

“Alan is a Great American Patriot . . . it is our Honor to welcome him into the Party of COMMON SENSE!” —PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP

WHY I QUIT THE DEMS

AND SO SHOULD YOU!

(confessions of a reluctant Republican)*



ALAN DERSHOWITZ

#1 NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLING AUTHOR

**WHY I
QUIT THE
DEMS**

**AND SO
SHOULD
YOU!**

Also by Alan Dershowitz

Founding Fathers and One Jewish Mother
Could President Trump Constitutionally Serve a Third Term?
Jewish Blood Is No Longer Cheap
The Preventive State
Trump to Harvard: Go Fund Yourself
Palestinianism
The Ten Big Anti-Israel Lies
War on Woke
War Against the Jews
Get Trump
Dershowitz on Killing
The Price of Principle
The Case for Vaccine Mandates
The Case for Color-Blind Equality in an Age of Identity Politics
The Case Against the New Censorship: Protecting Free Speech from Big Tech, Progressives, and Universities
Cancel Culture: The Latest Attack on Free Speech and Due Process
The Case for Liberalism in an Age of Extremism: or, Why I Left the Left But Can't Join the Right
Confirming Justice—Or Injustice?: A Guide to Judging RGB's Successor
Defending the Constitution
Guilt by Accusation: The Challenge of Proving Innocence in the Age of #MeToo
Defending Israel: The Story of My Relationship with My Most Challenging Client
The Case Against Impeaching Trump
The Case Against BDS: Why Singling Out Israel for Boycott Is Anti-Semitic and Anti-Peace
Trumped Up: How Criminalization of Political Differences Endangers Democracy
Electile Dysfunction: A Guide for Unaroused Voters
The Case Against the Iran Deal
Terror Tunnels: The Case for Israel's Just War Against Hamas
Abraham: The World's First (But Certainly Not Last) Jewish Lawyer
Taking the Stand: My Life in the Law
The Trials of Zion
The Case for Moral Clarity: Israel, Hamas and Gaza
The Case Against Israel's Enemies: Exposing Jimmy Carter and Others Who Stand in the Way of Peace

Is There a Right to Remain Silent? Coercive Interrogation and the Fifth Amendment After 9/11
Finding Jefferson: A Lost Letter, a Remarkable Discovery, and the First Amendment in the Age of Terrorism

Blasphemy: How the Religious Right is Hijacking Our Declaration of Independence

Pre-emption: A Knife That Cuts Both Ways

Rights from Wrongs: A Secular Theory of the Origins of Rights

America on Trial: Inside the Legal Battles that Transformed Our Nation

The Case for Peace: How the Arab-Israeli Conflict Can Be Resolved

The Case for Israel

America Declares Independence

Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge

Shouting Fire: Civil Liberties in a Turbulent Age

Letters to a Young Lawyer

Supreme Injustice: How the High Court Hijacked Election 2000

Genesis of Justice: Ten Stories of Biblical Injustice that Led to the Ten Commandments and Modern Law

Just Revenge

Sexual McCarthyism: Clinton, Starr, and the Emerging Constitutional Crisis

The Vanishing American Jew: In Search of Jewish Identity for the Next Century

Reasonable Doubts: The Criminal Justice System and the O.J. Simpson Case

The Abuse Excuse: And Other Cop-Outs, Sob Stories, and Evasions of Responsibility

The Advocate's Devil

Contrary to Popular Opinion

Chutzpah

Taking Liberties: A Decade of Hard Cases, Bad Laws, and Bum Raps

Reversal of Fortune: Inside the Von Bülow Case

The Best Defense

Fair and Certain Punishment: Report of the 20th Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing

Courts of Terror: Soviet Criminal Justice and Jewish Emigration (coauthored with Telford Taylor)

Criminal Law: Theory and Process (with Joseph Goldstein and Richard Schwartz)

Psychoanalysis, Psychiatry, and Law (with Joseph Goldstein and Jay Katz)

WHY I
QUIT THE
DEMS

AND SO
SHOULD
YOU!

(confessions of a reluctant Republican)*

ALAN DERSHOWITZ



Skyhorse Publishing

Copyright © 2026 by Alan Dershowitz

All Rights Reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any manner without the express written consent of the publisher, except in the case of brief excerpts in critical reviews or articles. All inquiries should be addressed to Skyhorse Publishing, 307 West 36th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10018.

Skyhorse Publishing books may be purchased in bulk at special discounts for sales promotion, corporate gifts, fund-raising, or educational purposes. Special editions can also be created to specifications. For details, contact the Special Sales Department, Skyhorse Publishing, 307 West 36th Street, 11th Floor, New York, NY 10018 or info@skyhorsepublishing.com.

Skyhorse® and Skyhorse Publishing® are registered trademarks of Skyhorse Publishing, Inc.®, a Delaware corporation.

Visit our website at www.skyhorsepublishing.com.

Please follow our publisher Tony Lyons on Instagram [@tonylyonsisuncertain](https://www.instagram.com/tonylyonsisuncertain)

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available on file.

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-5107-8936-4

eBook ISBN: 978-1-5107-8937-1

Cover design by Brian Peterson

Printed in the United States of America

DEDICATION

Dedicated to my fellow former Democrats who have the courage to put principle before party.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Annie Hoyos for her assistance in preparing this manuscript, to Hector Carosso for his excellent editing, to Alan Rothfeld for correcting my mistakes, to Marshall Sonenshine for arguing with me and sometimes convincing me, and to Aaron Voloj for his excellent research and good ideas.

A special acknowledgment to my dear wife of forty years for her love, encouragement, and constructive criticisms.

Contents

Introduction

[A. Leaving the Democrats Without Joining the Republicans](#)

[B. My Changing Priorities](#)

[C. Have I become a Single-Issue Voter?](#)

[D. Would There Be Anti-Zionism If Israel Were Not a Jewish State?](#)

[E. “If I Am Not for Myself . . .”](#)

[F. To Everything There Is a Season](#)

[G. My Decisions over Time](#)

[The Dangerous Stalinism of the “Woke” Hard Left, August 31, 2019](#)

[A Few Thoughts on Law and Justice, Lecture with Q & A, June 9, 2020](#)

[The New McCarthyism Comes to Harvard Law School, March 5, 2021](#)

[The Squalid “Squad” Is Trying to Destroy Bipartisan Support for Israel, September 23, 2021](#)

[Mainstream Democrats Introduce Bill Endangering Israel, September 26, 2021](#)

[The Democrats’ Self-Inflicted Wound, November 5, 2021](#)

[Harvard President Should Use His First Amendment Right to Condemn the *Harvard Crimson*’s Antisemitism, May 9, 2022](#)

[Why Is the Flawed Palestinian Cause So Prominent on the Hard Left? July 10, 2022](#)

[Why Biden Might Be the Dems’ Last Pro-Israel President, May 18, 2023](#)

[A New Reckoning Is Long Overdue for American Universities over the Antisemitism with Which Their Campuses Are Riddled, October 10, 2023](#)

[There Are no Pro-Palestinian Rallies—Only Pro-Hamas, Antisemitic Hate, October 30, 2023](#)

[Campus Antisemitism Has Become Systemic Due to “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion,” December 4, 2023](#)

[Harvard Prez Claudine Gay’s Exit Is Just the First Step in Saving Our Universities, January 2, 2024](#)

[Steering a Course Toward the Center Is the Path to Victory in November—Despite the Temptation, for Biden and Trump, to Please Extremists in Their Parties, January 26, 2024](#)

[Golden Age of American Jewry May Be Ending, But the Open Free Market Economy Beckons, March 21, 2024](#)

[Universities Like Columbia Must End the Double Standard and Stop Tolerating Campus Antisemitism, April 18, 2024](#)

[Ivy League Anti-Israel Protests Could Prove More Dangerous Than January 6 or Charlottesville, April 22, 2024](#)

[How Many Campus Protesters Will Turn Terrorist Themselves? Remember the '60s! April 30, 2024](#)

[Ignoring a World of Human Rights Abuses, Student Protesters Reserve Their Anger for Israel, May 15, 2024](#)

[Why I Am Proud to Call Myself an American Zionist, May 31, 2024](#)

[Did Harris Reject Shapiro Because Progressives Resist a Jewish Zionist? August 9, 2024](#)

[Why I Left the Democratic Party, September 12, 2024](#)

[Why Have So Many Israelis and Jews Moved to the Right? May 23, 2025](#)

[Take This Test Before You Cast Your Vote for Mayor, October 24, 2025](#)

[What Does Mamdani's Victory Portend for America, Jews, and Israel? November 5, 2025](#)

[The Left Never Supported Free Speech; Only When It Supported Their Views, Q & A, February 18, 2026](#)

[Imminence Is No Longer the Criterion for Military Preventive Action, April 15, 2026](#)

[Why I'm Becoming a Republican, April 20, 2026](#)

[1935: Was It the Worst Year in History? April 22, 2026](#)

[Why Are Some in Our Media Cheering for Iran? May 1, 2026](#)

[Antisemitism Will Get Worse If It Becomes a Good Career Choice, June 4, 2026](#)

[Antisemitism Is the Most Dangerous Human Rights Violation in the World Today, July 14, 2026](#)

["Whataboutism" Is Essential to Moral Clarity, July 21, 2026](#)

[Will Any Left-Wing Democrats Stand Up Against Their Party's Anti-Israel Bigotry, July 24, 2026](#)

[Newsmax *Saturday Report* Interview with Rita Crosby, July 18, 2026](#)

[Conclusion: Is This 1932 Germany? What Comes Next?](#)

Introduction

When I announced that I was leaving the Democratic Party and joining the Republicans in April of 2026, the two questions I was asked most frequently were: (1) “Why after so many years as a Democrat are you switching parties?” And (2) “What took you so long?”

These are both questions I’ve thought a great deal about. My simple answer is that the current Democratic Party—with its radical left-wing pivot, especially but not exclusively against Israel and its supporters—bears little relationship to the Democratic Party with which I identified for more than seventy years. To paraphrase President Ronald Reagan: I didn’t leave the Democratic Party, they left me. If that is true, then the questions above should be addressed more to those who have remained Democrats than to me. Nonetheless, they are fair questions, often coming from close friends and relatives, and they deserve serious and thoughtful answers. Hence this short book.

I have been a loyal and consistent Democrat since I was a fourteen-year-old student in the Borough Park neighborhood of Brooklyn. Having been blessed with a strong voice, I was recruited by Democrats to speak from a truck driving through the local streets, campaigning for a local politician named Philip Schupler. His opponent had accused him of getting rich as an assemblyman, and I assured my listeners—reading from a script prepared by his campaign staff—that Assemblyman Schupler was an ordinary hard-working Brooklyn Democrat, who didn’t even have air conditioning in his

home. I recall my first encounter with the hypocrisy of politics when Mrs. Schupler invited me to her home for some lemonade after a long, hot day on the truck. The first thing I noticed was the air conditioner in the living room. I asked Mrs. Schupler about it, and she claimed it was a gift from a friend. After that, I refused to include his hot air claim of poverty in my endorsement.¹

I campaigned for other Democrats as well, including Adlai Stevenson in 1952 and 1956 as well as Averell Harriman in 1954. The Democrats were the party that supported Israel when it was founded and were more supportive of Jewish equality than the Republicans. There was no conflict that required balance. It was a no-brainer choice, and nearly all Jewish voters made it.

My parents, also automatic Democratic voters, supported my engagement in politics, thinking that perhaps someday I could aspire to becoming the Democratic assemblyman from my neighborhood. There were almost no Republicans, so local elections were decided by the primaries. In fact, when I graduated from law school some years later, I was approached by a Democratic leader about a possible political career. But I had been offered a clerkship with the Supreme Court and then an assistant professorship at Harvard, so I never became a politician. I continued, however, to support Democrats, wherever I was living—in DC, in Cambridge, on Martha's Vineyard, in Florida and in New York. I never gave it a second thought. My knee always jerked in the same direction.

My only full-time involvement in Democratic politics came in 1970 when former Justice Arthur Goldberg—for whom I had clerked six years earlier—sought and obtained the Democratic nomination for governor of New York. He ran against one of the most popular governors in New York history, Nelson Rockefeller. But New York was a traditionally Democratic state, so Goldberg thought he had a good chance of beating the incumbent Republican governor. I traveled with candidate Goldberg throughout New

York State but primarily in Brooklyn and Manhattan. Another of his former law clerks, Stephen Breyer, who subsequently became a Supreme Court Justice, campaigned alongside me.

I vividly recall a phone call I got from a journalist writing for the *New York Daily News* who advised me that he was about to run a story criticizing Goldberg for being somewhat elitist and stuffy. He intended to include a report that Goldberg still required me to call him by his formal title, “Mr. Justice.” I said I would get back to him. So I went to see the candidate and I said, “Mr. Justice, they are about to write a negative story saying that you insist that I call you Mr. Justice. I would like to be able to tell them truthfully that I call you ‘Arthur.’ But in order to do so, you have to give me permission to call you Arthur, rather than Mr. Justice.” Goldberg looked at me sternly and said, “I will allow you to call me Arthur in public, so as not to hurt my campaign, but I still want you to call me Mr. Justice in private.” And so I did, and I continued to call him Mr. Justice until the day he died in 1990.

Justice Goldberg was a wonderful man, a brilliant intellectual, a creative labor lawyer, a great justice, a loving mentor, and an all-around good person. But he was a terrible candidate, and he lost to “Rocky” in a landslide. So much for my political career. I also learned an important career lesson from Goldberg’s defeat: No matter how smart and capable you may be at some undertakings, there are some career choices that may not suit your talents. Justice Goldberg made a disastrous mistake by resigning from the Supreme Court and entering politics.

I almost got into politics earlier, when then Attorney General Robert Kennedy asked me if I would consider coming to work for him in the Justice department following my clerkships. Although I was a strong supporter of the Kennedys, I declined. I did however work on his campaign for president in 1968 and was devastated when he was assassinated on the night he won the California primary.

My remaining interactions with the Democratic party were limited to endorsing candidates, contributing to their campaigns and making an occasional speech, as I did for Ted Kennedy when he ran against Jimmy Carter in the 1980 presidential primaries. I had helped represent him in 1969, when he drove his car off a bridge in Chappaquiddick, resulting in the death of Mary Jo Kopechne. I also worked on legislation and other matters with him and his staff for many years. When constitutional issues arose, Ted would tell his staff to “call Al.” We remained close until his death. Not long before he died, we sat together in a box at Fenway Park sharing reminiscences, especially about his untiring work on behalf of Soviet Jews.

I also represented several Democratic elected officials over the years, including Senator Alan Cranston of California, and consulted with President Clinton’s legal team, defending him against Republican efforts to impeach him. I advised Presidents Carter, Clinton and Obama on constitutional and other issues. I have handwritten letters from Carter, Clinton and Obama thanking me for my help. I also represented President Trump in his Senate impeachment trial and advised him on issues relating to Israel, as I had also done with prior Democratic presidents.

On rare occasions I voted for Republican candidates. In 1990 I supported my neighbor and former student Bill Weld when he ran for Massachusetts governor against John Silber. I also sent small contributions to several of my former students who were running as Republicans for political office around the country, but I did that out of loyalty to them rather than to their party. I supported Joe Lieberman in 2006 when he successfully ran as an independent after the Democrats had denied him their nomination.

Although I voted and campaigned against Richard Nixon, his deputy attorney general offered me a high position in the Nixon-Mitchell Justice Department, which I declined because I disagreed with many of its policies. The offer came well before Watergate, but if I had accepted, I might have

been in that tainted department when so many of its lawyers—including the one who offered me the job—got into serious trouble.

All in all, I can fairly be described as a loyal and enthusiastic supporter of the Democratic Party and their candidates—until a few years ago.

So what changed? Not me. I am still what I was at age fourteen. A boringly consistent liberal, egalitarian, meritocratic, civil libertarian, civil rights activist, environmentalist. I remain a pro-choice, left-leaning supporter of the traditional Democratic party—the party exemplified over the decades by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry Truman, the Kennedy brothers, Mario Cuomo, Bill Clinton and even Joe Biden. But these are no longer the standard-bearers of the current Democratic Party.

The new faces of the party are AOC, Elizabeth Warren, Chris Murphy, Bernie Sanders, Zohran Mamdani, “the Squad,” and other hard-left anti-Israel radicals with whom I have little in common. They are not only the current faces most closely identified with today’s Democratic Party, but they also seem to represent its future, because so many young students admire them. Among the ideologies they have in common is a disdain for Israel, an insensitivity to protecting Jews against increasing antisemitism, a negative attitude toward police and military, a refusal to appreciate the virtues of the American experiment and a worldview that is generally incompatible with my long-held values. At a more gut level: I simply don’t like these people and what they stand for; and they don’t like me and what I stand for. I haven’t changed! The Democratic Party has changed, from top to bottom, with a few notable exceptions.

No reasonable observer can dispute the reality that the Democratic Party is shifting rapidly from being a centrist liberal party to becoming an extremist hard-left, anti-Israel party. This is the way an article by Matthew Continetti in the *Wall Street Journal* put it on April 22, 2026:

Israel is the Democratic Party’s new litmus test, and [Senator Bernie] Sanders is leading the turn against the Jewish state. Backing America’s closest Middle Eastern ally now jeopardizes

one's future in the Democratic Party.²

I proudly fail that litmus and continue to support Israel, while disagreeing with some of its policies and practices. The *Wall Street Journal* article continued:

In a Pew Research Center survey conducted in March, 60 percent [of] Republicans continue to view Israel favorably, while 80 percent of Democrats don't . . .

Anti-Israel sentiment runs through every level of the party, from former presidents to insurgent candidates. The woolly fringe is now mainstream. Barack Obama was all smiles in a recent photo-op with New York Mayor Zohran Mamdani, a socialist for whom anti-Zionism is a calling card. The Democrats' newest congresswoman, Analilia Mejia of New Jersey, is a former Sanders delegate who omitted Israeli terror victims from an October 10, 2023, social-media post condemning violence in Gaza.

The front-runner in Maine's Democratic Senate primary, Graham Platner, says he plans to remove the Nazi-associated tattoo on his chest. In a recently unearthed Reddit post from 2014, Mr. Platner spoke well of Hamas military tactics: "From a strictly professional standpoint, this was a damn fine looking and successful raid against a superior opponent," he wrote. "I dig it." Sen. Elizabeth Warren [who refused to attend Prime Minister Netanyahu's congressional speech] campaigned with Mr. Platner . . .

The Senate's anti-Israel roll call included every type of Democrat except for the sui generis Sen. John Fetterman (D., Pa.): moderate and progressive, insurgent and stalwart. Presidential ambitions drove Sens. Jon Ossoff (D., Ga.), Elissa Slotkin (D., Mich.), Mark Kelly (D., Ariz.), Cory Booker (D., N.J.), Chris Murphy (D., Conn.) and other potential 2028 candidates into Mr. Sanders's corner.³

The question facing the Democratic primary electorate won't be whether a candidate opposes Israel but how vehemently. California Gov. Gavin Newsom says he never has and never will accept money from American Israel Public Affairs Committee. Former Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg said he'd block weapons sales to Israel. New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has falsely accused Israel of genocide in the Gaza Strip.

Michigan Democrats heard from Abdul El-Sayed, a Sanders-endorsed anti-Israel physician tied for the lead in the state's Senate primary. Among Mr. El-Sayed's supporters is Hasan Piker, a streamer known for such vile assertions as "America deserved 9/11," the collapse of the Soviet Union was "one of the greatest catastrophes of the 20th century," and " Hamas is a thousand times better than a fascist settler colonial apartheid state."⁴

Even the *New York Times*—barely a credible newspaper when it comes to Israel—has reported that more and more Jewish Democrats face hostility

because of their support of the Jewish state. In an article from April 29, 2026, titled “Excruciating and Agonizing: A New Reality for Jewish Democrats,”⁵ the *Times* reports that moderate Democrats are booed for simply supporting Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state. Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel, the first openly gay statewide officeholder in Michigan history, explained that she now receives more threats for being Jewish than for being gay or female combined. Though she has no role in foreign policy and receives no AIPAC funding, she has repeatedly been denounced as an “AIPAC whore.”⁶

Even Jewish candidates who have gone out of their way to pledge allegiance to the progressive cause have fared no better. California state senator Scott Wiener, who ignorantly accused Israel of committing genocide in Gaza, encountered posters accusing him of placing “foreign state interests above your own.”⁷

Mayor Mamdani called AIPAC and its supporters “monsters.” These “monsters” are American Jews, many of whom vote Democrat and are critical of some Israeli policies. Mamdani has received little criticism from Democratic leaders for invoking an antisemitic epithet—“monster” that is right out of the classic antisemitic playbook. During the Dreyfus case in the late 1890s, Dreyfus and his supporters were characterized as “monsters”: I have cartoons hanging on my wall from a series of images entitled “The Musée des Horreurs” that portrays Dreyfus and his supporters as part of a “*panthéon de monstres*.”

Congressman Josh Gottheimer of New Jersey, who I like and supported, summarized the resulting alienation as follows: “It’s like you’re losing your home in the Democratic Party and in the country.”⁸

The accusation of dual loyalty against Jews in America is gaining traction, even as many more Jews turn against Israel. The Anti-Defamation League reports that 45 percent of Americans now believe Jews are more loyal to Israel than to the United States—a staggering increase from 24

percent in 2020. Such views once existed primarily on the political fringes. Increasingly, they are migrating toward the mainstream. Governor Shapiro stated that Kamala Harris's team had asked him whether he was ever an Israeli agent⁹—and as I argued at the time, it is difficult to imagine that had his name been Jim Shepard instead of Josh Shapiro he would have been asked that question, or denied the vice presidential nomination.

The Democratic Party I grew up with and enthusiastically supported throughout my long political life is no longer recognizable to me and many old school liberals. More and more, it is beginning to emulate the left-wing parties of Europe, Great Britain, Ireland, Spain and Belgium, as well as Canada and Australia. The Bernie Sanders wing of today's Democratic Party is close to what Jeremy Corbyn's Labour Party had become, before it was disastrously defeated. Sanders had crossed the Atlantic to campaign for the overt antisemite who was then leading the Labour Party. Left-wing Socialist parties in Spain, France, Italy and the Scandinavian countries are becoming increasingly anti-American and anti-Israel. Were I a European, I could not support any of these parties today, though I would have in years past. Many of my overseas friends are experiencing similar changes in party affiliations.

In our own country, Democrat leaders, including Senators Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, as well as Congressman Ro Khanna crossed state lines to campaign for Graham Platner, a neo-Nazi, hard-left antisemitic candidate for the Senate in Maine, who was running against moderate Republican incumbent Susan Collins. Nor are they the only ones. Most Democratic leaders either endorsed this Jew-hater or remained neutral. Few condemned him, until he was accused of rape and forced to end his campaign. He of course blamed the Jews for his political demise.

The chicken and egg question is whether the increasingly anti-American and anti-Israel trends of these left-wing parties reflect current polling or whether current polling reflects the influence of the changing party

leadership. Probably, a bit of both! In either case, some Jewish liberals—not enough in my view—have begun to change party affiliation. This has been true for a while in England, Canada, France, Spain and Australia. It is becoming increasingly true in the United States. The shift from Democrat to Independent or Republican has been slower here, because the party's shift to the hard left has been more gradual and somewhat less visible, but it is now happening with increasing frequency and this trend is likely to continue, or increase.

My wife Carolyn, who has long identified as a Democrat, now identifies as an Independent who votes for the best individual candidates without regard to party affiliation. Most of the rest of my family remain anti-Mamdani Democrats.

The United States thrives at the center and suffers at the extremes. During the 1930s when many European countries were divided between fascists and communists, a majority of Americans were New Deal Democrats eschewing both communism and fascism. Though there were communists and fascists among American voters, neither extreme ever took hold here, especially after our nation was attacked and we entered World War II.

Jews and Israel also thrive at the center. There have, of course, been Jewish communists and even Jewish fascists. Several thousand Jews, who were members of the Association of German National Jews, voted for Hitler in the 1932 election. Many of them were subsequently murdered by the Nazis for whom they voted.¹⁰ Tens of thousands of Russian Jews were Bolsheviks, many of whom were also subsequently murdered by Stalin. History shows that some self-haters become self-killers!

A considerable number of American Jews joined the Communist Party in the first decades of the twentieth century, but few remained after the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939. Those who did were rabid Communists who placed their loyalty to Stalin over their heritage. Julius and Ethel Rosenberg

were among them. They were executed for spying for the Soviet Union. Julius was guilty. Ethel was not, but she was a fervent Stalinist.

The vast majority of Jews has always understood that Jews are best off at the center. Historically, they have always been caught between the red or pink of Communism and the black or brown of fascism. Fascists have been responsible for the deaths of many millions of Jews, while Communists have been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands. Life for Jews hasn't always been perfect in the center, but it has been far better. That is perhaps why so many American Jews almost automatically became Democrats back in the day. Although that party has always contained a left wing, it has for the most part been a centrist liberal party, both domestically and in foreign policy. In the 1930s the Republican Party tended to be isolationist and reactionary. It always attracted some Jewish voters, but rarely a majority or plurality.

My grandmother, like many Jewish immigrants, had a picture of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in her home. When I was seven years old and listening to the radio I told her about Roosevelt's death. She cried and expressed her love for him, as she had for Emperor Franz Joseph who had been her sovereign when she lived in the Austro-Hungarian empire. He too rejected extreme nationalism and antisemitism.

The leadership of the Democratic Party is no longer centrist. Neither are many of its voters, especially among the young. I have observed this trend toward left-wing extremism for several years, particularly on university campuses, and I have tried to expose and oppose in an effort to reverse or slow it down.^{[11](#)} That is why I remained within the Democratic Party as a loyal dissenter and advocated for centrism within the party. But since October 7 and the reaction to it, it has become apparent to me that this dangerous trend is unstoppable and irreversible—at least during my lifetime. It is different from what we experienced during the Vietnam War, when many young people veered left, while remaining committed to liberal

values—including support for Israel during the 1967 and 1973 wars. Some extremists—led by Noam Chomsky, William Kunstler and the Berrigan brothers—turned against Israel even back then, but they were few and far between.

Remaining part of a political party that stands for the extremism of the current Democrats—especially but not exclusively toward Israel and its supporters—violates all the principles to which I have adhered for more than seventy years. I still favor much of the domestic agenda of the Democratic Party, such as reproductive choice, gay rights, environmental safety, racial equality and health care; though I oppose anti-meritocratic policies such as race-based affirmative action and DEI (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion). Were it not for its dramatic shift against Israel, however, I might well have remained a lonely Fetterman Democrat, as some of my friends have. But it was the party's blatant irrational anti-historical and ignorant anti-Israel stance—even among many who consider themselves centrists on most other issues. The straws that broke my back were threefold: first, the selection of anti-Israel speakers at the Democratic National Convention of 2024,^{[12](#)} second, when forty of forty-seven Democratic senators voted to block an arms sale to America's strongest ally in the Middle East, and finally, when so many leaders of the Democratic party endorsed anti-Israel and antisemitic candidates.^{[13](#)} These and similar incidents appear to be causing severe back pain even among many who have remained reluctant Democrats.

