

De-Legitimization and 'Lawfare:' Israel's Fourth Struggle

By Emmanuel Navon

Beth Israel Beth Aaron Congregation (Montréal), 28 April 2011

It is an honor for me to be addressing the Beth Israel Beth Aaron Congregation. Rabbi Poupko's name is known throughout the world not only for being an outstanding scholar and Rabbi, but also for his strong support for Israel. Rabbi Poupko and this Congregation work for *Am Israel*, for *Ahdut Israel*, for *Ahavat Israel*. Thank you for your support, thank you for your contribution to the unity of the Jewish people, and thank you for inviting me here tonight.

It is also a pleasure to be in a country whose Prime Minister declared recently that "Those who threaten the existence of the Jewish people are a threat to all of us" and that "the existence and persistence of the Jewish homeland is a sign of hope."

Both your congregation and your Prime Minister are exceptional. Unfortunately, this also means that you are an exception.

Most world leaders today do not have the courage and moral clarity of Stephen Harper when it comes to Israel. And many Jewish communities in the Diaspora are not as strongly supportive of Israel as they used to be.

Maybe this will surprise you, but even Israelis themselves are not as supportive of their own country as they used to be. Our people's faith in the justice of its cause is not as strong today as it was a generation ago. And this is the greatest threat to the future of Israel—more than Iran's nuclear program or Hezbollah's missiles.

In the past year, I have basically taken off from my company to defend Israel in the world, because I am concerned about the future of my country and of my people. And I am less concerned about our enemies from without than by our enemies from within.

I am here tonight to talk about two types of threats and about what you can do to play your part in the defense of Israel. The first threat is the de-legitimization of Israel by our enemies. The second threat is the de-legitimization of Israel by Jews themselves. In order to counter those two threats and to be victorious, Israel needs you.

Within 63 years of independence, Israel has achieved something unparalleled and unheard of in modern history. Though hugely outnumbered by its enemies, Israel has always prevailed on the battlefield. It has maintained the highest standards of democracy despite a constant state of war and terror. It has turned a backward and forsaken region of the former Ottoman Empire into one of the most productive, dynamic and technologically-advanced economies in the world.

It has forged a coherent and functioning nation out of dozens of ethnic and linguistic groups.

So Israel is head-and-shoulders above the other nations that have gained independence since the Second World War. But it is also head-and-shoulders above them in terms of the purpose it serves: to safeguard a people whose powerlessness led to genocide, to rebuild a country that was destroyed during Antiquity, and to regenerate a culture that is the pillar of Western civilization.

What a paradox and what an irony, then, that it is precisely this country (and only this country) whose right to exist and whose very legitimacy are being challenged.

I know that many people who fight Israel or who question its right to exist say they do so because of Israel's policies.

If such is the case, why is it that the very same people who are constantly on Israel's case are silent on China's occupation of Tibet, on Turkey's occupation of Cyprus, on Morocco's occupation of Western Sahara, or on the statelessness of the Kurds?

Why do the people who try to stop Israel from building a security fence to protect its citizens have no problem with the fence that the United States is building on its border with Mexico or with the fence that Turkey built in occupied Cyprus?

Why do the same people who accuse Israel of war crimes in Gaza turn a blind eye at NATO's lethal actions in Afghanistan and praise the Sri Lanka government for wiping off the Tamils?

Why do the same people who call the IRA in Ireland and the ETA in Spain terrorist organizations describe Hamas and Hezbollah as political parties?

Why does the co-called Human Rights Council, a body dominated by human rights abusers, constantly accuses Israel of human rights violations but never has anything to say about countries such as Sudan, China, or Saudi Arabia?

And why does the legitimate criticism of Israel's policies always has to degenerate into denying Israel's right to exist?

Why? I'll tell you why. Because challenging Israel's right to exist (what is known as "de-legitimization"), and harassing Israel in kangaroo courts (something known as legal warfare or "lawfare") are part of a deliberate policy.

I call it Israel's fourth struggle.

The first struggle was military. Since its independence, Israel has been attacked and fought on the battlefield by relentless enemies. But all attempts to eliminate Israel by the sword have failed.

So our enemies tried to make us suffocate economically by boycotting Israeli companies. This attempt has failed too. While most Arab countries are economic basket cases, Israel is an economic wonder.

