

The People of Israel: A Comprehensive Rebuttal to Antisemitic Narratives of
Illegitimacy and Conspiracy

By Daniel Fry

10/1/25

Preface

This paper is not a political manifesto but an evidence-based response to recurring antisemitic narratives that undermine historical truth, human dignity, and the principle of self-determination. It aims to serve scholars, educators, policymakers, and civil society leaders as a reference resource against misinformation and delegitimization campaigns targeting the Jewish people and the State of Israel.

Purpose

This paper systematically dismantles three pillars of modern antisemitic narratives: denial of Jewish genetic continuity, denial of Jewish peoplehood (*Am Yisrael*), and the myth of a global Jewish conspiracy embodied in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* — by presenting overwhelming historical, scientific, legal, and textual evidence.

Key Findings

1. Genetic Continuity:

Modern population genetics provides conclusive evidence that contemporary Jewish communities share significant ancestral ties with the ancient Israelites and Levantine populations. These findings confirm one of the oldest continuous ethno-national connections to a homeland in recorded history and directly refute claims that Jews are “colonial interlopers” without historical roots in the land of Israel

2. Peoplehood Beyond Biology (*Am Yisrael*):

Jewish identity has never been defined solely by bloodline but by covenant, culture, law, shared memory, and destiny. Conversion confers full membership in the Jewish people, and this covenantal identity underpins both historical continuity and the modern right to self-determination — recognized in international law from the 1922 League of Nations Mandate to UN Resolutions 181 (1947) and 273 (1949)

3. *The Protocols* as Weaponized Disinformation:

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, a proven Tsarist-era forgery plagiarized from a 19th-century satire, remains a foundational myth for conspiracy theories that portray Jews as a

global cabal. Despite being repeatedly debunked — including by the U.S. Congress (1921, 1942, 1964) — its narrative persists, fueling antisemitism, political violence, and extremist ideology

Strategic Implications

- **Historical Legitimacy:** The Jewish claim to the land of Israel is rooted in continuous historical presence, documented ancestral lineage, covenantal identity, and binding international legal recognition.
 - **Modern Sovereignty:** Israel's existence is not an anomaly or colonial project but the legitimate reconstitution of a people's national home, a right explicitly recognized under international law and consistent with the principle of self-determination.
 - **Information Warfare Threat:** Persistent myths like *The Protocols* reveal how disinformation can outlive its debunking, shape ideologies, and destabilize societies. Combating these narratives requires not censorship but rigorous historical education, critical inquiry, and intellectual resilience.
-

Conclusion

Antisemitic myths crumble under the weight of empirical evidence. The Jewish people's genetic, cultural, legal, and covenantal ties to their ancestral homeland are among the most well-documented in human history. Exposing and dismantling falsehoods like *The Protocols* is not merely an academic exercise — it is a vital defense of historical truth, democratic society, and the principle that no people should have their legitimacy erased by hatred and lies.

The People of Israel: A Comprehensive Rebuttal to Antisemitic Narratives of Illegitimacy and Conspiracy

Antisemitism is defined by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) as “a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews.” It is experiencing a documented resurgence across Western societies and beyond.¹ In the United States, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) reported a 361% increase in antisemitic incidents on college campuses from 2022 to 2023, with 8,873 incidents nationwide, the highest number recorded since tracking began in 1979.² Similar trends are reflected in government data: the FBI’s most recent hate crime statistics show that over 60% of all religiously motivated hate crimes in the U.S. target Jews, despite Jews comprising less than 2% of the population.³

This dramatic rise is not simply a matter of prejudice or social hostility; it is increasingly being weaponized as a form of information warfare, where disinformation, conspiracy narratives, and historical distortions are deployed to erode public trust, delegitimize democratic institutions, and target Jewish communities. As historian Richard Evans notes, “antisemitism in the twenty-first century has evolved from crude hatred into a sophisticated narrative weapon, blending old myths with new political agendas.”⁴ These dynamics demonstrate that antisemitism is not merely a vestige of the past but an adaptive ideology, one that continues to metastasize and influence public discourse, policy debates, and social movements. This paper addresses that challenge by examining three examples of contemporary antisemitic rhetoric and providing evidence-based refutations: (1) the question of Jewish genetic continuity with ancient Israelites; (2) the enduring identity of Am Yisrael, the Jewish people as both faith and nation; and (3) the use of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* as a foundational myth of modern antisemitic conspiracy thinking.

