עש"ק פרשת וירא
20 Cheshvan 5787
October 30, 2026
Issue number 1639

Jerusalem 4:12
Toronto 5:53

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…

Pyromania, from Paris to Palestine By Seth Mandel

Brad Lander is currently on a selfie tour of Judea and Samaria. Here he is on a comfy bus ride guarded by IDF soldiers—Lander was with a group of foreigners seeking to provoke clashes between Jews and Arabs during the olive harvest, and the IDF accompanied him away from the area where he was trying to start a war.

Lander's fun trip turned sour, however, when he practically begged the IDF to arrest him and they refused. Lander told the friendly IDF soldiers that he wasn't yet a congressman, just a candidate for Congress, hoping they would put him in handcuffs or give him some anti-Zionist photo op. But the IDF didn't care that he wasn't that important; they treated him with respect anyway. All they required of him was to follow the law.

Lander's disappointment was palpable. Over the past week or so, a particular pattern has taken place. American activists join Arab Palestinians in rock-throwing attacks and other provocations against Jews in the area, Jews respond with their own acts of violence, the foreign media print only the Jewish violence, and more conflict tourists are incentivized to join a conflict on the other side of the world.

Jewish shepherds and farmers have had their animals stolen, others have seen their animals poisoned. Settlers have blocked roads, trapped Palestinians inside their houses, and committed their own disreputable acts of violence and provocation. It's a genuine cycle of violence, with a complicated back story: The Palestinian rejection of statehood has left Judea and Samaria in a state of limbo. Jews and Arabs thus try to create facts on the ground in a competition over land.

The other day, a Palestinian appeared to be caught on video trying to kill Knesset candidate Fleur Hassan by throwing a football-sized jagged rock through her car window while she and others were driving through Judea and Samaria. Brad Lander did not volunteer to drive Fleur Hassan around in an act of protective solidarity because such anti-Israel activists are there to provoke, not prevent, violence.

Lander's stunt was reminiscent of the self-humiliation ritual performed by Democratic Rep. Ro Khanna. In July, Khanna's vehicle was temporarily stopped by the IDF in a military zone. Khanna had been trying to provoke settler violence, failed, and his companion released video showing that Khanna's story about being detained was a fairytale.

Khanna is an interesting case, because while France was burning over the past week in a series of riots that had spread across Europe, Khanna tweeted his approval: "From the high schools of France to the streets of Madrid to the universities of Tirana, young people are telling their governments the same thing: in an age of massive wealth inequality, they want a future they can believe in… The is what happens when nations let wealth and power accumulate in the hands of a few. This is what happens when young people lose hope in their future."

The two incidents are more alike than one might think. Those who obey a violence-first doctrine support such violence everywhere. Khanna's show of giddiness while Europe burned was entirely consistent with his attempt to spark conflict in Judea and Samaria.

Nor is it just a coincidence that many of those burning Europe carried Palestinian flags. In the hands of a Palestinian, it is the flag of a national movement. In the hands of left-wing rioters, it is the flag of an ideology. In anybody's hands, it is a flag of destruction.

There is one more aspect to the repeated Democratic pilgrimages to Palestine, and it tells us much about the perpetrators' intentions. All these activists desperately want Jews to behave badly. They want to believe that the Jewish state itself is worse than anybody has reason to think. This requires incitement and provocation and carefully curated video clips.

On the other hand, dangerous and unethical behavior comes naturally to Lander & Co. As does the shamelessness required to post that behavior on social media for all to see. (Commentary.org Oct 21)

The Anti-Semitic Ad Inspired by Abdul El-Sayed's Own Words
By Seth Mandel

"We're paying $5 gas. We're paying more for groceries because of a war we should not be fighting at the behest of whom? The government of Israel."

That's a quote from Abdul El-Sayed, the Democratic nominee for Senate in a tight Michigan race against Republican Mike Rogers. The reason I start off with that quote is that there has been an ad made in support of El-Sayed that everyone agrees is overtly anti-Semitic. El-Sayed won't denounce the ad, but his defenders insist he can't be blamed for it.

I provide the quote above to make absolutely clear that the ad everyone agrees is anti-Semitic is drawn from Abdul El-Sayed's explicit statements. The candidate and the ad, then, are equally anti-Semitic.

