

# **Yakov M. Rabkin: Iran Remains the Principal STRONGHOLD of Resistance to Israel**

Books in English on Israel, Zionism and Judaism by Yakov M. Rabkin *Zionism Decoded in 101 Quotes* *Israel in Palestine: Jewish Rejection of Zionism* *What Is Modern Israel? A Threat from Within: A Century of Jewish Opposition to Zionism*

## **#Nima**

Hello, everybody. Today is Thursday, March 19, 2026, and our dear friend, Yakov M. Rabkin, is here with us. Welcome back, Yakov. Glad to be here. Today we're going to talk about the situation with the war in the Middle East — the whole concept of Israel and what's going on in the region. You can find Yakov's books in the description of this video. His recent book is *\*Zionism Decoded in 101 Codes\**. We'll hear more about your books as we talk today. But Yakov, one of the greatest wars that everybody has been talking about for such a long time — for more than 30, even 40 years — is the conflict between the United States and Iran, between Israel and Iran in the region. It's happening as we speak. When it comes to the whole concept of war, what is your understanding? What do you make of what's going on in the Middle East?

## **#Yakov**

Well, I'm not a military expert, but from what I gather, it's not so much an American war against Iran as it is an Israeli war against Iran. The United States has been mobilized for this war, and we can talk about why that happened. I think this war also brings us closer to a breaking point, at which many Americans—both in official positions and ordinary citizens—dare to express their resentment of the role Israel plays in American foreign policymaking. My dear colleague John Mearsheimer and his colleague from Harvard, Steve Walt, wrote a book about this: *\*The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy.\**

And now we see it coming to fruition in a very obvious way — a war that didn't have any reason to begin on the American side. And again, I'm quoting Joe Kent, who recently resigned as head of the counterterrorism unit in the U.S. intelligence community. If he didn't believe there was any threat, apparently there wasn't. I think this war is important not only because of its sheer scale, destruction, and the disruption of world markets, but also because it exposes the main reason for hostilities and bloodshed around the Middle East, which, one way or another, is connected with Israel.

And when I say that—and not only I—practically today it's become commonplace to talk about it, which I think is very healthy, because a lot of people used to talk about it around the kitchen table. Now they go public. And I think the false accusations of anti-Semitism no longer impress many people or silence this debate. So what I'm saying is that Israel has been interested in this because it's very foundational to its very nature, which is a Zionist state—created on territory already populated by other people—and that necessarily creates violence. And that's what we see, in order to ensure that the apartheid nature of Israel is preserved.

Israel has resorted to violence multiple times because what we're talking about really is not the existence of Israel, or, as some people say, the right of Israel to exist. It's not the right to exist—it's the right to exist of the apartheid regime. Regimes may change; people can stay where they are. And in my recent article, which you may have seen, I say that the Israelis have a choice between destroying Iran and destroying the whole region in order not to permit Palestinians to be equal citizens in Israel—one state, which would have been a normal way to organize political life between the river and the sea.

## **#Nima**

You mentioned that the United States has its own reasons for being mobilized toward this war. What were those reasons? Because, as we've seen, Tulsi Gabbard was asked, and many U.S. officials—including the head of the CIA—were asked: what was the threat from Iran toward the United States? They said the president somehow felt there was an imminent threat from Iran, and that's why he attacked. What's your understanding of why the United States is going into another war in the Middle East, after years and years of, you know, endless wars and destruction in the region—in Iraq, in Afghanistan, in Libya, in Syria, and now possibly in Iran?

## **#Yakov**

Well, let me remind you of something most people remember—the report written for the incoming Netanyahu government in 1996, about thirty years ago. It spelled out that Israel could change the situation in the Middle East by becoming more aggressive, more ambitious—in other words, by weakening or fragmenting states that support the Palestinians. You can notice that the two countries spared from this violence are Egypt and Jordan, which are essentially vessels of the United States and of Israel, so they're not touched. Those that have been targeted, as you mentioned, were part of the acts of resistance to Israeli apartheid. And I think it's very important to remember what Israelis are fighting for. They're not fighting for their survival; they're fighting for the survival of that system.