The third attempt consisted in breaking the morale of Israeli society through terrorism. Yet Israeli society has withstood terrorism heroically, and the IDF has managed to turn the tables on our enemies.

It is not that Israel's enemies have given up on war, boycott, and terror. They are still quite active on those three fronts. But they realize that none of those struggles will bring them victory –even though an Iranian nuclear bomb would completely change the equation, God forbid.

The fourth struggle consists in trying to bring about Israel's demise by convincing the world and Israel itself that the Jewish state is criminal and illegitimate.

Our enemies are trying to depict Israel as a criminal state and as a remnant of colonialism with the hope that the world will eventually declare Israel an illegitimate member of the international community.

Unfortunately, this campaign is actually bearing fruit. Israelis are good at military strategy, at technological innovation and at enduring hardship. But they are lousy at PR, as you've probably noticed. Not only that, but some Israelis themselves are taking part in the de-legitimization and lawfare campaigns. So if we want to win

the fourth struggle, we (meaning Jews both in Israel and in the Diaspora) must get our acts together.

Whether you call it de-legitimization, lawfare or media war, the fourth struggle against Israel may be fatal if we fail to understand it and, of course, to win it.

The reason why I'm using the expression "fourth struggle" is that this struggle is part of the fourth generation war, a concept developed by the American journal *Marine Corps Gazette* in an article published in 1989. This article argued that ideologically motivated but technologically weak countries or movements would likely try to fight the West through psychology rather than technology.

Unlike previous generations of warfare, the fourth generation war does not attempt to win by defeating the enemy's military force. Rather, it tries, through propaganda, to convince the enemy that it cannot win, and to convince the world that the aggressor is actually the victim and that the victim is actually the aggressor. And the same way that mechanized war was made possible by tanks and airplanes, the media war is made possible by the television and the internet.

Fourth generation war is not just a theory. In fact, copies of the 1989 article I just mentioned were found by US troops in the caves of Tora Bora, the al-Qaida hideout in Afghanistan. In February 2002, Abu Ubeid al-Qurashi, one of Osama bin Laden's deputies, revealed that al-Qaida had adopted the "Fourth Generation War" strategy, and that the purpose of this strategy is to undermine popular

support for soldiers within the enemy's society. In this type of war, TV screens are considered as powerful if not more powerful than tanks.

This is the war that has been imposed upon Israel and upon the Jewish people, and this is the war that we must win.

We must win this war because Israel is indeed growingly perceived as criminal and illegitimate, and because genocide is always preceded by the de-legitimization and demonization of the target population. The Jews in Nazi Germany were depicted as enemies from the inside and were called "vermin." In Rwanda, the Tutsis used to be called "cockroaches." In Iraq, Saddam Hussein described the Kurds as "monkey-faced people" before killing them with chemical weapons. And today, the Iranian President calls Israel a "cancer." More and more people around the world agree with him.

The demonization and defamation of Israel is not a new phenomenon. During the first Lebanon war, the PLO tried to compare Israel to the Nazis and the Palestinians in Lebanon to the Jews during World War II. And this is indeed the narrative that was adopted at the time by many journalists in Europe and elsewhere.

With the launching of the second Intifada in 2000, the PLO and its allies unleashed an aggressive media war against Israel. First there was the al-Dura blood libel in September 2000, a television scene fabricated by Palestinian cameraman Talal abu-Rahma and broadcast by French TV channel France 2. Then there was the

Durban Conference in September 2001, which was orchestrated to brand Israel as an apartheid and colonialist state.

The purpose of the al-Dura hoax was to describe Israel as a country that intentionally and purposely kills children. And it worked.

Al-Jazeera repeatedly ran the clip of the boy being shot, and for several days the picture of his alleged death became the network's emblem. These images had a galvanizing effect in the Arab world. When Osama bin Laden made a recruiting video before 9-11, he had a special section on Muhamed Al Durah, explaining that when "the Israelis" murdered the boy, they killed every Muslim child in the world. Daniel Pearl was beheaded with a picture of Mohamed al Durah behind him and scenes of Al Durah spliced into the slitting of his throat.

As for the Durban Conference, its absurd contention that Israel is colonialist and racist has become the conventional wisdom on Western campuses and among a growing number of Western journalists.

The result is not a mere nuisance but a real threat.