The Republican Party too includes some anti-Israel and antisemitic bigots, but the leaders of that party have done a far better job of marginalizing these extremists, beginning with William Buckley's attack on Patrick Buchanan back in 1991 and including Donald Trump attacks on Tucker Carlson. Most Democratic leaders, especially those on the hard left, seem willing to accept any candidate, even overtly anti-Jewish ones, as long as they support "progressive" economic policies. As I said polemically in a

recent interview, Senator Warren, by her own criteria, might well have campaigned for Adolf Hitler in 1932 if he had supported a minimum wage.¹⁴

I don't feel completely home in either party, but I must choose between the imperfections in both. I cannot remain politically homeless, and the Republican Party has welcomed me and other former Democrats who support much of their foreign policy platform while disagreeing with some of their domestic agenda. The Democratic Party has been far less welcoming to those who identify more with Fetterman than with AOC. The growing intolerance of the Democratic Party over internal dissent, as it pivots hard left, has also been a factor in my decision to leave. It was also a factor in that party leaving me and other liberals who generally support Israel. I do not mean by this to distance myself from those who criticize certain Israeli policies, actions and political leaders. In fact, I disagree strongly and publicly with some policies and actions of the current Israeli government, just as I disagree with some policies and actions of the current US government. I favor criticism when done fairly, constructively and based on a single standard. I am referring to the singling out and demonization of Israel, including denying it the military means to defend itself, and in some cases opposing its right to exist as the nation-state of the Jewish people, as Mayor Mamdani and much of the squad does. More and more Democrats are taking these extreme positions. These include Jewish and non-Jewish Democratic members of Congress, including those who are centrist on other issues. Regardless of its actions or inactions, Israel seems to push even otherwise moderate politicians and voters to extremist positions in an effort to gain support from their most radical constituents.

A. Leaving the Democrats Without Joining the Republicans

My decision to change parties came in stages, beginning with my dissatisfaction with the policies and leadership of the Democratic Party. In 2020, I wrote *The Case for Liberalism in an Age of Extremism: or, Why I Left the Left but Can't Join the Right*. This is how I positioned myself then:

Bernie Sanders, who—according to the *New York Times*—“almost single-handedly moved the Democratic Party to the left,” has now been “elevated” to the role of “standard-bearer of American liberalism and the leader of a self-styled political revolution.” The very fact that the *Times* characterized a self-described “Democratic Socialist” as the standard-bearer of American “*liberalism*” shows how far left the center has moved.

We are in danger of losing our identity as a nation of centrist liberals and conservatives who talk to and argue with our counterparts as I used to with William F. Buckley. Debate is being replaced with demonization. Ideas matter less than identity. Disagreements are resolved by shouting louder than the other side, trying to prevent them from speaking, or walking out when they do speak. We are quickly becoming a nation of extremists, of warring camps of far-left radicals and far-right reactionaries—of Trump haters and Trump lovers. Classic liberals and conservatives—who place the values of speech, due process, and basic liberties *above* partisan results—are in the process of turning into endangered species, replaced by zealots who know “The Truth” and see no need for opposing views or due process. Zealots are *never mistaken*. Their opponents are *always* mistaken. There is no place for nuance, doubt or compromise. Purity and certainty are demanded. The spirit of healthy skepticism—which is the spirit of liberty and of true liberalism and conservatism—is incompatible with the comfortable certainty of self-righteousness, a comfortableness that is confirmed by niche media that tells viewers and readers what they already know and what they want to hear. We no longer respect the caution of Cromwell, who famously said, “I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible that you may be mistaken.” To invoke a religious analogy, the political world is now sharply divided into true believers and atheists, with no room for agnostics or skeptics.

The liberal tradition in America is on life support, and with it the center left and center right. Democrats in the tradition of Roosevelt, Kennedy, Johnson, Humphrey, Scoop Jackson, Moynihan, and Clinton are becoming as anachronistic as Republicans in the tradition of Rockefeller, Javits, and Eisenhower.

Being a centrist, liberal, civil libertarian who puts principle over partisanship—which is what I try to be—means that I cannot identify with the hard-left trend of the Democratic Party. But nor can I join the socially and religiously extremist right wing of the Republican Party. I find myself politically homeless in the current illiberal and partisan landscape. The hard left has left me because of intolerance for free speech and due process, and because of its knee jerk opposition to Israel and Western values; The hard right is not open to me because of its policies toward gay rights, a woman’s right to choose, the environment, separation of

church and state, and other social issues; The liberal civil liberty center, which remains my chosen home, is shrinking to oblivion, as is the conservative civil liberties center. To be sure, there are still some pundits and politicians who adhere to centrist liberalism or conservatism, but their numbers and visibility are shrinking, and their reasoned voices are being drowned out by the noisy extremists on both sides.

At first, I simply left the Democratic Party and became an Independent, but I soon realized that I need to oppose the Democratic Party's control of Congress. I did not want to see the likes of Sanders, Warren, Omar, AOC, Murphy, or Khanna chairing Congressional committees. They hate Israel and will do everything in their power to weaken or even destroy it. The only realistic way to prevent that under our two-party system was to join the opposition. So I have become a Republican with an asterisk—representing my continuing opposition to some Republican policies and platform planks. Notwithstanding this selective opposition, the Republican Party has welcomed me, unlike the Democrats, many of whom condemned me for my pro-Israel views even before I joined the Republicans. I now believe that the Republican Party is closer to my principles and priorities than the current Democratic Party. So I am a reluctant Republican (with an asterisk) and I will work hard to keep my erstwhile party out of power.

B. My Changing Priorities

My priorities have always been to support those groups and individuals most in need of my advocacy. As a young lawyer, these included the victims of McCarthyism; African Americans who were discriminated against; gays who were denied the right to marry, and even to love; as well as other groups and individuals who were the targets of state discrimination and persecution. Although subtle antisemitism was still rampant in Wall Street law firms and other institutions during my early years as a lawyer, I never felt it as a major priority, because the trajectory was in the right direction. Yes, I was denied even an interview for a Rhodes scholarship because of my Jewish heritage, despite being the sole applicant

recommended collectively by all the city colleges of New York, none of which had ever received a Rhodes; yes, I was turned down by thirty-two Wall Street law firms, despite being first in my class at Yale Law School and editor-in-chief of the law journal; yes, I could not buy a house in Point O' Woods on Fire Island; and yes, I couldn't aspire to certain positions at Harvard—becoming a dean or house master, for example. But discrimination against others was worse and matters were improving for Jews. So I prioritized my involvement under the principle of “the worst, first.” (The Democratic Party back then tended to be on the right side of these issues.)

Early in my career I represented, on a pro-bono basis, an Italian American lawyer who was denied a well-deserved partnership in a WASPy Wall Street law firm because he was an ethnic Catholic. Several Jewish leaders urged me not to take the case because the firm was beginning to hire Jews. I placed principle above religious identity, took it and won. Back then, anti-Italian discrimination by Wall Street firms was worse than anti-Jewish discrimination, which was largely limited to Jews of Eastern European heritage.

Now the worst has become worldwide antisemitism, blatant anti-Israelism and the application of an invidious double standard to nearly everything Jewish. Israel is now the Jew among nations and is being subject to the kind of discriminations that Jewish individuals and groups have suffered for millennia.

Today antisemitism is the single most pressing civil rights, civil liberties, human rights and anti-discrimination cause throughout the world. And the trajectories all point to the problems worsening. The situation regarding other discriminated against groups is moving in the right direction. There is still far too much discrimination based on sex, gender, race, sexual orientation and other such factors, but very few in today's world justify these forms of invidious discrimination. The opposite is true

as to Jews. Discrimination against Jews and the double standard applied to the Jewish nation-state is not only widely justified, it is praised as a perverse manifestation of human rights, and an admirable attack on “privilege.”

Moreover, the campaign against Israel and its supporters is today led by many “Jewish” individuals, such as Peter Beinart, Bernie Sanders, Omer Bartov, Noam Chomsky, and Norman Finkelstein, and by self-proclaimed “Jewish” groups such as Jewish Voices for Peace, J Street, If Not Now, and many others. These self-hating Jews give cover and credibility to other haters. They claim to base their opposition to Israel on “Jewish values,” which they distort and pervert in the interest of promoting their bigoted agendas.

Much of the mainstream media, led by the *New York Times*, CNN and MSNOW (formerly known as MSNBC), also distort and pervert the “news” to serve their radical, leftist agenda. The irony, of course, is that a central component of the antisemitic trope is that Jews and Zionists control and manipulate the media. Yet the *New York Times*, which was founded and controlled by a Jewish family, has probably done more harm to Jews and Israel than any other mainstream American media. Historically, it defended Stalin,¹⁵ downplayed the rise of Nazism and the Holocaust, opposed the establishment of Israel, and generally disserved the interests of the Jewish people. Now its news coverage of the Mid-East is notoriously slanted against Israel, and its editorial and op-ed writers, with few exceptions, demonize and defame the nation-state of the Jewish people, on a regular basis. The “gray lady” has turned pink. It was never blue and white.

The extraordinarily irresponsible article by Nicholas Kristof,¹⁶ accusing Israeli prison guards of systematically raping Palestinian prisoners, is only the most recent example of the double standard employed by “the newspaper of record” when it comes to Israel. Its publishers and editors launder questionable news reporting as opinion, in order to bypass the usual

requirements of checking factual claims before reporting them. All responsible media have different standards for publishing facts and opinion. So does the law, which protects false opinions more than false facts. As the expression goes: everyone is entitled to their own opinion, but not to their own facts.

Kristof's article was based on alleged facts—e.g. that guards trained their dogs to rape Palestinians. This is either true or false. (It is false!) It is not like Kristof's fellow anti-Israel screedster Tom Friedman, who infamously proclaimed that he was “torn” between wanting Iran to win the war, or Trump and Netanyahu prevailing. That was a ridiculous and despicable opinion, which is not subject to proof or disproof. The claim that Israeli soldiers and guards systematically trained dogs to rape Palestinian prisoners is subject to empirical verification. Under the standards generally employed by the *New York Times* for publishing serious accusations like that one, far more fact-checking and corroboration are required. Anonymous, unconfirmed accusations by individuals with agendas are generally not published in the news sections. But by disguising—laundering—his questionable factual claims as “opinion,” Kristof evaded the usual checks.¹⁷ Even some *Times* journalists saw through this obvious ploy and complained about the double standard, but to no avail.¹⁸

This is all too typical when it comes to media coverage of Israel. Many who raised doubts about claims of rape and sexual assault against Israelis by Palestinian terrorists have accepted without question Kristof's anonymous and uncorroborated accusations. (Some of these same hypocrites questioned credible accusations against Graham Platner that he abused women.¹⁹) Indeed Kristof's likely false or exaggerated accusations have received more attention than the corroborated claims of rape against Israelis that were carefully documented by a report issued by the Israeli government at about the same time the *Times* decided to publish its blood libel against Israel.

So, no—the media is not controlled by Jews. Nor is Hollywood, many of those whose stars have ignorantly followed the left-leaning crowd by siding with Israel’s enemies, who include terrorists, homophobes, sexists, and fundamentalist censors who ban Hollywood films.

We currently live in a world of inversion where concepts such as genocide, which derived from the victimization of Jews, is now used against Jews. Similarly, apartheid, which Jews were instrumental in opposing, is now being falsely applied to one of the most integrated and egalitarian nations in the world, namely Israel. Virtually every organization that claims the mantle of human rights now focuses on the nation with one of the best human rights records in history, especially when faced with such intense efforts to destroy it. Israel’s record with regards to civil liberties during wartime, though far from perfect, is superior to those of the United States, Great Britain, France, Canada, Australia and other democracies.

The priorities of much of the world have shifted to demonization of Israel. Israel is condemned more than all the other countries of the world combined—by the United Nations, by “human rights” organizations, by academics and by other thought “leaders.” Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, has become a dirty word, to be thoughtlessly condemned without appreciating its positive history. Even when Israel or its Jewish supporters deserve criticism for some actions, that criticism is all out of proportion to what is justified.

Consider the obnoxious taunting by Israeli Minister Itamar Ben-Gvir of anti-Israel agitators who tried to enter Gaza illegally as part of a flotilla. He reportedly said to kneeling detainees, “Welcome to Israel. We are the landlords here.”^{[20](#)} No one was hurt by Ben Gvir’s inexcusable taunting, yet much of the media and foreign nations treated the episode as equivalent to terrorism or other forms of violence. Moreover, all of Israel and its supporters were deemed complicit in the wrongful actions of one minister, who was condemned by virtually all Jews and Israelis.^{[21](#)}

Once again, Jews have become the scapegoats for every wrong in the world. This is not a new phenomenon; it is a return to a pattern of bigotry that goes back thousands of years. The pattern was broken for half a century, following the worst genocide in recorded history and the failure of the world to intervene. The right of the Jewish people to an independent state on land from which they were long ago expelled was correctly seen as a response to the failure of every other state to open its doors to Jewish refugees. The creation of a strong Jewish army was properly seen as a response to the forced weakness of Jews and their inability to defend their children against genocide. Israel was morally recognized as a miracle and as a just response to a long history of discrimination against stateless Jews.

This moratorium on Jew hatred began after World War II and continued until roughly the beginning of the twenty-first century. But now it has ended—with a vengeance. The nation-state of the Jewish people is seen by many as illegitimate. Many of those who reject the democratic, secular, heterogeneous nation-state of the Jewish people accept Muslim and other intolerantly religious states, even those ruled by theocratic tyrants.

The so-called “Nakba”—a self-inflicted wound that Arab leaders imposed on their followers by refusing to accept the two-state solution voted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1947—is compared to the Holocaust by phony “scholars” such as Omer Bartov and Norman Finkelstein, who go so far as to question the legitimacy of Israel’s birth by distorting, rewriting and omitting history.

The well-planned massacres of October 7 achieved the greatest victory for Hamas in its history. Yes, it resulted in the well-deserved death of most of their leaders and many of the perpetrators, and in a reduction of its capacity to fire rockets at Israeli civilians. But it also increased support for Palestinian terrorism and decreased support for legitimate military efforts by Israel to prevent threatened recurrences.^{[22](#)} The shift in world opinion caused by the events of October 7 and Israel’s predictable response will

only encourage more massacres, while discouraging legitimate efforts to prevent, deter and respond to them. Recall that the condemnation of Israel began on October 8, well before the IDF began its air and ground attacks on Hamas terrorists.^{[23](#)} It was Israel's weakness on October 7, as well as the strength it showed in response, that generated the anti-Israel protests.

To be sure, there were many civilian casualties, because of Hamas policy of hiding terrorists and weapons among civilians deliberately in order to increase civilian deaths. Even so, the ratio of civilian to terrorist deaths has been considerably lower during the Gaza War than during comparable wars fought by Western nations.^{[24](#)}

The priorities of the world have shifted dramatically in the past quarter of a century, and most recently since the massacres of October 7, 2023. These massacres revealed a physical weakness by Jews and their state, and the bullies of the world saw an opportunity to pile and gang up. Israel responded as it had to, with a show of strength, which many thought disproportionate to the murders, rapes and kidnappings it had experienced. But even if Israel's actions were disproportionate—and I do not believe they were—the overreaction of the world to Israel's acts of self-defense were even more disproportionate.^{[25](#)}

C. Have I Become a Single-Issue Voter?

Jews who care about Israel and the safety of Jewish communities are often accused of being single-issue voters. Similar accusations are rarely leveled at Black, gay, environmental, Muslim or feminist voters who prioritize concerns about their issues over more general ones. I too have decided now to prioritize Jewish concerns over the other civil rights and liberties issues, to which I devoted much of my life, because of the changing situation of Jews and Israel. Today, double standard discrimination against Jews and Israel has become the single most pervasive and serious civil rights and liberties issue in the world. It would be perverse for me NOT to prioritize these issues in light of my long history of going after the worst first. I wish I

didn't have to prioritize Jew hatred, and I hope that I can someday soon return to my other priorities. But for now, I must unapologetically focus my attention on the dramatic, dangerous and pervasive rise in these evils.

When the priorities of the world change, the priorities of those who claim the mantle of civil liberties, civil rights and human rights must change as well. And so mine have changed, especially since October 7 and the days following, during which so much of the world rushed to condemn Israel's legitimate responses. My actions have always followed the realistic need to defend rights and liberties that are currently endangered. My priorities of the day are determined by the realities of the day, and today's realities demand that those who claim the mantle of human and civil rights must prioritize the fight against antisemitism and anti-Israelism.

To do otherwise is to become complicit in the age-old sin of discrimination against Jews and their nation-state. Neutrality is no more a morally acceptable option today than it was in the 1930s and 1940s. Switzerland, Ireland, Sweden and Spain—which refused to join the war against Nazism—should not be seen as moral barometers. Great Britain and its wartime leader, Winston Churchill, should. All decent people must take sides against the growing Jew hatred that is plaguing the world.

The words may be different now, but the cacophonous melody is the same. Today “Zionist” is often used as a cover for “Jew.” Many who would be ashamed to be called anti-Jewish are proud to boast of their anti-Zionism. This is so even when the term “Zionist” is transparently used as a euphemism for “Jews,” such as when “Zionists” are blamed for oppressing African Americans in Harlem (as Stokely Carmichael did), or for promoting the seventeenth-century slave trade (as Louis Farrakhan does), or for controlling the banks and the media (as Tucker Carlson does).

Today, Jews are blamed for everything any Israeli does, even if they disagree with Israeli policies. To be exempted from such “guilt by association,” a Jew must explicitly renounce Israel, Zionism and even

support for Israel's right to exist. Even moderate Jewish Democrats with presidential aspirations, such as Josh Shapiro,^{[26](#)} Rahm Emanuel^{[27](#)} and J. B. Pritzker, seem to go out of their way to denounce Israel at every opportunity.^{[28](#)} This form of compelled denunciation is not required of other religious or ethnic groups. In several universities, student groups have denied membership or speaking privileges to all Zionists, and have told Jewish students and faculty members that if they don't want to be excluded, they must explicitly renounce Zionism, because every Jew is rebuttably presumed to be a Zionist and responsible for all Israeli actions. Similar presumptions are not applied to other groups.

D. Would There Be Anti-Zionism If Israel Were Not a Jewish State?

Many critics of Israel seek to distinguish anti-Zionism from antisemitism, a distinction that may be valid in some contexts, but not in others. History, morality and empirical reality make one conclusion abundantly clear: if Israel were not the nation-state of the Jewish people there would be far less anti-Zionism. Both non-Jewish and Jewish criticism of Israel is motivated, at least in part, by Israel's Jewish identity. Antisemites hate everything Jewish, so it is no surprise that Jew haters—whether they be liberal or conservative, interventionist or non-interventionist, Democrat or Republican, American or foreign—demonize the nation-state of the Jewish people without regard to its policies, actions or leadership. Tucker Carlson, Candice Owens, Pat Buchanan, Graham Platner, Ilhan Omar and others of their ilk hate Israel because of what it is, rather than what it does. Nothing will change that.

The hard left—from Voltaire, to Stalin, to the Democratic Socialists of America—have always had a certain disdain for the Jewish people. Even when Israel was the only socialist state in the Mideast, many on the hard left favored the Islamo-fascist regimes that oppressed workers, women,

gays, secularists and dissenters. They condemned Zionism, which is the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, while supporting other liberation movements. There is no good explanation for this inversion of policies other than the Jewish identity of Israel and Zionism.

Conservatives generally favor what Israel now represents—a strong army, nationalism, a vibrant free market economy with safety nets, innovation. Yet some conservatives oppose Israel and Zionism. Why? Only because of its Jewish identity. Any other non-Jewish nation with Israel’s characteristics would be the darling of conservatives.

This double standard has long characterized antisemites who accuse Jews of being too cosmopolitan and too parochial, too liberal and too conservative, too rich and too poor, too patriotic and too unpatriotic, too nationalistic and too internationalistic, too educated and too uneducated, too capitalist and too communist, too religious and too atheist.

If there’s something bad in the world, Jews must have caused it. If there’s something good in the world, Jews must be opposed to it. During the World Cup of 2026, Algerian sports analyst Mustapha Mazouzi even blamed “the Jewish lobby” for a call in favor of Lionel Messi. He went on TV claiming that “the Jewish lobby . . . controls the world, they run it however they want, as if they were the mafia . . .” This “blame the Jews for everything” approach has long characterized classic antisemitism, and it now characterizes much anti-Israelism and anti-Zionism.

Does this mean that I endorse every Israeli policy? Definitely not. I have been critical of specific Israeli actions and leaders, just as I have been critical of American ones—and I hold both democracies to the same exacting standard. But criticism of particular decisions must not be confused with a rejection of the state itself or of the general values it embodies.

Israel, more than any other nation in its region—and more than many in the West—reflects the liberal values I have championed throughout my

career: equality before the law, meritocracy, due process, civil liberties, freedom of speech and of the press, minority rights, an independent judiciary. These are currently being challenged by some on the Israeli hard right, but the center seems to be holding. Judicial independence is also being challenged by the American hard left which is advocating court-packing, as FDR did in the 1930s, but here too the center seems to be holding, at least on this issue.

These are not merely Western values; they are *liberal* values—the very values the Democratic Party once proudly claimed as its own. It is therefore precisely my liberalism that leads me to support Israel—not in spite of my principles, but because of them.

The double standard criticism of Israel and Zionism is also common among Jewish critics of Israel. Such Jewish critics fall into several distinct but often overlapping categories. Some are simply self-hating Jews who turn against everything Jewish. Throughout history, such self-haters have joined ranks with the enemies of the Jewish people—during the Inquisition, the pogroms and even the Holocaust. Others simply follow the hard left, wherever it leads them. They followed the dictates of Communism when those dictates pointed in favor of Israel and continued to follow them when they turned against Israel. Then there are those Jews who because they are Jews feel compelled to apply a self-righteous double standard against the nation-state of the Jewish people. Whatever the reason, the fact that these Israel haters are Jewish magnifies their hatred in the court of public opinion.

The Democratic Party has done little to oppose these growing threats of Jew hatred. By their silence, coupled with the occasional support of anti-Jewish bigotry by some of their office holders and candidates, they have become part of the problem. The Republican Party has tried to combat this hatred. In doing so, they have been criticized for some of their tactics by many Democrats. Even if such criticism may occasionally be justified,

current Republicans have a far better record than current Democrats in regard to opposing anti-Jewish and anti-Israel bigotry.

This does not mean that I am not critical of some Republican decisions, including those made by President Trump. As I write these words in mid-July of 2026, I remain thankful to President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu for bombing Iran's nuclear facilities, but I remain skeptical of the ongoing negotiations with Iran. I will not hesitate to criticize the Republican administration if any final deal is not conducive to real peace and to the safety of Israel.

E. “If I Am Not for Myself . . .”

The great sage Rabbi Hillel put it wisely when he counseled: “If I am not for myself, who will be for me? If I am for myself alone, what am I? If not now, when?”^{[29](#)}

I have spent most of my life defending the rights of others: African Americans, gays, communists, Palestinians,^{[30](#)} even Nazis.^{[31](#)} Now is the season for defending our rights: the rights of Jews and their state to be safe and secure against increasing threats. I will continue to defend the legitimate rights of others, but my priority has shifted in favor of the most discriminated group in the world today—Jews and Israel. And so should the priorities of all decent people.

Although I will continue to support the rights of others, I will not support groups and organizations, such as Black Lives Matter, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders, as well as gay, feminist, environmentalist, academic and other groups that have turned against Jews and Israel. I will oppose these groups while supporting just causes they advocate. The same is true with regard to the current Democratic Party. I will continue to advocate for liberal planks in its platform, while fighting against their bigoted efforts to weaken Israel and to downplay attacks against Jews.

As with other anti-Israel groups, I will try to disempower them and their leaders, while empowering their just causes. This balancing act will not always be easy to pull off, but I must try. And so should you!

By prioritizing Hillel's first question—"If I am not for myself, who will be for me"—I may be accused of asking the parochial question my grandmother used to ask: no matter the subject—a baseball game, an election, the weather—her inevitable question was: "Is it good or bad for the Jews?" That question, borne of her Polish *shtetl* experience of pogroms, always seemed parochial to us second and third-generation Americans. It seems somewhat less parochial today. Unfortunately!

I was once asked in an interview if I could pick a different time to have been born, which era would I select. Without hesitation I said I often wish I had been born in the early twentieth century. I would then have become an adult in the early 1930s, and perhaps I might have been able to contribute to the saving of Jews from the barbarism of Nazi Germany. My answer was influenced by the exaggerated praise bestowed on me by Elie Wiesel, who said that "if there had been more Jews like Alan Dershowitz during the 1930s and 1940s, perhaps the fate of European Jewry might have been different." I doubt that is true, but at least I might have participated in the efforts to help the Jews of Europe. The failure to stop or even slow down the well planned and carefully executed genocide of European Jewry is among the darkest moments in history. Many, if not most, Jewish leaders of the time contributed to that massive failure, by their inaction and failure to change priorities.

We cannot go back in time, but we must learn from the mistakes of the past and avoid repeating them now.

The current situation facing world Jewry is dangerously similar to what they faced in the early 1930s, following the rise of Nazism and election of Hitler in 1932. This is not 1942, when Jews were being gassed and shot.

But it is close to 1932, when Jewish students were being harassed, threatened and subjected to discriminatory measures.

The world did nothing. Many became complicit. Harvard honored Nazi academics.³² The United States Olympic Committee fought to keep the 1936 games in Berlin even after Jewish athletes were excluded. British university students opposed interference in German domestic affairs. Most nations closed their doors to Jewish refugees. The *New York Times* downplayed the plight of Jews. Many Jewish leaders prioritized their own welfare and power over the needs of their European brothers and sisters. If any of this sounds familiar, it is because it is!

So I regard myself as now “living” back in the early 1930s and trying to prevent them from becoming the late 1930s. That is my priority and it motivates my decisions, including my party affiliations.

F. To Everything There Is a Season

The great wisdom book of the bible, Ecclesiastes recognizes that “to everything there is a season.” That is indeed a wise observation. The book also says, “there is nothing new under the sun.” That is plainly wrong: the sun itself may never be new, but everything on earth changes.

The most difficult issue faced by human beings is when and what to change as the world around them alters. Perhaps the best general rule is that fundamental principles should remain constant, whilst strategic and tactical approaches to achieving those principles should adapt to the realities of changing circumstances. This balance is not easy to achieve, since principles, strategies and tactics are often interrelated, at least in practice.

With these general considerations in mind, I have tried hard to maintain my basic principles that have matured over the years, while adapting my tactics and strategies—including political affiliations—to the changing realities. The end does not justify the means, but achieving noble ends may often require rethinking the means. This is a lifelong process which I continue to undertake.

Changing my party affiliation has been one of the most difficult decisions in my lifetime, especially since I have largely stood alone, without being joined by close friends and family members. Most have understood my change because they understood my priorities are somewhat different from theirs. Fortunately, we agree to disagree while maintaining our friendship and love. Many so-called “friends” have abandoned me as a result of my abandonment of the Democratic Party. As my real friends remind me, these erstwhile fair-weather “friends” were never actual friends; they were tactical allies who placed partisanship over principle. I do not miss most of them, as I’m sure they do not miss me. Acquaintanceships of convenience also have a season, as does partisanship.

So as I approach my nineties, I am undergoing many changes in my life. I have no choice. My commitment to, and my priorities about my principles compel me to make these changes. And I plan to continue to adapt my strategies to ever-changing circumstances in the future. This may be uncomfortable, but I have never sought comfort as a priority. So change will be my constant, as I adapt and challenge for the rest of my life. As then-President Obama wished me on my seventy-fifth birthday: “many more years of advocacy, mischief and great fun.” I doubt that he agrees with my current advocacy.

G. My Decisions over Time

My decisions to leave the Democratic Party, become an Independent, and then join the Republican Party were gradual and developed over time. This process was documented by op-eds I wrote and interviews I gave. Accordingly, I present this documentation in roughly chronological order, reflecting my changing views, and my recognition that this is a work in progress that is influenced by ongoing events. I try to keep inevitable repetition to a minimum. So here are my op-eds and interviews, followed by a conclusion in which I cautiously try to peer into the future through the inevitably darkened glass.