¹ International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA). *Working Definition of Antisemitism*. Adopted May 26, 2016. <https://holocaustremembrance.com/antisemitism/working-definition-antisemitism>.

² Anti-Defamation League. *Audit of Antisemitic Incidents 2023*. New York: ADL, 2024. <https://www.adl.org/resources/report/audit-antisemitic-incidents-2023>.

³ Federal Bureau of Investigation. *Hate Crime Statistics, 2023*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, 2024. <https://cde.ucr.cjis.gov>.

⁴ Evans, Richard J. *The Third Reich in History and Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, 89.

Antisemitism is not an episodic prejudice but a recurring historical pattern, visible in nearly every era. From the Babylonian exile in 586 BCE to the massacres of the Crusades, from the expulsions of medieval Spain and England to the Holocaust that claimed six million Jewish lives, Jews have faced systematic persecution across continents and centuries. As historian Solomon Grayzel notes, “the Jew in exile lived from century to century in a state of uncertainty, always vulnerable to sudden attack or expulsion.”⁵ Léon Poliakov’s comprehensive survey concludes that “antisemitism has no parallel in the history of other peoples: it is at once more ancient, more continuous, and more obsessive.”⁶ This paper does not attempt to recount the entire history of antisemitism. Instead, it focuses on three recurring arguments that continue to animate antisemitic narratives today: the denial of Jewish genetic continuity, the denial of Jewish peoplehood (*Am Yisrael*), and the persistent influence of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. By addressing these three claims with historical, genetic, legal, and textual evidence, we expose the mechanisms of antisemitic disinformation and demonstrate why it remains urgent to confront them.

Jewish Genetic Continuity

One of the most enduring features of antisemitic thought — from medieval polemics to contemporary propaganda — is the attempt to deny, diminish, or delegitimize the identity, continuity, and legitimacy of the Jewish people. These attacks typically fall into three recurring categories: the claim that modern Jews are not genetically or historically descended from the ancient Israelites; the claim that Judaism is merely a religion and not a people, thereby stripping Jews of collective national rights; and the claim, rooted in fabricated texts like *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, that Jewish influence is the product of a clandestine global conspiracy. As historian Gavin Langmuir observes, “Antisemitism thrives on essentialist denials of Jewish history, Jewish nationhood, and Jewish legitimacy because to admit those realities would undermine the myths on which hatred depends.”⁷ David Nirenberg similarly notes that antisemitic discourse “has always targeted the very idea of Jewish peoplehood as a threat, portraying Jews as rootless, inauthentic, or conspiratorial precisely because their continuity

⁵ Grayzel, Solomon. *A History of the Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1947, 212.

⁶ Poliakov, Léon. *The History of Anti-Semitism*. Vols. 1–4. New York: Schocken Books, 2003

⁷ Langmuir, Gavin I. *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990, 306.

defies historical attempts to erase them.”⁸ These three themes continue to structure antisemitic narratives in the twenty-first century and therefore form the foundation of this paper’s response. By examining and rebutting them in turn through genetic, historical, theological, and documentary evidence, we aim to dismantle the ideological scaffolding upon which modern antisemitism rests.

Modern genetic research has confirmed that contemporary Jewish communities share significant ancestral continuity with the ancient Israelites and Levantine populations. A landmark study by Doron Behar and colleagues, analyzing genome-wide data from 14 Jewish populations, concluded that “Jewish communities from Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East derive from a common Middle Eastern source, preserving genetic continuity over millennia.”⁹ Similarly, Gil Atzmon and colleagues found that “despite dispersion and admixture, the major Jewish Diaspora groups share Middle Eastern ancestry, tracing back to common founders in the Levant.”¹⁰ As geneticist Harry Ostrer summarizes: “Jews are a people with a shared genetic legacy, reflecting both their common Middle Eastern origins and their history of migrations, separations, and admixtures.”¹¹

These findings refute claims that modern Jews are merely a “religious sect” disconnected from ancient Israel. They show instead that Jews represent one of the oldest continuously existing peoples, maintaining both genetic and cultural ties to their historic homeland. While some dissenting interpretations, such as Eran Elhaik’s 2013 “Khazarian Hypothesis,” have argued for non-Levantine origins, subsequent studies have demonstrated significant methodological flaws in his model and reaffirmed the mainstream consensus of Levantine continuity.¹² Thus, the evidence establishes that Jewish identity is rooted in an unbroken thread

⁸ Nirenberg, David. *Anti-Judaism: The Western Tradition*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2013, 14.