And we've seen in our lifetime how countries can change political regimes without disappearing. The Soviet Union is a good example—fifteen different countries emerged with relatively little violence, except for the current war in Ukraine. So, in 1996, that ambitious plan was considered reasonable

because the Soviet Union had disappeared. There was no balance of power in the world; there was only one big superpower—the United States. And those “Israel-firsters,” the American officials who wrote that report, said that was the moment to go ahead and get rid of all opposition to Israel. That’s what we’re observing now. It’s, I think, the last chapter of putting into practice what that report said. So, for the United States, as far as I can tell, there was no compelling reason to begin or enter this war. And I think Marco Rubio was right when he said we began it because Israel decided to do so.

But that statement—which, of course, he rolled back later—that’s a normal thing to do. But it shows something very interesting: it shows that the tail wags the dog, that Israel decides and the United States has to follow. I think that creates tremendous resentment in the United States, among people and among officials. I think the resignation of Joe Kent is not the last one; we’ll see more of that later. But it’s also important to understand that the people responsible for it constitute this Zionist lobby, or Israel lobby, of Christian Zionists—like Ambassador Huckabee, for example—and Jewish Zionists. But I must say, the Christian Zionists are far more numerous, many times more numerous.

In the United States alone, there are over 50 million of them. In Brazil, there are quite a few, as far as I know. So it’s very important not to conflate the Israel lobby with Jews, because many Jews, in fact, oppose it. But Israel conflates it all the time. And I think one of the reasons Israel went ahead with this war is that they feel support from both Christian Zionists and Jewish Zionists is melting. So it was important to use the opportunity, while in the corridors of power Zionism still reigns supreme, to begin this war, to involve the United States, and then, through all kinds of things—including false flag operations—to keep the United States in.

You know, in the interview that Joe Kent gave yesterday, he alluded—he’s very careful not to say things that could somehow compromise his security clearance. So he said that maybe one of the reasons was threats against the life of the president. He said there were strange things around the assassination attempts on Trump and on Charlie Kirk, and that when he was at his office, he was prevented from exploring foreign connections in those two episodes—the assassination of Charlie Kirk and the attempted assassination of then-presidential candidate Trump. He said he was blocked. And when he was asked, “Who blocked you?” he wouldn’t identify anyone. But by implication, it’s obvious there’s only one country that might be interested in taking part in this, and that’s Israel.

## **#Nima**

How do Israel and the Zionists see the whole Middle East and Israel itself? Because there’s a drastic difference when it comes to the Arab states and Iran, for example—they see them differently. And what’s the agenda on their part toward these two, you know, I’d say these two different concepts in the Middle East? Because Iran’s position isn’t the same as that of the Arab states regarding the Gaza situation in Palestine. So how is that going to be perceived by Zionist ideology in Israel?

## **#Yakov**

Well, I think we have to realize that the Arab states are run by governments that have very little democratic legitimacy, or none at all. Some of them are monarchies, some are nominally mixed political systems, but the position of the governments is very different from the sentiment of the people. And this democratic deficit, as we could call it, is very important because the governments are happy to cooperate with Israel, to buy arms and surveillance equipment from Israel. They really sold out the Palestinians long ago. For them, it's not an issue—it's more of a nuisance, something to get rid of. And you could see that during the massacre in Gaza: Arab countries continued their cooperation with Israel, continued to buy arms from Israel.

A country that's not Arab, of course, but majority Muslim—Turkey—has continued, and still continues, to be the main conduit of gas and oil to Israel from Azerbaijan. So Arab governments—and you have to distinguish between Arab governments and Arab populations—are pretty much subject to Israeli influence, and particularly to the joint American-Israeli condominium in the area. Iran, however, is different. In Iran, I think the gap between public opinion and the position of the government is much narrower. Both the government and the population see it as their religious duty to support justice. And what's being done to the Palestinians is injustice—and justice is a very important concept.

You know, we're speaking on the last day of Ramadan—iftar today—and it's very important to realize that religious principles seem to play a role in policymaking in Iran. That's why the late Khamenei, the spiritual guide, was religiously opposed to nuclear weapons. Just as Iran never developed chemical weapons in response to Iraq's use of them during the long war against Iran. So religious factors do play a role, and I would say in this case, a positive one, because there are humane elements that prevented Iran from developing nuclear or chemical weapons. There's a kind of moral accounting that's part of their worldview. And I don't see that happening in Arab governments, however ostensibly Muslim they may be—and certainly not in the Israeli government, regardless of the size of the head coverings you may find in Israel.

