people "collectively," and chastising them for failing to "do [their] part to stop an ongoing genocide," as if a Jew in Ottawa has any more obligation to stop what's happening in Gaza than does a Chinese man in Vancouver to stop what's happening in

Xinjiang.

If you suggest that Jewish people collectively bear some responsibility for the harms being perpetrated against Palestinians, as Mr. Lewis did in his statement, then you place a target on the back of any and every Jew living in Canada. And when some Canadians hear that Jewish people collectively are complicit in genocide (and hear that from a Jew, no less!), it becomes reasonable, by this twisted logic, to smash a Jewish bakery's windows, or to tear down mezuzahs from Jewish homes, or to bring a shotgun to a synagogue in Belleville, Ont. during Yom Kippur services and spray bullets through its stained glass windows. Because why should the people complicit in genocide know peace, even if they live in Canada?

Mr. Lewis' foolish and bigoted statement should be disqualifying for the leader of a major political party, and especially a progressive one. However, because he is leader of the NDP, and because his target was Jews, it very well could boost his internal support by five points. But even if his party looks the other way, the rest of Canada should not simply shrug off such a crass and dangerous statement.

If Mr. Lewis didn't intend to blame Jewish people collectively for the ongoing violence in Gaza, even though that's precisely what he said, he should address that publicly, and explain what he really meant. If, on the other hand, he meant exactly what he said, he should tell us why Russian people in Canada bear some responsibility for failing to stop the ongoing assault of Ukraine, and advise on what Muslim people in Canada should be doing to atone for the mass killings carried out by extremists done in their name. Because if one group has an obligation to stop the actions of a government in another country, shouldn't they all?

Mr. Lewis clearly had a lot to say this Yom Kippur about atoning for the sins of others. But perhaps he should look closer to home, and start with atoning for a pretty despicable one of his own.

(Globe & Mail Sep 22)

'Fauda' is a Global Hit, Though People Still Root for the Terrorists By Thane Rosenbaum

The fifth season of the Israeli thriller "Fauda" is now streaming on Netflix, 10 years after the hit television series first introduced the gritty realism and high drama of Israeli counterespionage to the world of undercover cop procedurals. It has been an improbable hit since its launch.

Each season landed in the top 10 in the 43 countries in which Netflix aired the show, doing especially well across Europe and Asia. Season five has already nabbed the top spot in both Israel and Lebanon. In non-English-speaking Netflix territories, the new season is charting at number four, its highest position ever.

This means that in many of the countries that believe Israel has no right to exist and routinely root for terrorists to slaughter Jews, a television show that depicts Israeli covert operatives outsmarting and dispatching Arab terrorists has an inexplicably loyal audience.

Counterterrorism dramas are fan favorites worldwide. But that generally holds for James Bond and MI6, or the CIA aided by SEAL Team Six. Historically, cultural entertainment that showcases the derring-do of the Mossad, Shin Bet and the Israel Defense Forces ... not so much.

The world likes its Jews as victims, so long as they do not become objects of special pleading or self-pity. Leveraging the suffering of Jews is, apparently, intolerable. Dead Jews must end up devoid of sympathy. That's the kind of plot conceit an audience can get behind.

In no way can Jews be depicted as heroes. There is no room in prime time for that.

Battle-hardened Jewish warriors or Israeli secret agents have rarely captured the public's imagination. "Exodus" (1960), "Masada" (1981), "Munich" (2005), "Victory at Entebbe" (1976), "Raid on Entebbe" (1977), "The House on Garibaldi Street" (1979), "The Debt" (2010), "Operation Finale" (2018), "Uprising" (2001) and "The Red Sea Diving Resort" (2019) were all inspired, heart-stopping tales. Some were successful, but none compared to the likes of the Bond film "Skyfall."

In this sense, the success of "Fauda" is unusual. None of the cast members are stereotypically Hollywood Handsome. It features Jews straight out of central casting: balding, gruffly unshaven, plodding but

surprisingly spry with Krav Maga.

There are no girls cast as vixens, villains or femme fatales. No field operative ever appears in a tuxedo playing high-stakes poker or taking a spin at the roulette wheel at a casino. The characters have sex, but real sex—not tongue-in-cheek orgasms around the world.

Yet while each cyber-skilled, GPS-savvy Israeli operative was licensed to kill, they received the same lukewarm support among Hollywood elites as any number of snubbed Taylor Sheridan shows at the Emmys.

Fauda, which means "chaos" in Arabic, is never short on taking its special undercover unit on nail-biting escapades. The series coincides with the last two wars Israel has waged inside Gaza, though many of the covert operations have taken place in Judea and Samaria, Lebanon, Belgium and France.

The essential narrative arc of the show is the subterranean depths of its undercover work. Because they are Israelis, the operatives are composed largely of Mizrahi Jews, and some Bedouins—meaning they look just like Arabs and not like the Jews of Poland, to the great disgust of Israel-bashers everywhere. These Jewish James Bonds speak Arabic and know their way around a mosque better than most Muslims. This makes their counterterror raids, hostage rescues and urban warfare in dense civilian environments all the more death-defying and believable.

And they are not necessarily always the good guys. "Fauda" could just as easily be Arabic for "flawed." They grapple with moral dilemmas and often find a way to spare the Arabs they target. Their enemies are referred to as "terrorists," not Muslims. They are very much unlike the Islamists who threaten Israel with terror and have no ambivalence at all about murdering Jews.

The unit may disguise themselves as Arabs, but they do not mask their intentions or the inner conflict that has rendered them deeply damaged by all the death they have witnessed and participated in.

Season five is the first to have launched after the Hamas-led terrorist attacks and massacre of 1,200 men, women and children—and the kidnapping of 251 others into Gaza—in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023. One of its cast members, an actual reservist in the IDF, was seriously wounded in the counterstrike against the terrorists in Gaza.

It is set two years after the attack and takes full advantage of the backstory of Hamas's bloody joyride and Israel's traumatized demand for vengeance. The members of the unit take the losses of that day personally.

The unit's former commander, Eli, loses his entire family on Oct. 7—both children slaughtered, his wife raped by a Hamas officer and then murdered. Doron, the show's central protagonist, portrayed by Lior Raz, also a co-creator and co-writer, saw the events on Oct. 7 play out firsthand.

We see him in flashback trying to rescue teenagers but arriving too late, haunted by the image of dead bodies piled high inside blast-resistant shelters, girls with blood dripping from their pelvises, ringing the crime scene.

Doron is relying on psychotherapy to return to a life among the living. Eli discovers the man who murdered his family is alive and well in Marseilles. Another Hamas plot, an Oct. 7 encore, is being planned and must be thwarted. Both men return to active and moral duty.

The fact that "Fauda" continues to be so popular around the world while global public opinion still seems to be rooting for terrorists tells you everything you need to know about the twisted reality, moral inversions and upside-down perversions that Israel faces in waging its wars against traffickers in terror.

News gets misreported. Casualties count for one side only, and the numbers never add up. International law gets rewritten on the fly. Blatant lies—"genocide," "mass starvation," "apartheid"—are too beguiling to rebut.

The world simply won't allow Israel to humanize the reasons why it has always been forced to defend itself, even when a hit TV show reveals the truth so graphically. It can't seem to move its audience to translate what they see on their screens into what they feel in their hearts. (Jewish Journal Sep 23)