The ad depicts a couple in a grocery store doing their food shopping. The wife tells her partner he has to put the eggs back because they can't afford them: "We have to set that seven dollars aside for killing Palestinians."

The husband whines about the money they already give Israel and the wife complains that each individual American must now fork over another $161 to the Jewish state to "drop bombs on Gaza." The couple then complain that Americans are also paying for Israeli universal healthcare. "Might as well put the bananas back."

None of this is true, obviously. But the lies are almost beside the point of an ad that would make the Nazis blush. The real point is to plant the idea that Americans are going hungry because of the Jews.

The video isn't new—what's new is the addition of the names of the Michigan Senate contenders. The ad is put out by a group run by left-wing propagandist Cenk Uyghur (who happens to be the uncle of Hasan Piker, another anti-Semitic El-Sayed proxy).

But the idea undergirding the ad is El-Sayed's. So let's just be clear: If the ad is indefensible, so is El-Sayed.

Here's another example. In August, the writer Anand Giridharadas interviewed El-Sayed and asked the Michigan Democrat about his obsession with connecting Israel to local issues. Here is how El-Sayed responded: "Israel is an affordability issue. Every time you want to put glasses on kids' faces or give people healthcare or fix a school, somebody pops up and is like, Well, how are you going to pay for that? I don't know. Maybe we should keep our money here instead of sending it there to drop bombs on people's schools or their hospitals. That's our money. You just saw $3.3 billion voted to send abroad to a foreign government that, by the way, has guaranteed healthcare and can guarantee college education without debt. We can't. And you want to send my money over there? That's insane."

Notice the common formula? El-Sayed says Michiganders can't afford basic services because that money is being spent by Israel "to drop bombs." Israel, he complains, just like the complaining couple in the Jew-baiting ad, "has guaranteed healthcare." It's therefore "insane," El-Sayed says, that "you want to send my money over

there."

El-Sayed has been saying some form of this all campaign. It's basically his only idea. Every bumper-sticker line you hear from El-Sayed is a version of this grocery ad.

He's not the only Democrat angrily spitting this propaganda, of course. Darializa Avila Chevalier, a New York Democratic House nominee, blamed the Jewish state for gentrification. New York Assembly candidate Lydia Green said, "The more we're spending on genocide and displacement of Palestinians, the less we're spending on housing, feeding, and caring for New Yorkers."

Does it require an astonishing level of innumeracy and economic ignorance to believe that when the U.S. gives Israel vouchers to buy weapons from American manufacturers—thus expanding American jobs and American manufacturing—it's somehow taking eggs and bananas out of the mouths of theoretical Abdul El-Sayed voters?

Yes, it does. That's why no one believes it. But some people want to believe it, and others pretend to believe it. One person in the latter category is Abdul El-Sayed, the inspiration for some of the ugliest political anti-Semitism in America. (Commentary.org Oct 27)

The Alarming Rise of Islamic Power By Melanie Phillips

The huge Arab turnout in the Israeli election this week should ring loud alarm bells for both Israel and the West.

What suddenly became visible in Israel was what's been emerging in Europe and now also in America: the weaponization of democracy by Islamic power.

In Israel's election, the various Arab parties clocked up a record number of 19 Knesset seats. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Likud has accused these parties of fraud, bribery, intimidation and ballot manipulation.

Now the chairman of the Central Elections Committee, Noam Sohlberg, has ordered an inquiry by Israel's security agency, the Shin Bet, into "serious suspicions of improper influence" through funding by foreign actors working against Israel's interests. The main finger of suspicion is pointing at Qatar having funneled money to boost Arab turnout.

Alarm should go even deeper than this. The Arab parties have used the country's utterly dysfunctional electoral system to put Israel's existential Zionist project in peril.

The astonishing Arab tally of 19 mandates has put a huge obstacle in the way of both the Likud and the opposition "change" blocs in forming a Zionist government.

While this deprived the Likud bloc of possible Knesset seats, it presents a worse predicament for the anti-Netanyahu faction. If these centrist and left-wing parties who have sworn never to join forces with Netanyahu refuse to abandon this position, their only route into government is to form a coalition with the Arabs.

But these parties consist of anti-Zionist Arab nationalists, anti-Zionist communists and Muslim Brotherhood-connected Islamists.

It may yet turn out that the sheer size of this Arab achievement, not to mention a possibly corrupted election process, will force the creation of what many think would be the best way forward for Israel.