## **#Nima**

When it comes to the United States—you mentioned that the Zionists somehow felt this was their last chance to start this war—do you think the war is going the way they wanted it to? Because it seems the war began on the assumption that they'd go in, hit the government, assassinate the head of state, and everything would collapse. And some people in Israel seemed to believe that these were the "real" people of Iran, who would then come in and take over everything. What was the agenda? Do you think it was meant to be a long war, a short war, a regime-change war? Because my understanding is that we're dealing with two different agendas: one from the United States government and another from the Israelis. How do you see those two concepts, those two strategies, coming together in a war with Iran?

## **#Yakov**

There was also a third agenda—the agenda of Christian Zionists—to bring about a massive conflagration, tremendous violence, apocalyptic events, Armageddon, in order to usher in the Second Coming of Christ. And it's not just my guess; we've had several reports that commanders of U.S. forces have been telling their troops that this is a holy war, that Donald Trump is anointed by Jesus, and that the purpose of this war is to help Jesus come back to Earth. These things are being said openly to the soldiers. You could also hear that in the words of Ambassador Huckabee in Jerusalem, the American ambassador to Israel, who is very much animated by biblical concepts—which, the way he understands them, is not necessarily the Jewish way of understanding them. And I see that this third scenario, this third agenda as they put it, is no less important than the other two. Now, the other two are political.

For Israel, as I mentioned, it's important to dismember, to weaken, to eliminate Iran as part of the resistance. It doesn't care what happens to the Iranians. It doesn't care what happens even to the world economy. What matters to Israel is preserving the apartheid state. And weakening Iran, creating chaos, is fine with Israel. Now, they use the pretext of nuclear weapons. Everyone knows now—and I think has known for a long time—that that was completely artificial. You know, Prime Minister Netanyahu has been telling everyone, including the UN General Assembly, for 25 years that Iran is just a few weeks away from a nuclear bomb. He's been saying it for 25 years. You'd think he'd be ashamed to keep repeating things that are obviously untrue, because they've lasted for 25 years. No. No. I think the word "shame" doesn't apply. It's a concept unknown to the political class in Israel.

They're focused only on self-preservation, and they're deeply convinced that only the apartheid system they call the Jewish state can protect them. They can't imagine a democratic state of Israelis, Palestinians, or whoever, just coexisting—like we do in Canada, like you do in Brazil, or anywhere in the United States, for that matter. Even in Israel itself, you know, there are about two million Palestinian citizens who are second-class citizens, but still citizens—and nothing terrible happens. It's very paradoxical. I've heard, though I'm not sure, that the majority of pharmacists in Israel are Palestinians.

So Israelis trust their lives, their health, to Palestinians, but they don't want to live with them in one state. There's something very curious about that. Going back, though—for Israel, the agenda is very clear: fragment, weaken, make Iran disappear as an opponent. For the United States, the agenda was not clear. President Trump was saying one thing at ten o'clock, another at eleven, and something else in the evening. Why is that? Why wasn't there a united narrative? Because it was entirely a war the United States didn't need. So he had to justify it somehow—with a nuclear weapon, or "we want to bring democracy to Iran," or "we want to help women in Iran," or whatever.

The real explanation is that the Israel lobby put tremendous pressure on the president, and Israel itself put tremendous pressure on him too. The presence of many Christian Zionists in his entourage made this pressure much more effective than it was in the case of Obama or Biden, who are also

very pro-Israel—supporting, giving money, and all that. Under Biden, they were complicit in the genocide, but he didn't have Christian Zionists in the inner circle of the White House, whereas Trump was surrounded by them. And that's what made this war possible. Again, neither the American people nor American strategic interests are served by this war. In fact, one could say it undermines them.