⁹ Behar, Doron M., et al. “The Genome-Wide Structure of the Jewish People.” *Nature* 466, no. 7303 (2010): 238–42.

¹⁰ Atzmon, Gil, Li Hao, Itsik Pe’er, Christopher Velez, Adam Pearlman, Pier Francesco Palamara, Bernice Morrow, et al. “Abraham’s Children in the Genome Era: Major Jewish Diaspora Populations Comprise Distinct Genetic Clusters with Shared Middle Eastern Ancestry.” *American Journal of Human Genetics* 86, no. 6 (2010): 850–59.

¹¹ Harry Ostrer, *Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 14.

¹² Behar, Doron, et al. “No Evidence from Genome-Wide Data of a Khazar Origin for the Ashkenazi Jews.” *Human Biology* 85, no. 6 (2013): 859–900.

of history, heritage, and descent, linking today's Jews to their ancient forebears in the Land of Israel.

The expansion of Jewish genetic heritage over time is closely linked to the major waves of diaspora, as defined by the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, which describes “the scattering of a people from their original homeland while maintaining connections of identity, memory, and often return.”¹³ The first major dispersion occurred when the Assyrian Empire conquered the northern Kingdom of Israel in 722 BCE, followed by the Babylonian exile after the destruction of the First Temple in 586 BC.¹⁴ A further transformative dispersion followed the Roman destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, resulting in the mass displacement of Judean communities across the Mediterranean.¹⁵ Later medieval expulsions — notably from England (1290), France (1306, 1394), and Spain (1492) — extended the Jewish presence across Europe, North Africa, and beyond.

Despite this vast geographic spread and local admixture, genetic research shows that Jewish populations have retained a shared ancestral component traceable to the ancient Levant. The landmark study *Abraham's Children in the Genome Era* found that “besides Southern European groups, the closest genetic neighbors to most Jewish populations are the Palestinians, Bedouins, and Druze... Their genetic proximity to one another and to European and Syrian Jews suggests a shared genetic history of related Middle Eastern and non-Semitic Mediterranean ancestors who chose different religious and tribal affiliations.”¹⁶ Additional evidence demonstrates significant overlap in Y-chromosomal haplogroups between Jewish populations and neighboring Middle Eastern groups, and studies of microsatellite markers likewise confirm genetic proximity among Israeli Jews, Palestinian Arabs, and Druze.¹⁷

¹³ Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002, 3.

¹⁴ Grabbe, Lester L. *Judah Between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule [ca. 400–200 BCE]*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992, 27.

¹⁵ Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Vintage, 2007, 377–81.

¹⁶ Atzmon, Gil, Li Hao, Itsik Pe'er, Christopher Velez, Adam Pearlman, Pier Francesco Palamara, Bernice Morrow, et al. “Abraham's Children in the Genome Era: Major Jewish Diaspora Populations Comprise Distinct Genetic Clusters with Shared Middle Eastern Ancestry.” *American Journal of Human Genetics* 86, no. 6 (2010): 850–59.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 855

These findings demonstrate that Jewish communities around the world represent distinct geographic isolates or clusters that nevertheless share *identity-by-descent* (IBD) segments — genetic threads connecting them to a common ancestral origin in the ancient Near East. As historian Harry Ostrer summarizes, “Despite millennia of migrations, conversions, and admixture, Jews remain a people with shared Middle Eastern ancestry that ties them to their origins in the land of Israel.”¹⁸ This continuity makes the Jewish historical connection to the land one of the oldest continuously documented ethno-national relationships in the world.

