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Dear Choate,

Welcome back. It’s fall, leaves are falling, sweaters are being donned, votes are being cast, and in the center of it all, our masthead and writers have been enthusiastically producing our first issue of the year. We are grateful that amid the excitement over Deerfield Day and finals weeks, you felt compelled to flip through this issue and engage, consciously or not, in the most core value of a free society: civil discourse.

We attend a school that proclaims the importance of articulation. Our teachers ask us to present our ideas for scrutiny, and when scrutiny is what we receive we defend those ideas with zeal. There are few skills that serve a Choate student better than knowing what they think. This publication acts as a kind of edifice to that. We are proud to showcase well formulated and carefully crafted arguments, both because they are available for us to showcase, and that speaks well of our education, and because they are made respectfully and with a conscious attention for those that may disagree, and that speaks well of us.

Public discourse is the single most effective tool to hold our systems of power accountable. The circulation of information lets us pick through all the white noise that comes with a complicated culture and find both injustices and sources of pride. When we have spaces to debate, and then necessarily evolve, the mechanisms by which we make policy, educate each other, and otherwise formulate our world, evolve with us. Conversation is the best mechanism to promote a more perfect society.

The Choate Administration has, in published statements, promised to promote "inquiring and respectful discourse, made richer by the different experiences around us,” but tolerance and the free exchange of ideas are core values that not only Choate but all of our nation's academic institutions are built upon. In the wake of alarming political polarization, many esteemed academic institutions across the country have given up on these ideals at their greatest moments of trial. We maintain a steadfast commitment to furthering ideological diversity within our community. We champion open debate and oppose social ostracism. We have no political affiliation or motive besides fostering the democratic tenets that Choate was founded upon.

This is the inaugural issue of our new masthead, the first year of the publication without its founders Finn McGaan and Brooke Edwards. We have spent a lot of time thinking over what we want our version of this publication to be. The form will always remain pro/con op-ed pieces, but every new generation builds on the philosophy of the journal. We want to take care to promote argumentation as a collaborative process. Our pieces aren’t the only two opinions on any of the issues, and we are not asking you to choose one or the other; there will be no winners or losers. We want you to read these pieces with the intention of incorporating parts of them into your own perspective. Maybe certain lines resonate and others don’t, remember the ones that do, and use them to scrapbook together your position.

We are overjoyed to be running The Inquiry this year, and we hope you connect with at least some of what we’ve put together.

Sincerely,

Oona Yaffe (Editor-in-Chief)
Elia Ahmadi (Managing Editor)
Many countries around the world have adopted stringent gun control laws that have seen gun deaths plummet. The United States, however, watches its gun-related deaths climb. In 1996, a gun massacre in Australia resulted in a mandatory gun buyback. Before the buyback, a mass shooting happened about once every 18 months in Australia. There has been one mass shooting there in the last 26 years. (NYT). Britain banned all semi automatic weapons after one was used to kill 16 people in 1987, it followed with a ban on handguns after a 1996 school shooting, resulting in Britain now having one of the lowest rates of gun deaths in the world. (NYT). Canada, Germany, New Zealand and Norway have all enacted gun control laws with success. Of countries with populations of 10 million or more, the US ranks first in rate of firearm homicides with 4.12 per 100,000 people. Chile comes in second with 1.82 deaths, Canada third with 0.5 and Japan last with 0.02 deaths per 100,000 thousand. (Health data)

Research, studies and common sense confirm that when countries enact strong gun control laws, fewer people die of gun violence and mass shootings are drastically reduced. (NYT). The Gun Violence Archive defines a mass shooting as one where four people or more are killed or injured. Using this definition, as of October 14th of this year, there have been at least 531 mass shootings. (Gun Violence archive). Last year they tracked 692 mass shootings with 28 involving four or more fatalities.

While the United States has adopted some gun control legislation, the latest, enacted under the Biden administration this past June, doesn't go as far as gun control activist would like. Specifically, there is no ban on any type of guns or ammunition, policies that have been proven to reduce gun homicides enacted by other countries. What the bill does do is provide certain incentives to states to enact their own legislation to keep guns out of dangerous people's hands, protections for victims of domestic violence, addresses aspects of illegal gun purchases and trafficking and provides for more screening for those under 21 (Vox).