## **#Nima**

In one part of your article, you mentioned that Iran remains the principal stronghold of resistance to Israel. Is that one of the main reasons Benjamin Netanyahu, or whoever is in power in Israel, is always talking about Iran—about bringing down the government and pushing for regime change there? Because who else would be resisting or going against Israel's concept for the whole Middle East? What is the agenda for the region? Do they really want, as you mentioned, the Arab states somehow cooperating with Israel? And if Iran is removed, who else is going to be supporting Palestinians, Gazans, and people in the West Bank?

This is one of the main questions for people living in the region, for the people I hear from. I mentioned before that I receive many messages from Kuwait and Bahrain. They're emailing me and talking—mostly Sunnis, not Shias—because Iran is a Shia Muslim country. They're Sunnis, and they're not suffering from any economic difficulties in their own countries, but they're sending emails saying they're not happy with the current situation or with their governments. What do you mean when you say Iran is the principal stronghold against Israel?

## **#Yakov**

Well, as I just mentioned, Iran has been supporting the Palestinian resistance through Syria, back when Syria wasn't headed by a former Al-Qaeda chief. Now, with Israeli and American help, you have Al-Qaeda heading the Syrian state. So, Syria, Yemen—as you know, the Houthis—and... It's important to understand that this division between Shia and Sunni may matter in some ways, but Iran was supporting Hamas, even though it's certainly not a Shia movement. It's a Sunni movement. I think it's a concept of justice. I return to the issue of justice. Yes, Iran has strategic interests; Iran is a political system. But there are also some moral and religious principles behind it. You may agree or disagree with them. Some people don't like the prohibition of alcohol in public places—well, that's fine.

But I'm just saying there's a kind of moral scruple—scruples, that's the word—and Iran may be the only country in the region that still has them. For Israel, it's important to eliminate this last significant state that supports Palestinian resistance. If they succeed in fragmenting and weakening Iran, then they'll rule supreme over all of West Asia. But Israel's expansionist nature is such that it might even go further and start conflicts with other countries, like Pakistan—though the fact that

Pakistan is a nuclear power perhaps brings the Israelis to their senses. Israel really wants to be a "super Sparta"—that's Netanyahu's term—alone if necessary, even without American support, because they know that support is fading. Still, Israel has been remarkably flexible in its ideology.

It was supported by the Soviet Union at the beginning, you know, with arms from Czechoslovakia and so on. Then it became an ally of the colonial powers, Britain and France. Then it became an ally of the United States and really developed an entire lobby there that amplifies Israeli influence in the U.S. But if things don't go well with the United States, Israel has very important connections with Russia, China, and India. So it may not be quite alone. I think Israeli strategic thinkers are quite good, and they don't want to put all their eggs in one basket. Maybe ten or twelve years ago, I wrote a couple of articles on Israel's relations with China and Russia. The reason I wrote them was that it was important to understand how Israel is cultivating these links in case things go badly with the United States.

## **#Nima**

But recently we've seen that Israel's government—Benjamin Netanyahu himself—is saying that China is the enemy. And we had Naftali Bennett saying that Turkey is the enemy, you know, one of Israel's worst enemies. The list just keeps growing, and the targets are getting bigger and bigger. And who's going to fight these wars? Because you have to understand, with the war in Ukraine going on for more than four years now, we know that a country like Ukraine going up against Russia—that's not a good idea.

But Israel's case is different because they have the United States on their side to fight for them. But then you go beyond Iran—you go to Turkey, Pakistan, then China. Talking about China, it doesn't seem that there's a unified understanding, even among the Zionists in Israel, about what the main goal is. Is this an endless war? And how capable is Israel of pursuing that sort of ideology? Yeah, you have to understand the physics—you have to understand that your body isn't capable of going that far.

## **#Yakov**

Well, I think what you're talking about is reliance on violence as a solution to political problems. You can resort to violence, or you can resort to negotiations, compromise, and so on. Israel has always relied on violence—from '47, before the state was established, when they started expelling Palestinians from their homes, and continuing through '48 and even '49. So there was no attempt to find a modus vivendi, a compromise. In the 1930s, the British authorities wanted to convene some kind of parliament in Palestine to implement their mandate, which had been given to them by the League of Nations—namely, to prepare Palestine for self-rule. One way of preparing was to have a representative assembly.