Over the last decade, Israeli politicians and army officers have been threatened with arrest in countries such as the United Kingdom for alleged war crimes. Boycotts and divestment campaigns against Israeli products and institutions are spreading across Europe. Israeli officials are prevented from speaking on US campuses. On European campuses, some have been attacked by mobs.

Members of European parliaments have been discussing suspending the Association Agreement signed between Israel and the EU in 1995. In many Western intellectual circles, it has become politically incorrect not to question the legitimacy of the Jewish state.

The de-legitimization and lawfare strategy is based on three messages:

1. Israel is criminal. It does not defend itself, but only attacks harmless people and intentionally kills innocents.
2. Israel is racist. Like apartheid South Africa, it promotes a segregationist social model.
3. Israel is colonialist. There is no historical connection whatsoever between the Jews and Palestine.

If Israel is criminal, racist, and colonialist, then it is illegitimate and has no right to exist. It must therefore be isolated, banned and pressured until it gives up on its own existence. And if it refuses to do so, then Iran's president is only promoting justice by calling for Israel's demise.

Lawfare is seriously affecting Israel's ability to defend itself.

In 2004, the International Court of Justice issued a ruling questioning the legality of Israel's security fence without considering the waves of suicide bombing attacks on Israeli civilians that caused the construction of the fence. The International Court of Justice went as far as to question whether the right to self-

defense (recognized by Article 51 of the UN Charter) applies to the terrorist attacks against Israel.

After Israel unilaterally withdrew from the Gaza Strip in 2005, its citizens became the victims of daily mortar attacks from Gaza, which killed dozens of Israelis, maimed hundreds, and caused considerable material and emotional damage. Yet when Israel fought back to stop the attacks against its citizens, attempts were made, through legal warfare, to stop Israel from acting. Hence the infamous Goldstone Report from September 2010, which accuses Israel of deliberately killing civilians without producing a shred of evidence to prove this libelous accusation.

The purpose of the Goldstone Report is to deny Israel's right to self-defense.

More recently, in May 2010, the Israeli navy stopped a Turkish flotilla of six ships that sought to break Israel's blockade of the Gaza Strip. This blockade was instituted in response to the repeated rocket fire launched by Hamas at Israeli civilian targets since 2001. Allowing unrestricted access to Gaza by sea would have enabled the delivery of heavy rockets from Iran. Military blockades are a form of self-defense recognized by international law. NATO put Yugoslavia under a naval blockade during the Bosnian War, and the UN Security Council placed a naval blockade on Iraq after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait.

When Israeli naval commandos boarded the *MV Marmara*, they were violently attacked and lynched. IDF soldiers only opened fire on their aggressors to protect

their lives. Yet Israel was widely condemned, while Turkey was not questioned for its role in sending a terrorist organization (the IHH) with the only purpose of letting Iranian weapons flow into Gaza. And Western powers, which had themselves imposed naval blockades on Iraq and Yugoslavia just two decades earlier, questioned Israel's right to do just that in Gaza.

In addition, pro-Islamic NGOs take advantage of legal loopholes in Western legal systems in order to initiate legal measures against Israeli politicians and army officers visiting Europe, accusing them of human rights violations and war crimes. Hence the arrest warrants in Britain against opposition leader Tzipi Livni or against former Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. Those radical NGOs cynically abuse the human rights discourse and the principle of universal jurisdiction, which was originally adopted in the West in order to bring to justice perpetrators of genocide and crimes against humanity, even when those crimes were committed outside of the country whose courts are petitioned to act.

The legal warfare aims at legally tying the hands of the IDF and at presenting any act of Israeli self-defense as a crime against humanity. Sadly, the goal of this campaign has been mostly achieved.

The second aspect of the "fourth struggle" is de-legitimization. While lawfare tries to describe Israel's acts of self-defense as a crime, de-legitimization tries to present Israel's existence as a fraud. The idea is to claim that there is no Jewish people and that the Jews have no historical connection to Palestine.

During the Camp David negotiations in July 2000, Arafat shocked President Clinton and the Israeli delegation by claiming that there never was a Jewish temple in Jerusalem. This has now become an official Palestinian myth publicly endorsed by Mahmoud Abbas, by Saeb Erekat, and by Yasser Abd Rabbo. While officially denying the Temple Mount's Jewish past, the Palestinian Authority is actively erasing that past with acts of archeological vandalism conducted underneath the Temple Mount since 1996.

