



What Does the War in Gaza Show Us About Israeli Society?

Without a doubt, the IDF (Israel Defense Forces) is the voice of the Jewish-Israeli commonwealth ~ilana

In teasing out right from wrong, discriminate we must between acts that are criminal only because The State has criminalized them (*mala prohibita*), as opposed to acts which are universally evil (*malum in se*). Israel's sacking of Gaza is *malum in se*, universally evil. Gaza is clearly an easy case in ethics. It's not as though the genocide underway in Gaza could ever be finessed or gussied up.

Yet in Israel, no atrocity perpetrated by the IDF (Israel Defense Forces) in Gaza is too conspicuous to ignore. One of the foremost authorities on Gaza, Dr. Norman Finkelstein, calls Israel a Lunatic State. "It is certainly not a Jewish State," he avers. "A murderous nation, a demonic nation," roars Scott Ritter — the legendary, larger-than-life American military expert to whose predictive, reliable reports from theaters of war I've been referring since 2002.

That the Jewish State is genocidal is not in dispute. But, what of Israeli society? Is it sick, too? What of the Israeli anti-government protesters now flooding the streets of metropolitan Israel? How do they feel about the incessant, industrial-scale campaign of slaughter and starvation in Gaza, north, center, and south?

They don't.

In desperate search for a universal humanity — a transcendent moral sensibility — among the mass of



Ilana Mercer





Israelis protesting the State, I scoured many transcripts over seven months. I sat through volumes of video footage, searching for mention, by Israeli protesters, of the war of extermination being waged *in* their name, *on* their Gazan neighbors. I found none.

Much to my astonishment, I failed to come across a single Israeli protester who cried for anyone but *himself*, *his kin and countrymen*, and *their hostages*. Israelis appear oblivious to the unutterable, irreversible, irremediable ruin adjacent.

Again: I found no transcendent humanity among Israeli protesters; no allusion to the universal moral order to which international humanitarian law, the natural law, and the Sixth Commandment give expression. I found only endless iterations among Jewish-Israelis of their sectarian interests.

For their part, protesters merely want regime change. They saddle Netanyahu solely with the responsibility for hostages entombed in Gaza, although Benny Gantz (National Unity Party), ostensible rival to Bibi Netanyahu (Likud), and other War Cabinet members are philosophically as one (Ganz had boasted, in 2014, that he would "send parts of Gaza back to the Stone Age"). With respect to the holocaustal war waged on Gaza, and spreading to the West Bank, there is no chasm between these and other squalid Jewish supremacists who make up "Israel's wartime leadership."

If you doubt my findings with respect to the Israeli protesters, note the May 11 droning address of protester







Na'ama Weinberg, who demanded a change of government. Weinberg condemned the invasion of Rafah and a lack of a political strategy as perils to both hostage and national survival. She lamented the "unspeakable torture" faced by the hostages. When Weinberg mentioned "evacuees neglected," I lit up. Nine-hundred thousand Palestinians have been displaced from Rafah in the last two weeks. Forty percent of Gaza's population. My hope was fleeting. It soon transpired that Weinberg meant citizens of Israeli border communities evacuated. That was the extent of Weinberg's sympathies for the "slaughter house of civilians" down the road. Hers was nothing but a lowerorder sectarian sensibility.

The grim spareness of Israeli protester sentiment has been widely noticed.

Writing for *Foreign Policy*, an American mainstream establishment magazine, <u>Mairav Zonszein</u>, scholar with the International Crisis Group, <u>observes the following</u>:

The thousands of Israelis who are once again turning out to march in the streets are not protesting the war. Except for a tiny handful of Israelis, Jews, and Palestinians, they are not calling for a cease-fire or an end to the war — or for peace. They are not protesting Israel's killing of unprecedented numbers of Palestinians in Gaza or its restrictions on humanitarian aid that have led to mass starvation.





(Some right-wing Israelis even go further by actively blocking aid from entering the strip.) They are certainly not invoking the need to end military occupation, now in its 57th year. They are primarily protesting Netanyahu's refusal to step down and what they see as his reluctance to seal a hostage deal.