The genetic link between modern Jews and their ancient Israelite ancestors directly undercuts the claim that Jews are merely a transplanted population with no ancestral connection to the land. Antisemitic narratives often invert this point, arguing that because Jews lack legitimate descent, they are “colonizers” with no rightful claim. By contrast, modern population genetics demonstrates that Jewish communities worldwide share significant ancestry with ancient Levantine populations.¹⁹

In response, some argue that Palestinians hold the more authentic ancestral claim. Yet historians note that Palestinian identity, as a distinct modern national identity, crystallized only in the mid-20th century. Rashid Khalidi writes: “It was only in the aftermath of the 1948 war known to Palestinians as the Nakba, or catastrophe, that the term ‘Palestinian’ became widely used to refer specifically to the Arab population displaced from or remaining within the former Mandate of Palestine. The experience of dispossession and exile played a decisive role in transforming a primarily regional or civic label into a fully developed national identity.”²⁰ This does not erase the centuries-long Arab presence in the land, but it highlights that Jewish peoplehood is rooted in a continuous identity stretching back millennia, whereas Palestinian national identity was shaped by the events of the mid-20th century.

The 1947 UN Partition Plan (Resolution 181) illustrates the divergence. As historian Benny Morris records, “The Jewish Agency and the Yishuv leadership accepted the United Nations Partition Plan of November 29, 1947, despite disappointment over the proposed borders.

¹⁸ Harry Ostrer, *Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People*, Oxford University Press, 2012, 17.

¹⁹ Behar, Doron M., et al. “The Genome-Wide Structure of the Jewish People.” *Nature* 466 (2010): 238–42.

²⁰ Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, 19.

By contrast, the Arab Higher Committee, the Arab League, and the governments of the neighboring Arab states rejected the plan outright as a violation of the rights of the Arab majority in Palestine, refusing to accept the establishment of a Jewish state on what they regarded as Arab land.”²¹ The rejection of partition, followed by war, directly contributed to the Palestinian refugee crisis, a tragedy that remains unresolved.

Thus, while both peoples have histories in the land, the claim that Jews are foreign “colonizers” collapses under the combined weight of genetic, historical, and legal evidence. Jewish continuity from antiquity to the present affirms that their presence is not an imposition, but the restoration of an indigenous people to its ancestral homeland.

The genetic link between ancient and modern Jews has not gone unchallenged. One of the most frequently cited alternative theories is presented by Eran Elhaik in his 2013 article, “The Missing Link of Jewish European Ancestry: Contrasting the Rhineland and the Khazarian Hypotheses.” Elhaik argues that the ancestry of Ashkenazi Jews, the largest Jewish population is not primarily derived from ancient Israelites who migrated into Europe (the “Rhineland Hypothesis”) but instead from a fusion of peoples centered in the Caucasus region, particularly the Khazars, a medieval Turkic polity that converted to Judaism in the early Middle Ages. As Elhaik writes:

The most parsimonious explanation for our findings is that Eastern European Jews are of Judeo-Khazarian ancestry forged over many centuries in the Caucasus... During the first millennium CE, the Judeo-Khazars expanded into Eastern Europe, where they became the foundation of Eastern European Jewry. Our findings thus reject the Rhineland Hypothesis, which posits a small group of German Jews migrating eastward and rapidly expanding, and instead support a model of a more complex demographic history involving a major Khazarian contribution to the ancestry of Ashkenazi Jews.²²

It is essential to note, however, that Elhaik’s analysis primarily focuses on Eastern European (Ashkenazi) Jewry and does not address the numerous other Jewish populations with well-established Levantine ancestry, including Mizrahi, Sephardi, and Yemenite Jews. Moreover, his conclusions have been widely criticized by population geneticists for methodological flaws,

²¹ Morris, Benny. *1948: A History of the First Arab–Israeli War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008, 48.

²² Elhaik, Eran. “The Missing Link of Jewish European Ancestry: Contrasting the Rhineland and the Khazarian Hypotheses.” *Genome Biology and Evolution* 5, no. 1 (2013): 69.

including selective sampling, assumptions about ancestral populations, and insufficient statistical support. A direct rebuttal by Doron Behar and colleagues concluded:

“Despite their long-term residence in different countries and isolation from one another, most Jewish populations were not significantly genetically differentiated, and they share a common Middle Eastern origin. The shared genetic elements identified among contemporary Jewish communities are consistent with descent from ancient Hebrew and Israelite populations of the Levant, followed by subsequent admixture with surrounding host populations. These results refute models that posit completely independent origins for Ashkenazi Jews — such as exclusive derivation from Khazar converts — and instead demonstrate that Jewish diaspora groups are genetically linked to one another and to Middle Eastern populations.”²³

The prevailing scientific consensus, supported by multiple independent studies,²⁴ holds that the vast majority of Jewish populations, including Ashkenazim, share deep genetic continuity with ancient Levantine ancestors. This continuity reflects a complex history of migration, admixture, and cultural evolution, but overwhelmingly supports the conclusion that Jews today are the direct descendants — biologically, historically, and culturally — of the ancient people who inhabited the land of Israel. Such continuity provides powerful historical context for Jewish peoplehood and strengthens the case for their enduring connection to their ancestral homeland.