In November 2008, PA Prime Minister Salam Fayyad addressed an inter-religious gathering at the UN. He spoke of Jerusalem's Muslim and Christian past, but made a point of not mentioning the city's Jewish past.

In March 2010, Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan claimed in the Saudi newspaper *al-Watan* that the Cave of the Patriarchs in Hebron and Rachel's tomb outside of Bethlehem are not Jewish but Islamic sites. In October 2010, UNESCO declared Rachel's tomb to be a mosque. In November 2010, the PA's Information Ministry publicly denied any Jewish historical connection to the Western Wall and claimed it was an Islamic site.

This denial is a recent phenomenon, since Islam used to recognize Jerusalem's Jewish past (starting with Jerusalem's original name in Arabic, *Bait Al-Maqdis* – a transliteration of the Hebrew *Beit Hamikdash*, which means Temple). And this Islamic denial is now being echoed by some Christian churches.

In 2008, the World Council of Churches issued a statement instructing Christians to understand all Biblical references to Israel metaphorically. A few months ago, the Archbishop of Greek Melkites, Cyril Salim Bustros, claimed that the Biblical concept of a promised land “cannot be used as a bias for the return of the Jews to Israel” and that the original promise to the children of Israel “was nullified by Christ.”

Of course, attempts to de-legitimize, demonize and criminalize Israel are not entirely new. During the Cold War, Soviet and Arab propaganda tried to depict Israel as a serial aggressor and Zionism as a racist movement (indeed, the 1975 UN initiative equating Zionism with racism was a joint Soviet-Arab initiative). And for the Vatican, the rebirth of Israel was always a hard theological pill to swallow.

What is new, different and worrying is where the new de-legitimization and lawfare is now coming from and what it has been able to achieve. The source of anti-Israel de-legitimization and lawfare is no longer the Soviet Union, of course. It is now Western Europe and it even enjoys a strong support in Israel itself.

In Britain, Scandinavia and Belgium, the assault on Israel has entered the mainstream of political discourse through universities, the internet, and the media. Hamas supporter Faisal Bodi, who says that Israel has no right to exist, has a column in the *Guardian* and a radio program on the BBC. *Hizb tu-Tahrir*, a Muslim brotherhood offshoot, is illegal in Egypt, Jordan and Pakistan, but it was invited by the British House of Commons.

Groups calling for the boycott of Israeli products generally do not distinguish between the West Bank and pre-1967 Israel. The Muslim Brotherhood branch in Britain, which is a leading force behind the anti-Israel boycott, denies Israel's right to exist regardless of its borders. As for the far-left leadership of the British "Stop the War Coalition," it calls for the dismantling of Israel. The organizations that promote the de-legitimization agenda do not limit their actions to the West Bank and Gaza. They generally support the "one-state" solution and the massive immigration of millions of alleged Palestinian refugees to Israel. That would mean the end of the Jewish state.

So the BDS (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions) movement in Europe has nothing to do with borders, peace and human rights. It has to do with the denial of Israel's right to exist.

It took the Goldstone Report for Israel to finally realize that de-legitimization and lawfare are not a mere a PR contest. It would be bad enough if Israel was responding poorly to the fourth generation war. What is even worse is that many Israelis themselves take an active part in the international de-legitimization and lawfare campaigns against Israel.

Avraham Burg, a former President of the Knesset and of the Jewish Agency, now says that the very idea of a Jewish state is an abomination. He calls for the

repelling of the Law of Return and lectures around the world to warn that Israel is turning into pre-war Nazi Germany.

Shlomo Sand, a History professor at Tel-Aviv University, says there is no Jewish people and therefore no need for a Jewish state. Nurit Peled-Elhanan, a sociology professor at the Hebrew University, claims that the IDF is led by war criminals and murderers. Prof. Neve Gordon from Ben-Gurion University and Prof. Rachel Giora from Tel-Aviv University are active in the international campaigns to boycott Israel.

Israeli filmmaker Udi Aloni is an international advocate for the BDS (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions) movement against Israel. Israeli-born artist Dror Freiler took part in the pro-Hamas Gaza flotillas in May 2010. An Israeli art exhibit in the city of Holon in December 2009 depicted the IDF as bombarding kindergartens.