What is interesting is that according to the Pew Research Center, 64% of American adults support the bill while only 21% say they disapprove. That being said, most Americans, 78%, believe it will do little to reduce gun violence in the country. A 10-year assault weapons ban that was signed into law by President Bill Clinton expired in 2004 and despite studies, such as the one conducted by the Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery in 2019, that showed during the time the ban was in effect, there were fewer mass shooting deaths (CNBC). 

Facing the fact that last year, on average, there was a mass shooting once every thirteen days, where do gun control advocates go from here? There is broad support for more gun control according to the Pew Research Center, with approximately six-in-ten (63%) of Americans saying they would like to see additional legislation to protect against gun violence. Everytown, the largest gun violence prevention organization in America, calls itself “a movement of nearly 10 million mayors, teachers, survivors, gun owners, students and everyday Americans.” Its goals include keeping guns out of the wrong hands, disarming hate, keeping communities safe by repealing “Stand your Ground Laws” and prohibiting “Open Carry” laws and promoting stringent requirements for concealed carry permits. It also advocates for keeping guns out of schools, responsible gun ownership and changing laws that would ultimately hold the gun industry accountable for gun violence. Finally, it continues to fight for bans on assault weapons and dangerous hardware, such as bump stocks, conversion devices and high-capacity magazines.
The threat of technologically-advanced firearms has prompted renewed calls for restrictions on gun ownership. Gun control advocates often argue that those who oppose new firearm restrictions misinterpret the Second Amendment and have When analyzing the historical context and the data behind the gun violence crisis in the United States, it is clear that these proposals are fueled by misconceptions and would do little to reduce the threat guns pose to individuals in contemporary America.

Many advocates of increased gun-control legislation argue that the Constitutional right to bear arms is being heavily scrutinized and misinterpreted, according to the language of the second amendment, which allows for a "well-regulated militia." Gun-control proponents use this text to assert that the Constitution permits heavy restrictions on which weapons might be afforded to that militia. Through a historical lens, it is apparent that such a reading is incorrect. While in the 21st century, we interpret the words "well-regulated" to mean subject to control or restriction, the 18th-century meaning of the phrase differs.

The present-day interpretation of the Second Amendment -- an individual's right to bear arms -- is misunderstood and meant to apply exclusively to state militias. When analyzing the history behind the Second Amendment, it is clear that such an interpretation is false. In the context of the period, well-regulated was used to refer to the functionality and efficiency of systems or groups. For example, an appropriate use of the phrase "well-regulated" in the 18th century would refer to a piece of machinery as "well-regulated" if it had no deficiencies or problems.

Many gun control advocates argue that implementing a ban on certain types of firearms (most often rifles) is an acceptable constraint, for it would still allow the general populace to purchase firearms deemed less of a threat (such as handguns). However, according to the FBI, it would have a minuscule effect on gun violence in the country. A common argument for an "expansion" of gun control is that the right to bear arms would not be inhibited entirely but, instead, be limited to a select group of weapons deemed less lethal (i.e., handguns). If gun-control advocates' primary mission is to prevent death, such a measure would be largely ineffective. According to the FBI's 2019 report on homicides, of all homicides in the United States in which the type of gun is known, handguns account for 91.8% of them.

In contrast, rifles account for a mere 5.2% of all homicides. Assuming that criminalizing the ownership of certain firearms would result in all deaths from said firearms dropping to zero, this would have zero impact on 91.8% of gun deaths in the U.S. -- and this assumption does not account for instances in which rifles are used for self-defense. The firearms that are most cited as acceptable to outlaw would have a minute effect on gun violence. If gun control proponents propose laws that are most effective at reducing the amount of life lost, the most ineffectual and least-deadly weapons would have to be outlawed. In other words, all guns would have to be illegal to impact the firearm homicide rate within the United States. For some, preventing death is enough to justify such a radical ban.