“Am Yisrael” – The People of Israel

Am Yisrael — “the People of Israel” — is a central concept in Jewish identity that encompasses far more than shared ancestry. The term itself is rooted in the Hebrew words *am* (עַם), meaning “people,” “nation,” or “kin-group,” and *Yisrael* (יִשְׂרָאֵל), the name given to the patriarch Jacob after he “wrestled with God” (Genesis 32:28). In biblical usage, *Am Yisrael* refers collectively to Jacob’s descendants — the Israelites — as a distinct people bound by covenant, law, and destiny. “Now therefore, if you will indeed obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession among all peoples... and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exodus 19:5–6, ESV).

²³ Doron M. Behar et al., “The Genome-Wide Structure of the Jewish People,” *Nature* 466 (2010): 238–42; Gil Atzmon et al., “Abraham’s Children in the Genome Era: Major Jewish Diaspora Populations Comprise Distinct Genetic Clusters with Shared Middle Eastern Ancestry,” *American Journal of Human Genetics* 86, no. 6 (2010): 850–59; and Harry Ostrer, *Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09103>.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 850–859

While the preceding sections have focused on genetic continuity, Jewish identity has always been defined by more than biological descent. Judaism has historically functioned as what historian Salo Baron calls “a religious civilization” — simultaneously a faith, a nation, and a culture.²⁵ As Shaye J. D. Cohen observes, “From its earliest sources, Jewish identity fused kinship, covenant, and culture — it was never reducible to mere religion.”²⁶ Daniel Boyarin similarly argues that *Am Yisrael* is “a people formed by Torah and history, whose continuity resides in shared narratives, legal obligations, and collective memory as much as in descent.”²⁷

This multidimensional identity can be understood through four overlapping lenses. Religious: Jews are bound by covenantal faith, Torah, and mitzvot. Cultural: They share languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Yiddish, Ladino), customs, and traditions. Historical: Their identity is shaped by a continuous narrative stretching from Abraham to the modern State of Israel. Political: They have historically constituted a nation (*goy*) with laws (*Torah*), governance (*Sanhedrin*), and sovereignty (*Malkhut Yisrael*). As Josephus wrote in the first century AD, the Jews were “a people (*ethnos*) with their own laws and polity” (*Against Apion* I.8). Thus, *Am Yisrael* refers not to a mere religious community, but to a living people whose existence as a nation spans over three millennia and whose identity remains deeply tied to the land of Israel.

Jewish identity is not restricted to lineage; it also includes the transformative process of entering the covenant through conversion. The Torah establishes this principle explicitly: “If a stranger (*ger*) shall sojourn with you and would keep the Passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised. Then he may come near and keep it; he shall be as a native of the land. But no uncircumcised person shall eat of it. There shall be one law for the native and for the stranger who sojourns among you” (Exod. 12:48–49, ESV). This passage demonstrates that those who join the covenant are to be treated as fully equal members of Israel, bound by the same obligations and entitled to the same rights as those born into the people.

²⁵ Baron, Salo W. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952, 5.

²⁶ Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, 3.

²⁷ Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004, 27.

Rabbinic tradition deepened this principle. The Babylonian Talmud teaches: “A convert who converts is like a newborn child” (*Yevamot* 22a), underscoring the idea that conversion entails a complete transformation of status. The convert is not an outsider joining an existing family but a newly created member of *Am Yisrael*, whose prior lineage no longer applies for purposes such as inheritance or marriage law. Maimonides codifies this in his *Mishneh Torah*: “A convert who converts and accepts upon himself all the commandments... is counted among Israel and is obligated in all the commandments, and his lineage is joined to Abraham.”²⁸

As historian Shaye J. D. Cohen explains, “The Rabbis did not conceive of Jewishness as solely biological: conversion was a rebirth, a legal and spiritual transformation that incorporated the individual fully into the body of Israel.”²⁹ Thus, Jewish peoplehood is not exclusively inherited but covenantal — extending full membership to those who enter through conversion. This means that the covenantal bond to the Land of Israel is not only the inheritance of the genetic descendants of Abraham but also of those who, by joining the covenant, become part of his people.