This would be a unity government, in which Netanyahu's centrist foes swallow their "never Bibi" pledges to form a patriotic Zionist cabinet around him.

But it remains the fact that the Arab tail is now wagging the Israeli dog. It's no surprise that Mansour Abbas, leader of the Arab Ra'am party, has gloated: "Everyone's speaking with us."

Those piping up to say the Arabs' 19 seats prove that Israel is not an "apartheid state" are missing the deeper point. The Arabs' result is not a triumph of civil rights. It's a strategy of using those civil rights as a weapon for Israel's destruction.

Jubilant supporters of the Arab Joint List, whose candidates celebrated the terror attacks in southern Israel on Oct. 7, 2023, sang Biladi, biladi ("My homeland, my country") during election-night celebrations. The song extols the redemption of Palestine and its liberation through blood and fire.

In a post-election interview, Abbas once again refused to call Hamas a terror organization. In the past, he's said he had publicly accepted that Israel was a Jewish state solely to avoid his party being disqualified from running for the Knesset. He's also called the Jews invaders and murderers, declared that "their occupation will depart" and stated: "We are waging a civil jihad."

Abbas is an Islamist who was created by the Muslim Brotherhood, from which he only distanced himself to gain a foothold in the Knesset. The Brotherhood uses democratic entryism, pretense and manipulation alternatively with terrorist violence, as its strategy to destroy Israel and conquer the West.

Yet many Israelis regard Abbas as a pragmatist intent upon using a presence in government to secure improvements for Israeli Arabs in their daily lives. This is precisely the same delusional ignorance about Islamic fanaticism that the Israelis displayed so catastrophically over Hamas in Gaza and that led to Oct. 7.

It should be unthinkable for Israel to allow these Arab parties to function at all. Indeed, in September, the Central Elections Committee disqualified them from running in this election. It found they all fell afoul of the Basic Law that prohibits political parties if they support "armed struggle" or terrorism against Israel, or deny it as a Jewish state.

But the Supreme Court overruled this, claiming preposterously that there was no evidence of any of that and that the parties were needed to represent Israel's Arabs.

As ever, the court demonstrated how it's in thrall to the leftist ideologies that are currently writing the West's suicide note.

Leftists and liberals in the West traduce their own cultural identity as colonialist and oppressive, refuse to acknowledge the threat posed by an Islamic world that is steadily taking over their own societies, and denounce anyone who opposes this as racist and Islamophobic.

In Israel, the left has realized that it can only gain power with the help of the Arabs. In America and Europe, there's been a similar realization in progressive political circles that, with a rising sectarian Muslim population focused overwhelmingly upon an Islamic agenda, the route to power is through the extinction of Israel and the hounding of Jews.

Accordingly, the Islamic jihad is rising as a political force in Britain, Europe and America.

From mega-mosques to mass Muslim prayer in public spaces and the "red-green alliance" between leftists and Islamists marching together "for Gaza" on the streets, the Islamic world is demonstrating that it is taking control of the West.

As Israel has now suddenly seen, the Islamists have been making huge progress through their strategic deployment of the democratic system.

In Britain, there's now a sectarian Islamic bloc, a steadily rising Muslim presence in local government and, to the stupefaction of the general public, five "Gaza First" members of parliament.

When he was running for his current post as New York's mayor, Zohran Mamdani embraced Imam Siraj Wahhaj, who had championed the most brutal forms of Islamic sharia law, endorsed terrorism and called for a takeover of America, saying "politics are a weapon to use in the cause of Islam."

In Michigan, the Democratic candidate for the Senate, Dr. Abdul El-Sayed, is a follower of the Muslim Brotherhood, which has supported him with campaign cash and endorsement from its front groups and other fellow-travelers.

The claim that such concerns are "racist" misses the point by a mile. The West's bargain of citizenship means that minorities are welcome to establish their own forms of worship and culture provided they all sign up to the West's core values, such as one law for all, freedom of religion and equality for women.

Tragically, the West has torn up this bargain and refuses to privilege its historic core values over those of its Islamic minority.

In Israel, most are unaware that this bargain should be applied to its own Arabs as a minority population. Israeli Arabs should acknowledge that Israel is a Jewish state and that its identity, laws and institutions are based on Jewish precepts.