The phenomenon is not limited to some radical Israeli academics, artists, and public figures. In fact, it is an Israeli fund, The New Israel Fund, that financed 92% of the Israeli organizations that testified against Israel in the Goldstone Report. And it is The New Israel Fund that finances the organizations (such as the Palestinian Center for Human Rights and Adalah) that sue Israeli leaders in Europe.

The list is unfortunately longer, but the bottom line is that we are not going to win the fourth generation war without addressing the Jewish tendency for self-

hatred and self-destruction. And this is where Jews in the Diaspora and in Israel need to work together. We need each other to save Israel from itself.

How? By helping Zionists in Israel to be in positions of power. If we let post-Zionists and anti-Zionists dominate our Academia, legal system and media, Israel will be lost.

And I'm not making this up. A prominent Israel law Professor, Menachem Mautner, argues in his last book *Law and Culture in Israel at the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century* that Israel's intellectual elites lost some of their power with their first electoral defeat in 1977. Those elites discovered with horror that Judaism, which they hoped had been relayed by Zionism to the dustbin of History, was still important to most Israelis. Having lost their power in elections, Mautner explains, Israel's secular elites tried to maintain that power through the judiciary.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Israel's Supreme Court gradually and effectively curtailed the powers of the executive and legislative branches of Government in order to grant the Court the power to determine the state's values and to distribute the state's material resources. Mautner candidly admits that the safest way to predict a Supreme Court decision is to read *Haaretz's* editorial page.

Mautner's book is no conspiracy theory. Indeed, he himself is a member of Israel's liberal elite, and shares the Supreme Court's political agenda. He admits, simply, that the Supreme Court's legal activism is meant to hold on to a power lost at the polls. And he laments the fact that trying to impose a radically liberal agenda on a

mostly conservative society through unelected judges is showing signs of exhaustion and even of revolt.

Witness, for the example, the fact that Israeli law professors such as Ruth Gavison or Amnon Rubinstein have become critical of the Court (indeed, Gavison was barred from the Court by its former Chief Justice Aharon Barak, because she had dared to become a dissident). Or the fact that polls indicate a growing distrust of Israelis in their Supreme Court.

So Israel's former secular elites must think of another strategy, Maunter argues. Instead of trying to impose their values through self-appointed judges, Israel's dethroned secularists should convince their inferior fellow-citizens to trade Jewish identity for multiculturalism. Patiently explain to the people that Israel should cease to be a nation-state; add an Arab stanza to the national anthem; give expression to the Arabs in the national flag and the state seal.

As Mautner explains, the early secular Zionists saw in Zionism an alternative to Judaism. They called themselves "Hebrews" or "Israelis" rather than "Jews." To Mautner's horror, however, more and more Israelis now define themselves first and foremost as Jews, and not as Hebrews and Israelis. Worse, some Israeli intellectuals have gone to the enemy by showing interest in Jewish culture and by defending the idea of a "Jewish State." So ultra-liberal intellectuals must prepare their counter-offensive by promoting post-Zionism.

And this is exactly what they are up to.

Ever since Israel's first Minister of Justice Pinhas Rosen called his law partner Moshe Zmora to appoint him President of the Supreme Court, the country's ruling elites have mastered a type of nepotism that favors and reproduces intellectual uniformity. Former Chief Justice Aaron Barak made sure that Ruth Gavison wouldn't get his job because she had dared to question his judicial activism ("She has an agenda" Barak explained –as if Barak himself didn't have one).

In January 2008, Barak declared that the Minister of Justice's attempts to reform the appointment of Israel's Supreme Court could turn Israel into a third world country. Actually, Israel is the only Western democracy whose Supreme Court is not appointed by politicians. What Minister of Justice Daniel Friedmann wanted to do in 2007 was to give the political system a majority.

A selection process dominated by the judiciary, like in Israel, perpetuates ideological uniformity, because sitting Judges prefer candidates who share their own views. This is why Barak blocked Gavison, and this is why Israel's Supreme Court is not representative of the country's social fabric.

The same intellectual nepotism rules in Academia. A few months ago, Dr. Ran Baratz lost his job at the Hebrew University's philosophy department because of his politics (he lives beyond the "Green Line," is a fellow at the conservative Shalem Center, and is involved with the unapologetically Zionist grassroots movement "Im Tirzu"). While he received his doctorate with honors and was

consistently rated the department's best lecturer by students, he committed the "crime" of not toeing the party line.