-
- 1 Schupler later died by suicide after he was indicted on grand larceny charges. He was reported to have taken \$6,500 from a Brooklyn grocer to get the grocer's son into medical school. See "Silver Releases Tape of Schupler; Prosecutor Says It Refutes Frame-Up Accusations by Ex-Councilman," *New York Times*, May 8, 1958. Payment for admission to state medical schools was all too common back then, as was payment for judgeships and other benefits. That was one of the reasons I decided not to run for office.
 - 2 Matthew Continetti, "The Democrats Unify Against Israel," *Wall Street Journal*, April 22, 2026.
 - 3 As John Fetterman wrote in a recent op-ed, "[O]nce-common views have become increasingly toxic in the Democratic Party, a result of catering to the fringe and agitated parts of our base. The party is fractured by their demands, heightened after the Gaza war and even more after Trump was elected in 2024. Numerous protesters have followed me . . . to tell me I'm a traitor simply for voting my conscience, unapologetically standing with Israel and the global Jewish community . . . securing our border—stances that were not unusual. My values have not changed, and I have always turned to those kinds of ideals that defined being a Democrat." John Fetterman, "I Haven't Changed, Here's What Has," *Washington Post*, May 7, 2026. After half of Democrats in the House voted for a measure to end all aid to Israel, Senator John Fetterman declared that if the Democratic Party ever became officially the anti-Israel party, he would leave the party. Alexander Bolton, "Fetterman Warns He Would Leave Democratic Party if It Turns on Israel," *The Hill*, July 15, 2026. In my view, that moment has already arrived, making my own departure from the Democratic Party all but inevitable.
 - 4 Id. El-Sayed defended his alliance by arguing that political leaders must go to "unlikely and uncommon places." Joey Cappelletti, "How Big of a Tent Do Democrats Want? Hasan Piker Is Testing the Limits in Michigan State's Primary," *Washington Post*, April 7, 2026. One wonders whether Democratic leaders would show similar tolerance toward commentators trafficking in equivalent racial or anti-gay slurs. The answer is obvious.
 - 5 Jennifer Media, "Excruciating and Agonizing: A New Reality for Jewish Democrats," *New York Times*, April 29, 2026.
 - 6 Id.
 - 7 Id.
 - 8 Id. Politico recently reported that Gottheimer was one of the few Democrats who stood up to New York's Mayor Zohran Mamdani after he had called AIPAC "dark money monsters." While most fellow Democrats stayed silent, Rep. Josh Gottheimer (D-NJ) criticized Mamdani for "laundering antisemitism." Gottheimer wrote on X that if "AIPAC" was swapped for "Jews," the language about a hidden hand turning people against one another amounted to "the oldest antisemitic conspiracy theory in the books . . . That's not criticizing a lobby. That's laundering antisemitism from your podium as Mayor of a city with more than a million Jews." Jason Beeferman, Chris Sommerfeldt, Madison Fernandez and Leah Clark, "Mamdani called AIPAC 'dark money monsters.' Fellow Democrats Stayed Silent," Politico, June 22, 2026.
 - 9 Katie Glueck, "Josh Shapiro Writes That Team Harris Asked If He Had Ever Been an Israeli Agent," *New York Times*, January 18, 2026.

- [10](#) See, e.g., Dan Freedman, “Hitler’s Enablers Included Conservative German Jews,” *Moment Magazine*, Spring 2025, <https://momentmag.com/hitlers-enablers-included-conservative-german-jews/>.
- [11](#) I first predicted this trend in my 1991 book *Chutzpah* (see Conclusion)—see also Alan M. Dershowitz, *Cancel Culture: The Latest Attack on Free Speech and Due Process* (2020).
- [12](#) Anti-Israel speakers at the Democratic convention: AOC, Senators Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson, and Al Sharpton. At the time of the convention, I said in interviews, “I cannot be associated with the party that features as its speakers, AOC, [A] Sharpton, Liz Warren, and Bernie Sanders. That’s not my party.” Victor Nava, “Alan Dershowitz Renounces Democratic Party, Cites ‘Anti-Jewish’ Lawmakers at DNC,” *New York Post*, November 7, 2024.
- [13](#) At the time this book went to press, the House of Representatives rejected a measure to end US aid to Israel. The proposal was supported by nearly half of House Democrats and opposed by all but one Republican. Annie Karni, “Almost Half of House Democrats Vote to End Aid to Israel,” *New York Times*, July 15, 2026.
- [14](#) *Cats & Cosby with John Catsimatidis and Rita Cosby*, May 26, 2026.
- [15](#) See e.g., Izabella Tabarovsky, “How *The New York Times* Helped Hide Stalin’s Mass Murders in Ukraine,” *Tablet*, October 23, 2020, <https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/arts-letters/articles/walter-duranty-ukraine-new-york-times-mr-jones-agnieszka-holland> ; See David Folkenflik, “*The New York Times* can’t shake the cloud over a 90-year-old Pulitzer Prize,” May 8, 2022, NPR, <https://www.opb.org/article/2022/05/08/new-york-times-cant-shake-cloud-over-90-year-old-pulitzer-prize/>.
- [16](#) Nicholas Kristof, “The Silence that Meets the Rape of Palestinians,” *New York Times*, May 11, 2026.
- [17](#) See “Your Questions About Nicholas Kristof’s Column on Palestinians and Sexual Assault,” *New York Times*, May 21, 2026, <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/05/21/opinion/kristof-palestinian-sexual-assault.html>.
- [18](#) “Nick’s Kristof’s Incendiary Israel Abuse Claims Sparks Civil war at *New York Times*: ‘I’m Sick of Being Embarrassed,’” *New York Post*, May 18, 2026.
- [19](#) Morgan Phillips, “Democrats Extend Platner ‘Grace’ Despite Abuse Allegations After Kavanaugh Reckoning,” FOX News, June 8, 2026.
- [20](#) Rami Ayyub, “Outrage Grows After Israeli Minister Mocks Gaza Flotilla Activists,” Reuters, May 21, 2026.
- [21](#) Even Prime Minister Netanyahu said that his actions were “not in line with Israel’s values and norms.” “Nethanyahu Scolds Israeli Security Minster for Videos Taunting Flotilla Activists,” NPR, May 21, 2026.
- [22](#) I’ve written about this phenomenon in my 2002 book, *Why Terrorism Works*.
- [23](#) On October 8, 2023, thirty-four student groups at Harvard infamously condemned Israel, writing in an open letter that the Israeli regime was “entirely responsible for all unfolding violence,” stating that “apartheid is the only one to blame.” J. Sellers Hill and Nia L. Orakwue, “Harvard

Student Groups Face Intense Backlash for Statement Calling Israel ‘Entirely Responsible’ for Hamas Attack,” *Harvard Crimson*, October 10, 2023.

[24](#) See Alan Dershowitz, *The Ten Big Anti-Israel Lies: And How to Refute Them with Truth* (2024).

[25](#) See Dershowitz, *Jewish Blood Is No Longer Cheap* (2026).

[26](#) “Gov. Shapiro falsely claimed that Netanyahu bullied Trump into waging war against Iran.” All-In Podcast, April 8, 2026.

[27](#) Rahm Emanuel called for the end of US aid to Israel. “Rahm Emanuel Joins Call to End US ‘Financial Aid’ as Democratic Support for Israel Hits New Lows,” *Times of Israel*, April 21, 2026.

[28](#) And even that, as shown above, does not make Jewish candidates immune from vile accusations of dual loyalty. See Jennifer Media, “Excruciating and Agonizing: A New Reality for Jewish Democrats,” *New York Times*, April 29, 2026. Throughout history Jews have converted to become assimilated, with the result that they were still viewed as Jews by mainstream society after.

[29](#) Pirkei Avot 1:14.

[30](#) I defended the rights of Palestinian students to fly the Palestinian flag in Harvard Yard when Yassir Arafat died in 2004.

[31](#) And I defended the rights of Neo-Nazis to march through Jewish neighborhoods in Skokie, Illinois.

[32](#) See Matt Lebovic, “A century before Claudine Gay, Harvard helped Nazi Germany improve its image in the West,” *Times of Israel*, January 3, 2024.

The Dangerous Stalinism of the “Woke” Hard Left, August 31, 2019

Civil liberties are in greater danger today from the intolerant hard left than from the bigoted hard right. This may seem counterintuitive: There has been far more violence—mass shootings in malls, synagogues and other soft targets—from extremists who identify more with the hard right than with the hard left. But the influence of the hard left on our future leaders is far more pervasive, insidious and dangerous than the influence of the hard right. People on the “woke” hard left seem so self-righteous about their monopoly over Truth (with a capital T) that many of them see no reason to allow dissenting, politically incorrect views to be expressed. Such incorrect views, they claim, make them feel “unsafe.” They can feel safe only if views they share are allowed to be expressed. Feeling unsafe is the new trigger word for demanding censorship.

No university student has the right to be safe from uncomfortable ideas, only from physical threats, and any student who claims to be in physical fear of politically incorrect ideas does not belong at a university. The most extreme example of this distortion of the role of higher education took place at my own university when a distinguished dean of a Harvard residential college was fired from his deanship because some “woke” students claimed to feel unsafe in his presence because he was representing, as a defense lawyer, a man accused of rape.

We often forget that the concept of “political correctness” originated in the Stalinist Soviet Union, where Truth—political, artistic, religious—was determined by the central committee of the Communist Party and any deviation was regarded as unacceptable. To be sure, there is a vast difference between how Stalin treated political incorrectness and how the “woke” generation treats it. Stalin murdered those who deviated from his Truth, while “wokers” generally shun, cancel, and discredit, though there has been occasional violence from elements of the hard left toward those who deviate from their Truth. But both produce a similar result: less dissent, less reliance on the marketplace of ideas and more self-censorship.

For many “wokers,” freedom of speech is nothing more than a weapon of the privileged used to subjugate the unprivileged. It is a bourgeois concept that emanates from an anachronistic white, male constitution that is irrelevant to the contemporary world. Free speech for me—the underprivileged—but not for thee—the privileged. That is what the “wokers” want.

Affirmative action for speech!

The other dangerous similarity between the Stalinists and the “wokers” is that both disdain due process for those they deem guilty of political incorrectness or other crimes and sins.

They reject any presumption of innocence or requirement that the accuser bear the burden of proof.

These “bourgeois” concepts are based on the recognition of human fallibility and uncertainty.

For Stalinist and “wokers,” there is no uncertainty or fallibility. If they believe someone is guilty, he must be. Why do we need a cumbersome process for determining guilt? The identities of the accuser and accused are enough. Privileged white men are guilty perpetrators. Intersectional minorities are innocent victims. Who needs to know more? Any process, regardless of its fairness, favors the privileged over the unprivileged.

When I was in college in the 1950s, it was the McCarthyite right that was censoring and denying due process. It was the liberal left that was defending free speech, dissent and due process. But for some on the left, this stance was merely a self-serving tactic, because it was people on the extreme left who were being denied these protections. Now that it is conservatives who are being censored and denied due process on campuses around the country, many on the left have remained silent—or complicitous. Civil liberties for me, but not for thee.

That is why I make the controversial claim that today the “woke” hard left is more dangerous to civil liberties than the right. To be sure there are hard-right extremists who would use—and have used—violence to silence those with whom they disagree. They are indeed dangerous. But they have far less influence on our future leaders than their counterparts on the hard left. They are not teaching our college age children and grandchildren. They are marginalized academically, politically and in the media. The opposite is true of hard-left Stalinists. Many have no idea who Stalin even was, but they are emulating his disdain for free speech and due process in the interests of achieving the unrealizable utopia they both sought. They also have in common the attitude that noble ends justify ignoble means.

It is precisely because the ends sought by the “wokers” are often noble—racial and gender equality, a fairer distribution of wealth, protection of the environment, a woman’s right to choose, gay marriage—that liberals find it harder to condemn them for their intolerance toward civil liberties. But we must always remember that it is not only the road to hell that is paved with good intentions. It is also the road to tyranny.

A Few Thoughts on Law and Justice, Lecture with Q & A, June 9, 2020

I am a centrist liberal. For me, the real enemies of America are the extremists on both sides: the hard left that would bring America down, the hard-right white supremacists and neo-Nazis.

It is too bad that the right and the left do not have real conversations. The conversations tend to take the form now of bumper stickers, protests, and screaming. The recent protests are understandable. There is far too much killing of unarmed African American men. Protests that are entirely protected by our Constitution.

When these protests are hijacked by people on the hard left who care much more about undoing America than about what happens in the African American community, or people on the hard right who exploit racial tension and try to bring about their own revolution, we are in great danger.

The greatest danger does not even come from those on the streets who are burning buildings, or those on the streets who are running people down, or those on the streets who are yelling slogans that have nothing to do with African Americans, but rather with Israel, Palestine, Jews, capitalism, you name it.

The real problem I see is with the *New York Times*, which no longer tolerates dissent. The most remarkable episode in the past couple of weeks

was the firing of the op-ed editor of the *New York Times* and the demotion of his deputy.

I have written dozens of op-eds for the *New York Times*. Today, the *New York Times* is unlikely to publish an op-ed by me. Many mainstream media will not publish any dissenting views that disagree with the mainstream left.

The idea that the editor of the *New York Times* would be fired for publishing a column by a distinguished United States senator, Senator Tom Cotton, a former student at Harvard Law School, is shocking.

I do not agree with everything Senator Cotton said, but the idea that the *Times* publisher would give in to the mob in his own newsroom and eliminate the distinction between news and opinion by allowing others to tell him whose opinions are to be published on the op-ed page of the *New York Times* is deeply disturbing.

I am a skeptic. I read. I want to see data analyzed. I want to see an opposing point. That is what op-ed pages are for, to present opposing points of view. The *Times* has taken the “op” out of “op-ed.”

I think the last thing the *New York Times* wants is for people to come to their own conclusion, because the *New York Times* bars dissenting points of view. It is so anti-newspapers, so anti-media, so anti-First Amendment spirit.

The cancel culture is moving from the extreme to the mainstream.

I too have been victimized by the cancel culture. The 92nd Street Y where I spoke for twenty-five years—I was the second-most-frequent speaker after Elie Wiesel—has canceled me. I was not allowed to speak in defense of Israel from the 92nd Street Y, because they do not want their viewers and their listeners to hear from people who are victims of the cancel culture.

I see this as so dangerous whether you are a liberal or a conservative. On college campuses today, I cannot speak without having efforts made to try to silence me, sometimes by violence.

When I spoke at Berkeley, antifa came out and tried to prevent my speech from going forward. The same has happened in other places. When I spoke at Johns Hopkins University, a Hitler mustache was painted on my face and swastikas were put on the program announcing my speech.

People from the hard left do not even want to hear from people on the center left. We are the enemies of the hard left, which is why I wrote my book, *The Case for Liberalism in an Age of Extremism: or, Why I Left the Left But Can't Join the Right*.

I think I speak for many people about the frustration we experience, the homelessness we experience in today's political world. America has thrived at the center—the conservative center, the liberal center, but the center.

Our competitive advantage has been historically that we have not been seduced by the extremes. Compare us to France, Germany, Spain, or many South American countries where the arguments were not between centrist liberals and centrist conservatives, but between communists and fascists.

In the 1930s, we saw the death of center parties in Europe, in France, in Italy and in Spain. It was, again, the fascists versus the communists, and the fascists won. Who knows who would win in the United States if we ever saw a situation between fascism and communism?

America would not benefit from either of those extreme “isms.” I am afraid we are moving in that direction. I worry about what the platforms of both parties will say in the upcoming election—how far left the Democrats will move, how far right the Republicans may move.

Both want to attract their base and want to broaden the base as much as possible. You do not broaden your base when you stay at the center, at least that is what is thought. I do not agree with that. I think the party that is seen as the centrist party will win future elections.

The party that seems the party of stability, the party that opposes extremism on both sides, is likely the party that will win. I think America

craves today a kind of moderation, a kind of stability and centrism. We shall see in November what happens.

I also worry about the November election. What if the virus comes back and it is hard to have people come to the polls? Can we really have an election online or by mail? What if the virus becomes so serious that mail deliverers have to stay at home?

I place the blame squarely at the foot of the extremists, the people who are taking advantage of tragedies such as the death in Minneapolis and other places to promote their own brand of extremism. I think we live in very troubled, dangerous times.

Nobody can ever anticipate unpredictable events. Take, for example, what happened in Minneapolis. After the policeman who was on the videotape putting his knee on the neck of the African American man, George Floyd, was initially arrested and charged with third-degree murder, which seemed, on its face of it, to fit the videotape—reckless disregard for human life—the crowds pressured the prosecutor to up the charge to second-degree murder.

Which, as a scholar of criminal law, does not seem, at least on the face of it, to fit the facts or the law. Prosecutors and political agendas tend to follow the crowd. We are the only country, the only Western democracy, the only one that elects prosecutors. It is an outrage that we have elected prosecutors in this country.

No other democracy makes its justice system so politicized. In every other Western democracy, prosecutors are civil servants who are appointed based on experience and expertise. Their politically neutral job is to simply do justice fairly, not to respond to the passions of the voters.

It is not helpful if we have prosecutors who put their finger up to the wind and say, “What will better help me get reelected? Should I overcharge or undercharge an alleged offense?”

The combination of elected prosecutors and elected judges has made our legal system far too political. Too many decisions are made by people, crowds, and pressure groups. When you combine four aspects of our system—prosecutors are elected, judges are elected, juries are ordinary, lay people, and the judges who control the juries are often subject to reelection—the risks of our justice system being turned over to the masses, to the mobs, to the crowds, to the chanters becomes all too real, and our system of checks and balances becomes weaker. Remember that when America was founded at the end of the eighteenth century, the greatest fear was of the mob.

The framers created a system of checks and balances that were supposed to check, not only each branch of the government, but also the public, the voters. There were no direct elections of senators. There was no direct election of the president.

The Senate was to be appointed by state legislatures and senators would be of equal number in the largest state and the smallest state as a way of checking the power of the larger states. Many of those checks and balances have over time been eliminated, mostly for the good. We now have a much broader electoral base, many more people vote.

At the time of the framing, women did not vote, Blacks did not vote. You had to be a white, Christian landowner. Now we have broadened the basis for election, but we have failed to check, in our justice system, the role of the mob.

In China, some years ago, I was invited to go to the trial of a man who was accused of stealing some items. After the evidence came in—you had evidence from the prosecution, the defendant testified—and then the judge ordered the doors opened. Hundreds of people poured in from the streets.

The judge said, “Now we’ll hear from the masses.” The masses started yelling, “Convict! Convict! Convict!” Of course, the judge convicted, because the masses were the ones in a communist country who had control

over the justice system. I never want to see that happen in the United States of America.

We are living in difficult times. We are living under difficult pressures. It is very hard to be a dissenter today. If you are a dissenter today, you risk being canceled. If you are an editor who is willing to publish dissenting material, you risk being fired.

If you are a dissenter today in a crowd, you risk being beaten up. Look at the mayor of Minneapolis who said he was willing to defund the police. A stupid idea that would harm mostly disadvantaged, poor people.

If there were no police, if the police were defunded, wealthy people would hire private security guards, but the people who cannot afford private guards need to have a well-funded police force. I am in favor of extra funding for the police. Give them better training. Teach them how to subdue people without using lethal force.

All of those are good things, but the idea of defunding the police, of abolishing the police force in cities in America, is an invitation to violence and is the first step toward some kind of anarchy, which none of us wants to see happen.

Question and Answer

Q: George Floyd's family appealed to the UN to intervene. What are the chances of UN troops invading US soil? And can the USA defund the UN? They seem to hate the US and Israel.

Professor Dershowitz: It is a good question. I was a big supporter of the United Nations when it was first established. I had worked for Arthur Goldberg when he was a justice to the Supreme Court. I was his law clerk.

When he became the United States ambassador to the UN, he asked for my help in helping to draft Resolution 242, which was basically the peace treaty that ended the 1967 Six-Day War. I was a big supporter of the UN, I belonged to the United Nations Association.

Obviously, since the 1970s, it has turned viciously against Israel and against the United States. The UN, of course, would have absolutely no jurisdiction over a domestic matter in the United States. It could not send troops, it could not even legitimately pass a resolution. The problem with the UN is not that it passes too many resolutions, but too few. It never attacks its favorite countries. It applies a double standard of injustice. It has devoted more time to condemning Israel than all the other countries of the world combined.

Let us see what it says about recent reports concerning murders in Iran of gay people, for instance the recent murder of a fourteen-year-old by her father as an honor killing. Let us see what it says about so many of the violations of human rights around the world. Well, do not hold your breath. It will say nothing. It will focus only on Israel and the United States.

There is a case to be made for the United States withdrawing and defunding. I think the current Secretary-General of the United Nations is trying very hard. He has done a much better job of trying to create some kind of equity and equality in resolutions, but he has not yet succeeded.

We have withdrawn from the UN Human Rights Council, which is really a Council on Human Wrongs, dominated by some of the worst abusers of human rights. In fact, a few years ago I attended a UN meeting in Switzerland when the guest of honor at the United Nations Human Rights Council was Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a Holocaust denier and a vicious opponent of human rights.

Do not expect condemnation from the United Nations.

Q: 1968 was a period thought of as revolutionary. The 1930s had a substantial communist and fascist movement in the US. The country survived those periods as a strong, prosperous democracy. Do you see the current movement as revolutionary? Will it dissipate or deepen into broader civil strife? Is it the moment that America's luck and special features run out and it devolves into a weak and hopelessly divided country?

Professor Dershowitz: What a great question. We did have fascist parties in the United States. I live part time on the east side of New York, and my neighborhood was right close to what was called Germantown, which had a very large Bund contingency, and they filled Madison Square Garden with Nazis doing “Heil Hitler” salutes and wearing Nazi regalia as late as the late 1930s. Even up until Pearl Harbor.

Of course, we had a significant but never large communist presence in the United States in those days, too. I think we were always blessed because the Depression could have easily led to the same kind of fight between fascism and communism as we saw in France and Spain, and even in England to a lesser degree.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the deeply flawed president, made lots of mistakes. But his New Deal pushed America to the center. It pulled the rug out from under a nascent communist movement because it gave Americans Social Security and protections of other kinds.

We survived the small amount of fascism and communism. I think Pearl Harbor obviously ended the fascist movement in America and those Germans who supported it.

By the way, not only some German Americans, some, supported fascism, but some Italian Americans, some, again, a small number, supported Mussolini. We are a free country, and people are free to support whomever they choose to support.

I was never in favor of making it illegal to be a member of the Communist Party or to be a member of the Fascist party. I lived through McCarthyism. I remember what happened in the '50s as a result of that.

I do not think we are at that moment. I think we are closer than we were, in many respects, to the early 1930s.

I have to tell you if we were to sink into a deep, enduring depression, and if we were not able to lick the coronavirus and develop a vaccine, and if the virus were to spread even more lethally around the country and require

the continuous closing down of our economy, there is no predicting what could happen. I hope we are not there, but if we were to experience a worse pandemic, worse economic situation, worse racial tensions, all of those could lead to a crisis for democracy, which is always very fragile.

Indeed, I think the extremists on the hard left are hoping that happens so that they can try to attract other people to their extremist anti-American agenda.

The people on the extreme hard right—I'm not talking about conservatives, not at all—I am talking about the survivalists, the militia people, the virulent white supremacists, antisemites. They would love to see a revolution and they, of course, have the guns. The people on the hard left have the Molotov cocktails. Both are wrong, both are bad.

The idea that two young lawyers, it was shocking to me, one of them at a big firm, would throw a Molotov cocktail into a police car, even if it was an uninhabited police car.

We know that in other instances, there were policemen in the car and in the vicinity when people threw potentially explosive devices. Look, I'm a liberal criminal defense attorney. I cross-examine policemen on the stand all the time.

I am an admirer of the police and the FBI. I have had my differences with individual FBI agents, certainly, and with individual policemen, and with individual prosecutors, but it is folks at the front line of law enforcement that keep us civil and keep us peaceful. If you defund the police, you increase the power of the lawless. You increase the power of the extremes on the hard right and the hard left. We have to support the police.

Our system of checks and balances is very fragile and was endangered this year, I believe, by the Democratic effort to impeach a president against whom I voted in the 2016 election.

I think that endangered our system of checks and balances by trivializing the impeachment power of the Constitution, which the framers

wanted to limit to cases of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors—not allegations of political abuse of power or political obstruction of Congress. That was never the intent. That effort weakened our checks and balances. The *New York Times*'s failure as an institution weakens our external checks and balances.

We used to have the media serving as checks and balances on the excesses of government. Today, the *New York Times* follows the crowd rather than allows dissenting views to be expressed.

My disappointment with the *New York Times*, with National Public Radio, with CNN, which censors the news horribly, and with many other mainstream media, is that they are failing to serve as checks and balances.

I also think the church is failing. There was an op-ed in the *New York Times* yesterday by a woman placing all the blame for our problems on white Christians, and she quotes one of the great paragons of Christianity, the Reverend Daniel J. Berrigan.

Do you remember the Reverend Berrigan? A virulent antisemite, who called Israel a criminal Jewish community? Blamed the Vietnam War on the Jews, fomented antisemitism, and the *New York Times* publishes a piece praising the Reverend Berrigan.

Now I want them to publish that piece because I do not believe in censorship, but that piece was ten times more provocative, ten times worse, ten times more inaccurate than anything published by Senator Cotton.

Q: You have been a principled contrarian. Is there any hope for our country to find its middle ground again when ordinary people are terrified now even to approach the topic of race for fear of being labeled, sidelined as you yourself have been in many fora?

Professor Dershowitz: Good question. Unfortunately, today it takes courage to speak out on divisive issues in America. To speak out on issues of race. To speak out on issues of sex and due process and free speech—you

endanger your career if you do it. You endanger your standing and your status.

Being principled today is very difficult to do. Throughout my life, people praised me for being principled. I did not deserve the praise because earlier in my life, it took no courage to stand up for Israel, to stand up for democracy, to stand up against suppression of free speech, to stand up against excesses of race-specific affirmative action programs. It did not take any courage to do that.

Unfortunately, today, it not only takes courage, I think you have to be somewhat foolhardy. I have to tell you, there are members of my family and my friends who urge me to be quiet.

Who say, "Look, you are too provocative. Look what has happened to you. The 92nd Street Y will not allow you to speak. the *New York Times* will not publish your op-ed. CNN has banned you. All because you maintain a principled willingness to speak on behalf of the Constitution without necessarily taking partisan political sides."

I worry for our country. In a way, I am a perfect example of the cancel culture, of how my reputation has been tarnished by people on the hard left, and by some on the hard right.

People on the hard right always hated me, but because of my stands on principle the hard left has also turned against me.

I have been accused of all kinds of terrible things and as a result of speaking on forums that others disagree with.

My point is, you have to get your views out there for all to hear. Because the basic saving grace of democracy is the people.

As long as we can get our message out to the people, hopefully, the people will come down in the center and understand that their interests are best served by going back to the days when the debates were between liberals and conservatives at the center, rather than extremists.

I worry that our voices are being cut off and that we cannot get access to the media anymore.

Q: Do you think there will be a shift from the center-left's being appalled at the current situation, such as defunding the police, so that they would considering leaving the party and voting for Trump?

Professor Dershowitz: It's a complicated question. I think there are many Democrats who are very upset. It could happen if the platform of the Democratic Party were ever to include defunding the police, which I believe it will not, but Bernie Sanders might push in that direction.

I do not think you can stay at home in an election. You have to come and vote. A lot of people will feel the same way I feel: homeless, not comfortable in the current Democratic Party, not comfortable in the Republican Party. In the last election, 2016, a great many Americans did not vote for a president; they voted against a president. They voted against Hillary Clinton, thereby casting a vote for President Trump, or they voted against President Trump, thereby casting a vote for Hillary Clinton. The number of people who enthusiastically cast the vote for Trump or for Clinton was less than in previous elections.

Q: Professor Dershowitz, as a lifelong liberal in the truest sense of the word, do you not feel that the Democratic Party has left you and all others similarly situated; would you consider moving over to the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln?