The fact that those outside Jewish lineage can enter the covenant and receive all the rights and responsibilities of a born Jew opens an important dimension of the discussion on peoplehood and land. The Abrahamic covenant first articulated in Genesis establishes an enduring relationship between God and Abraham’s descendants: “I will make of you a great nation... and to your offspring I will give this land” (Gen. 12:2, 7); “I will establish my covenant between me and you and your descendants after you throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant... and I will give to you and to your descendants after you the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession” (Gen. 17:7–8, ESV). This covenant was not merely a promise of spiritual blessing but included a specific territorial dimension the Land of Canaan and was to be a “perpetual sign” of identity, marked by circumcision (*brit milah*) and covenantal faithfulness (Gen. 17:10–14).

Because halakhic conversion confers full membership in *Am Yisrael*, those who enter the covenant are considered descendants of Abraham in a legal and covenantal sense. Maimonides

²⁸ Maimonides. *Mishneh Torah: Sefer Kedushah, Issurei Biah* 13:17. Translated by Eliyahu Touger. New York: Moznaim Publishing, 1990.

²⁹ Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, 109.

codified this principle: “A convert who converts and accepts upon himself all the commandments... is counted among Israel and is obligated in all the commandments, and his lineage is joined to Abraham.”³⁰ As such, the covenantal bond and the associated right to the land are not limited to biological descendants but extend to all members of the Jewish people, regardless of ancestry.

This covenantal inclusivity reframes the earlier discussion of genetic continuity. While shared ancestry demonstrates historical connection, the Jewish claim to the land is ultimately rooted in a covenantal identity that transcends biology. As legal scholar Howard Grief notes, “The right of the Jewish people to self-determination is collective, deriving from historical, cultural, and legal continuity not from racial or genetic homogeneity.”³¹ Modern international law reflects this principle. The United Nations General Assembly, in Resolution 181 (1947), recognized that “the Jewish people, having historical ties to the Land of Israel, are entitled to reconstitute their national home in that country.”³² Thus, Jewish peoplehood defined by covenant rather than blood alone ensures that the collective right to the land belongs to all Jews, including those who join the covenant through conversion. This inclusivity strengthens the Jewish claim rather than weakening it; it demonstrates that the right to the land is neither racial nor exclusionary, but rather historical, covenantal, and national.

The positive case for the universal Jewish right to the State of Israel does not stand in a vacuum; it must be considered alongside serious counterarguments, both political and religious. The most common counterargument holds that ancient covenants and religious identity, however meaningful within a faith tradition, cannot serve as a legal basis for modern statehood or territorial sovereignty. From this perspective, biblical promises are theological claims rather than recognized sources of international law, and historical or ancestral ties — even if real — do not automatically confer rights in a world governed by principles such as self-determination, territorial integrity, and democratic consent. Political legitimacy, critics argue, must rest on

³⁰ Maimonides. *Mishneh Torah: Sefer Kedushah, Issurei Biah* 13:17. Translated by Eliyahu Touger. New York: Moznaim Publishing, 1990.

³¹ Howard Grief, *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law*, Jerusalem: Mazo Publishers, 2008, 32.

³² United Nations General Assembly. *Resolution 181 (II): Future Government of Palestine*. A/RES/181(II), November 29, 1947.

contemporary legal frameworks, effective governance, and the will of current populations, not on sacred texts or covenantal narratives from antiquity.

Historian Rashid Khalidi makes this point directly: “Biblical promises and ancient historical claims cannot, in and of themselves, constitute a valid basis for sovereignty in the modern era, especially when they are invoked to deny the political rights of a population that has inhabited the land for centuries.”³³ Similarly, Edward Said argued, “To assert a right of possession based on ancient covenant or mythic memory is to confuse the sacred with the political. Modern nations are not founded on divine promises but on the consent of their populations and the principles of self-determination.”³⁴ Legal scholars have also echoed this perspective, emphasizing that the legitimacy of statehood under international law depends on criteria such as defined borders, effective governance, and recognition by the international community, rather than religious or ancestral narratives.³⁵

This line of critique presents a serious challenge: that Jewish covenantal or religious identity, while historically significant, cannot, in itself, ground modern sovereignty without reference to secular and legal norms.