Many Israeli Arabs do exactly that. Arabs fighting in the Israel Defense Forces are far greater Israeli patriots than the ultra-Orthodox Jews declaring that they would rather die than enlist.

But Israel's ruling elites have been asleep to the growing radicalization of other Israeli Arabs who are identifying with the Palestinian agenda of exterminating Israel and killing Jews.

In part, this is because those elites are dominated by Ashkenazi Jews. These have a similar mindset to the West, which has now destroyed its moral compass by privileging misbehaving minorities over the victimized majority.

Just as the West needs to understand the foundational influence of Judaism upon its historic identity, so Israel needs to understand how its elites have been influenced by the West's current decadence.

Both need to lay down red lines. The West must promote and defend its historic cultural identity. And in Israel, the Arabs and their political parties must sign up to the Jewish state. Otherwise, they will need to be treated as enemies of the state.

Whether motivated by hatred of National Security Minister Itamar Ben-Gvir or corrupt funding by Qatar, the huge mobilization of Israeli Arabs at this election was the democratic version of the "Al-Aqsa Flood" of Oct. 7.

In both Israel and the West, public bamboozlement is so great that deliriously energized Islamists believe they're now within sight of victory over both.

To prevent that, governments in Israel, Britain and America need to wake up to the jihadi threat they are facing. (JNS Oct 29)

Who Gets a Veto Over Israeli Action Against Hamas and Iran?

By Jonathan S. Tobin

As the world awaited the official counting of the votes in Israel's election for a new Knesset, one thing seemed clear: Neither the coalition led by Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu nor that of the "anyone-but-Bibi" alliance of parties arrayed against him appeared to have a path to a majority that would enable them to easily form a government.

Yet the results raise the question of whether a government could be formed by the anti-Netanyahu coalition combining its strength with that of the anti-Zionist Arab parties, which significantly increased their strength in this round of elections.

To do so would violate the pledges made by three of the main anti-Netanyahu parties led by former Israel Defense Forces chief of staff Gen. Gadi Eisenkot, former prime minister Naftali Bennett and former defense minister Avigdor Liberman, who all promised never to be part of such a coalition during the campaign.

Many on the Israeli left and elsewhere say those parties were bullied into making such a pledge by Netanyahu and their fear of being viewed as aligned with parties that oppose the existence of the Jewish state. Critics of Netanyahu and the Israeli right claim that attempts to exclude the Arab parties from government or even to speak of anyone winning a majority of the Zionist or Jewish vote, as the prime minister did in his election-night address to his supporters, is inherently racist.

That may sound reasonable to Americans, whose political parties have always been vaguely ideological, but not sectarian or representing ethnic or religious groups. And it is entirely true that the votes of Israeli Arabs count just as much as those of their Jewish fellow citizens, and that their representatives have the right to enter the Knesset. Contrary to the smears and blood libels hurled at Israel, it is not an "apartheid state" but a democracy.

And it is also true that a precedent was established by the ragtag, shaky coalition formed in June 2021 led by Bennett, when one of the Arab parties participated: Ra'am, led by Mansour Abbas.

So what factor, other than anti-Arab prejudice, would bar either of the two Zionist coalitions from forming some sort of pact with Abbas and Ra'am, and the larger Joint Arab List, to end the uncertainty and form a government?

The answer is obvious. And it has nothing to do with Jews being prejudiced against Arabs and/or Muslims.

Simply put, at a time of ongoing war against Iran and its terrorist proxies—Hamas in Gaza, Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Houthis in Yemen—the notion of giving parties ideologically opposed to the existence of the State of Israel an effective veto on security questions and the stability of Israel's government is unimaginable. Or at least it would be, if those seriously considering such a deal prioritized the defeat of these forces, rather than merely being obsessed with ousting Netanyahu.

As Netanyahu noted with grim satisfaction in an address to his supporters on Tuesday night, the pre-election polls coming from media outlets hostile to him greatly underestimated the strength of his Likud Party and its allies. As the votes were counted, Likud did emerge as by far the largest of the parties. But his alliance of right-wing and religious parties was still short of winning an outright majority, which marked a change from the last election, when it did achieve that goal.

That allowed his foes to claim that Israelis had rejected the prime minister since a majority had voted for parties not aligned with him. That was a half-truth because it involved combining the votes of the anti-Netanyahu Zionist parties and those Arab and Islamic parties.