Professor Dershowitz: Look, if the Republican Party were like the Conservative Party in Great Britain, I would join it in a minute. The Conservative Party in Great Britain supports a woman's right to choose, supports gay marriage, supports environmental controls, supports reasonable gun control, opposes the death penalty, and supports many aspects of what are the traditional, nonpolitical, liberal agenda.

They are obviously to the right on economic issues and foreign policy issues, but were I living in Great Britain, I would vote Conservative. Obviously, I would not have voted for a Jeremy Corbyn. I would have voted for Boris Johnson.

Today's Republicans are hard for liberals to join, because of their views on abortion and gay rights. My brother-in-law is a brilliant person who votes Republican, even though he supports all the liberal elements.

What he says is: "Look, we have won gay rights. We have won equal rights for Blacks. We have won many of the other issues. The issues that are now more important are the fight against terrorism, the fight against extremism."

He believes the Republicans do a better job on that. I understand that argument, and that is why I never criticize friends of mine who vote Republican or who vote Democrat. I am on Martha's Vineyard now where it is easy for me to socially distance because nobody wants to see me or talk to me—for the fact that I defended President Trump in front of the United States Senate. By the way, I was told I was the oldest person ever to argue an impeachment case of a president. It is nice to have been the youngest professor in Harvard's history and the oldest person ever to argue against the impeachment of a president.

As the result of taking that on—I thought it was patriotic and based on the Constitution—old friends of mine, people whose kids I recommended to college, people whose kids I helped bail out of jail at 3:00 in the morning, people whose fathers and mothers I helped represent pro bono [free of cost] when they were in trouble, will not talk to me, will not have anything to do with me. They are socially distancing from me, but that is the price you pay for principle today.

I am very happy living in my house with my family on Martha's Vineyard, taking my walks every day, writing three or four op-eds a week, and I will continue to do that without regard to how I'm treated on Martha's

Vineyard. The idea of making a transition from the Democrats to the Republicans, I am not there yet. When Keith Ellison, who is now the attorney general of Minnesota, was running to become chairman of the Democratic Party, I issued a public statement saying I would leave the Democratic Party if he had been elected—because he is a Farrakhan supporter, has a history of association with antisemitic causes. He lost the election, but he is now an attorney general. It is an open question. Right now, as I sit here today, I am a liberal Democrat who is trying very hard to keep the Democratic Party bipartisan on the issue of Israel, and bipartisan on so many other issues of importance to all of Americans.

If I fail, if the Democratic Party moves even further away from where I stand, obviously I have an open mind on these issues.

Q: You mentioned the impeachment and not following the Constitution, etc., but we now know that Adam Schiff, his cohorts, and others actually lied, and slandered and libeled the president of the United States in the allegations they made regarding the testimony they gave in committee.

Is there really no recourse under the law, other than the ballot box?

Professor Dershowitz: Great question. There is no recourse for senators and congressmen who lie in the course of their work. The Constitution provides for immunity, but there is recourse against the media for lying. Take, for example, CNN. I answered a question put to me by Senator Cruz, whether or not a quid pro quo [a deal, “this for that”] is enough to impeach a president. I said, “It depends on the quid pro quo.” If there was anything illegal about the quid pro quo, of course a president can be impeached.

But just because a president does something legal to get himself reelected in what he believes is the national interest, however, that is not impeachable. I clearly made the distinction between legal and illegal. CNN doctored the tape.

They edited the tape to take out “illegal” and had me saying that a president, even if he does anything illegal, cannot be impeached, that a

president is free to do anything he wants, legal or illegal.

Can you imagine? What could be worse for a journalist or a station than to doctor a tape to make you say the opposite of what you said? Then you had many of the commentators saying explicitly, “Alan Dershowitz has said that even if a president does something illegal, he can’t be impeached.”

I said exactly the opposite. If a president does something illegal, he can be impeached. But that is CNN. How do we hold the media accountable?

Hopefully courts remain an institution open to people who have been victimized by false accusation. The framers of our Constitution intended that, the First Amendment permits it. When the false accusation is done with malice, and of course, both CNN and Netflix did it with malice.

I think it is important for the First Amendment to hold irresponsible media—powerful, irresponsible media—accountable. Checks and balances also include using the courts to check the power of the media.

The New McCarthyism Comes to Harvard Law School, March 5, 2021

A recent petition, signed by hundreds of Harvard Law School students and alumni, raises the specter of the new McCarthyism coming to the law school at which I taught for half a century. The petition states that “Harvard Law School faces a choice of whether to welcome the architects and backers of the Trump administration’s worse abuses back into polite society.” It demands that Harvard not “hire or affiliate with” any of these sinners, and threatens that “if it does so the school will be complicit if future attacks on our democracy are even more violent—and more successful.”

The petition sees this ban as part of the educational and employment mission of the school: “it would also teach ambitious students of all ages that attempting to subvert the democratic process” will deny them access to the “revolving door to success and prestige.” This self-serving defense of censorship is intended to convey a crass economic threat: if you want to get a good job after law school, make sure that Harvard bans teachers and speakers who are trying to “rehabilitate their reputations and obscure the stain of their complicity in the Trump administration.”

This is similar to the message that the original McCarthyites tried to have Harvard convey in the 1950s, when students were denied editorship of the *Law Review*, clerkship recommendations, and other opportunities that

they had earned, solely because of their alleged affiliation with Communism and other left-wing causes. One would have thought that current Harvard Law School students would be familiar with the sordid history of McCarthyism that infected many American universities, including Brooklyn College, which I attended as an undergraduate and where I fought against the denial of civil liberties to suspected communists.

One would also think that signatories would be aware that if these vague criteria—anti-democratic, racist, xenophobic and immoral—were applied across the board, they would result in bans on anyone who was associated with the current regimes in China, Cuba, Turkey, Belarus, Russia, Venezuela, the Palestinian Authority and other repressive governments. It would also apply to supporters of American anti-democratic and anti-free speech groups, such as antifa, and the very organization—People’s Parity Project—that is promoting this anti-free speech petition. Indeed, historically, repression and censorship have been directed primarily against the left. Even today, the French government is expressing concern about the impact of “Islamist-leftist” influences from American universities.

The Harvard Law School petition is directed only at Trump supporters, not supporters of left wing anti-democratic repression, either here or abroad. It is based on the assumption that there is a special “Trump exception” to freedom of speech and due process. But exceptions to free speech and academic freedom for some risk becoming the rule for all.

“Free speech for me but not for thee” is not a defensible principle. Today it is the mantra of the new censors, who demand deplatforming and cancelling speakers, teachers and writers who disagree with their anti-Trump zealotry. The voracious appetite of the censor, however, is rarely sated. Some are now trying to silence defenders of the Constitution, such as me, who opposed many of Trump’s policies, but who also opposed what we believe were unconstitutional efforts to impeach him. When I was invited to

speak by a Harvard Law School student group, the event had to be moved off campus as the result of threats to shout me down and silence me.

Much of this effort to exclude Trump supporters from campuses comes from individuals and organizations that also demand more “diversity.” But their definition of diversity is limited to race, gender, sexual orientation and ethnicity. It does not extend to the central mission of universities: to hear and learn from the widest array of views, perspectives, ideologies and political preferences.

Today’s students should welcome Trump supporters and challenge them—respectfully, civilly and with open minds. They should be willing to listen to views diametrically opposed to their own deeply felt morality and politics. Many of these cancelled speakers would express views that are accepted by tens of millions of American voters. Those of us who disagree with these views should feel confident that they will be soundly rejected in the open marketplace of ideas, as they were in the 2020 election. No university or law school should shut down this marketplace, as the old McCarthyism did and as this new McCarthyism is now trying to do. There is no place for selective censorship based on political affiliations at Harvard Law School or any institution of higher education, whether it receives federal funding or not—but especially if it does.

This anti-civil liberties petition should be rejected in the marketplace of ideas by all students, faculty and administrators who value diversity of opinions both inside and outside the classroom.

The Squalid “Squad” Is Trying to Destroy Bipartisan Support for Israel, September 23, 2021

The Squad is a small group of radical members of the US House of Representatives who run for Congress under the banner of the Democratic Party but do not reflect its mainstream policies. They represent niche districts that are not typical of the Democratic base.

They probably could not be elected in statewide races because they lack widespread support. They were nominated because of low turnout in primaries and were elected because their districts are overwhelmingly Democrat. They are fringe Democrats who should not have influence beyond their districts. But the House leadership of the Democratic Party has exaggerated their significance and given them more power than they deserve.

One important issue that distinguishes them from mainstream Democrats is their knee-jerk hatred of Israel and their willingness to deny America’s most important Middle East ally the means to defend its civilians against rocket attacks from terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, as well as from Iran’s nuclear program. At least one member of the Squad is an overt antisemite who has repeatedly made bigoted statements against American Jews. Instead of being marginalized for these

outrageous canards, she was rewarded by the Democratic leadership by being given a plum assignment as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Now the Squad has managed to extort the leadership into trying to remove a billion-dollar commitment to replenish Israel's Iron Dome defense system that protects civilians from rocket attacks. The Squad, and its Democrat allies in the House, threatened to vote against an appropriation bill unless the Iron Dome allocation was removed. And they won—at least for now. The allocation was removed over the objection of mainstream Democrats and Republicans, and the Squad claimed victory.

Although the victory was largely pyrrhic—the Iron Dome funding is likely to be restored in subsequent legislation—the success of the Squad's sordid maneuver may be a sign of their growing influence in the Democratic Party.

The fact that the Squad picked on the Iron Dome to make its stand against Israel is significant. The Iron Dome is a system developed jointly by the United States and Israel that is purely defensive. It does not kill, injure, or threaten anyone. It only protects civilians against war crimes committed by terrorist groups that direct lethal rockets against innocent civilians. The fact that the Squad would try to deny Israel the right to defend its civilians speaks volumes about the lack of morality and decency among Squad members and their allies. It follows from this effort that the Squad will oppose any and all aid to Israel, including protecting its innocent civilians against Iran's nuclear threat. The obvious goal of Squad members is to deny Israel the right to defend itself against aggression. At least one of its members has denied that Israel has the right to exist.

These bigoted actions directly violate the platform of the Democratic Party (as well as that of the Republican Party). The Democratic Party must decide whether it will become captive to its most extreme wing or whether it will marginalize these radicals who are not only anti-Israel but, in many

ways, anti-American. They are intolerant of dissent and due process for those who disagree with them. They are anti-police, anti-military, and anti-free market economy. Their vision of America and the world is out of sync with most Democrats and independents. Up until recently, they could be largely ignored by voters as a loud but ineffective distraction. But now that they have managed to influence legislation in so negative a manner, they must be taken seriously by voters and rejected.

Quite understandably, Republican leaders are trying to capitalize on the Democrats' capitulation to these extremists. They are claiming that they represent the future of the Democratic Party. If that were true, it would mark the demise of the two-party system, since mainstream American voters—who generally determine the outcome of contested general elections, as distinguished from primaries—do not support radical extremism. The Democratic leadership must make it clear that they reject the policies, attitudes and statements of the Squad. They cannot get in bed with them. The time has come, indeed it is long past, for the Democratic leadership to stand strong against the anti-American, anti-Israel and anti-decency squalid Squad. The leadership can no longer stand idly by the bigotry of their members. If they persist in tolerating the intolerable, they will lose the support of the all-important mainstream voters. I know because I am one of them.

Mainstream Democrats Introduce Bill Endangering Israel, September 26, 2021

Just when Congress overwhelmingly defeated an effort by eight radical Democrats and one Republican to defund Israel's Iron Dome defense system, several "mainstream" Democrats proposed legislation that is equally dangerous and filled with half-truths, omissions and outright fabrications.

Congressman Andy Levin has introduced a bill that purports to further the "two-state solution" to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Although I favor two states for two peoples, I strongly oppose Levin's perhaps well-intentioned but ill-conceived bill, because it would destroy any prospect for peace, would reward and encourage terrorism and disincentivize Palestinian leaders from negotiating with Israel.

The bill declares that the West Bank, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip are occupied territories and must be referred to as such by all American statements. It implies that the occupation is illegal and entirely the fault of Israel.

First and foremost, it is a categorical lie to say that Gaza is occupied. There is not a single Israeli soldier, policeman, settler, or citizen in Gaza in 2021. The occupation ended in 2005. Gaza could have become Singapore

on the Mediterranean, with a seacoast, farming and democracy. Instead, Hamas overthrew the legitimate government of Gaza by force and assassination. It “occupied,” in effect, Gaza. It was only after Gaza became a terrorist enclave and committed war crimes by rockets, terror tunnels and murderous terrorism that Israel imposed restrictions designed to protect its civilians. This is not an “occupation.” It is legitimate and entirely lawful self-defense. It would be a lie—a blood libel—for the United States to declare Gaza to be occupied territory.

Many Israelis and others believe it was a mistake to end the occupation of Gaza and allow it to become a base for terrorist attacks. Under international law, a military occupation may continue as long as there is belligerence, as there certainly continues to be. Had Israeli troops remained, Israel would be criticized. Now that they have left, there is still criticism. For some, Israel can do no right.

Jerusalem is more complicated. The Old City’s Jewish Quarter and the Western Wall had been illegally occupied by Jordan between 1948 and 1967, and excluded Jews in violation of international law. When Jordan attacked Israel in June 1967, Israel liberated these ancient Jewish sites and opened them up to all. These are not occupied territories. Nor is the rest of East Jerusalem, which is part of a united city.

The West Bank is also complicated. Some of the area—the Etzion Bloc, Maale Adumim, Gilo—are disputed but will remain part of Israel even under a two-state solution, as Palestinian leaders have acknowledged. These areas are not occupied. As to the rest, Israel twice offered to end its presence in more than 95 percent of the West Bank in exchange for peace. The Palestinian leadership refused these offers and are thus responsible for the current situation.

The bill proposed by Levin and his fellow Democrats encourages the refusal of Palestinian leaders to negotiate painful compromises that are essential to achieving peace. It also rewards the pay-to-slay and terrorist

policies that are the primary barriers to peace. It sends a dangerous message to Palestinian naysayers: you don't have to negotiate or compromise; the United States will compel Israel to give in to your demands without requiring the Palestinians to negotiate, compromise or give up terrorism.

A far better bill would be one that conditioned reopening the Palestinian embassy on a willingness of the Palestinian leadership to return to the negotiating table and engage in genuine and honest discussions leading toward a peaceful two-state solution that assured security for Israel and autonomy for the West Bank Palestinians. (There can be no solution for Gaza except a military one as long as Hamas remains in charge, persists in its terrorism and refuses to recognize Israel.)

A two-state solution is far from perfect, but it is far better than the one-state solutions advocated by the hard left and Palestinian extremists (one Palestinian state) and by some Jewish extremists (one Jewish state). It may also be better than the status quo.

The one way to assure that the Palestinians will persist in their refusal to negotiate would be to enact the misguided Levin bill into law.

The Democrats' Self-inflicted Wound, November 5, 2021

As a lifelong Democrat, I am appalled at the way the leaders of the party have shot themselves in the foot by kowtowing to left-wing radicals.

The recent Republican victories were not so much a vindication of Republican policies as a rejection of the extremism of Democratic leaders and their tolerance for radical hard-left policies.

Although most pundits were focusing on the Virginia gubernatorial race, an even more telling example of the failure of the Democratic leadership played out in Buffalo, New York, the Empire State's second-most populous city.

A left-wing extremist and avowed socialist named India Walton managed to beat the longtime incumbent mayor, Byron Brown, in the low-turnout Democratic primary. Brown then decided to mount a high-risk write-in campaign against Walton. As expected, Walton was strongly supported by the left-wing fringe of the Democratic Party led by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who campaigned with her. What was shocking, and what reflects the self-inflicted wound, was the support she received from mainstream Democratic senators including Chuck Schumer, Kirsten Gillibrand, Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders and others.

Not surprisingly, Walton was also endorsed by the usual Israel-haters as well as by anti-American extremists who do not reflect the views of

mainstream Democratic voters.

She could never be elected to any office that required the votes of a majority of Democrats or voters in general. Walton could only win elections with small turnouts of extremist voters.

She does not represent American voters or Democratic voters. She represents the extreme fringe of the Democratic Party, as does Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and her squalid squad.

But you wouldn't know that from the Democratic leaders who immorally endorsed her. Whether they did so because they agree with her policies or because they are afraid of losing the votes of extremists does not matter. They endorsed her. That was wrong and self-destructive. They should have endorsed her centrist Democratic opponent who ended up winning an overwhelming victory despite the odds against write-in candidates. Brown's win reflected the true Democratic voting base.

The leaders who endorsed Walton must be rebuked if the Democrats are not to suffer further electoral losses because of their immoral association with dangerously extremist candidates. They cannot have it both ways. They cannot claim to be centrist while campaigning for anti-centrist candidates like Walton. They must renounce, not support, the fringe elements within their party if they purport to represent its voting base.

The recent election demonstrates that voters see through the duplicity of the current failed leadership of the Democratic Party and will make their party pay in next year's midterm elections unless there is reform at the top.

Even the *New York Times*, in a "news" article that reads like a campaign ad for Walton, admitted that her lopsided defeat by a write-in candidate constitutes a "stinging rebuke for the left wing of the party, both nationally and in New York."

The message of this most recent election is that centrists win and extremists lose—except perhaps in atypical districts and in small-turnout primaries.

If I were a Republican, I would be making the same demand of the leadership of that party: rebuke candidates from the extreme right, such as Marjorie Taylor Greene and others who do not represent the mainstream of the Grand Old Party. American voters crave a return to centrism and a rejection of the kind of intolerant extremism reflected by Larry David's refusal to even talk to me because I supported then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo's efforts to bring about peace in the Middle East. The mere fact that Pompeo is a Republican—in David's words, a "part of that group"—was enough for him to end a quarter of a century friendship.

Americans may like David's comedy, but they surely do not like his politics, as evidenced by the results of the last election. Larry David and Chuck Schumer and those who represent that brand of divisive partisanship may be the cause of the Democrats' continuing losses at the polls. I urge my party to reject the politics of intolerance and extremism and to embrace the politics of centrism. President Biden seems to agree. After the recent losses, he warned: "If we keep things the way they are, it's just not going to cut it in next year's midterm elections." I hope he was referring to the dangerous and self-defeating left-wing influence in his party.

Harvard President Should Use His First Amendment Right to Condemn the *Harvard Crimson*'s Antisemitism, May 9, 2022

The president of Harvard—a proud Jewish supporter of Israel and a good person—has thus far refused explicitly to condemn the *Harvard Crimson*'s blatantly antisemitic editorial singling out Israel for a political boycott. The *Crimson* editors justify their bigotry by subtly invoking the classic antisemitic trope of Jewish “power,” and by presenting a one-sided history that places no fault on the Palestinian leadership, ignores the threats faced by Israel from Palestinian terrorist and Iranian nuclear threats, and mendaciously omits the numerous Palestinian rejections of Israel's offers to accept a two-state solution.

The former president of Harvard, Lawrence Summers, condemned the editorial as antisemitic in both “intent and effect.” But Harvard president Lawrence Bacow refused to condemn the editorial, limiting himself to the following:

First let me say that I will not comment on the *Crimson* editorial. The *Crimson* is a student newspaper. It is independent of the university, and, I think it is fair to say, the *Crimson* does not represent, or certainly the editorial board does not represent, the views of the university. The *Crimson* editorial board represents the views of the *Crimson* editorial board. We believe

in a free press. They are entitled to publish what they wish and to share their views as they may.

Standing alone, that statement can be justified. But the more difficult question is whether it passes the “shoe on the other foot test” of neutrality. Would a similar refusal to condemn explicitly other bigoted editorials that singled out other groups or nations be deemed acceptable by the Harvard community? I doubt it.

Consider the following hypotheticals—hypotheticals only because the current reality would never permit them to be published:

- An editorial supporting the overruling of *Roe v. Wade* and calling for the banning of all “baby-killing” abortions;
- An editorial blaming race-based affirmative action for lowering standards throughout the country;
- An editorial calling gay and transgender people abnormal and immoral;
- An editorial calling climate concerns “fake news”;
- An editorial singling out Black African nations for human rights violations that are worse in other parts of the world;
- An editorial declaring Donald Trump the legitimate winner of the 2020 election.

These outrageous statements may seem farfetched to the contemporary eye. But it was less than ninety years ago that the *Harvard Crimson* supported giving an honorary doctorate to the official spokesperson for Hitler’s Nazi Germany. Harvard’s then president, James B. Conant, did not condemn the editorial. Indeed, he himself supported Nazi Germany in many ways.

I do not mean to compare the current editorial to the one in the 1930s, or to compare the reactions of Harvard’s presidents. There is no comparison. I cite the pro-Nazi editorial to make the point that what is politically acceptable today—singling out the nation-state of the Jewish

people for bigoted and mendacious condemnation—may be as different in the future as it was in the past.

The question Bacow should ask himself is whether he would refuse to comment on any of the hypothetical editorials were the *Crimson* to publish them. And if his answer is that they are different, he should ask why. The one about affirmative action would involve Harvard directly, and so there would be a justification for “no comment,” but at least some of the others would be quite analogous to the anti-Israel editorial: they would cause pain to many Harvard students but would not directly affect the university itself.

Harvard cannot have a double standard regarding matters Jewish or the nation-state of the Jewish people, even if some radical students demand it. Bacow should reconsider his no-comment stance and use his bully pulpit to say what I’m sure he believes in his heart: that the *Crimson*’s editorial was a bigoted, mendacious and irresponsible attack on the nation-state of the Jewish people and its supporters. If he persists on not commenting on this editorial, he must apply that same standard to other statements that are associated with the Harvard name, even when they do not represent “the views of the university.”

The left shoe must fit comfortably on the right foot—and vice versa.

Why Is the Flawed Palestinian Cause So Prominent on the Hard Left? July 10, 2022

The anti-Israel claims of the Palestinians, though deeply flawed, have become a central part of hard-left ideology, especially among those who adhere to so-called intersectionality.

Why does the Palestinian cause get so much attention, when there are much more compelling causes around the world such as those of the Kurds, Uyghurs, and other stateless and oppressed people? There are more demonstrations on university campuses against Israel than against Russia, China, Belarus and Iran. Why? The answer has little to do with the Palestinians, and everything to do with Israel, as the nation-state of the Jewish people. It is a political manifestation of international antisemitism. It is only because the nation accused of oppressing Palestinians is Israel.

This is not to say that it is wrong to support the Palestinian cause. It is to say that it is wrong—and bigoted—to prioritize that deeply flawed cause over other, equally or more deserving, causes. Not only does the hard left prioritize the Palestinians; it largely ignores other causes, just because Israel is on the other side of the Palestinian issue. The reason really is as simple as that. It has little to do with the merits and everything to do with

antisemitism. It calls itself anti-Zionism, but it is only a cover for anti-Jewish bigotry.

A recent example is the decision of Ben and Jerry's ice cream to boycott parts of Israel, while continuing to sell to countries in which far greater abuses occur. When asked why Ben and Jerry's limits their boycott only to Israel, its founders admitted they had no idea. Well, I have an idea. In Ben and Jerry's case, their ignorant founders are simply useful idiots, following unquestioningly the crowd of hard-left antisemites. To paraphrase an old expression: bigot sees, bigot does.

Who is leading the crowd of antisemitic bigots? The movement to single out the nation-state of Israel for boycott, known as BDS, was originated by a Palestinian radical named Omar Barghouti, who does not hide the fact that his goal is the destruction of Israel and the substitution of a Palestinian state "from the river to the sea," meaning the Jordan river and the Mediterranean Sea—namely all of current Israel. He and others who lead the BDS movement want to see this entire area *judenrein*, that is, ethnically cleansed of the more than seven million Jews who now supposedly "occupy" Muslim and Arab land. These supposed "occupiers" include Jews who are Black and Brown; European, Asian, African, and American; many are descendants of people who have lived there since before Islam began, and certainly before many current "Palestinians" moved there from Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, the Gulf and North Africa. Jews are as indigenous to Israel as descendants of immigrants are to America.

Do the Palestinians deserve a state? Yes, but no more so than the Kurds and other stateless people. Why no more so? Because the Palestinians have been offered statehood numerous times and have rejected it. As the former leader of the Palestinian people essentially put it when the two-state solution was first proposed in the late 1930s: We want there not to be a Jewish state more than we want there to be a Palestinian state.

This leader, Mohammed Amin al-Husseini, allied himself and his people with Nazi Germany during World War II. Al-Husseini spent the war years in Berlin with Hitler, planning to bring the “final solution” to the Jews of what is now Israel. He was declared a Nazi war criminal.

Yet his picture was featured in many Palestinian Arab homes, and he was regarded as a hero and leader.

Despite being on the losing side of the war, the Palestinians were offered a state on the vast majority of arable land, as part of a United Nations proposed two-state solution; the Jews were offered a state on a far smaller area of arable land. In the area proposed for the Jewish state, the Jews constituted a substantial majority of the population. The Jews accepted the compromise two-state solution. The Arabs rejected it and went to war against the new Jewish state, seeking to destroy it. It was this act of unlawful military aggression that resulted in the Palestinian refugee situation, which they call the “Nakba” (“catastrophe”). But it was a self-induced catastrophe. And many current Palestinian leaders and followers fault their predecessors for not accepting the two-state solution offered by the United Nations seventy-five years ago, as several have told me.

Rather than trying to negotiate for a state during the subsequent years, the Palestinian leadership under Yasser Arafat opted for terrorism against Israeli and international civilian targets. The Palestinians could have had a state in 1948, 1967, 2000–2001, 2005 and 2008. They still preferred no Jewish state to a Palestinian state living in peace with Israel. They can have a state now, if they would negotiate a compromise instead of fomenting terrorism.

I wonder how many of those who demonstrate against Israel have any idea of this history. Or are they, too, merely serving as useful idiots to those who know the history but want to undo it because it resulted in a nation-state for the Jewish people? It does not really matter. The bottom line is that

the hard left's irrational opposition to Israel is a modern manifestation of the world's oldest and most enduring bigotry.

Why Biden Might Be the Dems' Last Pro-Israel President, May 18, 2023

Long-range planners in Israel worry Joe Biden may be the last pro-Israel Democratic president. More fundamentally, they fear Israel is quickly becoming a wedge issue separating Democrats from Republicans. Backing for the nation-state of the Jewish people has historically been bipartisan, with Democrats being slightly more supportive. But this has changed recently for several reasons.

First, Israel has moved more to the right as the result of demographic changes: increased immigration from former Communist countries and higher birth rates among ultra-Orthodox and Sephardic Jews. And the refusal of Palestinian leaders to accept peace proposals has weakened the left. Second, the Republican Party, especially its influential evangelical base, has become more supportive of Israel than old-line business-oriented Republicans used to be. Finally, and most important, younger Democrats are moving to the left (and away from the increasingly conservative Israeli government). And their decreasing support for Israel is not necessarily limited to the current regime.

It may represent a fundamental turn toward the Palestinian narrative, which emphasizes “anti-colonialism” and other mantras of the left. This shift away from bipartisan backing has not yet been felt on the ground.

Military and intelligence cooperation between the two nations is as strong as it has ever been. With a few exceptions, so is diplomatic cooperation. But domestic political support among elected Democratic officials has wavered of late. This reflects the ambivalence among many Democratic voters about Israel, with recent polls showing increasingly favorable attitudes toward the Palestinian side by younger Democrats, including young Jews.

The growing influence of the rabidly anti-Israel radical wing of the Democratic Party may portend the future. It will certainly have an effect on primaries, where a relatively small but energized group can determine the outcome—as evidenced by the 2018 primary victory of Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in a heavily Democratic New York district.

We will likely see more such victories by radical anti-Israel Democrats in years to come. The diminishing support for Israel among the Democratic Party's left wing coupled with the expanding support among Republicans has not yet had a discernible impact on American Jews, who still vote overwhelmingly for Democrats. That's because Israel is less central to Jewish voters' identity than it used to be.