To rebut this argument, it is necessary to approach the issue from both religious and political-philosophical perspectives. The claim that contemporary legal frameworks, governance structures, and the will of present populations alone define sovereignty fails to account for the deeper philosophical and moral foundations on which all such systems rest. Every legal and political worldview, whether democratic, autocratic, communist, or otherwise, is ultimately grounded in a conception of the good, and every conception of the good presupposes a worldview about human nature, purpose, and justice. As Alasdair MacIntyre observes, “Without shared standards of the good, there can be no moral reasoning; and without moral reasoning,

³³ Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997, 19.

³⁴ Said, Edward W. *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage, 1979, 56.

³⁵ Quigley, John. *The Case for Palestine: An International Law Perspective*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

there can be no shared life. Human beings cannot flourish — indeed, cannot long survive — without some conception of the virtues and the common good.”³⁶

Even explicitly secular ideologies, such as liberal democracy or Marxism, function as comprehensive worldviews, articulating moral visions, shaping legal codes, and legitimizing state authority in much the same way that traditional religions do.³⁷ To describe these frameworks as “non-religious” is to overlook their metaphysical commitments, commitments that are, in substance, religious or quasi-religious. As political theorist Eric Nelson argues, many of the ideas foundational to modern constitutional government, such as covenantal law and social contract theory, originate in biblical political theology.³⁸

Therefore, dismissing Jewish covenantal identity as an illegitimate basis for sovereignty because it is “religious” is inconsistent: *all* political orders derive legitimacy from foundational narratives and metaphysical commitments. The covenant that has shaped Jewish identity, law, and attachment to the Land of Israel for over three millennia is no less legitimate and may in fact be more enduring than any other worldview underpinning a nation’s claim to statehood.

The second flaw in the argument that “ancient covenants and religious identity do not confer modern political rights” is that it rests on a false dichotomy: it assumes that religious-historical identity and contemporary legal legitimacy are mutually exclusive. In reality, the modern international order has repeatedly recognized that nations are entitled to self-determination precisely because of their shared history, culture, and identity — even when those identities are religious or ethnonational in character. Article 1 of the UN Charter (1945) affirms the principle of “equal rights and self-determination of peoples,” and Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) states that “all peoples have the right of self-determination.” As international law scholar James Crawford notes, “The right of peoples

³⁶ MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, 149.

³⁷ See John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 4–5; and Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

³⁸ Nelson, Eric. *The Hebrew Republic: Jewish Sources and the Transformation of European Political Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010, 7–9.

to self-determination has been understood not as a rejection of historical or cultural identity, but as its vindication.”³⁹

Modern examples demonstrate this principle: the independence of states such as Pakistan, Armenia, and Ireland was largely justified based on religious and ethnonational identity. In the same way, the Jewish people’s covenantal identity, shaped by millennia of continuous historical memory, law, and attachment to the Land of Israel, is not irrelevant to their sovereignty but one of its strongest foundations. The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 (1947) explicitly recognized this, affirming that “the Jewish people, having historical ties to the Land of Israel, are entitled to reconstitute their national home in that country.” Thus, Jewish covenantal identity is not only compatible with modern legal legitimacy; it is precisely the kind of historical-cultural foundation that international law has repeatedly accepted as the basis for statehood.

The right of the Jewish people to reconstitute their national home in the Land of Israel is rooted not only in ancient memory but also in binding international law instruments. The League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, confirmed in 1922 by all 52 member states, explicitly affirmed “the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country.”⁴⁰ The Mandate was not a theological document, but a legal one, enacted under the authority of the post–World War I international system, and it obligated the British government to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home.

The Mandate itself was derived from the San Remo Resolution of April 1920, in which the Principal Allied Powers incorporated the Balfour Declaration (1917) into international law. As Article 4 of San Remo noted, “the Mandatory will be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made by the Government of His Britannic Majesty and adopted by the other Allied Powers, in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.”⁴¹ As legal scholar Howard Grief explains, “The Mandate recognized the pre-existing

³⁹ Crawford, James. *The Creation of States in International Law*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, 107.

⁴⁰ League of Nations. *Mandate for Palestine*. Preamble. July 24, 1922.