The Zionists were dead opposed to that. Why were they opposed? Because they were in the minority. Zionists were a minority in Palestine. Local Jews, and definitely local Muslims and Christians, were opposed to the Zionist cause. So, in such a representative assembly, the Zionist cause would have been defeated. They preferred violence over a political process, and they continued with violence in '48 when the state was unilaterally declared. And ever since, because the purpose is to preserve the apartheid structure of the state—to preserve what they call the Jewish state. And to do that, you have to eliminate all sources of resistance.

So they're trying to get rid of Hezbollah, of Hamas; they got rid of the Assad government, they got rid of the Saddam Hussein government, they got rid of the Libyan government of Muammar Gaddafi. And I'm saying "they" because these wars were benefiting Israel. There was no benefit for the United States from the war in Iraq. There was no benefit from the attack on Libya. There is no benefit—and a lot of loss—in the current war against Iran. But for the Zionists, it doesn't matter. What matters to them is preserving their ethnic nationalist supremacy in the country. And for that, they need to eliminate all resistance around them. So, you know, I would say that if, at some point, Brazil is going to support Palestinian resistance, Israelis will find a way to get to it.

## **#Nima**

And it's so good to understand that here in Brazil we have many Jewish communities, and most of them are supporting Palestinians. I think here comes the main question, because whenever they talk about Zionism, they try to link it with Judaism and with Jewish people. But I think it's beyond that. We have atheist Zionists, Christian Zionists, Jewish Zionists, even Muslim Zionists, I would argue. So how come they're so powerful—able to suppress all these people, Muslims, Jews, Christians—to silence them and to raise their own voice above everyone else, saying, for example, as Benjamin Netanyahu tries to do, that this is the only Jewish state on the planet, and therefore they can do whatever they want? No, they're suppressing many people. They're not allowing their voices to be heard. How have they been so successful in achieving that?

## **#Yakov**

Well, you're asking, how is the Zionist lobby so effective?

## **#Nima**

Yeah.

## **#Yakov**

Well, one thing—one kind of compliment I'd like to give to the Zionists—is that they're very committed. They're committed to supporting Israel not only with words, but with a tremendous

amount of resources. You know, when Israel realized that TikTok was publishing too many bloody scenes from Gaza, a Zionist in the United States just bought TikTok. And I think, for spare change, he's also buying CNN and CBS. So they're very committed. You shouldn't underestimate that commitment. And they have the resources to back it up.

I think they also know how to play the American political system, which really gives tremendous power to different lobbies—not only the Israel lobby, but, say, the National Rifle Association is also very powerful, and there are other lobbies too. So they play the system very well. As Netanyahu said—and I think I quoted him in this article, maybe not in the English version but definitely in the French and Spanish ones—a few years ago Netanyahu boasted, “I know America. I know how to manipulate it, to move it in the right direction.” And what we're observing today is exactly that.

Now, you're asking me why resistance to Zionist discourse and Zionist behavior is suppressed, or at least not as strong as it could have been. Well, there's one reason—a weapon I call a weapon of mass destruction. Not destruction, but *\*distraction.\** And that's the tactic of blaming critics of Israel as anti-Semites. Now, let's be clear. And here, as a professor of history, you have to endure a little bit of history. When Zionism was formulated as a political movement at the end of the 19th century, many Jews rejected it because what the Zionists were saying was very similar to what the anti-Semites were saying. They said, “You Jews don't belong here.”

“You belong—you're a distinct nation, and you belong in Palestine.” That's exactly what the anti-Semites were saying. And Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, wrote in his diary that anti-Semites would be their best friends and allies—and they have been throughout history. So it's important to understand that accusations of anti-Semitism serve largely to suppress free debate, and in the case of the United States, to undermine freedom of speech, which for Americans is extremely sensitive. That's another source of resentment against the Zionist lobby: they undermine not only foreign policy, but even internal policy in the United States.

At the same time, people who are enraged by what Israel does—like that Lebanese man who attacked the synagogue in Michigan a few days ago, or in Australia, or wherever—these people are actually helping Israel. And I know they're not very sophisticated; they can't distinguish between Jews and Zionists, particularly because Israel goes around the world saying, “We represent all the Jewry,” and many Jewish communities cooperate with that by putting up Israeli flags and slogans like “We stand by Israel.” Well, if you stand by Israel, there may be a fallout. But it's important, in this current wave of resentment against Israel that's building up in the United States and elsewhere, to avoid the trap of anti-Semitism—to avoid the trap of blaming Jews.