Other issues—such as choice, the environment, gay and transgender rights, gun control, separation of church from state—are at least equally important. Indeed, Israel is more important to many Christian evangelicals than to some Reform and Conservative Jews.

Candidates reflect the views of voters, so our fear that Biden ends up the last Democratic candidate for president who strongly supports Israel may well prove accurate. If so, Israel will become even more of a wedge issue, especially since all likely Republican candidates in 2024 and beyond are certain to continue Donald Trump's vigorous advocacy. That wedge is evident already in several European countries, where the government's support for Israel depends on whether the right or left wins.

Israel must prepare itself for that eventuality here as well. It cannot count on pressure by American Jewish voters, most of whom are likely to continue to vote Democrat even if that party turns away from Israel.

Things may change, of course. If Israel were to become involved in a hot war with Iran that posed an existential threat, many more Jewish voters might prioritize their support.

If the Israeli government were to move more toward the center, some voters could view it more favorably. The same might be true if a deal were made with the Palestinians. But no one can count on any such changes. The likely future is a growing wedge between the Democrats and Republicans over Israel. This poses a dilemma for longtime Democrats like me who do prioritize backing for Israel.

Should we remain within the Democratic Party and try to influence it away from its shift against Israel? Or should we give up on the party we have supported for so long and help the party now on the Israel side of the wedge?

I am still planning to remain a Democrat and vote for Biden while seeking to marginalize the radical anti-Israel elements in that party. Others are making similarly painful choices.

A New Reckoning Is Long Overdue for American Universities over the Antisemitism with Which Their Campuses Are Riddled, October 10, 2023

Why are Harvard, Yale, and other top universities remaining silent as the oldest hatred is voiced on their campuses following the Hamas mass-murder, rapes, and kidnappings of October 7?

Student groups at Harvard, Yale, City University of New York, and other major institutions of learning have issued statements in support of the Hamas murderers and rapists. Hundreds of students at Harvard issued the following statement:

“We the undersigned student organizations hold the Israeli regime entirely responsible for all unfolding violence . . . the apartheid regime is the only one to blame.” Similar statements were issued by student groups around the country. Many faculty members and administrators support—indeed encourage—such bigotry.

This should not be surprising in light of the propaganda demonizing Israel that has flooded university campuses for decades. Speakers such as

Norman Finkelstein have become among the most popular supporters of Hamas's genocidal goals.

While Israeli babies, women, and elderly civilians were being butchered, this despicable bigot and Holocaust minimizer published the following: "If we honor the Jews who revolted in the Warsaw Ghetto—then moral consistency commands that we honor the heroic resistance in Gaza. I, for one, will never begrudge—on the contrary, it warms every fiber of my soul—the scenes of Gaza's smiling children as their arrogant Jewish supremacist oppressors have finally been humbled."

The comparison is obscene. In the Warsaw uprising, brave civilians arose against well-armed Nazi soldiers who were trying to kill them. The only murders and rapes were by the stormtroopers. In Israel, the murderers and rapists were the Hamas butchers who warm Mr. Finkelstein's heart!

Despite, perhaps because of, these outrageous, immoral, and historically inaccurate defamations, Mr. Finkelstein will continue to be invited to speak to large audiences at our major universities, while pro-Israel speakers—even those like me who support a two-state peaceful solution—will continue to be banned.

It is outrageous that hard-left woke progressives who claim to support women's rights are in the forefront of defending rapists who parade their bleeding victims. Many of the Israelis who were murdered at the peace concert and at nearby kibbutzim supported a two-state solution and the rights of innocent Palestinians.

This doesn't matter to the genocidal Hamas murderers. All that matters is that the victims were Jews—Israeli Jews, American Jews, British Jews. The goal of these murderers is not a two-state solution or a peaceful resolution of the Middle East conflict.

No, it is the murder of Israel's population and of Jews around the world who support the only nation-state of the Jewish people. It is bigotry pure and simple.

The most troubling aspect of these university statements in support of rapists and murderers is that many who signed them will be our future leaders. The universities that admitted and teach them have historically turned out future members of Congress, presidents, economic leaders, journalists, and others who will determine the fate of our children and grandchildren. These universities have failed our future.

Much of the blame lies with the faculty and administration of elite universities, which have taken strong views against racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of bigotry, while remaining silent about the oldest prejudice, antisemitism, which today disguises itself as anti-Zionism. Jews and Zionists are not included among minorities who deserve protection.

Among the Harvard groups most prominently blaming Israel for these rapes and murders is “Amnesty International at Harvard.” That group is the Harvard affiliate of the Nobel Prize-winning international organization that claims to be in favor of peace and nonviolence.

I don’t know whether the Harvard affiliate represents the views of its parent organization, but Amnesty International has failed, at least so far, to disassociate itself from these abhorrent anti-peace and pro-violence views. Nor has Harvard University, with which these groups boast an association, disassociated itself from them.

None of these major universities would allow a Ku Klux Klan or other anti-Black, anti-gay, anti-woman organization to be associated with the university. Whatever these universities would do with regard to such other bigoted groups, they must do with regard to these bigoted groups.

This is not about politics. This is about supporting murderers and rapists of Jews. These bigots must not be allowed to hide behind political claims. When a single African American named George Floyd was brutally and unjustifiably murdered by police, this caused a major “reckoning” at American universities and other institutions.

Billions of dollars and other resources were redirected at remedying anti-Black bigotry. The time has come for a new reckoning—a reckoning by American universities with their own tolerance and even encouragement of antisemitism and anti-Zionism.

There Are No Pro-Palestinian Rallies —Only Pro-Hamas, Antisemitic Hate, October 30, 2023

Despite the headlines about pro-Palestinian protests on university campuses, in cities around the world and on the Arab street, there has not been a single rally that is actually pro-Palestinian. All have been anti-Israel, pro-Hamas, pro-terrorism and often antisemitic. None has called for a two-state solution. Instead, attendees have chanted about eliminating Jews “from the river to the sea”—which is all of Israel.

The most anti-Palestinian entity in the world is Hamas. It has killed and exiled elected officials from the Palestinian Authority. It has stolen food, fuel, and medical supplies from the Palestinian people. It has used Palestinian children and women as human shields. It has prevented Gaza’s civilians from moving south and away from Israeli bombing. It has denied Gazans education and religious and political freedom. It has made life miserable for its people. It has caused the deaths of more Palestinian civilians than Israel has.

All this was well before the war Hamas started with its massacres, which the terrorist group knew would make things worse for Gazan civilians. Indeed, that was part of its motive in attacking: to force Israel to

respond forcefully so the world would see the dead Palestinian babies they use as human shields.

Now things have gotten much worse and are likely to get even more serious, as Hamas hoards Gaza's remaining fuel and humanitarian supplies. This is all the fault of Hamas and its puppet master Iran. It is anything but pro-Palestinian to back the anti-Palestinian policies of Hamas and its supporters.

Yet the media persist in calling these vicious anti-Israel and anti-Jewish rallies "pro-Palestinian," making them seem more positive and acceptable to the public.

The same is true of anti-Israel and pro-Hamas organizations such as Students for Justice in Palestine. That group is against justice for Palestinians. It seeks injustice for Israel and Jews. It hides its true beliefs behind a name entirely misleading about its goals and means.

The time has come for good people to understand this is not a conflict between pro-Palestinian and pro-Israel people. Many of us are both. We support a peaceful Palestinian state living side by side with Israel.

Most Israelis agree the two-state solution is the best—or at least the least-worst—possible outcome. We want a democratic, peaceful Palestinian state that cares about its people's welfare. It is precisely this goal Hamas sought to undercut when it sent its murders and rapists into Israel October 7.

Hamas realized Israel and Saudi Arabia were on the verge of making a peace that would have required Israel to limit its West Bank settlements and move toward a two-state solution, which would have been good for Palestinians. Such a peace would have been a game-changer. And it would have marginalized Hamas and other terrorist groups that oppose peace and any two-state solution that allows Israel to continue to exist.

This dispute is between a nation that would love to live in peace with its neighbors and gangs of terrorists who would like nothing more than to

overthrow all governments in the Middle East and substitute caliphates.

The media must do their job by accurately describing the demonstrations on campuses and streets around the world. Do not label them “pro-Palestinian.” Truth in reporting requires them to be labeled anti-Israel and pro-Hamas.

This will deny students who join these protests and sign letters in support of their goals the excuse many are using, that they were not aware these groups support what Hamas did October 7 and demand Israel’s eradication.

Anyone who joins these “pro-Palestine” protests or signs their petitions should know what they’re supporting: not the Palestinian people who seek peace but Hamas terrorists who seek to destroy Israel and the Jewish people.

There can be no doubt Hamas, besides seeking Israel’s destruction, is an antisemitic hate group. It also opposes the rights of women, gays and transgender people as well as freedom of speech and religion. These are all policies progressives and wokes claim to support.

Accordingly, the best proof that those who join the Hamas rallies and sign their petitions are complicit in antisemitism is they are willing to support a group that opposes virtually all their core values, as long as it also opposes Jews and their nation-state.

Freedom of speech requires transparency and honesty.

By calling these bigoted groups “pro-Palestine” while hiding their true agenda, the media disserves these important interests.

Campus Antisemitism Has Become Systemic Due to “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion,” December 4, 2023

Two major changes in universities have contributed significantly to the dramatic rise of antisemitism on college campuses.

The first is the creation of large bureaucracies whose purpose is to propagandize students in favor of a particular ideology: diversity, equity and inclusion. The second is the formation of special departments and programs designed to promote the ideologies of particular identity groups, such as Blacks, women, gays, Muslims, Native Americans and Jews.

The multibillion-dollar DEI bureaucracy has become a central contributor to anti-Jewish attitudes on campuses. The effect, if not the intent, of this ideological bureaucracy is to marginalize Jews.

The first component of DEI is diversity, but its definition of diversity is limited to skin color and other aspects of identity politics. It explicitly excludes diversity of opinions, ideas and ideology. The effect is the university looks more diverse, but actually is less diverse in the most important aspect of education, namely ideas. This genre of diversity also lowers the number of Jewish students and faculty. Indeed, this is one of its goals.

Jews do not conform to diversity in terms of identity politics, even if they do for other aspects of diversity. In fact, the number and percentage of Jews at top-tier universities have declined since the introduction of DEI.

The second element is equity, which is precisely the opposite of equality. Equality is reflected in Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream that someday his children will be judged not by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character. Equity demands that people be judged by the color of their skin and other immutable characteristics. Jews thrive on equality and meritocracy. They suffer from the artificial and easily manipulable concept of equity.

Finally, there is the stated goal of inclusion. As former Harvard president Lawrence Summers has noted, DEI inclusion in most bureaucracies explicitly excludes Jews. When inclusion becomes a justification for exclusion, the entire concept must be questioned.

In addition to discrimination against Jews, DEI also discriminates against dissenting views. On many campuses, applicants for admission and jobs must signify approval of DEI. Those of us who fundamentally disagree with the goals and means of DEI are threatened with exclusion if we follow our consciences.

The second development that has plagued universities over the past several decades has been the creation of special departments and programs that pander to specific identity groups. The result has been a massive increase of antisemitism emanating from these identity departments. Many of these departments have voted to boycott and divest from Israel. Others have invited only anti-Israel and antisemitic speakers, refusing to allow pro-Israel and anti-DEI speakers to express their contrary ideas to students. This includes several Jewish Studies departments, which have followed the woke progressive line of being hypercritical of Israel and Zionism.

Universities should teach about all identities with the same critical eye they apply to other subjects. Academia should not have special identity

departments, many of which are nothing more than uncritical cheering squads for particular groups, and booing squads for other groups.

The end result of DEI and specialized identity departments has been to institutionalize antisemitism at many universities. There have always been antisemites among university faculty, administrators and students, but these two developments have turned sporadic individual Jew hatred into systemic antisemitism.

Just as the George Floyd case encouraged a “reckoning” with systemic racism, the recent increase in antisemitism requires universities to engage in a reckoning about how these two developments have contributed to the singling out of Jews and Zionists for discrimination and prejudice on many campuses.

DEI bureaucracies and identity departments have turned identity politics on campus into a zero-sum game. Particular groups benefit at the expense of other groups. Identities are pitted against each other. The result has been for students and faculty to be valued less as individuals and more as members of groups. And some groups on campus are privileged more than other groups. In this hierarchical ranking, Jews are the least privileged—ironically because they are seen as the most privileged by society in general. This encourages antisemitism.

A related cause is that the woke-progressive mindset deplors meritocracy as a criterion for success. And Jews have historically thrived within meritocracy. There used to be systemic racism, sexism and homophobia in many university admission and hiring decisions. Such systemic prejudice no longer exists. To the contrary, at most of today’s universities, we have systemic anti-racism, anti-sexism and anti-homophobia.

But this systemic change has contributed to the growing antisemitism on many university campuses. This blight will only get worse unless

changes are made in DEI and special academic departments based on identity.

Harvard Prez Claudine Gay's Exit Is Just the First Step in Saving Our Universities, January 2, 2024

Harvard President Claudine Gay has resigned, likely as the result of pressure from the Harvard Corporation.

She was appointed largely because of her deep commitment to the diversity, equity and inclusion bureaucracy, which has dominated Harvard and other universities since the 2020 killing of George Floyd. Accordingly, she is only a symptom, albeit an important one, of the destructive impact DEI is having on universities throughout the country.

Unless the DEI bureaucracy is dismantled, universities will continue their decline as institutions of objective learning.

Over the last several years many universities have changed their mission from objective, fact-based scholarship to “social justice.” But it turns out social justice for some has resulted in social injustice for others. It has been a zero-sum game in which African Americans have benefited at the expense of Asian Americans, Jewish Americans and other out-of-fashion minorities.

Indeed, the DEI bureaucracy has been a major source of, and stimulus for, the recent increase in antisemitism on campuses. Central to the DEI ideology has been a phony academic construct called “intersectionality,”

under which the world is divided into oppressors and oppressed, based entirely on identity politics.

The oppressed can do no wrong, while the oppressors can do no right. White males, especially Jewish ones, are accused of being the primary oppressors. It is acceptable therefore to silence and marginalize them while giving loud voice to the oppressed.

The power of these oppressors, DEI says, is enhanced by meritocracy. Judging individuals by their hard work and accomplishments, according to the racist underpinnings of identity politics, guarantees the continued empowerment of the oppressors. So meritocracy must go, along with grades and other criteria of individual accomplishment. Meritocracy must be replaced by equity, which evaluates individuals based on characteristics beyond their control, such as race and sexual identity.

The Harvard Corporation, which made the mistake of appointing President Gay in the first place, is composed largely of DEI supporters, as are the boards of many other universities. But Gay's forced resignation demonstrates that these elite boards need not be given the final word.

Universities consist of more than the current faculty, student body and boards. They are made up of large numbers of alumni as well as future students. And since universities represent our future leadership, the general public also has a stake in who governs them.

Here's how we got here:

- Harvard first faced calls to fire Gay after she stood by the more than thirty Harvard student groups that published a letter claiming they held Israel "entirely responsible" for Hamas's October 7 terrorist attacks.
- Gay faced further calls to step down after disastrous House testimony on antisemitism, in which the embattled president told Representative Elise Stefanik (R-NY) that calls for genocide against the Jews would only violate Harvard's rules depending on their "context."

- Harvard announced Gay would remain president despite the school losing a reported \$1 billion in donations.
- Journalists Christopher Rufo and Chris Brunet revealed that the embattled president plagiarized sections of her doctoral thesis, and that Harvard had previously covered up its own probe and threatened the *Post* when it looked into plagiarism allegations against Gay.
- Former professor Carol Swain, whose work Gay is accused of plagiarizing, said Harvard lacks the courage to fire “its first black president.” She added that Gay is “getting a free pass.”
- Billionaire Bill Ackman, a Harvard graduate and donor, claimed the school won’t fire her because it would look like it was “kowtowing” to him.
- Four doxxing trucks were parked outside Gay’s home, calling her “the best friend Hamas ever had.”
- The embattled prez was hit with six new plagiarism allegations on Monday, January 1, 2024.
- She was set to step down the following day. So the success of these “outsiders” in forcing Gay’s resignation is an important first step in changing the ill-conceived direction in which many of today’s universities are heading.

If the process ends with Gay’s resignation, nothing much beyond symbolism will have been accomplished. But if it marks the beginning of a fundamental reconsideration of the universities’ mission, it will have accomplished much.

The next, and more important, step must be the complete dismantling of the DEI bureaucracy.

The good news is most of these newly hired bureaucrats do not have tenure and do not have the qualifications to become professors. They can easily be fired, at the savings of hundreds of millions of dollars. The bad

news is they have become a powerful force at many universities. It will take courage and resolve to get rid of them, but it must be done.

The DEI mindset must be replaced by the prioritization of meritocracy, broadly defined beyond mere grades but based on hard work and accomplishment. Grades, however, are an important component of any meritocracy, and they must be restored along with other fair methods of evaluation.

We must return to a time when we all shared Martin Luther King's dream of a society, as well as a university, where people are judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

The short presidency of Professor Gay may be a turning point in the history of American academia, but only if we take it to the next step and learn the appropriate lessons from her mistakes—and of those who appointed her.

Steering a Course Toward the Center Is the Path to Victory in November— Despite the Temptation, for Biden and Trump, to Please Extremists in Their Parties, January 26, 2024

Primary campaigns are often about appealing to extremes. General elections are about winning the center.

In the upcoming election both the Democrats and the Republicans will be tempted to broaden their bases by appealing to the extremes within their party. Whoever gives in to that temptation may well lose.

We are a centrist country that has always eschewed extremes. The vast majority of Americans, whether Democrat or Republican, regard themselves as moderates. That is certainly true of independents and voters who might be attracted to “no labels” type of approaches.

The so-called “progressive,” hard-left extremists within the Democratic Party are the loudest and most aggressive of its components. Yet they are the least important in terms of winning the general election. To the contrary, they are most likely to lead the Democratic Party to defeat.

The recent wave of what the press calls pro-Palestinian demonstrations—but are in reality anti-Israel and anti-American protests—are a symptom

of the Democrats' problem. These extremists have disrupted life in many parts of the country.

They have blocked access to roads, transportation hubs, and even holiday celebrations. They have disrupted presidential speeches, classes, and other public events. They have shouted down speakers and shut down meetings.

The demonstrators are largely composed of three groups: radical anarchists who weaponize any issue that attacks the government; anti-Israel and pro-Hamas Muslims and Arabs; and useful idiots, especially students who are looking for issues to protest. They constitute a tiny fraction of American voters and do not represent mainstream views.

Because they are so loud, raucous, and omnipresent, some politicians and pundits mistakenly believe they will be more influential in the general election than they are actually likely to be.

It is unlikely that any of these rabble-rousers will vote for President Trump, and so the only question is whether they will remain home. If they do, it could reduce the number of Biden votes in places like New York, California, and Massachusetts, where they are most influential. Yet these states will certainly end up voting for President Biden regardless of how many far-left voters stay home.

There are a few states whose outcomes could be influenced by such voters on the left staying home. Michigan is among them, not because of the far left as such, but because it is home to a large number of Muslims and Arabs who have promised to protest the Biden administration's support for Israel. Counteracting Michigan might well be Florida, whose large pro-Israel population could possibly make a difference by voting for Mr. Biden—unless he capitulates to the anti-Israel left.

It is also possible that the threats to stay home may turn out to be a bluff. Voters often cast their ballots for their least unfavorable candidate even if they disapprove of many of his policies, which in Michigan may be Mr.

Biden. Yet even if many leftists and Muslims do decide to stay home, they are unlikely to impact the election.

What may impact the election negatively for Mr. Biden would be the perception that he is turning left to accommodate his party's extreme liberal wing. That might well be a kiss of death. Centrists and independent voters do not want to see America fall into the hands of the far left.

Nor do they want to see Mr. Biden abandon Israel. Mr. Trump's advisors know this, and they will campaign against any turn of Mr. Biden to the hard left or away from Israel's right to defend its citizens, if they see the opportunity to do so.

So my advice to Mr. Biden, if he wants to be reelected, is to ignore the "progressive" hard left and continue to stay the course as a centrist supporter of American values and American allies such as Israel.

Though I am not a Republican, I also offer my advice—as a patriotic American—to Mr. Trump. Ignore the extremists among Republicans. Become a more centrist conservative.

Accept compromises about abortion, immigration, gun control, climate change, and other divisive issues. Give voters the choices they really want—between moderate conservative and moderate liberal approaches.

Moving both parties closer to the center would be good for Americans and for our two-party system.

Golden Age of American Jewry May Be Ending, but the Open Free Market Economy Beckons, March 21, 2024

The notion that Jews are being “overrepresented” and taking the rightful places of larger minority groups echoes the argument made in tsarist Russia and other nations that imposed the notorious “numerus clausus”—anti-Jewish quotas and ceilings.

The headlines seem bleak for Jews: “The Golden Age of American Jews Is Ending”; “Jewish Erasure from American Life”; “The Vanishing”; “American Jew.” The articles tell a consistent story:

“Suddenly, everywhere you look, the Jews are disappearing”; “Antisemitism on the right and left threatens to bring to a close an unprecedented period of safety and prosperity for Jewish Americans . . .”

The data seem to support this assessment. Universities are rejecting Jewish applicants in numbers reminiscent of the days of quotas. Jewish representation in public offices is decreasing. Jobs in many areas seem to be closed to Jews in favor of other, more favored, minorities.

Honorific positions in elite cultural institutions—such as museums and orchestras—are being offered to leaders of other groups; university presidencies and deanships, which had been closed to Jews until the 1960s and then opened up to them in the 1990s, once again seem closed.

Academic prizes, such as MacArthur and Guggenheim awards, have far fewer Jewish winners than in the past. Book publishers are rejecting Jewish authors. Even Hollywood, which was invented by Jews, is imposing quotas on Jewish filmmakers and other artists.

This trend, supported by precise numbers, is documented in an article by Jacob Savage in *Tablet*, and confirmed by several others, including a cover story in the *Atlantic* by Franklin Foer.

The facts, though, tell only part of a more complex phenomenon. They tell the part in which success is judged by how others—institutions and individuals—select the winners. They don't, though, tell the equally remarkable story of persistent Jewish accomplishments in areas where success is not dependent on being picked by others, where success is self-determined and self-proving, in an open and free-market economy, without barriers to entry.

Jews are thriving in areas in which success is based entirely on meritocratic criteria, such as creativity, innovation, talent, and hard work. There has been no discernible reduction in Jewish inventors, musicians, investors, entrepreneurs, groundbreaking scientists, or chess champions.

Jewish doctors are still saving lives. Jewish lawyers are winning cases. Jewish comedians are making people laugh. Jewish podcasters are attracting large audiences. As long as the criteria are objective and identity-blind, Jews thrive.

The same is generally true of Asian Americans. Jews are a tiny percentage of the American population—between 2 percent and 3 percent, depending on the criteria—and so when their numbers exceed that percentage, Jews are accused of being “overrepresented” and taking the rightful places of larger minority groups.

This was the same argument made in tsarist Russia and other nations that imposed the notorious “*numerus clausus*.”

There are course limits to the kind of success that can be achieved in the face of discrimination by others who get to pick applicants for routes to success. Reduced Jewish admission to universities, reduced publication opportunities for Jewish authors, reduced scientific honors will eventually have an impact even on self-determined Jewish success. This was certainly true in past eras of anti-Jewish quotas.

As long as the United States has a free-market economic system with few barriers to entry, Jews—and others—denied admission to restricted organizations will be able to achieve a modicum of success. That success will enable them to fight against other discriminatory measures, as wealthy, self-made Jewish contributors are now doing with regard to universities.

So the water in the Jewish glass is lower than it has been during our “golden age.” It is, though, half full. Not half empty. It will remain at least half full as long as our free-market economy allows discriminated-against individuals to thrive in areas where meritocracy is rewarded with success.

Today’s culture, though, is determined to destroy what is left of meritocracy, because it is seen as undercutting the identity-oriented diversity, equity, and inclusion criteria for selection and success.

Universities Like Columbia Must End the Double Standard and Stop Tolerating Campus Antisemitism, April 18, 2024

Columbia University's president and other college administrators have stated that the chant "From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free" is permissible political speech.

On an abstract level, they are correct.

It is also permissible for white supremacists to demand all Blacks be sent back to Africa and all Muslims to Saudi Arabia. The First Amendment protects homophobic, sexist and transphobic speech too. But would any school permit such bigoted chants?

Imagine what would happen if a group of white-supremacist students demanded South Africa be returned to white apartheid control: "From the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, South Africa should be free of BLACKS and returned to WHITE control!" Would any school tolerate such a chant? Would it take action against such racists? Of course it would.

The racist diversity, equity and inclusion bureaucracy and its bigoted brother "intersectionality" would demand it, and the school would comply.

So the issue is not one of abstract free speech. It is whether the school applies the same standard to Jews, Blacks, gays and other minorities. And with these universities the answer is clearly no.

What is permissible to say against Jews and Israel would not be permissible to say against Blacks or gays. That is the reality. Universities, whether public or private, should apply a single standard of free speech, harassment and tolerance for dissenting views.

As the Supreme Court has held, there's no such thing as a false idea under the First Amendment. There is also no such thing as a true or good idea that is given preference over false or bad ideas. There must be what we'll call "a circle of symmetry." And what is outside and inside the circle must be based on neutral principles.

Columbia and other universities must decide whether to ban or permit all racist, sexist, homophobic, antisemitic and other offensive speech. They cannot punish anti-Black racism while tolerating anti-Jewish racism, even if the First Amendment protects both.

Columbia and other universities must make a decision: apply the First Amendment and permit all forms of bigotry; or design symmetrical neutral rules that protect all groups equally.

What is unacceptable is what most universities are doing today: protecting some minorities favored by DEI and intersectionality over Jews and other minorities disfavored by DEI. This double standard cannot be allowed to become the accepted standard, as it has at Columbia, Harvard and other universities.

Jews are explicitly second-class citizens under DEI and intersectionality. These ideas have been the source of some of the worst anti-Jewish and anti-Israel demonstrations, petitions and harassment. As long as these bigoted bureaucracies continue to hold sway at universities, corporations and other institutions, Jews will continue to be the object of discriminatory treatment in speech, admissions, hiring and other decisions.

These bureaucracies must be dismantled, uprooted and delegitimized if real equality and meritocracy are ever to be restored, as they should be in every institution. But many universities are doubling down on their commitments to these dangerous ideologies.

Presidents, professors and administrators in most schools are too terrified to challenge these powerful bureaucracies. But they must if the future of America's great universities is to be preserved.

Ivy League Anti-Israel Protests Could Prove More Dangerous Than January 6 or Charlottesville, April 22, 2024

The First Amendment protects the right to say idiotic things, but the marketplace of ideas also requires that speakers be held morally and politically accountable for the words they speak, especially if they are hateful ones.

The demonstrations currently taking place on many Ivy League campuses are not only about Palestinians, Gaza, or even Israel. The war in Gaza is providing an excuse for anti-American and anti-Western radicals and anarchists to try to damage and weaken our government and those of other Western democracies.

None of the slogans call for a two-state solution or for release of the hostages. At a minimum they call for the end of Israel “from the river to the sea” and its replacement by either an Islamic caliphate or a radical left-wing tyrannical state. Few protesters are seeking democracy, civil liberties, equality or decency.

They want to destroy Israel. They want to destroy America, and they want to destroy Western values. Some among them are simply demonstrating because their peers asked them to. There have always been “useful idiots” that go along with any radical protest.

The protesters comprise four major groups: First, Arab and Muslim Israel haters and antisemites who want to see the end of Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people, and the end of any Jewish presence in the Middle East. These are the spiritual descendants of the grand mufti of Jerusalem who aligned himself with Hitler in the 1940s in an effort to eradicate the Jewish presence in what is now Israel.