Public incitement continues apace. Genocidal statements saturate Israeli society. The "lovely" Itamar Ben Gvir has provided an update to his repertoire, the kind chronicled so well by the South Africans (this one included). On May 14, to the roar of the crowd, Israel's national security minister urged anew that Palestinians be encouraged to voluntarily emigrate (as if anything that has befallen the Palestinians of Gaza, since October 7, has been "voluntary"). He was speaking at a settler rally on the northern border of Gaza, in which thousands of vahoos watched the "fireworks" on display over Gaza, and cheered for looting the land of the dead and dying there.

"It's the media's fault," you'll protest.
"Israelis, like Americans, are merely brainwashed by their media."

Inarguably, Israeli media — from Arutz 7, to Channel 12 ("[Gazans need] to die 'hard and agonizing deaths'"), to Israel Today, to Now 14 ("We will slaughter you and your supporters"), and the lowbrow, sub-intelligent vulgarians of <u>i24</u> — are a self-obsessed, energetic Idiocracy.





These media feature excitable sorts, volubly imparting their atavistic, primitive tribalism in ugly, anglicized, Pidgin Hebrew. And, each one of these specimens always has a "teoria": a theory.

Naveh Dromi is a lot more appealing in visage and voice than i24's anchor Benita Levin, a harsh and vinegary South African Kugel. Dromi is a columnist for a Ha'aretz, the most highbrow of Israel's (center-left) dailies. Ha'aretz once had intellectual ballast. In her impoverished Hebrew, Dromi has tweeted about her particular "teoria": "a second Nakba" is a coming. Elsewhere she has rasped a-mile-a-minute about "the Palestinians as a redundant group." Nothing crimsons her lovely cheeks.

Such statements of Jewish supremacy pervade Jewish-Israeli media. But, no; it's not the Israeli media's fault. The closing of the Israeli mind is entirely voluntary.

According to a paper from Oxford Scholarship Online, the "media landscape in Israel" evinces "healthy competition" and declining concentration. "[C]alculated on a percapita basis," "the number of media voices in Israel," overall, "is near the top of the countries investigated."

Israel has a robust, and privately owned, media. These media cater to the Israeli public, which has a filial stake in lionizing the Israel Defense Forces (IDF), in which each and every son and daughter serve. For this reason, avers Ha'aretz's Gideon Levi in his many YouTube television interviews, the military is the country's golden calf.





Mainstream public opinion, Levi insists, molds the media, not the obverse.

Levi attests that right-wing and leftwing media are as one when it comes to the subject of the IDF and the Palestinian People. And in this, Israeli media reflect mainstream public opinion. It is the public that wishes to see nothing of the suffering in Gaza, and takes care never to disparage or doubt the IDF. For their part, military journalists are no more than embeds, in bed with the military.

At least until now, Israelis have been largely indifferent to their army's orgiastic, indiscriminate bloodletting in Gaza. Most were merely demanding a return of their hostages, and the continuance of the assault on Gazans, punctured by periodic cease fires.

So, is Jewish-Israeli society sick, too?

When "88 percent of Jewish-Israeli interviewees" give "a positive assessment of the performance of the IDF in Gaza until now" (Tamar Hermann, "War in Gaza Survey 9," Israel Democracy Institute, January 24, 2024) and "[a]n absolute majority (88%) also justifies the scope of casualties on the Palestinian side" (Gershon H. Gordon, *The Peace Index, January 2024*, Faculty of Social Sciences, Tel Aviv University), it is fair to conclude that the diabolical IDF is, for the most, the voice of the Jewish-Israeli commonwealth.

Consider: By January's end, the Gaza Strip had, by and large, already been rendered uninhabitable, a moonscape. Nevertheless, 51 percent of Jewish-Israelis said they believed the IDF was using an appropriate amount of force





in Gaza, while 43 percent said it was not using enough force. (Source: Jerusalem Post staff, "Jewish Israelis believe IDF is using appropriate force in Gaza," January 26, 2024.)

Note: Polled opinion was not split between Israelis *for genocide* and Israelis *against it*. Rather, the division in Israeli society appeared to be between Jewish-Israelis *for current levels of genocide* versus those for *greater industry* in what were already industrial-levels and methods of murder.