And the example I often give—and I think for audiences outside North America it's important—is that Jews have been very active in pro-Palestinian movements in the States and in Canada. I'm very proud that years ago I helped found Independent Jewish Voices, a Canadian organization that works

to clarify these issues and express solidarity with Palestinians. And, you know, an example I like to give is the election of Mamdani in New York. About one-third of the votes cast for him were Jewish. Some people say, well, it's because of his social program. In spite of—just a second.

## **#Yakov**

In spite of his anti-Zionism, I would say it's because of his anti-Zionism that Jews voted for him. So we're observing not only tremendous changes in West Asia; we're also observing, I think, very important changes in the political landscape in the United States—less so in Europe. But the United States is really the most important part of the equation, because the country has been dragged into a war it didn't want. It's the only war that didn't have popular support from the very beginning, and we don't know how it's going to turn out. It may end up bringing very drastic changes in American policy.

## **#Nima**

In what sense? Because we know there's been something going on with the presidential election. The outcome was Donald Trump, but we also know that Democrats have suffered because of their policies toward Israel. The progressive wing of the Democrats didn't vote for Kamala Harris because of her position on Israel. On the other hand, we've seen Donald Trump come in, with Tulsi Gabbard joining him, along with Tucker Carlson and others. Many in the anti-war community somehow voted for him because he said, "no more wars." And right now, there's a significant fracture happening within the Republican Party, which is considerable—nobody can ignore that. How do you see the outcome of what's going on with the war against Iran in the Middle East for the political parties in the United States, and for the future candidates in 2028?

## **#Yakov**

Well, I'm a professor of history, not a prophet. I can't tell what's going to happen in '28. But I'd like to put myself in the shoes of Israelis. If I observe that there's a defection of Charlie Kirk, a defection of Tucker Carlson, and others—solid supporters of Trump and solid supporters of Israel in the past—what would I do to achieve the political goals I mentioned earlier? Well, I'd try to eliminate, one way or another, those sources, particularly those with a large following. I might also try false-flag operations that would mobilize American opinion in favor of this war—something like a mini 9/11, some kind of terrorist act on U.S. soil, blamed on Iran, of course. Israelis are very good at that, and I wouldn't exclude it.

I think what President Trump has done is split the Republican Party against his own promises, as you mentioned. So for the Israelis, it's important to use the time that's left to achieve their goals. And if it takes a false-flag operation, if it takes a targeted assassination—which Israel is extremely good at—you know, if there's one thing they do really well, it's targeted assassinations. So I would use all these means to stem the tide against Israel that's rising in the United States and do as much

as possible to keep the United States in the war. Eventually, there will be a backlash. Eventually, there will be a breakdown of the Israel lobby in the United States. But in the meantime, use whatever you have to achieve your goals. That, I think, is the Israeli position. And whatever happens in 2028, we don't know—but I expect rather drastic changes.

## **#Nima**

Do you feel that the United States has so far achieved its goals in Iran—with the war in Iran—or that Israel has achieved some of its goals there?

## **#Yakov**

Israel is certainly achieving its goals. It's destroying Iran—that's the purpose. It's simple. It doesn't take much; it takes a lot of bombs and missiles, nothing else. I can't say whether the United States is achieving its goals, because it didn't really have any. You can't achieve a goal if you don't have one. They were all over the map: we want to change the regime, we want to help women, we want to prevent nuclear weapons—which weren't there. So this incoherent narrative from the United States shows there are no real goals, that the only goal is somehow to please the Israel lobby. And again, as Joe Kent said in his interview, perhaps even threats on the life of the president—I don't know. He was the head of an anti-terrorism group; he knows a lot more than I do. I'm just quoting him.

## **#Nima**

Before wrapping up, Yakov, this is interesting. Let me bring up your recent book, which was published in February this year, 2026. Let's talk a little about it—your new book, *\*Zionism Decoded in 101 Quotes.\** What's the concept of this book, and what are you trying to convey? I know it's available on Amazon—you can buy it there. Go ahead, Yakov.