The bottom line of the gun debate in the United States is that all technical arguments about the ostensible validity of gun control measures are irrelevant because the right of the people to bear arms is exactly that -- a right. The burden of proof does not fall upon gun owners because people's right to arm themselves is not conferred conditionally, but rather, in the words of the framers of the Constitution, an unalienable right.
Because the evidence demonstrates that the most ineffective guns cause the most deaths, the debate is not "which guns ought we regulate?" but "ought we allow guns at all?" Nobody denies the tragedy that gun homicides inflict upon victims of gun violence and their families. Given the relative unlikelihood for the average American to be a victim of homicide, such infringement upon an unconditional right of Americans is not justified. The horrific actions of the few do not warrant stripping many of their rights. The fundamental liberties guaranteed to Americans via the Constitution come with their respective costs – exercising obscene and hateful speech compels people to commit hate crimes, yet the First Amendment remains a lynchpin of freedom that cannot be forsaken. The same logic applies to the Second Amendment, for all the cost that the freedom to bear arms brings; it is a liberty that Americans can not, should not, and must not sacrifice if they so cherish all other freedoms afforded to them.
The reality is that Choate’s current policies regarding sexual education and intimacy are not student-centric. In fact, at an extreme, one could argue that these policies are actually detrimental to the sexual development and, by extension, the emotional development of students and actively promote an environment where students are more likely to have negative sexual experiences. The connection between teenagers and sex is something that can’t be avoided, prevented, or ignored. Despite Choate’s stringent regulation of private spaces, the reality is that such policies have done nothing to curb sex on campus. What these policies do create, however, is the perfect environment for uncomfortable and potentially damaging sexual experiences, which are often times students’ first and most important experiences. So why are our policies designed in such a way? Fear. Fear of the negative consequences of sexual intimacy, namely pregnancy and sexual assault. But this fear isn’t for the students, it’s for the school itself, which can be seen clearly in Choate’s current policy. Firstly, Choate openly discourages any and all sexual relations while somewhat paradoxically offering students easy and confidential access to various forms of contraception. Secondly, Choate has implemented yearly seminars on the legal aspects of sexual assault, which seem strangely geared towards avoiding legal action rather than protecting students.

So how can Choate move towards a more student-centric sexual development policy; how can Choate regulate something which it cannot prevent? Education. Choate’s current handling of sex education feels like cramming for a final the night before; none of the information is retained for more than a week, and details slip right through the cracks. It seems to be not a preventative measure but a performative one. During my time at Choate, I’ve met an unsetting amount of people who don’t even understand their own biology. I feel I was fortunate enough to receive an unusually robust sexual education in middle school, but my personal experience is in the minority. The school only loses by choosing deterrence over education.

Choate’s current policy is to sweep sexual intimacy under the rug, based on the assumption that because it’s officially discouraged, it doesn’t happen.

While Choate as an institution prides itself on being a college ‘preparatory’ school, it prepares its students for college very selectively. It certainly does prepare students for a higher education workload and to function separately from their parental figures. But in many ways, it doesn’t prepare students for the freedoms that come with the transition to college. This is unfortunate, as I feel Choate is in the perfect position to do such a thing, being a completely controlled micro-community. With a greater focus on emotional and sexual education over academic education, Choate could cultivate an environment that promotes a high level of emotional intelligence as well as academic intelligence, affording students a more powerful foundation to build the rest of their lives.

In response to the second part of this prompt, I’m not fully sure what is meant by explicitly in this context, and furthermore, I don’t like its use here, regardless, as it adds an immediately negative connotation to the question. Secondly, it’s difficult to ‘increase’ the explicitly taught when there isn’t anything being taught to begin with. It’s like multiplying something by zero. So I’ll answer what I perceive this question is attempting to get at: What should and shouldn’t be taught if Choate implemented required Sex Ed? Fundamentally, I believe that students should leave high school with a comprehensive understanding of human reproductive biology. However, I also believe that this kind of class shouldn’t be taught in a dry, purely scientific manner either. The reality is that sex and emotion are inseparably linked, and to talk about sex in a purely biological light wouldn’t be doing it justice. There is a degree of baseline objective knowledge that should be taught in any sex ed class, but really, sexual education
should be more about having uncomfortable conversations. The reality is we as humans are terrible communicators when we're uncomfortable or don't fully understand something, which is exactly why we need to spend time talking through the discomfort. Yes, it’s a problem that there are kids at this school who don’t understand what’s going on inside their own bodies, but it’s the fact that most of us can’t talk about sex without laughing, cracking a joke, or cringing a little bit that’s the real issue here.