Attitudes in Israel have only hardened since: By mid-February, 58 percent of this Jewish cohort was grumbling that not enough force had been deployed to date, while 68 percent did "not support the transfer of humanitarian aid to Gaza." (Jerusalem Post Staff, "Majority of Jewish Israelis opposed to demilitarized Palestinian state," February 21, 2024.)

Scrap the "hardened" verb. Attitudes in Jewish Israel have not merely hardened, but bear the hallmark of societal sociopathy.

When asked, in particular, "to what extent should Israel take into consideration the suffering of the Palestinian population when planning the continuation of the fighting there," Jewish-Israelis sampled have remained consistent through the months of the onslaught on Gaza, from late in October of 2023 to late in March of 2024. The Israel Democracy Institute, a polling organization, found that,

[D]espite the progress of the war in Gaza and the harsh criticism of Israel from the international





community regarding the harm inflicted on the Palestinian population, there remains a very large majority of the Jewish public who think that Israel should not take into account the suffering of Palestinian civilians in planning the continuation of the fighting. By contrast, a similar majority of the Arab public in Israel take the opposite view, and think this suffering should be given due consideration. (Tamar Hermann, Yaron Kaplan, Dr. Lior Yohanani, "War in Gaza Survey 13," Israel Democracy Institute, March 26, 2024.)

Large majorities of the Israeli Center (71 percent) and those on the Right (90 percent) say that "Israel should only take into account the suffering of the Palestinian population to a small extent or should not do so at all."

Let us, nevertheless, end this canvas with the "good" news: On the "bleeding heart" Israeli Left, "only" (I'm being cynical) 47 percent of a sample "think that Israel should not take into consideration the suffering of Palestinian civilians in Gaza or should do so only to a small extent, while 50 percent think it should consider their plight to a fairly large or very large extent." (*Ibid*.)

In other words, the general run of the Jewish-Israeli Left tends to think that the plight of Gazans should be considered, but not necessarily ended.

On the facts, and, as I have had to,





sadly, show here, both the Israeli state and civil society are driven by Jewish supremacy, the type that sees little to no value in Palestinian lives and aspirations.

Libertarian Methodological Individualism

Commensurate with the surveys shared above, and as many have quite reasonably concluded, Jewish-Israeli civil society is sick, too. As uncomfortable as it is for the libertarian methodological individualist, the facts dictate, alas, that, on the matter of the mass murder of the Palestinians of Gaza, Jewish-Israeli society does not stand apart from the Jewish State.

But if such generalizations can be made, don't they betray the libertarian fidelity to methodological individualism?

No. Stating statistical verities does not violate methodological individualism.

Methodological individualism does not mandate that aggregate group traits be denied. Rather, methodological individualism correctly practiced means that generalizations are to be considered, while each and every individual is treated on his merit, and not conflated with the group.

Provided they are substantiated by hard evidence, not hunches, generalizations are not incorrect. To the contrary: Science relies on the ability to generalize to the larger population observations drawn from representative samples.

Human action is governed by probabilities and generalities. People make prudent personal and economic







decisions in their daily lives as to where scarce and precious resources — one's life and property — are best invested. They do so based on reliable, aggregated data or on shared common-sense assessments.

When broad statements and assessments about aggregate group characteristic are both true and crucial to our understanding, libertarian methodological individualists needn't demand that these be expunged from our formulations.

So, while we must take great care as libertarian methodological individualists to separate state from society, and each member of society from the next — treating each individual on his or her merit in our dealings — generalizations about certain group characteristics are, in aggregate, valid. They do not in any way flout the imperative to treat each and every individual as an individual.

We risk disarming ourselves of the firearm of truth, analytical and empirical, if we discard the aggregate group findings surveyed so far.

With shuddering clarity, I can say then, that, in symbiosis, Israel — state, society — and its Anglo-European sponsors share the blame for the sacking of Gaza. Israelis, by and large, have become a solipsistic sorority of Jewish supremacists. Palestinians have paid a terrible price for this systemic Israeli sociopathy.





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.