## **#Yakov**

Yeah, well, since you're talking about my recent books, there's another one that was published a few months earlier. It's called *\*Israel in Palestine: The Jewish Rejection of Zionism,\** and it's also available on Amazon. Now, the book I just mentioned, *\*Israel in Palestine,\** is a shorter, updated version of my earlier book on Jewish opposition to Zionism, which explains the subject in detail. These two recent books are quite short—it won't take much time to read them. The book you're asking about, *\*101 Quotes About Zionism,\** is a compilation of quotes from supporters and ideologists of Zionism, as well as from its opponents, to show what that political movement really is.

Because Zionism, as I keep repeating, is the main source of violence in West Asia. It's the main source of undermining both foreign and internal policies in the United States. It's really Zionism, not anything else. So Zionism is illustrated with my comments, obviously, in the book—and it's a short

book—where I show, for example, a quote from Jabotinsky. Jabotinsky was a Russian Jew from Odessa, a very talented writer in Russian, who embraced the Zionist cause at the beginning of the 20th century and became the ideologue of the movement that Prime Minister Netanyahu is now heading. What is today Likud—well, they changed names, it's a long history—but the founder is Jabotinsky, and I'm sure Jabotinsky's picture is somewhere on the wall in the prime minister's office in Jerusalem.

So what did Jabotinsky say in 1910? Of course, I can't quote it literally, so people can look up my article where I cite it, or check the book. But his main point was this: some people, he says, believe that a nation or group that has suffered so much in history would show mercy and compassion toward others and not oppress them. "This is childish humanism," says Jabotinsky. "Now the rules of the game are different." And what we see is that Israel has been behaving like that—without mercy, without compassion. You hear exactly those same words from officials in the United States. Pete Saiget said, "We'll show no mercy." Steve Miller, one of the insiders in the White House, said the rule is run by force and power. And President Trump said, "I don't need international law."

I'll be guided by my own morality. So what you see are the consequences that dovetail with that old speech, or that old article, that Jabotinsky wrote in 1910. For some people—and there are quite a few of them—who say, well, Netanyahu, Smotrich, Ben-Gurion, they've hijacked Zionism, they've hijacked Israeli society, they're moving in the wrong direction. My book shows that they didn't do anything of the sort. They embody the political tendencies that are inherent in the Zionist movement as an ethnic nationalist movement. Again, ethnic nationalism has very pronounced fascist tendencies, and you can see that in the history of the Baltic republics and of Poland between the two wars in the 20th century.

They're very strong in their pro-fascist tendencies because it's all based on ethnic nationalism—meaning, this state belongs to my nation, and whoever happens to be there and doesn't belong, well, too bad for them. Either they're discriminated against or, in the worst cases, killed. Of course, the Nazi genocide during the Second World War was the ultimate expression of ethnic nationalism. And the genocide in Gaza—much milder than the genocide during the Second World War—also has its roots in the same ethnic nationalism of Central and Eastern Europe. Unfortunately, it's still a very powerful movement in Europe and in Israel. But it doesn't fit at all in areas with mixed populations, where you have many confessions and many ethnic groups, as Palestine has always been—and Eastern Europe as well.

You know, Eastern Europe was home to different groups—Jewish, German, Polish, Lithuanian. As a result of the Second World War, with tremendous violence and millions of lives sacrificed, many of those states became more homogeneous. Poland became more homogeneous. Most Jews were killed, and others were expelled in 1968. Germans were expelled right after the Second World War. So it became more or less a Polish state, with very few minorities left in it. But look at the means it

took to create this “pure,” in quotation marks, state. The idea of pure states—of purity of the nation—is one of the most dangerous ideas that Europe has produced in its history. So that’s my take. That’s my answer to your question.

**#Nima**

Yeah, thank you so much for being with us today, Yakov. A great pleasure, as always.

**#Yakov**

Well, it's a pleasure to talk with you, but I do hope that one day we'll have a chance to talk about more pleasant subjects.

**#Nima**

Exactly, exactly. See you soon. Bye-bye. Have a great day. Bye.