A few months ago, Hebrew University Professor Zeev Sternhell published an op-ed in *Ha'aretz* in which he argues that the Left deserves to dominate Israeli Academia because only the Left wants peace. In the same article, Sternhell complains about the fact that there are new think-tanks and movements in Israel that "dare" to challenge intelligent, saintly, and well-meaning people such as himself: It is because, you see, those Israeli right-wingers never managed to produce a true intellectual. So because there is no Israeli equivalent of Raymond Aron or Milton Friedman, the Israeli Right is trying to intimidate the country's academics via the Shalem Center (a conservative think tank) and Im Tirzu (a Zionist student movement).

The fact that there is hardly an Israeli equivalent of Raymond Aron or Milton Friedman is mostly true. And there is a reason for it too: Israel's Social Sciences and Humanities departments would never let such people emerge in the first place. Zeev Sternhell is part of the intellectual cartel that prevents people who don't think like him to have an academic career in the Humanities and in the Social Sciences. And Sternhell complains about the fact that dissidents, because they are barred from academia, have the nerve to try and express themselves elsewhere.

Now, mind you, Sternhell is a Zionist. He strongly opposes any Jewish presence beyond the Green Line, but he does believe that the Jews constitute a nation and

that they are entitled to their own nation-state. But Sternhell has also contributed to the creation of an intellectual monopoly in Israel, a monopoly that is progressively turning against Zionism.

Why? Because of the failure of the Oslo process, which people like Sternhell so enthusiastically embraced in the 1990s. There have basically been two reactions, within the Israeli Left, to the failed attempt to achieve peace and normality. Some have gone to the Right, while others have withdrawn their support for Zionism itself.

Two good examples are Benny Morris and Avi Shlaim. They are both Israeli historians who called themselves “new historians” some twenty years ago because they challenged what they called “Israel’s founding myths.” They clearly and proudly identified with the Left. And they both published a comprehensive history of the Arab-Israeli conflict roughly at the same time: Morris published *Righteous Victims* in 1999, and Shlaim published *The Iron Wall* in 2000. Both books were very critical of Israel and both concluded that peace with the Palestinians was possible based on a return to pre-1967 Israel.

And then came Camp David and the Second Intifada. It’s always unpleasant when reality contradicts your theory. The failure of the Oslo process came as a shock to Morris and Shlaim, and they reacted to that shock in opposite ways. Morris no longer believes in peace and argues that Israel should care for its survival regardless of the moral consequences. Shlaim no longer believes in Israel and he is ready to sacrifice Israel for the sake of his understanding of morality.

In an interview he gave to *Ha'aretz* in 2004, Benny Morris compared himself to Albert Camus. The same way that Camus put his mother before his political ideals during the Algerian war, Morris puts the survival of his people before universal moral principles. In the same interview, he goes as far as to say that Israel should have kicked out all the Arabs in 1948, and that it should do so today in case of another war.

Avi Shlaim, on the other hand, puts universal moral principles before the survival of his people. If Zionism is incompatible with those principles because of the pervasiveness of the conflict, than is too bad for Zionism. Shlaim now claims that Zionism is the worst enemy of the Jewish people and that Israel is a shame to the Jews.

And this is what the struggle in Israel is about today. If we can't achieve peace and normality because of our enemies' refusal to accept us, then it means that Zionism is indeed incompatible with peace and normality. And so we have to make a choice and decide what's more important to us: a Jewish state without peace, or peace without a Jewish state. Post and anti-Zionists have chosen the second option. And their influence is growing in Israel.

It is not a coincidence if a growing number of Israeli academics and public figures are turning their backs to Zionism. Israel's academia was founded by idealistic Jews who hated nationalism. Martin Buber and Yehuda Magnes, the two emblematic figures of the Hebrew University in its early days, were opposed to

the establishment of a Jewish state. They wanted a bi-national state and advocated a return of Palestinian refugees together with an end to Jewish immigration.