It’s less so that we need an explicit sex education class and more that we need a kind of life education class. My biggest issue with Sex-Ed is how it often fails to acknowledge the full complexity of the subject and instead brakes it down to its most basic parts. I think students need a personal education class, a class where they can learn the internal and interpersonal skills they need to function at their highest capacity. While Choate students might be able to care for their academic needs, they also need to be able to care for themselves in order to use the skills they’ve learned at Choate to their fullest capacity, and it’s fully within Choate’s power to endow its students with such knowledge.
To be clear, it’s not Choate’s responsibility to require sex education in the first place; thus, its explicitness should also not be increased. It’s not up to Choate — or any education system for that matter, to decide what to teach children, especially if their parents or home life have different opinions. When parents or guardians allow their children to leave home, in the case of boarding students, or join a more international and diverse community for day students, they are taking a significant risk in leaving a lot of learning up to Choate; not only classroom and academic learning but socio-emotional learning as well. By having Choate teach such a sensitive and deep subject matter such as sexual education, particularly at such a pivotal age, parents are unable to consent when they may disapprove of the content, whether for religious reasons or otherwise. They aren’t present or informed of the curriculum — parents still deserve to know and make decisions regarding their child’s education, especially if they are still minors. Choate should not ‘replace’ parents and guardians in this sense: Choate has no right to judge whether or not parents have or plan to teach their children certain things regarding their sexual health and relationships, and thus should not feel the need to fill that gap if it exists. Choate has no right to certify that they must teach sexual education simply because students’ home life doesn’t; that’s not up for them to decide.

Secondly, if Choate were to teach these classes without a specific course guideline that would be shared with families, they would never know the breadth and scope of the course, let alone understand how graphic or explicit it is. Potential outcomes or expectations are never a true indication of how any course is taught or may be presenting itself, let alone what is being taught.

Furthermore, unless these courses are being taught by genuine professionals who are experts in their field, the job would have to be delegated to teachers, who aren’t necessarily equipped to teach it accurately. Not to mention it’s simply awkward and uncomfortable for a student to have a teacher who used to teach them U.S. History now teach them bodily autonomy.

Sexual education classes in general, when left up to schools such as Choate, are taught with a degree of explicitness that isn’t necessarily suitable for all students there. For example, while some students are mature enough to hold conversations at that level with a certain base of knowledge, others will inevitably be more immature. This immaturity may not just be laughing at a topic and not taking it seriously; some may not even be psychologically or physically prepared to analyze sexual education, which encapsulates a wide variety of topics. Specifically, suppose Choate decides to teach these classes to students of all genders and sexual orientations. In that case, it may be uncomfortable for some students to be forced to learn about bodily autonomy different from their own in the presence of those who identify that way - which goes both ways. Furthermore, sexual education classes involve a whole lot more than forms of birth control and labeling diagrams; schools in general send the incorrect message when lessons focus more on how to ‘do it’ and hide it rather than overall comprehension of love and respect for one another, which should be left up to families, not up to Choate.

Additionally, students of different faiths would continuously be undermined in these scenarios of required classes, especially if the content goes against their beliefs. While an exemption for those reasons would certainly be feasible, it ostracizes those few students who would go against the norm simply for their religion. Many Catholic and Christian faiths have long taught their children and families that pre-marital sex is wrong, and should not be pursued. Point-blank, it is morally wrong that students would be required to sit in a class where an authority figure, whom they are supposed to respect, preaches about a topic that contradicts their beliefs.
These lessons seldom focus on the possibility of saying ‘no’ to certain aspects of sexual relationships. Giving students the option to follow what feels best for them and leaving it inherently ambiguous because places like Choate don’t want to enforce certain sayings in turn sends the message to the student body that there are no standards to go by whatsoever.

Ultimately, it’s not Choate’s responsibility to replace the role of families or guardians by teaching students about sexual education and increasing its explicitness, which may not be in the best interest of all students at Choate.
If the U.S. stopped providing military funding to Israel, it would result in the loss of Israel as an innovator in business and technology, destabilize the delicate peace that currently exists in the Middle East, and put Israel's very existence at risk.

A February 2022 Congressional Report stated that almost all current U.S. aid to Israel is in the form of military assistance. It cited the strong bilateral relationship between Israel and the United States, which is based on a number of factors, including robust domestic U.S. support for Israel and its security; shared strategic goals in the Middle East; a mutual commitment to democratic values; and historical ties dating from U.S. support for the creation of Israel in 1948.