The idea that supporters of the United Arab List and the Ra'am Party on the one hand, and on the other, those backing Eisenkot, Bennett or Lieberman, are somehow aligned with each other is fictional. However, it does open up the possibility that although the anti-Netanyahu coalition seems to have gotten far fewer seats than the prime minister's bloc, it could manage to form a government by allying itself with the Arab parties.

It's important to remember what these two Arab parties stand for.

Abbas's United Arab List, better known by its Hebrew acronym Ra'am, came into being as the political wing of the Islamic Movement in Israel, an extension of the international Islamist and terrorist Muslim Brotherhood. It has broken off from that movement but still holds to its basic ideology while also claiming to favor a two-state solution with Israel. That's a contradictory position that allows it to maintain its links to its old allies (whose factions have been banned for inciting and advocating violence) while attempting to represent Israeli Arabs—in particular, the Bedouin, who support it in large numbers.

Abbas got high marks from liberal Israelis and others who cheered his willingness to join with Netanyahu's opponents in 2021. In return, for propping up the government led by Bennett (who was elected on a pledge to never sit with anti-Zionist parties or those of the Israeli left), he received much-needed funding for Arab communities.

The other Arab Party is the Joint List, a coalition of secular nationalist Arab parties that includes Hadash, the former Communist Party of Israel, and is led by academic Yousef Jabareen. It improved its showing in the last election in 2022 by reuniting with one of its former constituent members, the radical leftist Balad Party, which ran on its own four years ago and fell below the threshold of votes needed for entry to the Knesset.

This restored Joint List did far better than Ra'am this time. Its radicalism and full-throated opposition to Israel's existence and Zionism is undiluted by any appeals to moderation. It appealed more to Arab voters, who on the whole do not seem to have rewarded Abbas for his past service in a Zionist-led government.

Abbas appeared to double down on posing as moderate in this election. Ra'am gave the second slot on its list to Yoav Segalovitz, a

Jewish former Israeli law-enforcement officer and member of Knesset for the center-left Yesh Atid Party, who was essentially acting as a beard for his new Islamist friends. But this tactic didn't garner many Jewish voters. By contrast, Arabs were inspired to turn out in large numbers by the prospect of electing radicals who would be their answer to Israeli right-wingers like Otzma Yehudit's leader Itamar Ben-Gvir, the current national security minister. But for all the complaints heard in Israel and around the world about Ben-Gvir and his outrageous statements and behavior, the members of the Joint List, and to some extent, those affiliated with Ra'am, are far more radical and dangerous to Israel and its democracy than those on the Jewish right.

Some on the Israeli left say the Arab parties ought to be no more out-of-bounds for participation in a government than the Haredi parties: the Mizrachi Shas and the Ashkenazi United Torah Judaism, which are not, at least in principle, Zionist.

But this argument is somewhat disingenuous.

It's true that, strictly speaking, Shas and UTJ aren't Zionist because the rabbis who act as their spiritual authorities don't consider the current State of Israel to be the answer to the messianic hopes of Jews for the last 2,000 years. One can certainly criticize them for enabling a culture of avoidance of military service or even of participation in the economy for Haredi men. But they have not only worked with and participated in the government of Israel for decades; they also do not sympathize with or support Israel's enemies. They illustrate the difference between non-Zionism and anti-Zionism. One is based on acquiescence to the need to cooperate with the Jewish state. The other is part of an effort to destroy it.

The two Arab parties have offered to provide their votes to Eisenkot and the Zionist left from outside the government to enable them to oust Netanyahu. But whether inside or outside the Cabinet, it would make Eisenkot and his colleagues utterly dependent on factions that could pull the plug on them at any moment.

That means they could rely on Jabardeen and Abbas to back their plan to topple Netanyahu and perhaps enact constitutionally dubious legislation to ensure that he would be barred from office in the future. Once that was accomplished, Eisenkot—or whoever it was that wound up forming such a minority government—would know that their tenure would end the moment they displeased these Islamist and Arab nationalist factions.

That could effectively give Iran insurance that Israel would not strike (with or without the United States) its nuclear and ballistic-missile facilities, as well as other targets that aid its fomenting of international terrorism. That would likely also extend to any action to ensure that Hezbollah isn't able to re-establish its ability to threaten northern Israel, which was largely eliminated by the current government's victories won during the course of the war that ensued after the catastrophe of Oct. 7, 2023.