Second, radical anarchists who use all conflicts as recruiting tools in their efforts to undercut American democracy, Judeo-Christian values and the free market economy. Third, professional organizers who raise and earn money orchestrating these demonstrations, and fourth, useful idiots who think it's fun to join radical demonstrations, even at the expense of intimidating vulnerable minorities and fellow students.

Let there be no mistake about the fact that the illegal aspects of January 6 were extremely dangerous to democracy, even though they represented only a relatively small number of people trying to interfere with the congressional role and confirming the results of the 2020 election. So, too, was the Charlottesville March in which several handfuls of people were shouting "We will not be replaced by Jews."

The current anti-Israel and anti-American demonstrations are different. They involve tens of thousands of elite students, many from wealthy and influential families. They are our future. Some of these bigoted demonstrators will soon be seeking jobs in the most influential and elite institution.

Before long they will run for Congress. These future leaders, by supporting Hamas, are supporting the murder, beheadings, and kidnappings of Jews, Americans and others. That's what Hamas did October 7. Some of the protesters promised a repetition of October 7 "every day for 1,000 days."

Some of these useful idiots have no idea what Hamas did on October 7 and what they are implicitly supporting. They have simply been told what

to say, what to chant, and they follow their pro-Palestinian pied pipers from the river to the sea without knowing which river or what sea are being referred to.

Useful idiots, though, must be held responsible when they promote the evils of Hamas. They were useful idiots who marched with Hitler's youths in the 1930s and with Castro's revolutionaries in the 1950s.

Those who chant hateful and bigoted slogans should be identified and their names and school affiliations publicized. Potential employers have a right to know whether job applicants support the rape of Jewish women or are willing to march with those who do.

The First Amendment protects the right to say idiotic things, but the marketplace of ideas—which is the foundation of the First Amendment—also requires that speakers be held accountable for the words they speak, especially if they are hateful ones.

Imagine if the shoe were on the other foot. Imagine if a group of white supremacists were to occupy an Ivy League campus demanding the lynching and rapes of African Americans, or imagine if a group of white former apartheid leaders of South Africa were to demonstrate in favor of the return to white rule in South Africa: "From the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, South Africa will be free of all Blacks and returned to exclusively white rule."

Would Columbia University tolerate such bigotry in the name of academic freedom? Most of the students and professors who are defending these student bigots are essentially saying "free speech for me but not for thee." That is not how the First Amendment works.

There must be one standard for all, but no Ivy League university would apply a single standard. They are part of the "intersectionalist" mentality that supports free speech for those favored by the diversity, equity, and inclusion bureaucracy but this opposes free speech for those who are disfavored.

Universities are supposed to educate our future leaders. They are failing abysmally in that task. And we will pay a heavy price if the current one-sidedness continues to be encouraged by university leaders.

How Many Campus Protesters Will Turn Terrorist Themselves? Remember the '60s! April 30, 2024

The chants and signs in support of Hamas are becoming increasingly dangerous. They go well beyond supporting the people in Gaza or even opposing Israel's right to exist. Some now defend the murders and rapes committed by Hamas and demand even more violence against Israeli citizens.

Protesters chant, "We are Hamas," "We love Hamas rockets," "Burn Tel Aviv to the ground" and "10,000 repetitions of October 7th."

A leader of the Columbia rioters recently said, "Zionists don't deserve to live" and that he feels "very comfortable calling for these people to die" (though he later apologized).

If Hamas is not defeated in Gaza, it is likely that its terrorism will extend beyond the Middle East. Already Hamas terrorist cells have been identified in several European cities. It is almost certain that Hamas operatives are planning terrorist attacks in the United States as well.

It is not a bridge too far to believe that radicals who claim to be in Hamas, love their rockets and call for the death of Israelis and Jews might take the next step and help Hamas operatives engage in terrorism against US targets.

They could be recruited to help purchase weapons, identify targets and even plant bombs. Something similar happened in the late 1960s and early 1970s when American supporters of terrorism became terrorists themselves, including students, professors and university graduates.

They planted bombs, tried to blow up army bases and recruitment centers and murdered police officers and armed guards. For them, as with today's Hamas supporters, "any means possible" justifies their revolutionary ends. Hamas will do the same if given the opportunity in this country.

The line between advocacy, incitement and actual violence is not always an easy one to draw, though the First Amendment demands that we do so. But common sense also demands we be on guard, lest these lines be crossed invisibly or quietly, as terrorists often do.

We may not be able to arrest and prosecute people who advocate murder, rape and rocket attacks, but we surely have the power, under our constitution, to be concerned and to take constitutionally permissible precautions against the possibility that radicals who advocate violence may well engage in it in the not-too-distant future.

During the Vietnam War protests, law-enforcement authorities were caught off guard. They did not believe college-educated protesters from good families would turn into terrorists. But they did, and people died.

Some of the terrorists went to prison. Others did not. Some who went to prison for murder, like Kathy Boudin, were actually hired after their release by universities like Columbia to teach students. Others were befriended by the likes of Barack Obama.

The terrorists of the late 1960s and early 1970s were glorified by the media—and continue to be so in films and books. We must never glorify terrorists, for starters. Rather, we must do everything in our power to prevent violent and hateful protesters from turning into murderous terrorists.

This must all be done consistent with the First Amendment. But we must be prepared for actual violence from those who currently advocate violence. Certainly, our law enforcement and intelligence agencies must remain on alert, monitoring social media channels and, perhaps, looking for links between, say, protesters who commit crimes and known terror groups and individuals.

Track funding sources, too. The lights are flashing; connect the dots. Most of those who today support and admire Hamas will not cross the line from advocacy to terrorism, but some likely will.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish the less dangerous former from the more dangerous latter, but we must try, within the constraints of the Constitution. As Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter, the original of which hangs on my wall: “We have nothing to fear from the demoralizing reasonings of some, if others are left free to demonstrate their errors, and especially when the law stands ready to punish the first criminal act produced by false reasoning. . . .”

No democracy can ignore the presence of a dangerous “fifth column” aiming to do us harm at the behest of enemies like Hamas. When you watch these agitators call for “Death to America” and praise Hamas rockets, remember: You may be their next target.

As the late Elie Wiesel reminded us, “It may start with the Jews, but it rarely ends with the Jews.”

Ignoring a World of Human Rights Abuses, Student Protesters Reserve Their Anger for Israel, May 15, 2024

In a world of rampant human rights abuses, only one country engenders the kind of protests we are seeing at university campuses today. Where are the protests against the Chinese government's mistreatment of the Uyghurs? Or against Iran's murderous attacks on gays and women? Or against Russia's invasion of Ukraine? Or the gassing of Syrian opponents of the Assad regime? Only Israel generates such widespread protests.

Moreover, the hatred of Israel is so passionate, so deep and so one-sided that it is clear that something more is at stake here than the merits. This is not only about Israel's self-defense against Hamas. This war may have been the immediate stimulus for the current demonstrations, but similar protests against Israel's right to exist have been common on university campuses for years. Indeed these protests began immediately after the Hamas barbarisms of October 7, before Israeli troops entered Gaza. Why? It is not because Israel is a "colonial, settler, white supremacist state," as protesters falsely claim. Even if it were, why not also protest against New Zealand, which was in fact a colonial nation settled by Europeans with no connection to the land of the Maori? Jews are indigenous to Israel and were exiled from it over the millennia.

There was a time when much of the left, including the hard-left and radical students, were among Israel's best friends. That was back in the day when Stalin's Soviet Union supported Israel at the United Nations, and when its vassal Czechoslovakia provided it with necessary weapons. Once the Soviet Union switched sides, though, and decided to encourage relationships with Egypt and other Arab states, American radicals switched sides as well.

It started with the Communist Party, which became anti-Israel, and then it migrated to hard-left academics and radicals. Now it has become a—if not the—primary target of the radical left. There is no rational basis for the left hating Israel with such passion. Israel's record on human rights, civil rights and civil liberties is among the best in the world despite being in one of the most dangerous neighborhoods and the need to fight against the slaughters of October 7, the pervasive terrorism and the wars that have been imposed on it.

The opposition to Israel is not about what it does but rather what it is—a Jewish nation. But every Muslim and Arab country is ethnically defined, many with fewer rights given to other citizens—if they're even allowed to become citizens.

In early twentieth-century Poland, there was an expression: "If anything in the world is bad, it must be the fault of the Jews." Nazi Germany blamed its loss in World War I and the resulting depression on the Jews. Karl Marx blamed capitalism on rich Jews, while other antisemites blamed poverty on poor Jews. Rich, poor—It doesn't matter. As long as they're Jews.

The same attitude runs through the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion bureaucracies that now dominate many campuses. DEI, and its intellectual godfather intersectionality, divide the world into mutually exclusive groups: the oppressors and the oppressed. Jews are always among the oppressors regardless of how poor or unprivileged they may be. Arabs and Muslims are among the oppressed no matter how rich or privileged they may be. This

provides a justification for antisemitism, now often disguised as anti-Zionism.

Students—who have now become cult-like followers of their radical professors—probably have no idea that they are participating in a bigotry that goes back 2,000 years and is surely among the most lethal in world history. They are on the wrong side of morality. Nor can they be excused because of their age.

There are good and decent professors at many of the universities at which these know-nothing protests are being conducted. But for the most part these professors lack the courage to stand up in public against student bigots. They are testicularly challenged: they have no balls. Some oppose them in private. I know because they call to tell me quietly.

As John Stuart Mill observed, “Bad men need nothing more to compass their ends, than that good men should look on and do nothing.” That was also the lesson of the world’s collective silence during the Holocaust. Harken “good” professors—do something now. Grow a pair!

Why I Am Proud to Call Myself an American Zionist, May 31, 2024

I am proud to call myself an American Zionist. In many quarters, being called a Zionist is an insult. Some applicants for positions are being asked to confirm that they aren't Zionist. So are authors. Jews are accused of being Zionists, as if it were a term of opprobrium. It should not be a term of opprobrium to reasonable people who understand its true meaning.

To be a Zionist means only one thing: a belief in Israel's right to exist as the nation-state of the Jewish people in their ancestral homeland. Zionists believe that the Jewish people, like other groups, have the right to an independent state in which all are treated equally.

Beyond these fundamental beliefs, which the vast majority of Americans support, nothing more is required to count as a Zionist. One need not agree with the policies or actions of any particular Israeli government. One need not support Israel's military actions in Gaza. One need not agree with Israeli settlement policies in the West Bank.

One can strongly support a two-state solution. One can hate or love Benjamin Netanyahu or any other Israeli leader. One can be critical of America's policies toward Israel. One can be a peacenik or a hawk, religious or secular. One could advocate the return of all Jews to Israel or support the maintenance of a vibrant Jewish diaspora around the world.

Zionism has no catechism. The only litmus test is the belief that the Jewish people have the right to an independent state in their ancestral homeland, Eretz Yisrael. Beyond that, as the old adage goes: two Jews, three opinions. Or more relevantly, two Zionists, dozens of opinions, political parties, newspapers and ideologies.

Pursuant to this broad and open-ended definition of Zionism, the vast majority of Americans—regardless of religious or political affiliation—qualify as Zionists. Similarly, the vast majority of Americans qualify as American patriots, despite growing differences in what support for America really means.

Zionism is based on the historical reality that what is now Israel is part of the ancestral homeland of the Jewish people. Israel is not a colonial, settler, white supremacist entity—as its ignorant or malevolent critics claim. There has been a continuous Jewish presence in Israel since biblical times.

To be sure, much of the Jewish population was expelled during various phases of history, including the Babylonian exile, the Roman wars, the Crusades and other efforts to make the land *Judenrein*. They all failed, though. Jews always returned.

The first census of Jerusalem in the early nineteenth century showed more Jews than any other group living there. There were also large Jewish populations in Safed and Hebron. Tel Aviv has always been a Jewish city, and the Negev was cultivated and settled largely by Jews.

Israel is not, say, New Zealand—which is and always has been a colonial, settler, white-dominated state.

Israel, on the other hand, is populated by a diverse array of ancestry groups, heritages, and religious affiliations, including dark-skinned Sephardim, Ethiopian Blacks, Asians, Russians and others. Twenty percent of its population are Arabs, and an increasing number are Christian. Many are secular. There are also a considerable number of gay Israelis, who are accorded equal rights, as contrasted with Muslim and Arab states that

persecute gays. Tel Aviv was selected as the “most gay-friendly” city in the world. Tehran was not a runner-up. Neither was Ramallah.

Israel is not perfect. Nor is any other state. Judged by any single standard, it is among the freest, most moral nations in the world today. This is especially commendable in light of the sad reality that its citizens have never had a moment of peace since its establishment seventy-six years ago—and even before.

It has been constantly under attack from enemy armies and terrorists bent on its destruction. Yet it has maintained its commitment to civil liberties, democracy and the rule of law. To be sure, it has made compromises, just as other democracies have done when faced with threats to their very existence. It has done better than most, though.

That is why I am a proud Zionist. It is also why all decent people should regard themselves as Zionists. And they should not hide their belief in Israel’s right to be among the nations of the world. They should proudly proclaim their belief in Zionism, which is the national liberation movement of the Jewish people.

Did Harris Reject Shapiro Because Progressives Resist a Jewish Zionist?

August 9, 2024

Progressives certainly lobbied hard against Josh Shapiro and are now celebrating a victory of bigotry over principle.

What role did Governor Shapiro's Jewishness have in his not being selected as Vice President Harris's running mate? We will never know the answer with certainty, because we do not have access to the workings of Ms. Harris's mind. On paper, though, it seems clear to many that Mr. Shapiro was the obvious choice to help Ms. Harris's electoral prospects.

He is, after all, the popular governor of the most important state on the electoral map for Democrats. He is more to the center than Ms. Harris, thus expanding her base and potentially attracting more independents and moderates. Many knowledgeable observers think that if Mr. Shapiro's name had been, say, Jim Shepard instead of Josh Shapiro he would've been selected.

Yet woke progressives mounted a campaign against him, focusing on his Zionism, his support for Israel, and his opposition to some of the post-October 7 protests. In these respects, he was no different than the other potential candidates, including Governor Walz. Indeed, in an effort to placate the anti-Israel progressives, Mr. Shapiro went out of his way to

exaggerate his criticism of Prime Minister Netanyahu, calling him “one of the worst leaders of all time.”

No reasonable critic of Mr. Netanyahu would categorize him with past leaders such as Stalin, Castro, and Arafat. Mr. Shapiro also seemed to apologize for his teenage activities on behalf of Israel, claiming that he was young. None of these attempts to pander to the hard left have worked. He is a Jew, and therefore automatically suspect.

Some defenders of Ms. Harris’s selection argue that it was about the Chicago convention, at which anti-Israel protests are expected. They believe that this problem would have been exacerbated by the selection of the Jewish vice-presidential candidate and that the selection of Mr. Walz will help mute these protests.

Whatever the precise reason or reasons, the rejection of Mr. Shapiro was a victory for the anti-Israel and often anti-Jewish elements of the progressive left of the Democratic Party. It was a defeat for moderates who hoped to broaden Ms. Harris’s base of support.

Both presidential candidates have selected running mates that move them away from the center and closer to the more extreme elements of their parties. The big losers are the vast majority of Americans who are moderate and who support centrist policies.

The difference is the feeling among Democratic moderates that Mr. Shapiro’s religion may have played a role in his rejection. For some that would be a determining factor: they could not vote for a presidential candidate who gave in to the bigotry of woke progressives who simply didn’t want to see a Jewish Zionist on the ticket. For those who suspect—but can’t be certain—that Mr. Shapiro’s religious affiliation may have played a disqualifying role in his rejection, the issue is more cloudy but still a concern.

There can be, in any event, absolutely no doubt that there are elements within the progressive left of the Democratic Party that did not want Mr.

Shapiro to be the nominee precisely because he is perceived to be a Jewish Zionist. Some of these progressives are simply Jew haters. Others are Israel haters. They lobbied hard against Mr. Shapiro and are now celebrating a victory of bigotry over principle.

There can also be no doubt that these bigots had some influence in the decision to reject Mr. Shapiro. Precisely how much and what kind of influence they had is subject to debate. What is also subject to debate is how unbigoted Democrats should evaluate the complexities that went into the decision to reject Mr. Shapiro.

It was a decision to reject Mr. Shapiro. Mr. Walz was selected, at least in part, because he is not Mr. Shapiro. He may be a plausible candidate. Yet he would not have stood a chance against a non-Jewish, equally popular governor of Pennsylvania. That is the sad reality that decent voters now have to face.

Why I Left the Democratic Party, September 12, 2024

Though most Democratic voters and elected officials are centrist, the party's leaders have become too beholden to its woke, progressive, and radical wing.

I have been a loyal Democrat since the mid-1950s when I worked for local Democratic candidates in Brooklyn. Since 1960 I have voted for every Democratic presidential candidate. The Democratic party I have supported for nearly seventy years, though, has now been hijacked by the hard left.

Though the vast majority of Democratic voters and elected officials remain centrist and moderate on most issues, its leaders have become too beholden to its woke, progressive, and radical wing, represented by Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Senator Warren, Senator Sanders, and the protesters in front of the Democratic National Convention who President Biden said made "good points."

It was this extremist wing of the Democratic party that precluded Governor Shapiro from becoming the vice-presidential candidate. It was this wing that persuaded Vice President Harris to violate her constitutional duty of presiding over the Senate, finding an excuse to be absent from Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech.

It was this dangerous wing of the party that successfully demanded prime speaking spots at the convention for the Minnesota attorney general,

Keith Ellison, who has a history of support for the leader of the Nation of Islam, Louis Farrakhan.

Other speakers included the Reverend Al Sharpton, who incited antisemitic pogroms at Brooklyn and Harlem; Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, who attacked Israel as genocidal; and other elected officials who boycotted Mr. Netanyahu's speech.

Watching the Democratic National Convention repelled me, as an American, as a Jew, and as a traditional Democrat. To be sure, the DNC invited the parents of an Israeli hostage to give a talk about their now murdered son, but even their talks were carefully curated to avoid supporting Israel in general, for fear of a reaction from the many anti-Israel delegates and speakers.

I am also convinced, despite hollow denials, that if Mr. Shapiro's name were John Shepard, the governor of Pennsylvania would have been the logical candidate for vice president. Ms. Harris was afraid to provoke her left wing by selecting a Jewish Zionist as her running mate, though.

Nothing I heard in the recent debate changed my views, especially after vice presidential nominee, Governor Walz, said that the anti-Israel protesters—many of whom are calling for a Hamas victory—are speaking out “for all the right reasons.”

This is not to say that I have no concerns about the Republican party. They featured Tucker Carlson, who has platformed antisemitic Holocaust deniers and has shown disdain for Israel. The GOP, too, has a dangerous isolationist wing that has too much influence over what has traditionally been a centrist conservative party.

My decision to leave the Democratic Party is not a decision to join the Republican Party. Nor is it necessarily a decision to vote for Republican candidates, including its presidential candidate. I will make that decision based on the totality of circumstances and without regard to party affiliation.

This decision has been a difficult one for me because my entire family and most of my acquaintances and colleagues are Democrats. I support much of the Democratic Party platform, regarding abortion, gay rights, reasonable gun control, climate concern and Supreme Court appointments.

That is why I still plan to vote for centrist Democratic candidates. The face and the voice of the party itself has changed, though. They have moved it away from the center and toward the extreme left. I hope that someday soon I can return to my roots.

For several years now I remained an active Democrat despite its leftward creep begun during President Obama's second term. I had hoped that I and others of like mind could help move the party back to the center where most of its voters want it to be. I have now given up that hope, at least under the current leadership.

Perhaps if other centrist Democrats follow my lead, the current leadership will decide to marginalize the hard left and move the party back to its traditional place on the political spectrum—as a centrist, liberal, pro-Israel home for all traditional Democrats, including Jewish and Zionist voters. Until then, I cannot remain associated with a party that does not reflect my principles and values.

Why Have So Many Israelis and Jews Moved to the Right? May 23, 2025

There can be little doubt that over the last quarter of a century Israeli voters have moved to the center from the left, and now to the right. The same is true, though to a somewhat lesser degree, of Israeli supporters in the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and other countries with significant Jewish populations. The primary reason is obvious: The left has turned against Israel and against its supporters.

Jews have traditionally been on the left side of politics both in Israel and in the diaspora. When Israel was first established, it had widespread support among the left, even among the extreme left. At its founding, Israel was a socialist democracy surrounded by reactionary Arab dictatorships, some of which had supported the Nazis.

Not surprisingly, the Soviet Union supported its establishment in 1948, and Czechoslovakia even supplied it with arms to defend itself against invading Arab nations. This all changed in the 1960s when the Soviet Union decided to abandon left-wing Israel and support the right-wing Arab states that were seeking Israel's destruction.

The reason for this switch was purely power politics: The undemocratic Arab states were rich in natural resources, especially oil and gas; they also had geographical advantages such as the Suez Canal. Israel on the other

hand was an agrarian socialist state with few natural or geographic resources; they exported Jaffa oranges and mud from the Dead Sea.

When the Soviet Union turned against Israel and in favor of Arab Tyrannies, the European and American hard left fell in line. Eurocommunist parties followed the lead of the Soviet Union, as did the American Communist party. Most moderate leftists continued to support Israel, especially during the Six Day War in 1967.

Israeli voters generally continued to support left-wing candidates until 1977, when Menachem Begin won a surprising victory. Since that time the trend among Israeli voters has been slightly right, though left-of-center candidates such as Yitzhak Rabin and Ehud Barak won elections in 1992 and 1999.

Then, two developments began to move Israeli voters discernibly to the right. The first was the immigration of hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews into Israel. These Jews had experienced discrimination and persecution from Communist regimes throughout the Soviet Union. Not surprisingly, they did not trust the left. These new immigrants asserted themselves politically and formed alliances primarily with center-right and right-wing parties.

Israel is a vibrant and dynamic democracy, where outcomes depend on the experiences, history, and ideology of the voters. So the influx of anti-Communist Soviet Jews had an immediate impact on Israeli politics, moving it to the right.

The second reason for the rightward movement by Israeli voters is the Arab rejectionism of Israeli peace offers. The most striking was the 2000–2001 peace initiative by a liberal prime minister, Mr. Barak, and President Clinton. Here is the way Clinton characterized the offer:

“[The] peace deal that we had worked out . . . would have given the Palestinians a state in 96 percent of the West Bank and 4 percent of Israel, and they got to choose where the 4 percent of Israel was. So they would

have the effect of the same land of all the West Bank. They would have a capital in east Jerusalem . . .

“All this was offered including . . . a capital in east Jerusalem and two of the four quadrants of the old city of Jerusalem confirmed by the Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barack and his cabinet, and they said no, and I think part of it is that Hamas did not care about a homeland for the Palestinians. They wanted to kill Israelis and make Israel uninhabitable.”

This rejection of a two-state solution was accompanied by an intifada in which thousands of Israeli and Palestinian civilians were killed. This led to the weakening of the Israeli left and the strengthening of the right. Many centrist Israeli voters grew frustrated with the failed efforts of the “peace camp” to achieve a two-state solution through negotiation and compromise. Israelis began to believe that terrorism could be prevented and/or deterred only through military actions.

Then came Hamas. In 2005, Israel’s conservative prime minister, Ariel Sharon, unilaterally ended Israel’s occupation of Gaza and turned Israeli equipment over to Palestinian leaders in an effort to create a viable Palestinian enclave—Singapore on the Mediterranean. Hamas then proceeded to murder Palestinian authority leaders and take over the Gaza Strip in an unlawful coup.

Hamas then proceeded to fire rockets into Israel for years.

This belligerency culminated in the October 7 massacres and kidnappings. The victims were primarily Israeli leftists and peaceniks who are active in efforts to bring about a two-state solution. Not surprisingly, October 7 weakened the left and strengthened the right.

The reaction of the left to October 7, and the positive support given by many to the Hamas barbarism, moved many Jews out of their traditional left-wing base and toward a more conservative perspective.

The above analysis is not intended to either justify or criticize this obvious right-ward movement among many Israelis and their supporters

around the world. It is intended to explain a phenomenon that many seem not to understand. It should be expected that when the left turns against a nation and its supporters and the right turns toward them, there will be a change in attitudes and voting patterns.

Many people somehow believe, however, that Israelis and Jews should be different: They should continue to support the left even though the left has abandoned them. To expect Israelis and Jews to act against their interest, though, is to impose an unacceptable double standard.

Take This Test Before You Cast Your Vote for Mayor, October 24, 2025

The second and final mayoral debate in New York changed nothing. Unless Curtis Sliwa drops out, Zohran Mamdani will be the next mayor of New York. An antisemite will lead the city with the largest Jewish population, and he will have been elected with the votes of thousands of Jews, who value their progressivism more than their Jewish heritage

Mr. Mamdani has condemned progressives who do not support Palestinianism. To Mr. Mamdani, “Progressive Except for Palestine” is not progressive. The reality, however, is that Palestinianism is anything but a progressive cause. At its core it calls for the end of Israel, and its replacement by a Hamas-dominated theocracy.

Polls show that a significant majority of Palestinians in Gaza, in the West Bank, and throughout the world support Hamas and reject any two-state solution that leaves Israel as the nation-state of the Jewish people. If there has ever been a regressive, anti-progressive group, it is Hamas.

Recently videos have shown Hamas terrorists executing fellow Palestinians and shooting at others. Many Palestinian supporters around the world have joined Gazans in cheering these murders. Many also cheered when Hamas threw gays off roofs, killed members of the Palestinian authority, and stole food from hungry Gaza civilians.

The pro-Palestinian demonstrations on campuses around the world that followed Hamas's October 7 massacres and Israel's responses did not call for a two-state solution. They demanded that Palestine be "free from the river to the sea" and that the intifada be globalized. This means the violent replacement of democratic Israel with tyrannical Hamas, which is an offshoot of the theocratic Muslim brotherhood.

It is true that many progressives support Palestinianism and oppose Israel, but such support does not make Palestinianism a progressive cause. Indeed, it raises the disturbing question of why so many progressives have focused so exclusively on the Palestinian cause, to the exclusion of other pressing causes, such as the Kurds, Uyghurs, Christians in parts of Africa, even Ukrainians. Is it because the alleged oppressors of these other groups are not Jews or allies of America?

The Kurds have a far stronger case for statehood than the Palestinians. There are many more of them. They are more distinct—in language, ancestry, and even religion—from their neighbors than the Palestinians are from other Arabs. They were promised a state by the Treaty of Sèvres. They have been far less violent in their quest for statehood than the Palestinians. Yet they are not a progressive cause.

Mr. Mamdani does not require alliance to the Kurdish cause as a precondition for joining his progressive club. It only shows how misguided some progressives can be and how they will oppose any nation that is an ally of the United States and support any group that is opposed to it. This isn't progressive. It is anti-American, anti-Western, and anti-Judeo-Christian.

The fact that anti-Israel protests persist even after a ceasefire proves that the objection of the Mamdani progressives is not to the policies or actions of Israel, but to its very existence. Real progressives—in the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt and more recently Ted

Kennedy and Barack Obama—support Israel’s right to exist, along with progressive domestic and foreign policies.

Mr. Mamdani’s litmus test—you can’t be a Mamdani progressive if you support Israel—turns progressivism into discriminatory bigotry that excludes many real progressives, not to say liberals. This is reminiscent of Soviet “progressivism,” which quickly pivoted from anti-Zionism to antisemitism.

If Mr. Mamdani were true to his word, he would reject the support and endorsement of all pro-Israel progressives, liberals, Democrats and independents. Yet he is actively seeking their support. In order to secure it, he will twist his words and positions to accommodate their need to deny that they are supporting an overtly anti-Israel candidate. And many—including some Jews—will fall for it, or pretend to.