Israel is under constant threat from both terrorist groups such as Hamas, an internationally recognized terrorist group in Gaza, and its neighboring countries – Iran, Syria, Lebanon, and others. Of the 20 countries in the Middle East, only 4 recognize Israel. Israel is a country with a land mass smaller than Massachusetts and a population of approximately 9M people. By comparison, Egypt’s population is 111M, Iran’s is 88M, Iraq’s is 44.5M, Saudi Arabia’s is 36.5M, and Syria’s is 22M. There are also approximately 4.5M Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. Without a technically advanced and well supplied military, Israel would be wiped off the map. Israel uses U.S. military funding to keep itself safe, mainly through purchasing and developing weapons and the Iron Dome missile defense system.

The Iron Dome is a missile defense system that Israel developed in part with U.S. aid. Israel then shared this Iron Dome technology with the U.S. Iron Dome is integral to the survival of Israel. This past August, Hamas launched 1,100 rockets into populated areas of Israeli cities from Gaza, in southern Israel.

Iron Dome was able to greatly limit civilian casualties by shooting down many of these missiles before they reached their intended targets.

The threat from Hamas and other terrorist organizations is ever-present, so Iron Dome is crucial to Israel’s safety. Without U.S. funding, Iron Dome would not have been possible, and millions in the region would have died, both Israelis and Palestinians. Considering that one of Hamas’s stated goals is to kill all Jews across the globe, every Jew could then be subject to genocide. Recognizing this, the U.S. House approved another $1B in funding for Iron Dome after the August conflict. Bill H.R. 5323 has yet to be voted on by the Senate.

U.S. funding also allows for innovation in technology, one of Israel’s biggest strengths and primary exports. U.S. funding has allowed Israel to become one of the world’s leaders in inventing new technology. According to the Startup Blink Global Ecosystem Report 2022, Israel is the 4th best country for startups, and Tel Aviv, Israel’s economic capital, produces the second most technology start-up companies in the world behind only Silicon Valley. Technological strides have not only been made in military applications. Google’s Waze App that provides directions and fastest routes when driving was originally developed in Israel by Waze Mobile, a company founded by Israeli entrepreneurs Ehud Shabtai, Amir Shinar, and Uri Levine. The technologies developed in Israel have helped expand the free flow of travel and trade between Middle Eastern countries to a record high point. This trade has led Israel to become a partner in trade globally, and in 2019 Israeli exports were valued at $17.44B. Israel sold about $14.1B worth of exports to the USA in 2020 and continues to be a partner to the U.S. in technology and innovation. By providing aid to Israel, the U.S. has helped to limit Israel’s need for aid –
Israel stopped receiving any significant non-military economic assistance from the U.S. in 2007.

U.S. support of Israel has also helped to foster agreements between Israel and its neighboring countries that would not have been impossible even a decade ago. U.S. influence forces countries to the negotiating table, and allows for multilateral discussion with a superpower instead of negotiating with Israel alone. Two big recent deals between Israel and neighboring countries, the Abraham Accords, and the Maritime Deal with Lebanon, were brokered by the U.S. In September 2020, Israel and the United Arab Emirates entered into the Abraham Accords in which the UAE and Bahrain recognized Israel’s sovereignty enabling full diplomatic relations. This agreement marked the first instance of Arab-Israel normalization since 1994. The Maritime Deal was a demarcation deal settling an offshore border dispute between Israel and Lebanon in the Mediterranean Sea, allowing both countries to exploit the natural gas fields in the area. More recently, Saudi Arabia opened its airspace to some international flights to and from Israel, as relations continue to build. These treaties are significant, and promote peace in the Middle East. Israel and the PLO signed the Oslo Accords in 1993 and 1995, and these agreements gave the West Bank and Gaza a right to self governance. However, since then the situation with the Palestinians has deteriorated, and Hamas is now governing Gaza. Hamas will never be a partner for peace with Israel, and Israel has become the only side truly pushing for peace in recent years. While Israel has pushed for lasting peace in some form five separate times with the Palestinians, each offer has been rejected. The reality is that peace will not be possible so long as the Palestinians seek the eradication of Israel.