Why? Because they believed in moral purity and in the Jews' duty to stick to such a moral purity. And since nationalism, power and sovereignty create conflicts with other nations, they are incompatible with moral purity. Buber and Magnes' intellectual heirs in Israel's social sciences and humanities departments were willing to accept Zionism and long as they believed in the prospects of peace and normality. But since they've been proven wrong by reality, they have withdrawn their support for Zionism.

Hence Shlomo Sand's theory that there is no Jewish people and therefore no need for a Jewish state. And hence Avraham Burg's call to repeal the Law of Return and to cease to define Israel as a Jewish state.

And so, despite Israel's material successes and incredible achievements, if the next generations of Israelis believe that the country should not exist in the first place, no amount of high-tech companies and fighter jets will be able to protect Israel from destruction. If there is no Jewish determination to fight and no Jewish belief that this fight is worth it, then Israel will lose –God forbid.

But Israel has to win. And this is why Zionists in Israel and in the Diaspora must fight back, together.

We in Israel are on the battlefield for the entire Jewish people. We send our children to the army, we brave terror and missiles, and we are the actors of the return to Zion. But Diaspora Jews are part of the same struggle. And we need you. We don't need the Jewish Diaspora to support the Israeli economy. Israel's economy is one of the most successful and advanced in the world. But we need you to be our partners to fight the de-legitimization of Israel both from without and from within.

We must combine our efforts to fight the de-legitimization and lawfare campaigns worldwide, and to win the battle of ideas that is being waged against Zionism in Israel itself. How? Buy supporting those people and organizations that are leading the struggle for all of us.

After the Second Lebanon War, a group of students and army officers started a protest movement called "Im Tirtzu." *Im Tirtzu* means "if you want it" in Hebrew. The expression was made famous by Herzl in his book *Altneuland*: אִם תִּרְצוּ, אֵין זוֹ אִם תִּרְצוּ –which means: "If you want it, it is no dream." Im Tirtzu understood that Israelis have lost their common will to carry on the Zionist dream and that this common will must be restored against the growing influence of the post and anti-Zionists.

Im Tirtzu is restoring the pride and hope of young Israelis who are sick of being brainwashed and intimidated by their post and anti-Zionistic professors. Im Tirtzu has put an end to the immunity of the anti-Zionists by exposing the fact that it is

an Israeli fund, The New Israel Fund, that finances most of the organizations that testified against Israel in the Goldstone Report. Im Tirtzu has put an end to the immunity of the anti-Zionists by lobbying the Knesset to establish a commission that is tracking the money trail of Israeli organizations that are leading the delegitimization and lawfare campaigns against Israel. Im Tirtzu has put an end to the immunity of the anti-Zionists by convincing major donors to stop donating money to Israeli universities whose professors call for the international boycott of Israel.

Im Tirtzu is rebuilding a Zionist society. I've had the privilege to meet their founders. They are all young Israelis in their thirties, married with young children, who work hard and serve in the army. They all come from secular homes in Israel's wealthy suburbs. They could have worked in high-tech, caring only about money and moving to North America for a more secure and comfortable life.

Instead, they decided to save Israel from itself. And they've managed to put the post and anti-Zionists on the defensive. These young people are heroes. They are our soldiers. They are our hope. And I am asking you to help them. I've never done that before in my life. I could just be running my business and teaching my classes in University. But I've decided to take that step because of the dangers faced by Israel.

This is also why I decided to run for office. It was a hard decision, but being passive is no longer an option. I know that I will be able to have a real impact and effectively make the case of Israel in the world only if I hold an official position

that will give me the exposure I lack as an academic and a businessman. A few months ago, I made my decision public: I will run for the primaries for the Likud to be on this party's list in the next Knesset elections. If I win, I will be the first immigrant from France to enter that list. Here also, I count on the support of Diaspora Jews from Western countries who want to have their voice heard in the next Knesset.

"All it takes for the triumph of evil if for good men to do nothing" said Edmund Burke. That is true. And so I am calling upon all good men, upon all good Jews, to mobilize for the future of our people and of our homeland.

As Prime Minister Harper has said, "the existence and persistence of the Jewish homeland is a sign of hope." So let's keep that hope alive and well by fighting and winning the "fourth struggle" both in Israel and in the world. If we manage to do so, we shall have fulfilled our duty vis-à-vis our children and grandchildren. And we shall also realize Herzl's prophecy: *"The world will be freed by our liberty, enriched by our wealth, and magnified by our greatness."*