In the debate, Mr. Mamdani said he would recognize Israel, but not a “Jewish state,” because he “would not recognize any state’s right to exist with a system of hierarchy on the basis of race or religion.” What mendacious hypocrisy. Every Arab and Muslim state has a system of hierarchy based on religion. Anyone seeking citizenship in Saudi Arabia must convert to Islam. It is illegal for Qatari citizens to own a Bible. And Sharia law prevails in several Muslim countries.

Yet Mr. Mamdani “recognizes” these countries. To deny Israel the right to be a Jewish country—or the nation-state of the Jewish people—is antisemitism on a national level and international level. Let’s face the sad reality that the hard left has become irredeemably anti-Israel, but that many—how many is unclear—voters who are not anti-Israel are prepared to prioritize their support for other left-wing issues and politicians over their support for Israel.

Mr. Mamdani is right about one thing. This mayoral race is a litmus test. If no one who is pro-Israel can call themselves a progressive, it would seem

to follow that no one who votes for Mr. Mamdani can call themselves pro-Israel. Take that test before you cast your vote.

What Does Mamdani's Victory Portend for America, Jews, and Israel? November 5, 2025

The deepest concern for this liberal Jew who grew up in Brooklyn is that antisemitism and anti-Israel bigotry are no longer disqualifying factors in a New York election.

The winning vote for New York City's mayor-elect, Zohran Mamdani—slightly more than 50 percent of the electorate, including many Jewish voters—tells us that eighty years after the Holocaust, New Yorkers are prepared to vote for an antisemite, not necessarily because of his anti-Jewish bigotry, but despite it.

Without making any comparisons or analogies, we must recall the 1932 voting in Germany, where Hitler and his Nazi party received a plurality of the votes, not necessarily because of his antisemitism but despite it.

Hitler campaigned on reducing unemployment, ending the Depression, and making Germans proud of their heritage. Antisemites voted for him, but so did ordinary Germans who simply wanted a better life. Even some Jews voted for him. They were prepared to ignore or discount his hatred.

Hitler's success during his first few years in keeping those promises turned many ordinary Germans into the antisemites who willingly supported anti-Jewish laws and ultimately the Holocaust. I am not

suggesting that Mr. Mamdani's victory will lead to such dire results, but if he succeeds as mayor—if he makes New York more livable and affordable without bankrupting it—many more people will follow him into his dark hatred of all things Israeli, Zionist, and Jewish.

The Jews who voted for him either don't believe this or don't care. Many of them are radicals first, anti-Trumpers second, anti-American third, anti the current Israeli government fourth, and anti-Israel fifth.

The difficult question is whether the Mamdani supporters who voted for a candidate who refuses to recognize Israel as the Jewish state while recognizing the numerous Muslim states represent the future of the Democratic Party or indeed the future of New York.

Alternatively, did Mr. Mamdani win largely because his two opponents were politics-as-usual candidates who represented the establishment and the past? Could he have beaten, for example, the capable and highly qualified police commissioner, Jessica Tisch, if she had run against him in a one-on-one election? We don't know, although it is possible we may learn it if Ms. Tisch decides to run against him in the next election.

For me, as a liberal Jew who grew up in Brooklyn, the deepest concern is that antisemitism and anti-Israel bigotry are no longer disqualifying factors in a New York election. That would not have been the case several years ago. Yet if it has become true in New York, it is probably true in much of the rest of the country and clearly in much of the rest of the world.

The double standard applicable to everything Jewish, including Israel, has become normalized. What you can say today about Jews and Israel cannot be said about other groups or even other nations.

The hard right has always had, and still has, a Jewish problem, as remanifested by Tucker Carlson, Nick Fuentes, and others. The hard left now has a similar problem, as represented by Mr. Mamdani, Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Senator Bernie Sanders, and many university faculty members, administrators, and students.

The animus on both ends of the political spectrum is based on the claim that Jews are “privileged” because of their wealth and accomplishments, along with the idea that Israel is privileged because of its support from America. Whatever the reasons, Jews and their national state are caught in a pincer movement between the hard right and the hard left.

This is not new. During the 1930s, the only thing Hitler and Stalin had in common was their hatred for Jews, Zionists, and cosmopolitans. In the Soviet Union “cosmopolitanism” was used by hard-left communists as a euphemism for Jews. Today “globalism” is used by hard-right neo-fascists as a euphemism for Jews, proving once again that Jews are caught between the red and the black.

Jews have always thrived at the center, though many individual Jews have been associated with extremes on both sides. America too has thrived at the center. Notwithstanding recent electoral successes by a handful of extremists, America is still a centrist country. So Mr. Mamdani’s victory may spread to other blue cities, but it is unlikely to bring socialism and anti-Israel bigotry to other parts of the country, whether light red or light blue.

We live in a dangerous world in which extremism on both sides is gaining traction. The Mamdani election is a symptom of a potentially contagious disease, but we have the ability to prevent its spread by maintaining the centrist tradition of America that has made us the most successful country in the history of the world.

The Left Never Supported Free Speech; Only When It Supported Their Views, Q & A, February 18, 2026

CARL CANNON: David DesRosiers made a very interesting point—that this intolerance we see in Europe began here on American college campuses. You’ve been at Harvard for sixty years. What happened there where liberals on college campuses began to turn against free speech? How did they do this, and why? And how did they talk the rest of the country into it?

ALAN DERSHOWITZ: I challenge your premise. I don’t believe they were ever liberals.

They were always predominantly radicals on the left and right. I don’t think the liberal mindset was ever really approved of on college campuses, certainly not in present years. The left promoted free speech when it was good for them, and the right did it when it was good for them.

I think it’s been very selfish. I think there are very, very few genuine liberals.

People ask me all the time, “Why have you changed? You’re no longer a Democrat.” I haven’t changed. I’m boringly consistent. My views are

exactly the same as they were in high school, in college—when I fought against McCarthyism.

I was student body president. There was a conservative professor whose name was Eugene Scalia—Antonin Scalia’s father. We argued about it. We argued civilly.

But I have never believed they were genuine liberals or civil libertarians—even when I was on the national board of the ACLU—what a bunch of phonies, most of them were. They talked about free speech, but it was only because free speech supported anti-war demonstrations in those days.

As soon as free speech became a weapon of conservatives, suddenly they were against it. They were never in favor of free speech. They were never real liberals.

You can count the number of real liberals—probably in this audience and others—because a genuine classic liberal and conservative are similar.

A genuine Bill Buckley conservative and a genuine Alan Dershowitz liberal have much more in common than they have differences.

Imminence Is No Longer the Criterion for Military Preventive Action, April 15, 2026

Ever since a ceasefire was announced between the United States and Iran, anti-Trump extremists have been accusing President Trump of “war crimes” for his original attack. This is nonsense.

Trump reasonably and understandably believed Iran was close to developing a nuclear arsenal, which the mullahs might have deployed against Israel in the near term, and perhaps eventually against the United States.

Regardless of whether the potential timing of this threat fits the traditional definition of “imminent”—which is to say, right on the verge of happening—it was real and would have been catastrophic if carried out. Accordingly, both the US and Israel had the right—indeed, the obligation—to regard the threat that Iran would soon develop and deploy a nuclear arsenal as sufficiently dangerous to warrant preventive military action. Had either country waited until this nuclear threat was truly imminent, it might have been too late to stop it.

We can say this from experience. We waited too long with regard to North Korea, and that rogue nation managed to develop a nuclear arsenal

under our noses. As a consequence, the Hermit Kingdom has been constantly threatening the world, and we can do nothing about it.

Iran, the world's top state exporter of terrorism, would pose a far more serious near-term threat than even North Korea.

Even the United Nations, in its 2004 report on “threats, challenges and change,” acknowledged that even a non-imminent threat of nuclear annihilation by a hostile country might justify preventive military action under the right circumstances. As the former foreign minister of Australia, Gareth Evans, who served on the panel, put it, “The classic non-threat imminent situation is early-stage acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by a state presumed to be hostile.”

It was such a justification that Israel used to preemptively destroy both Iraq's and Syria's nuclear weapons programs before their threats became imminent. An even stronger case can be made regarding Iran's nuclear arsenal program, since Iran has threatened to use it against Israel—which its leaders have called “a one bomb state”—and might well threaten to use it against other nations as well. Once Iran obtains a nuclear arsenal, it will already be too late for prevention or preemption.

Iran would not hesitate to drop a nuclear bomb on Tel Aviv, as evidenced by its repeated targeting of Israeli metropolitan centers with its rockets and drones. But Israel would never retaliate by using nuclear weapons against Tehran, for two reasons: First, Israel never has and will never target an enemy's large cities with a nuclear holocaust. The late hawkish Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, whose family was killed in the Holocaust, put it well in discussing a scenario involving a nuclear strike by Iraq: “That is not our morality. . . . The children of Baghdad are not our enemy.”

The same would be true of the current Israeli leadership and the children of Tehran, many of whose parents are strongly opposed to its current regime.

Second, were Iran to develop a nuclear arsenal, a strike against it may also entail the release of enormous amounts of radiation in many parts of Iran.

Israel therefore has no choice but to act preventively instead of reactively. Iran knows that Israel cannot deter its use of nuclear weapons by merely threatening retaliation against Tehran.

Professor Michael Walzer, who generally opposes military actions except as a last resort, put it well. “The Israeli attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981 is sometimes invoked as an example of a justified preventive attack that was also, in a sense, preemptive,” he wrote in September 2022. “The Iraqi threat was not imminent, but an immediate attack was the only reasonable action against it.”

According to other reasonable scholars, the justification for a preventive or preemptive attack involves more than merely the temporal immediacy of the threat itself; it is a function of the temporal opportunity for carrying out the preventive action, as well as the seriousness and irremediability of a nuclear attack against its civilian population. This view was reflected by then-Defense Secretary Dick Cheney, who initially condemned Israel’s attack on the Iraqi nuclear reactor but went on to praise it years later.

The same was true of Kevin Adelman, part of the American delegation when the United Nations condemned Israel. He subsequently regarded the Israeli attack as “the most wonderful example of preemption in the modern era. . . . Thank God Israel did that, looking back at it. The idea of Saddam Hussein being the main Arab leader with nuclear weapons since 1985 is frightful.”

The decision of whether to engage in preventive military action against the impending development of a hostile nuclear arsenal requires a balance of at least three factors. The first is the likelihood that the enemy would soon develop and possibly deploy a nuclear arsenal; the second is the degree of harm that be caused by such deployment; and the third is the

reasonable expectation that setting back this threat for a considerable period of time is feasible militarily, or in combination with war-ending diplomacy.

In this case, all three of these criteria have been met, even if the existential threat was not so immediate as to categorize it as “imminent.”

Why I'm Becoming a Republican,

April 20, 2026

I am a lifelong Democrat. I started campaigning for the party's local candidates as a teenager in Brooklyn, New York, have been a registered Democrat for sixty-seven years, made speeches for John F. Kennedy as a college student, and can count on one hand the number of Republicans I've ever supported for any office.

I still disagree strongly with the GOP on abortion, the separation of church and state, immigration, healthcare and taxes, among other things. Yet I've decided to bite the bullet and register as a Republican.

The Democratic Party has become the most anti-Israel party in US history. Last week all but seven Senate Democrats voted for an arms embargo against the Jewish state, and an avowed enemy of Israel, Abdul El-Sayed, is gaining ground in the Democratic campaign for US senator from Michigan.

There is no denying that the hard left, anti-Israel wing of the Democratic Party has moved from the fringe to the mainstream. Until recently there was an age gap, with younger voters more strongly opposing Israel, but recent polls suggest that the trend now includes Democrats of all ages. Republicans have their own antisemitic fringe, but for now it remains a fringe. According to a Gallop poll, sympathy for Israelis dropped from 40

percent in 2022 to 17 percent in 2026, while support for Palestinians rose from 38 percent to 65 percent among Democrats.^{[33](#)}

I believe that the Democratic Party's hostility to Israel represents a deeper and more dangerous shift away from the center and toward a radical approach that is bad for America and the free world. So I intend to work hard to prevent the Democrats from gaining control of the House and Senate, and I urge those who share my concerns about the increasing influence of radicalism in the Democratic Party to vote, campaign and contribute for continued Republican control of Congress. I will contribute money to Republican candidates, campaign for them, make speeches at Republican events, and urge pro-Israel Americans to change party affiliation or at least vote against Democrats. Until something changes, I will vote Republican for representative, senator and president.

I wish I could designate myself as a "foreign-policy Republican," but there's no such option, so I have to go whole hog. By registering as a Republican rather than an independent, maybe I can have some influence on moving some Republican policies toward the center. I have given up on trying to change the Democratic Party. My main goal is to send a message that many traditional Democratic voters can't accept what it is becoming—a replica of left-wing European parties that are hurting their countries.

Americans generally tend toward political moderation, but both parties have become more extreme, in part due to low-turnout primaries that attract passionate ideologues. Younger voters, who tend to be more extreme, are playing a more active role in politics. They may moderate as they get older, but the trend among Democrats is unmistakable: a hard left turn that is most evident in changing attitudes toward Israel. If the Democrats pay a heavy electoral price, perhaps they'll wise up and move back to the center, where I (and others) could rejoin them. I don't know if that is a realistic possibility, but it's worth a try.

³³ From John McCormick and Douglas Belkin, “Jewish Democrats Eyeing 2028 Presidential Bids Confront Party’s Hostility for Israel,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 8, 2026, <https://www.wsj.com/politics/jewish-democrats-eying-2028-presidential-bids-confront-partys-hostility-for-israel-7c5e8419>.

1935: Was It the Worst Year in History? April 22, 2026

Was 1935 the worst year in history? Why 1935? What happened that year?

Very little of significance. And that is precisely why it was such a bad year. Not for what was done—but for what was not done that could have been done.

1935 was the year that Hitler began in earnest to try to conquer the world. He quietly reintroduced the draft and began to build up the German arms industry, both in clear violation of the Versailles Treaty that ended World War I.

The other signatories to that treaty, which included Great Britain and France, did absolutely nothing. Moreover, the Olympic Committee allowed Nazi Germany to host the 1936 Olympics; Harvard and other American universities invited and honored Nazi academics and diplomats; and most of the world conducted business as usual with a regime whose leader had sworn to end the Jewish presence in Europe and to expand German “Lebensraum”—living space—by conquering areas of Europe with German-speaking populations. Winston Churchill later described the period including 1935 as “when England slept.”

What could the world have done in 1935 to prevent the catastrophe that happened between 1939 and 1945—a catastrophe that ended in the death of

more than seventy million people, including the genocide of six million Jews?

In retrospect it seems logical that Great Britain and France should have demanded enforcement of the Versailles treaty, and when Germany refused to comply, they should have taken military action. This would not have been a preemptive war, which requires an imminent threat. This would have been a preventive war designed to halt what would likely have been a future existential threat.

Had leaders of France and England engaged in such a preventive war, history would have treated them badly, accusing them of not waiting until the threat was imminent. But waiting until a threat is imminent is often too late to prevent the damage it would do.

Because history is blind and deaf to the future, historians would not have known that a preventive war in 1935 might have saved seventy million lives between 1935 and 1945. It would have taken a bold, courageous and forward-looking leader to have risked his reputation by engaging in a preventive war for which he would be condemned rather than praised. This is especially the case when the immediate damage caused by engaging in a preventive war is far more visible than the future damage prevented by such a war. This reality also makes preventive wars unpopular with voters, who may suffer immediate damage, such as higher prices, from a war that would have prevented far worse future damages that are currently invisible.

The important point is that inaction when action is warranted can be as bad or worse than action when inaction is warranted. Failure to take action when action was warranted is called a false negative. Taking action when none was warranted is called a false positive. Striking the appropriate balance between avoiding both is the difficult job of world leaders. Churchill understood that. Roosevelt less so. Chamberlain did not.

What does the failure to take military action against Nazi Germany in 1935 tell us about the current situation in regard to Iran? That is the difficult

conundrum today's world leaders face.

Iran has declared its intention to destroy Israel, which it calls "the Little Satan," and perhaps the United States, which it calls "the Great Satan." There is no doubt that it has been trying to develop a nuclear arsenal for many years, despite its denials and fatwas. If the United States and Israel were to continue their military attacks against Iran, causing the deaths of innocent civilians, we would know about the deaths these attacks would cause. What we would not know is how many deaths were prevented by military actions that completely destroyed Iran's ability to produce a nuclear arsenal in the near future. Also what we can't know is whether allowing this regime to survive and to continue trying to develop in secret a nuclear arsenal will eventually cause many more deaths.

So the question is, will 2026 be remembered by future generations for its inaction in failing to prevent the Iranian regime from developing and deploying a nuclear arsenal? Will a "deal" with Iran be viewed by future generations the way we now look at the deal Chamberlain made with Germany at Munich in 1938?

Or will 2026 be the year when action against Iran saved an indeterminate number of lives while those who took the action were criticized rather than credited?

Why Are Some in Our Media Cheering for Iran? May 1, 2026

It is shocking how many people with major media platforms would rather see Iran win its battle to preserve its nuclear program than have President Trump achieve some kind of success.

Thomas Friedman essentially conceded in a recent *New York Times* column that he is torn, because he doesn't want to see Trump or Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu "strengthened" by success against Iran. This is disgusting.

Imagine how an American soldier on the front line feels when he hears or reads about this moral betrayal from mainstream liberal figures in the American media.

Both the United States and Israel are taking proper military action against a tyrannical and unlawful regime that might well use a nuclear arsenal against its enemies, were it allowed to develop one. Neither country needs to take that risk if they have the military ability to prevent it.

Preventive wars against threatened nuclear attacks are justified morally, legally and under any theory of just war. Yet one doesn't have to agree with this entirely reasonable statement in order to disagree with those who are cheering for the most evil and dangerous regime since Nazi Germany.

Recall that hundreds of thousands of Americans and millions of Europeans were rooting for Germany in the run-up to World War II. So it

should not be surprising that some perverse America- and Israel-haters are rooting for Iran today.

No decent person should be on Iran's side or remain ambivalent about the need to defeat Iran's genocidal ambitions. No decent person should support Iran's repression and murder of tens of thousands of its own citizens just this calendar year.

But some indecent Americans and Europeans are siding with evil because they disapprove so strongly of the current leaders of the nations fighting it.

These are not close questions. Perhaps it is arguable that some of the means chosen by the United States and Israel are poorly designed to achieve their laudable ends. But there can be little dispute about these ends being laudable, or about these democracies being on the right side in their conflict with a tyrannical regime sworn to the destruction of democratic nations it characterizes as "the big Satan" and "the little Satan."

The First Amendment gives Americans the right to cheer for Iran if they want, just as it gave them the right to cheer for Nazi Germany. But their exercise of a constitutional right doesn't mean that others don't also have the right to point out that they are wrong on the merits.

The First Amendment bars the government from censoring Jimmy Kimmel's unfunny description of First Lady Melania Trump as having "a glow like an expectant widow," but it doesn't require ABC to promote such a revolting image.

Nor does it mean that the *New York Times* acts wisely in platforming anti-American and antisemitic bigots like Hasan Piker, even if it is free to do so. Piker praises major terrorist groups, including the proxy militias that Iran uses to destabilize its region. He trivializes the Holocaust and the rapes and murders that Hamas committed in its October 7, 2023, massacre in southern Israel. He has also coyly encouraged the assassination of Trump—

unmistakably but without directly saying so—as well as other US politicians.

The First Amendment is very limited in its exceptions. It empowers the government to censor only speech that creates a high risk of imminent harm. But some constitutionally protected speech can and does encourage non-imminent violence, including assassinations.

And private organizations are not bound by the First Amendment. They are not required to platform, promote or even tolerate speech that they reasonably believe may lead to violence. They all have standards that they apply to decide what to allow to appear under their imprimatur.

The spirit of the First Amendment should incline even private institutions to err on the side of permitting and not censoring controversial speech. But that presumption in favor of free expression should not be used as an excuse not to exercise good judgment in deciding which speech to promote.

Consumers of the media should be asking whether the media they read, watch or listen to are striking that balance appropriately today.

Antisemitism Will Get Worse If It Becomes a Good Career Choice, June 4, 2026

There are plenty of committed antisemites out there who really believe that the Jews and Israel control the world and cause all its problems. These crackpots have always existed. Way back in the nineteenth century, August Bebel characterized antisemitism as “the socialism of fools.” It is still that: many socialist fools who know nothing about the Mideast have become virulent anti-Israel bigots, with some crossing the line to overt and unapologetic antisemitism.

The Democratic Socialists of America requires its members to be anti-Israel, regardless of what Israel does or doesn’t do. That is the blatant bigotry of fools, even if they, in their ignorance, actually believe it.

But some cynical self-servers who don’t really care about these issues have seen the increasing acceptability of Jew hatred as an opportunity to burnish their brands, increase their clicks and make more money.

Take for example Tucker Carlson, who when he was at Fox didn’t express the bigoted views he now promotes. At least not publicly! I have no idea whether he was hiding his actual bigotry to keep his job at Fox. When he was fired, his career was in the gutter, so he began to look for a new audience. He selected the rapidly increasing right-wing anti-Israel fringe of

the Republican Party that shared some of the nativist and isolationist views he already held. Turning those views into a full-blown anti-Israel and anti-Jewish ideology was not a long stretch. But it was a profitable one. Simply being a general nativist or isolationist doesn't generate clicks. But targeting anything Jewish does, because there are always hundreds of thousands or more Jew haters out there looking for a justification for their bigotry. By directing his nativism and isolation squarely at the nation-state of the Jewish people and its supporters, Carlson guaranteed himself an automatic audience.

Similarly, Candace Owens has increased her clicks and her income by becoming more extreme in her anti-Israel and anti-Jewish bigotry. Other podcasters, comedians, and influencers have followed suit, recognizing that Jew hatred is good for business. David Chappelle, Michael Che, Tony Hinchcliffe, and Theo Von have faced criticism for either incorporating antisemitic tropes into their content or providing a platform to individuals who promote those views.

It hasn't always been that way. Until recently, it was generally more advantageous to one's brand and career to be pro-Israel or neutral. Today being even moderately pro-Israel is bad for business—especially if the business involves the media, academia, politics or other public activities.

This change can be dated to October 7, 2023, when Hamas terrorists and Gaza civilians broke down border fences and murdered 2,500 Israelis, nearly all civilians, and kidnapped several hundred more. Even before Israel responded to this brutal violation of an existing ceasefire agreement by sending troops into Gaza to prevent threatened recurrences, the tide began to change. It began on university campuses, then in the media and eventually among politicians, especially Democrats. Now, it has come almost full circle. What used to be unprofitable to say and do has become good for business.

This change is not attributable solely to Israel's military responses in Gaza, Lebanon or Iran. It would probably have occurred even if Israel had done nothing in response to the increasing threats to its very existence. Israel's military actions have provided an excuse for the increasing Jew hatred throughout the world. But even critics of Israel's actions cannot plausibly deny that the exponential growth in antisemitism and anti-Israelism reflects a disproportionate and double standard response to Israel's self-defense military actions.

Israel alone and its Jewish supporters are today being targeted for the degree of hate, intimidation, defamation and violence we are now seeing.

What we are experiencing has little to do with human rights in general. If it did, the primary focus would be on far more serious human violators, such as China, Russia, Iran, Turkey, Sudan and others. Israel is being targeted because it is the nation-state of the Jewish people, not because of its human rights record, which is better than most countries faced with comparable threats. Israel is the only country whose very existence is challenged by so many enemies. It is condemned not because of what it does, but because of what it is!

And the selective condemnation is getting worse, as is the antisemitism that accompanies it. And it will get even worse if it is rewarded by clicks, money and acceptance. As long as Jew hatred remains good for business, as it did in Germany in the 1930s, in many Arab countries in the 1950s, and in Europe and parts of the United States today, it will get worse.

Antisemitism Is the Most Dangerous Human Rights Violation in the World Today, July 14, 2026

Antisemitism—the hatred of Jews—is far more dangerous today than other forms of bigotry such as racism, homophobia, sexism, and anti-Islamism. All these forms of bigotry are dangerous and far too prevalent, but the difference is the trajectory. With regard to all other forms of bigotry and discrimination, the trajectory is moving in the right direction. Today hardly anyone justifies these other bigotries. Indeed, considerable governmental and non-governmental resources are being devoted to opposing them. But with regard to antisemitism, the trajectory is clearly in the wrong direction. Antisemitism is increasing rapidly throughout the United States and in the rest of the world. Sometimes its disguised as anti-Zionism and anti-Israelism, but clearly this hatred would not be directed at Israel if it were not the nation-state of the Jewish people. Many nations have far worse human rights records, and they tyrannize their own people. Israel may be a flawed democracy, but it is a democracy committed to equality and the rule of law.

Even assuming falsely that anti-Zionism and anti-Israelism have nothing to do with Jew hatred, it is still true that antisemitism, unrelated to Israel, is spreading throughout the world at a pace reminiscent of the 1930s

in Germany. Jews, especially visible Jews, are being subjected to beatings, taunts, threats and overt discrimination in many cities of the world. This includes cities with a significant Jewish presence, such as New York, Los Angeles, Paris and London. The virus of Jew hatred is spreading quickly and taking on new forms. Anyone who considers themselves a civil rights activist, a civil libertarian or an egalitarian must now prioritize Jew hatred as the most serious threat. To ignore Jew hatred, in face of its increasing manifestations, is to become as complicit as those who ignored similar developments in the 1930s, both in Europe and in our own country.

The mantra of human rights and civil liberties has always been “the worst first.” This means prioritizing the most dangerous abuses and threats. In the 1950s it was anti-Black racism. In later years it was homophobia and sexism. Efforts to combat these evils are on the road to success as more and more people reject these inequalities. Today almost no one justifies them. It is completely different in regard to Jews. Many radical leftists, including many Democratic Socialists of America, accuse Jews of “white privilege,” thus justifying applying an invidious double standard to them. I recall attending a Democratic Party fundraiser on Martha’s Vineyard where many questions were asked about anti-Black racism. When I tried to ask a question about growing antisemitism, I was dissed. That was several years ago. I’m sure it would be even truer today among many Democrats, but certainly among Democrat Socialists of America.

Among those trivializing antisemitism would be some Jews on the hard left. These are the same kind of Jews that voted for Adolf Hitler in 1932, because they thought he would be good for the economy. And he was, at least in the short term! Democrats such as Senators Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders enthusiastically supported a neo-Nazi candidate for the Senate who proudly wore a death head tattoo for many years. They believe that Democratic control of the Senate is more important than combating antisemitism.

If I were a non-Jew, I would today prioritize opposition to antisemitism, as I prioritized Black, feminist and gay issues as a non-Black, non-woman and non-gay civil rights advocate back in the day. “To everything there is a season.” Tragically this is the season for Jew hatred.

So it must now become the season for prioritizing the fight against Jew hatred in its many manifestations.

I urge my fellow rights advocates to join me in prioritizing the fight against spreading antisemitism. This is the right cause at the right moment and in the right place.

When the mayor of New York calls American citizens who support Israel “monsters,” that sounds more like what a German mayor might have said in 1932. Imagine a mayor saying that Americans who support BLM are “monsters”! Or a mayor demonizing activists for gay and transgender people as “monsters.” But Mamdani can get away with calling Jews who support Israel by a word that has been used by antisemites throughout history. If Jews were indeed “monsters,” then it would be appropriate to deal with them the way societies have long dealt with monsters. By dehumanizing a group, as the Nazis dehumanized Jews, and as the Stalinists demonized Zionists, it makes it much easier to kill them and treat them as subhuman. And now the mayor of New York is demonizing American Jewish supporters of Israel. So all those who fought legitimately for the rights of Blacks, women and gays must now join the struggle by Jews for equality, decency and safety. To do anything less would be hypocritical at best and complicit at worst.

