

In a court room, Kamala's pleadings for Palestinians would come across as ignorant. Why did they get applause at the convention?

By Lev Tsitrin

I did not hear the entirety of Kamala Harris's nomination speech – the weather was beautiful, and I went for a walk. But as I came back, this heartfelt plea greeted me from the radio: "President Biden and I are working to end this war such that Israel is secure, the hostages are released, the suffering in Gaza ends, and the Palestinian people can realize their right to dignity. Security. Freedom. And self-determination."

As California's former AG, Harris is well-trained in the art of rhetoric. But how about the substance? After all, lawyers plead for the criminals just as eloquently as for their victims. Its just business for them, nothing personal.

But shouldn't it be different when the price is presidency? In that situation, shouldn't the candidate's promises come from the heart?

If so, Kamala pleaded for the Palestinians without any knowledge of the facts of their case. In Gaza, "the Palestinian people *indeed had* dignity. Security. Freedom. And self-determination" after Israel's unilateral withdrawal in 2005; the only question was, how they would use them. All of us – but somehow not Kamala – know the answer: Palestinians used their "dignity. Security. Freedom. And self-determination" to build terror tunnels, to train a terrorist army, to rocket Israel in a war after a war, their efforts to

destroy Israel culminating on October 7. Nor, apparently, does Kamala know that 95% of the West Bank Palestinians likewise have “dignity. Security. Freedom. And self-determination” since they are ruled by the Palestinian Authority – yet the West Bank Palestinians are every bit as radicalized, their views being formed by Israel-hating PA textbooks and media, by glorification of terrorism via huge posters of the dead terrorists, by encouraging terrorism via the “pay for slay” funding of terrorists’ would-be imitators.

But if Kamala is an ignoramus, and does not know that the Palestinian definition of the self-evidently natural for them focus for their “right to dignity. Security. Freedom. And self-determination” is the destruction of Israel, two questions arise – one about her past as an AG (in the court room, did she ignorantly champion the guilty at the expense of the innocent?) – and the other one, about her ambitions for the presidential future. It is very hard to believe that she will be an Israel supporter. Her sympathies, so clearly expressed in her acceptance speech, are with the perpetrators, not the victims. And the thunderous applause she received shows that her oration (or rather, demagoguery) fell on fertile soil – that when it comes to the Middle East, the Democrats are on a completely wrong, anti-Israel track since given Palestinians ambitions, being “pro-Palestinian” is of necessity being “anti-Israel.” It is a zero-sum game – it is that simple.

Alternatively, Kamala shilled for the Palestinians while knowing full well that Palestinians are Hamas, that Palestinians are PA – in other words, that they are guilty as sin – because her experience as (of necessity cynical) lawyer makes her, as a politician, crave the anti-Israel, “uncommitted” votes, and if getting them means catering to those seeking Israel’s destruction, so be it. “Who pays the piper, orders the tune” – and the payment being votes that lead to presidency, she obliges.

The conclusion is simple –Kamala is either very ignorant, or very cynical – and willing to risk people’s lives to advance her career. Her speech made clear what will guide her policy towards Israel – not the facts, but political expediency.

This is not good. So the question becomes, why take the risk, given that the anti-Israel voices are so shrill that Biden also has to bow down to them and acknowledge that they “have a point”? Isn’t it right to play it safe and elect someone who is not fooled by the lies, and does not bow to Israel-haters? Shouldn’t we vote for a person who did so much good (and as importantly, right) for Israel in his first term in office – acknowledged Jerusalem as Israel’s capital and moved there the US embassy, recognized Israel’s sovereignty of the Golan Heights, clarified that West Bank settlements are not illegal, and withdrew from Obama’s cursed Iran “deal” that gave the ayatollahs the legal right to work on a bomb in exchange for a mere 15-year hiatus in doing so? If Kamala’s speech had any effect, it was to prove that she is a cynical lawyer without any innate sense of right and wrong, but talks out of both corners of her mouth, and that to entrust her with presidency would be sheer madness.

After Kamala’s display of her ignorance, or of her cynicism at Democratic convention, one thing became crystal-clear. Trump should be leading the country going forward. There can be no question about it. Trump should be the next president.