Additionally, Israel is the only country in the Middle East that shares America’s democratic ideals. Israel is a democracy in a region in which theocracies or dictatorships predominate. Israel ensures rights for its LGBTQ+ citizens, is incredibly eco-friendly, and has progressive gender laws. U.S. funding, vital to insuring Israel's existence, in turn helps promote and expand American values abroad, particularly in a region where rights for women and LGBTQ+ people are virtually nonexistent. Israel guarantees equal rights for its Arab citizens, and an Arab political party, Ra’Am, entered the Israeli government in 2021. Israel is incredibly useful to the U.S. as an ally, and Israel’s proximity to Iran and other countries hostile to the United States, is strategically significant. Further, by supplying help to Israel, the U.S. has strengthened its position against Iran, as Israel has likely taken action to prevent Iran from achieving nuclear capabilities, which could threaten the safety of America and its Western allies globally. By helping to ensure Israel’s existence through military aid, the United States advances our interests and promotes our values in the Middle East.

Since its founding in 1948, Israel has fought in eight wars with neighboring Arab countries, and is today still surrounded by countries that want to eradicate the Jewish State. Couple this with the ongoing Palestinian conflict which has led to two intifadas to date, and it is not hard to see that without support from the U.S, Israel would be wiped off the map. Military funding from the U.S. must continue in order to protect the Israeli people, keep a strong ally of the United States in the Middle East, aid the world through technological progress, promote democracy in the region, prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions from coming to fruition, and avoid conflict in the region which could lead to war. The world is safer because the U.S. supports Israel.
Many of those in support of US aid argue that Israel is a strategic ally for the United States, and sending aid strengthens US influence in the Middle East. I completely agree, and if I was solely concerned with what’s best for the United States, I would support aid to Israel without hesitation. But I am not only concerned with the United States. Continued US aid does not help Israel nor the Palestinian people.

The typical argument against US aid to Israel is that the United States shouldn’t send money to a country committing human rights violations—yet this is not the point I will make in this response. I can move my finger down the list of countries receiving the most US aid (Afghanistan, Israel, Jordan, Egypt, etc.) and point out similar human rights violations in each one of them. Specifically cutting aid to Israel because of such violations reveals an antisemitic double standard, unless you also propose cutting aid the others.

Yet I still argue against aid, for the very same reason many argue for it: the more aid sent, the more Israel is reliant upon the United States, and the more the United States gets to dictate Israeli policy. Aid creates a relationship of dependence rather than one of a mutually beneficial partnership. This is a bad thing for Palestinians and Israelis, mainly because the United States has very little incentive to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Seventy-four percent of US aid must be used by Israel to buy US military equipment and services, which means that the US makes money when Israel needs weapons and defense—the more conflict, the more need. Also, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is part of the larger Saudi-Iranian proxy conflict, in which the US has a large stake—the US worries that if the Israeli-Palestinian conflict ends, Israel could become friendlier with Russia and less indebted to the US. Ending the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is fundamentally against US foreign policy interests, and therefore as long as the United States keeps sending this much aid to Israel, the conflict will not end. I shouldn’t have to explain why this is a bad thing, for both Israelis and Palestinians. Trump’s Israeli-Palestinian Peace Plan failed so miserably because the officials who drafted it didn’t have a good incentive to actually make it work.

Furthermore, the United States does not see eye to eye with those in Israel or Palestine about how exactly the conflict should be resolved. The United States is still fixated on a two-state solution that the majority of both Israelis and Palestinians consider “dead.” It is as if we are still in the age of colonialism: a Western power drawing borders between two indigenous peoples at war. We need to let those who actually live in Israel-Palestine decide its fate. US aid to Israel prevents the two sides from forming a native solution.

Also, Israel no longer needs the United States. Initially, US support was vital to Israel’s existence, economically and militarily, but now Israel is a high-tech economic superpower that, if slowly weaned off US aid, could easily support itself. Replacing the $3.3 billion in US aid would cost each Israeli less than 1% of their yearly income.

Many will protest that Israel needs the United States diplomatically, and that the retraction of aid will also signal the retraction of this non-financial support. They will cite the Abraham Accords, where the United States brokered official peace between Israel and many Arab countries, or the numerous times the US has voted against anti-Israel resolutions in the United Nations. But the sheer amount of UN resolutions leveled against Israel has already made it numb to such attacks, and Israel has been strategically collaborating with Arab countries for years—unofficially, of course.

Those who predict Israel’s demise upon the retraction of US aid have been swept up in an American propaganda machine. US aid to Israel benefits one party only: the United States.