“Whataboutism” Is Essential to Moral Clarity, July 21, 2026

Critics dismiss the “whataboutism” argument as a deflection from condemning the wrongdoing of one group by pointing to the wrongdoing of other groups. That is a mischaracterization of the entirely proper demand for a single standard in assessing comparable conduct and misconduct. When critics condemn misconduct when committed by a group they disfavor, while refusing to condemn it when committed by a group they favor, they are guilty of “whataboutism”—of applying an immoral double standard.

So I will continue to challenge critics of Israeli actions who refuse to condemn Israel’s enemies and other nations when they engage in comparable or worse actions. The burden is on these selective critics to justify their double standard against the nation-state of the Jewish people. To apply an invidious double standard to the only Jewish state in the world is a not-so-subtle manifestation of international antisemitism. Asking the “what about?” question is an entirely proper way of challenging this double standard.

As it relates to Israel, there are two separate but related contexts in which the “what about” question is asked. The first is where there is a direct conflict between Israel and one its enemies, such as Hezbollah, Hamas or Iran. When Israel is criticized for firing rockets into, or occupying parts of,

Hezbollah-controlled areas, and the critics ignore the fact that Hezbollah began the firing at Israelites who live in the north so that they can't go home, or attend school, it is fair to ask "what about" criticizing Hezbollah for essentially "occupying" northern Israel by making it unlivable. Or when Israeli soldiers are accused of sexually assaulting Palestinian prisoners by critics who deny that Palestinians sexually assaulted Israeli hostages and kibbutz residents. This double standard makes it imperative to ask the "what about" question.

The second context is when Israel's accusers totally ignore far worse abuses committed by countries or groups unrelated to Israel. The UN has condemned Israel more than all the other nations of the world combined. This invites—indeed demands—that objective supporters of universal human rights ask that biased organization: what about Sudan, Belarus, China, Russia, Turkey and Iran? Why so few condemnations of other countries? What about them and other human rights violators?

Asking the "what about" question does not justify any violations committed by Israel; it just puts them into an appropriate comparative context and rebuts the claim that Israel is world's worst human rights offender—a canard that is widely believed by ignoramuses and bigots on many university campuses and by anti-Israel extremists on the hard left.

Morality requires a single standard applied equally to all nations and groups that are similarly situated. It should never depend on right-left or other political or ideological dichotomies.

Asking the "what about" question and demanding that a single standard be applied to Israel is essential to evaluating the military actions of the nation-state of the Jewish people. When that question is answered honestly and neutrally and when a single standard of conduct is applied fairly to all nations and groups, Israel emerges as a paragon of morality, especially considering the widespread efforts to destroy Israel militarily, isolate it

diplomatically and subject its citizens and supporters to terrorism and other manifestation of violence.

In the recent NY Democratic primary, several of the winning candidates for Congress demonized Israel as the worst human rights violator in the world, comparing it to Nazi Germany and accusing it of genocide and other war crimes. Many young voters are ignorant of the realities of war in which civilians suffer as collateral damage, especially when terrorists and other combatants are deliberately hidden among civilians. When they see civilian casualties, especially young children, they become willing to accept false accusations of genocide, regardless of the evidence. That is why comparative analyses are essential to truth and morality. And that is why the “what about” question is so important, especially now.

So when Israel is subjected to invidious double standards, I will unapologetically demand answers to the “what about” questions. Refusal to respond will demonstrate the hypocrisy of the selective accusers.

Will Any Left-Wing Democrats Stand Up Against Their Party's Anti-Israel Bigotry, July 24, 2026

There is no good reason—in logic, history, philosophy—for the left, especially the hard left, to be so vehemently against Israel and its national liberation movement, Zionism. Being anti-Israel has become a litmus test for today's left. It hasn't always been that way. When the nation-state of the Jewish people was first recognized by the United Nations in 1947, left-wing countries, individuals, and even communist parties rallied to its support. Communist countries provided arms and intelligence to Israel when it fought Arab nations for its survival. Shimon Peres was a featured speaker at many socialist gatherings. This remained the case until the Soviet Union decided to court oil-rich reactionary Arab and Muslim dictatorships. Predictably, most domestic communist parties around the world followed the party line and turned against Israel. The academic left quickly followed suit.

When this about-face took place, Israel was a socialist country with religious freedom, gender equality, freedom of speech, and an independent judiciary. Its Arab and Muslim enemies had not begun to reform. Saudi Arabia still had slaves, decapitated blasphemers, and denied women the right to walk in the streets without a male escort. No Arab or Muslim state

had freedom or equality of religion, freedom of speech, gender equality, or an independent judiciary. Almost none had elections.

This disparity did not seem to faze left-wing followers of Soviet dictats. They slavishly changed sides, ignoring the reality that Israel's policies were far more in tune with their left-wing ideology than were the policies of Arab and Muslim theocracies.

Suddenly Israel was a colonialist, imperialist, settler state that was occupying the land of its aboriginal population. This was of course never true: Israel fought British colonialism and most Israelis are descendants of Middle Eastern Jews who had lived for centuries in the region. Even after Israel and President Bill Clinton offered a deal to end its occupation of the West Bank and Gaza—which began after it won its defensive war in 1967—many on the left still denied Israel's right to exist and defend itself.

Then, after Hamas terrorists and Gaza civilians broke down barriers, crossed into Israel proper and murdered, raped and kidnapped thousands of Israelis (mostly civilians), the hard left doubled down in its opposition to Israel. More importantly, anti-Israel attitudes morphed from the hard left to many on the center left. The alleged justification was Israel's response to the Hamas atrocities. New accusations—all false—were now directed against Israel: genocide, war crimes, aggressors.

Thoughtful people on the center left—Rahm Emanuel, Jamie Raskin, Jake Auchincloss, and others who have now decided to cast votes against Israel's ability to defend itself—know that these and other accusations against Israel are false. They have said so. But they can't resist the pressure from the hard left to join the chorus of condemnation against Israel. They know that if they are perceived as supportive of Israel, they will be primaried by a candidate from the Democratic Socialist Party. They saw what happened in New York where moderate supporters of Israel were defeated in Democratic primaries by rabidly anti-Israel opponents. They know which way the political winds are blowing in blue cities among

Democratic primary voters. And they are prepared to compromise their long held pro-Israel principles in the interests of not being primaried out of office.

The *New York Times* and CNN also know that these accusations are false, but they pander to their readers and viewers in an effort to increase their clicks and revenue.

Reasonable university professors, administrators, and students also know that Israel is not the villain it is portrayed as in campus demonstrations, newspapers, and many classrooms. But many of them fear pushback and recriminations from radical Israel-haters among their peers. Today it is much safer and career-protecting to be mendaciously anti-Israel than to be honestly pro-Israel, even if critical of some of their policies and elected officials. Being anti-Israel has become good for politics, business, and friendships, much as being anti-Jewish served the interests of ambitious Germans, regardless of whether they actually believed the lies against Jews they were parroting.

So don't expect courage or truth-seeking from most of the testicularly challenged lemmings who populate so many of our institutions. But maybe there are some—even one—left winger who will emulate centrist Senator John Fetterman in telling the complex truths about the world's only nation-state of the Jewish people that is currently the victim of international antisemitism.

Newsmax *Saturday Report* Interview with Rita Crosby, July 18, 2026^{[34](#)}

Newsmax Interviewer: Well, nearly half of the House Democrats voted to cut off military aid to Israel. Everybody's stunned about this vote, but what does this say about the Democratic Party and antisemitism in America. Let's bring in professor emeritus at Harvard Law School and author of *The Preventive State*, Alan Dershowitz. Professor Dershowitz it's so great to see you. This news was really a biggie, and I think just very alarming. Over one hundred House Democrats voting to end US military aid to Israel, and I just wanna play, we just had on recently Florida Congressman Randy Fine in our last hour. This is what he said this means about Democrats in the House of Representatives.

Randy Fine (via video clip): Well, it says that the Democratic Party is a mainstream Jew-hating party, and you can't argue that anymore. This was an insane slap in the face of our greatest ally in the world, the only one that we can count on to go into battle with us, and when we had to take on Iran, Israel was right next to us. So to simply slap us in the face, any Jew that votes Democrat really needs to get their head examined.

Newsmax Interviewer: So Professor Dershowitz, is this evidence of a major anti-Israel shift gripping the Democratic Party because when this vote was taken a few years ago, it was about one-third of that number.

Dershowitz: Well, it's worse because it shows that mainstream people who are generally pro-Israel like Congressman Auchincloss of Massachusetts and Congressman Raskin of Maryland who was supposed to be pro-Israel voted against Israel in this resolution. Of course, we expect the whole Squad to vote against Israel, AOC and all those people, but to expect pro-Israel people to vote for this resolution shows the pressure that Democrats are putting on centrists to go against Israel. Even [Hakeem] Jeffries, the leader, he voted against the resolution, but he sent the letter out saying it's okay if you vote for it, and this is not something we're gonna ask you to vote. We're not gonna whip you into voting our side—you vote whatever way you want, basically giving Democrats like Raskin and Auchincloss and others permission to vote against Israel.

What people don't realize [is that] to vote against Israel is a vote against America. That this aid that goes to Israel comes back to America. It employs American workers and American armament plants in cities around America. It helps America jointly with Israel [to] build defensive measures like Iron Dome. This is an American vote and the 103 Democrats who voted against it, plus that one antisemite Republican who always votes against Israel and is no longer going to be in Congress starting in January, the only Republican who voted that way, really shows the trend of what's going on. It explains why somebody like me who's been a Democrat since I'm fourteen has now left the Democratic Party. I'm enthusiastically supporting the Republicans in the midterm election because I don't want any of these people who voted against Israel and voted against America to be in positions of chairmanships, and if the Democrats win the House these people will become chairman of committees who will be able to subpoena and be able to make all kinds of trouble for America and for Israel. So this is about America as much as it is about Israel.

Newsmax Interviewer: That's a very powerful statement. You know, you may have heard this, professor, that Democrat Adam Smith says he was

pressured by far-left activists into voting to cut off US military aid, he said that he got threats against him his family and his staff. What does that say about the climate now, that they're getting obviously violent that even a Democrat is coming out and saying that.

Dershowitz: Yeah, threats. I mean physical threats of violence. My understanding though is that he gave into the threats though and voted against Israel, is that correct?

Newsmax Interviewer: Yeah, he did. So what does that say too, that he gave into it. He caved, and then he said, "I was threatened."

Dershowitz: Look, a lot of these Democrats, like Jamie Raskin and Auchincloss and Smith, are testicularly challenged. I'll leave it to you to understand what that means. They lack a particular part of their anatomy, which is necessary for courage for both among men and women. And these folks have no principles. They're prepared to vote against—I think many of them actually believe that aid to Israel is a good thing, they're just terrified what will happen, they'll be primaried. We know they'll be primaried. We know Auchincloss in Massachusetts would definitely be primaried if he were perceived as voting for Israel, and he'd lose the primary to some Democratic Socialists of America antisemite.

So what's happening is because primaries rely on a small number of voters. These voters are scared out of their wits. These congressmen and senators, because they see what's happening, not in general elections but in primaries. That's where it's happening for the most part. Sometimes it happens in a general election like Mamdani in a city like New York. I still don't believe, and I'm beginning to doubt my own belief on this, but I still don't believe that any of these anti-American socialists could actually win in a statewide election in a major state. It's possible that they could put together a coalition in California, New York, that's possible, and maybe Michigan, but I can't believe they would ever win a general election. So

you know part of me as a Republican now is okay with the Socialists taking over the Democratic Party.

Look, what they should do if they're really principled, is the Democratic Socialists of America all form their own party. They ought to form their own party and they ought to leave the Democratic Party or the Democrats should throw them out. But the idea that they're taking over one of the Great American parties, the party of Bill Clinton, the party of Harry Truman, the party of all these people who were pro-Israel and are turning against America, is a terrible thing for the Democratic Party and for America.

Newsmax Interviewer: Yeah, and it is really troubling to the point that they're putting pressure and threatening to the point where you have a member of Congress saying I was threatened to do a certain vote. You brought up—go ahead, professor.

Dershowitz: My family has been threatened, people have taken it out on members of my family because I've left the Democratic Party, and I have a book coming out before the next election called *Why I Left the Dems: And So Should You!*, and I'm hoping people will read it before the election. It will change their votes. I would like to be able to have some influence on keeping the Republicans in control of the House and the Senate, and let's hope people come to their senses and understand that voting for the Democrats is voting against America.

Newsmax Interviewer: Wow. That's a very powerful statement and some of the values, you're right, are just, I think we're all scratching our heads. It's shocking. You brought up also, professor, Mayor Zohran Mamdani, and you may not have heard this as it just came out, he doubled down in a brand-new interview that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel should be arrested if he visits New York City, calling him a war criminal. What do you make of this? Of course he's planning to come. He's going to

come to the states probably for the Lindsey Graham funeral, but he's also planning to come separately to New York, I would assume UN.

Dershowitz: Yeah, and you know I have been his lawyer over the years, and I just wrote an email to him this morning. Literally when I read this, I wrote an email to him to his Israeli lawyer, offering to put together the America's best legal team in history to defend him on the streets of New York. If they try to arrest him, and we will do that and if anybody listening wants to join our team, happy to accept great lawyers to join the team. But we will have the best legal team ever in the United States of America standing between Mamdani and the prime minister. The duly elected prime minister of Israel. He will not be arrested and if he is arrested, I can tell you the end result will be the grave consequences legally for Mayor Mamdani, because he will be violating the law, and remember what he's basing it on. He's basing it on an arrest warrant issued by a rapist. By [Karim] Khan.

Just this morning on CNN, [Christiane] Amanpour interviewed the people who are victims of his rapes, and there's a strong and compelling case that the only reason that these arrest warrants were issued was to prevent him from being arrested for rape. Khan. So the warrants themselves are totally illegitimate, and we will challenge them in court and make sure that Mamdani doesn't allow his own bigotry to get in the way of his role as mayor of the city. He's not a federal official and Netanyahu has immunity as a federal official to address the United Nations. And if they dare to arrest him, there will be consequences, and we can tell you that the consequences will fall much more heavily on Mamdani, than they will on Prime Minister Netanyahu. I guarantee you that.

Newsmax Interviewer: Yeah, I think it's a remarkable statement for a local mayor to be saying that about a world leader. Professor Alan Dershowitz, thank you very much. Really great to have you here, and we always love your fight. Thank you very much.

Dershowitz: Thank you.

³⁴ Solange Reyner, “Dershowitz to Newsmax: Anti-Israel Trend Growing in Democratic Party,” Newsmax Saturday Report, July 18, 2026, <https://www.newsmax.com/newsmax-tv/dershowitz-israel-aid/2026/07/18/id/1263288/>.

CONCLUSION

Is This 1932 Germany? What Comes Next?

In 1932, when Hitler and the Nazi party ran in the German election, it was impossible to predict the coming horrors. The world had never before experienced anything like the death camps, gas chambers and shooting squads that resulted in the genocide of six million Jews. There were some signs, but similar signs of terrible things to come in the past had never produced anything like what happened between 1938 and 1945.

Many German and Austrian Jews, convinced that the growing antisemitism would pass, as similar eras of antisemitism had in other places at other times, remained in the country. Though there were then still opportunities to emigrate to England, France and other countries, few did. Albert Einstein and his family left early. So did Hannah Arendt, after she was arrested, interrogated and briefly detained by the Gestapo in 1933. A parallel exodus occurred in the arts that same year. Renowned filmmakers Billy Wilder and Fritz Lang fled, as did prominent non-Jewish writers Bertolt Brecht and Thomas Mann—who left to protect their wives of Jewish descent and to escape political prosecution. Sigmund Freud and his family waited until the last minute and only left after his daughter Anna was detained by the Gestapo. Others were not as lucky, and their late efforts to

depart were stymied by the German refusal to let them out or by other countries' refusal to let them in. This double combination of denials constituted a death trap for so many Jewish families.

By the time Kristallnacht took place on November 9, 1938, it should have been obvious that the Jewish communities of Germany and Austria (which had been annexed into Germany earlier that year) were in grave danger. But still the world did nothing. The deal between Great Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain and Hitler on September 30, 1938, led many to believe there would be "peace in our time" and the Jewish communities of Central Europe would be relatively safe.

The situation for the Jews of Poland, Ukraine and other Eastern European countries was different. They could not reasonably anticipate Nazi military expansion into these areas, especially following the Munich agreement. Few, if any, Eastern European Jews were able to escape. Some that did made the mistake of immigrating to France, which soon became complicit in the deportations and murders. So did the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and other "safe" havens. Hungary came last, where its Jewish population had already suffered even before the German invasion of March 1944, but after that Adolf Eichmann ordered the deportation of nearly half a million Jews to death camps. Nothing was done to stop this, even though Germany was on the verge of losing the war, especially after D-Day on June 6, 1944. Most of the world simply did not care what happened to the Jews of Europe. Those who did care did little to stop it.

Retrospective views tend to be 20/20, while prospective views are either near-sighted, far-sighted or astigmatic. It is perhaps unfair to blame the Jews of Europe and their leaders for not anticipating the absolutely worst-case scenario, which no reasonable forecaster could have predicted. But it is not unfair to blame American Jewish leadership for not doing more to ameliorate the situation once it became obvious that Hitler was determined to murder every Jewish man, woman and child within his expanding reach.

Too many Jewish leaders were reluctant to alienate their beloved president Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who not only did little or nothing to stop the Holocaust in Europe, but imposed antisemitic restrictions on the immigration of Jewish refugees to the United States.³⁵

Jews were politically weak back then, and antisemitism was rampant, particularly within the Charles Lindbergh wing of the Republican Party and the Joseph Kennedy wing of the Democratic Party. Henry Ford, Father Coughlin and the German-American Bund were overt Nazi supporters and Jew haters, who filled Madison Square Garden and other large venues with American Nazis shouting “Heil Hitler” and carrying banners adorned with swastikas. There were counterdemonstrations, advertisements and other efforts to help the Jews of Europe, but for the most part they failed.

That is our tragic history, but it is not our inevitable destiny. We are not in 1932 Germany—at least not yet. But there are enough similarities to warrant concern. We can and must do better than we did back then. We must learn from the mistakes of the past.

For the first time in my long life, I now understand how 1932 Germany would have become 1942 Auschwitz, and how otherwise decent people could fail to see the danger and do something about it. I see people all around me who could easily become complicit—by either action or inaction—in moving 2026 America closer to 1938 Germany.

False Positives and Negatives

In life there are two kinds of fundamental errors: the first is called a false positive—that is when we make predictions and take steps to prevent dangers that would not have occurred and did not occur. The second is called a false negative—that is when we fail to anticipate and take steps to prevent dangers that would and did occur.³⁶ During the lead-up to the Second World War, the Jewish community desperately feared being accused of promoting false positives—crying wolf where there is no wolf. That fear, borne out of weakness, caused its leaders and others to make the worst false

negative mistake in modern history—failing to take action against a pack of wolves that ended up devouring their brothers and sisters.

We face an analogous situation today. Many of my friends, relatives and colleagues believe that the current wave of antisemitism will pass. They hope that the Democratic Party will move away from its current toleration (or worse) of anti-Jewish bigotry and return to its Truman-Kennedy-Johnson-Clinton roots. They are reluctant to leave the Democratic Party, even though many realize it has left them. They are reluctant to join a party that has a history of antagonism towards Jewish values, and that they fear may be welcoming them only for short-term tactical reasons. I believe that is a serious mistake. Sometimes the pendulum may not swing back.

We must not look only to the past—which has a vote but not a veto. We must look to the present and the future, which will determine our fate. And the future of the Democratic Party will be decided not by its older current members but by its younger future and current members. We must look forward, even if our vision is through a glass darkly. We cannot rely on the hope that the Democrats will get better, as our mistaken forebearers relied on false hopes about Europe (and America). Optimism is not a strategy, especially when wishful thinking seems likely wrong.

But what if the Republicans also become worse? There are many young Republicans that do not seem to like Jews or Israel. They may represent the future of the Republican Party. That is surely a possibility, but based on current events and projections, it seems somewhat less likely.^{[37](#)}

So although I would love to return to the Democratic Party someday—or more precisely, I would love to see the Democratic Party return to its old values—I can no longer count on that occurring. And neither should you. Therefore, I will stick with my plan.

I will work hard to help the Republicans defeat the Democrats in congressional, presidential and local elections such as those that resulted in the dangerous mayoralty of Zohran Mamdani in New York (who became

the first New York mayor to refuse to attend the annual Israel Parade), the nomination (later undone) of Graham Platner in Maine (sporting a Nazi-tattoo and accusing Israel of genocide), the significant, even if minority, vote for Maureen Galindo in Texas (more than 7,000 Democrats voted for her after she called for the detention and castration of “Zionist billionaires”) and the nomination of Chris Rabb in Pennsylvania (who shared an Instagram post that claimed that the Bondi Beach attack on Jews was perpetuated by “Zionist themselves, and the nomination of several anti-Israel congressional candidates in New York City”³⁸).

These “new” kinds of Democrats can be found in blue cities across America today. Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson repeatedly described Israel’s actions in Gaza as “genocidal” and wore a keffiyeh at a public event, while Seattle Mayor Katie Wilson, taking a page from Mamdani’s playbook, repeatedly called Israel’s action a genocide and said she would look into divesting city funds from Israel.

Israel emerged as the defining fault line of the 2026 Democratic primaries with virulently anti-Israel candidates soundly defeating opponents who, while often critical of Israeli policy, still affirmed Israel’s right to exist.

Nowhere was this more dramatic than in New York City, home of the largest Jewish population outside Israel, where a slate of candidates endorsed by Mayor Zohran Mamdani swept three congressional races, defeating two moderately pro-Israel incumbents—Dan Goldman and Adriano Espaillat.

Darializa Chevalier, a thirty-two-year-old doctoral student and longtime anti-Israel activist at Columbia University with no prior political experience, upset the centrist incumbent Adriano Espaillat, the head of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus. Chevalier had attacked Israel on October 8, 2023, and her social media history included posts calling for abolishing

the police, voicing anti-American and pro-Russian sentiments, and sharing a post stating “Israel doesn’t exist.”³⁹

Meanwhile, Brad Lander, who defeated Dan Goldman, pledged to oppose US military aid to what he described as the “apartheid state” of Israel, and attacked Goldman for voting for defensive US military aid to Israel and for refusing to call the war in Gaza a genocide.⁴⁰

In his concession, Goldman said that “Jews have given back so much to this country” and warned that “antisemitic tropes and stereotypes, some of which I heard personally on this campaign, will ultimately be the undoing of our democracy if we all don’t lean in and speak out, even if it’s not politically expedient.”⁴¹ (On the campaign trail, Goldman was refused service at a coffee shop in Williamsburg, Brooklyn—home of a large Orthodox community—where the coffee shop proudly posted that it does not serve “racists, fascists, homophobes, genocide enablers or anyone in between.”⁴²)

At victory celebrations for Lander, crowds chanted “Free Palestine” and “F*** AIPAC.” As the *Wall Street Journal* reported, while Goldman tried to steer away the conversation away from foreign policy and focused on affordable housing instead, Lander kept a focus on Israel, accusing Goldman of being beholden to AIPAC and enabling a “genocide” in Gaza. Jamie Raskin (D-MD) noted that “[n]obody would have expected that this would be dividing line in a race for Congress.”⁴³ But it was; the only issue that distinguished the winning from losing left-wing candidates was how much they hate Israel.

Beth Miller of the self-hating Jewish group Jewish Voice for Peace (which isn’t Jewish and doesn’t use its voice for peace) declared, “What we’ve shown is that unapologetic support for Palestinian freedom is not just the moral position, it is the path to victory for progressive candidates.”⁴⁴

The results marked the first time that sitting members of Congress lost their seats in campaigns where they were repeatedly attacked for being too

supportive of Israel, sending what analysts described as an unmistakable signal that, for a widening swath of the Democratic congressional caucus, backing Israel has gone from being the politically safe move to a potential career-ender.

Following his victory, Lander endorsed Abdul El-Sayed for the Senate from Michigan, even after that bigot sought to justify the attack on a Jewish synagogue as understandable in light of Israeli actions.

This is New York, this is the Democratic party in 2026.

This is the current Democratic Party and there are few signs it is getting any better. I urge my viewers, my listeners and my readers to join me in making this reluctant, and for some uncomfortable, change in party affiliation. I don't believe we have a reasonable choice. We must not repeat the mistakes of the past.

I hope I am wrong. I hope this is a false positive. I hope the growing antisemitism and anti-Israelism will pass. I hope the Democratic Party will return to its roots. If it does, we can also return to our roots. Party affiliation is situational, not permanent. But we must act now on today's dangerous situation, because inaction may prove to be a lethal false negative.

The Jewish leaders who did not do enough in the 1930s and early 1940s also hoped that the predictions of doom for European Jewry were wrong.

They ignored and marginalized the warnings of some Jewish leaders who were considered extremists by the Jewish establishment. Their pessimistic warnings turned out to be much more accurate than the optimism of the established leaders.

The lesson of history is that if we are to err about the Jewish future, it should be on the side of avoiding a false negative, even at the risk of a false positive. History teaches that we must assume the worst, not the best-case scenario when it comes to attacks on the Jewish people and their state. We must act on that negative assumption. No more business as usual, as the

Jewish community potentially faces the worst crisis since Nazism. Inaction based on hope is not an option.

Prioritizing our comfort over our fears proved to be a tragic mistake in our past. I fear its repetition now that we are even more comfortable. In some respects, American Jews are today more influential than any Jewish community in history, though I fear our influence is waning in the face of decreasing support among young voters in both parties. We are experiencing a pincer movement not unlike what the Jews of Europe experienced in the run-up to World War II, when both Fascists and Communists were determined to destroy us. They succeeded beyond anyone's reasonable expectations. Today, it is many Democrats and some young Republicans who are targeting Jews and their state. We have no excuse for passively accepting an increase in the Jew-hatred we are now experiencing. We must decide and we must act on our decisions.

My decision to act has taken the form of changing parties and trying to defeat the party that I believe poses the greatest clear and present danger to the Jewish community. What is your decision?

[35](#) See e.g., Ken Burns, *The U.S. and the Holocaust*, PBS, 2022.

[36](#) I've written extensively about the problem of prediction and prevention in my books *Preemption: A Knife That Cuts Both Ways* (2003) and *Preventive State: The Challenge of Preventing Serious Harms While Preserving Essential Liberties* (2025).

[37](#) According to a recent Pew Research Center survey, six in ten Americans now hold negative views of Israel. Among Democrats, the number rises to eight in ten. The poll numbers suggest that Democratic voters view Israel more negatively than they view China, and in some cases even Iran itself. That would have been politically unimaginable a generation ago. For Republicans, 60 percent of Republicans have a favorable view of Israel. Laura Silver, "Negative Views of Israel, Netanyahu Continue to Rise Among Americans—Especially Among Young People," Pew Research, April 7, 2026.

[38](#) He later disavowed that blood libel and blamed a staffer for the post. Josh Kraushaar, "Pro-Israel Groups Celebrate Massie's Defeat, Brace for Rabb," *Jewish Insider*, May 20, 2026.

- [39](#) Luke Tress, “Mamdani-backed Congress candidate defends joining October 8 rally celebrating Hamas atrocities,” *The Times of Israel*, June 5, 2026.
- [40](#) Liam Stack, “Brad Lander Wins N.Y. House Primary in Which Israel Has Become a Top Issue,” *New York Times*, June 23, 2026.
- [41](#) Joshua Chaffin and Anvee Bhutani, “Mamdani Sweep in NYC Add Strains Between Jews and Democratic Party,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 24, 2026.
- [42](#) Miles G. Cohen and Olivia Bensimon, “Goldman Says Café’s Hostile Post About Him Does Not Warrant Civil Rights Case,” *New York Times*, June 23, 2026.
- [43](#) “Mamdani Sweep in NYC Add Strains.”
- [44](#) Ali Harb, “Wins by Mamdani-backed candidates deal blow to pro-Israel camp in US,” *Al Jazeera*, June 24, 2026.