And it might also be exactly what Hamas needs to ensure that it can get away with its refusal to abide by the terms of the October 2025 ceasefire agreement with the United States, and both disarm and surrender governance of the approximate 30% of the Gaza Strip it still controls.

That is why the precedent of Mansour Abbas's participation in the government led by Bennett and his colleague Yair Lapid from June 2021 to December 2022 isn't a reason to try such a scheme again.

Israelis may have patted themselves on the back during those 18 months for demonstrating to the world anew that it was a democracy in which Arabs as well as Jews could govern. While that fact didn't convince any of its critics to stop libeling it as an "apartheid state," it also took place in a time when Israel wasn't at war.

During the period before the Hamas-led Palestinian Arab orgy of mass murder, torture, rape and kidnapping that took place on Oct. 7, the entire Israeli military, intelligence and political establishments, including both Netanyahu and those who opposed him in the current election, were convinced that Hamas wasn't really a threat. Few understood the gravity of their country's security predicament as Iran put in place the forces that would launch a multi-front war on the Jewish state.

In the aftermath of that disaster and the costly war Israel was forced to fight against foes who amply demonstrated their genocidal intent, it's all well and good to second-guess Netanyahu and blame him for it happening on his watch. But it is equally apparent that refraining from inviting into the cabinet parties that are against ensuring the elimination of the ability of Hamas, Hezbollah or Iran to again call into question Israel's existence is not an irrational or bigoted perspective. It's simply common sense.

And that is not even taking into account the argument that in the remaining two years of President Donald Trump's second term, Israel has a unique window of opportunity to ensure its security. That window is likely to close once he leaves office and is replaced by either a Democrat or a Republican like Vice President JD Vance, who would, at best, be less interested in Israel's strategic dilemmas and might be hostile to Jerusalem.

Even if we assume that Eisenkot would wish to follow in Netanyahu's footsteps and form a partnership with Trump on these issues—an assumption that may be unfounded—the idea that an Israel governed by a coalition dependent on the goodwill of the Joint List, let alone Ra'am, could pursue such necessary policies is pure fantasy.

In the past, some Zionist thinkers have written and spoken of the need for a Jewish state where Arabs would also be empowered as partners. In particular, Ze'ev Jabotinsky, one of the founding fathers of Zionism and Israel and the ideological North Star of the Israeli right, wrote of the need for shared governance and Arab participation, even mentioning the idea of Arabs serving as vice premier of the state when a Jew was prime minister.

This is cited by those who oppose Netanyahu as a justification for a government with Ra'am or the Joint List.

Still, his idea presupposed the achievement of the "Iron Wall" Jabotinsky had written of in his 1923 essay on the subject of securing Arab acquiescence to a Jewish state. Only when the Arab and Muslim world was ready to realize that the Jewish state that would become Israel (after his death in 1940) could not be defeated and was a permanent fact accepted by the Arabs could such a scheme work. The tragedy of Oct. 7—and the subsequent surge of antisemitism across the globe driven by anti-Zionist agitation and blood libels—demonstrates that the world is a long way away from a theoretical era of peace when Jabotinsky's liberal vision could conceivably be accomplished.

From this perspective, the belief that Israel needs a government that secured its votes only from the Zionist parties that share a national consensus against repeating the mistakes of Oslo and the 2005 withdrawal from Gaza seems not merely reasonable but an imperative. To smear it as being racist is deeply wrong.

An Israeli government beholden to parties that oppose Israel and sympathize with its enemies is entirely possible and would be legal if attempted. Many of Israel's past governing coalitions were formed because politicians broke promises to the Israeli people.

Yet the next government of Israel will have the responsibility to ensure that the victories achieved after Oct. 7 via the heroism of its soldiers, the support of its citizenry and the courage of its leader are not thrown away. A Zionist government for Israel is essential in wartime.

Regardless of whether voters favor Netanyahu's continuance in office—or think that his ouster and giving Eisenkot a chance to lead Israel is the change their country needs—opposition to a minority government that relies on Arab nationalists, communists and Islamists is a rational course of action, not bigotry. Israelis and Americans who support the Jewish state should not be shamed or intimidated into failing to point this out. (JNS Oct 28)