⁴¹ San Remo Resolution, April 25, 1920.

historical rights of the Jewish people, and did not create new rights but reaffirmed them in international law.”⁴²

Thus, Jewish sovereignty was not only rooted in covenantal and historical claims but also explicitly affirmed in the binding international legal framework of the interwar period. The League of Nations Mandate represented the first modern international recognition of the Jewish people’s collective right of self-determination in their ancestral homeland.

This principle was reaffirmed by the international community in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 (A/RES/181(II), November 29, 1947), which recommended the establishment of two states — one Jewish and one Arab — in the territory of Mandatory Palestine. The resolution treated Jewish self-determination not as a religious privilege but as a legitimate application of the same principle that underpins the modern international system: that peoples with a shared history, culture, and identity have the right to political self-governance in their ancestral lands. Following its declaration of independence in May 1948, Israel was admitted as a member state of the United Nations through General Assembly Resolution 273 (A/RES/273(III), May 11, 1949), affirming that it satisfied the criteria for statehood under customary international law — including a defined territory, a permanent population, a functioning government, and the capacity to enter into relations with other states — as articulated in Article 1 of the Montevideo Convention (1933).

Importantly, the Jewish people's right to their homeland is not grounded merely in scripture or bloodline, but in an enduring national identity and an unbroken historical presence. Across millennia, Jews maintained continuous cultural, liturgical, and physical connections to the land — through pilgrimage, settlement, prayer, and law — despite repeated episodes of exile and dispersion. Modern population genetics has further substantiated this continuity: multiple studies demonstrate that diverse Jewish communities share significant ancestral links with ancient Levantine populations, including Doron Behar et al., “The Genome-Wide Structure of the Jewish People,” *Nature* 466 (2010): 238–42; Gil Atzmon et al., “Abraham’s Children in the Genome Era,” *American Journal of Human Genetics* 86 (2010): 850–59; and Harry Ostrer, *Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). These

⁴² Grief, Howard. *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law*. Jerusalem: Mazo Publishers, 2008, 132.

findings underscore that Jewish sovereignty is the culmination of continuous peoplehood — historically rooted, legally recognized, and scientifically supported.

Nor is Jewish peoplehood defined exclusively by descent. Conversion — recognized by Jewish law (*halakhah*) and enshrined in the State of Israel’s *Law of Return* (1950) — extends full membership in the Jewish people to those who voluntarily enter the covenant. Section 4B of the Law of Return defines a Jew as “a person born of a Jewish mother or who has converted to Judaism and who is not a member of another religion” (*Law of Return*, 5710–1950, §4B). This legal provision reflects a longstanding rabbinic principle that a convert is “like a newborn child” (*Yevamot* 22a), fully integrated into the covenantal community with all its rights and obligations.

This civic and covenantal conception of peoplehood directly undermines the claim that Jewish nationhood is a racial or biological category. Instead, it is consistent with the way international law understands “peoplehood”: as a collective bound by shared language, culture, history, and self-identification, rather than ancestry alone.⁴³ Like other nations that define belonging through both descent and voluntary association, for example, the United States through naturalization or Ireland through citizenship by descent and affiliation, the Jewish people constitute a national community whose legitimacy is grounded in historical continuity, cultural cohesion, and shared identity.

Thus, the Jewish people’s modern statehood is not grounded solely in theology. It is rooted in an interwoven framework of ancient covenantal identity, continuous historical presence, binding international law, and modern principles of self-determination. The covenant first established with Abraham, “I will establish my covenant between me and you and your descendants after you... and I will give to you and your descendants after you the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession” (Gen. 17:7–8, ESV), has provided the narrative and legal-religious framework of Jewish peoplehood for over three millennia. Across centuries of exile, Jews preserved cultural, liturgical, and physical ties to the Land of Israel through prayer, pilgrimage, and settlement.⁴⁴

⁴³ James Crawford, *The Creation of States in International Law* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 107; UNESCO, *A Study of the Right to Self-Determination of Peoples* (Paris: UNESCO, 1980), 7–9.

⁴⁴ See H.H. Ben-Sasson, ed., *A History of the Jewish People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976), 257–60.

These historical and cultural continuities were explicitly recognized in international law. The League of Nations Mandate for Palestine (1922) affirmed “the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country,” a recognition later reaffirmed by UN General Assembly Resolution 181 (1947), which called for the establishment of a Jewish state alongside an Arab one. The principle of self-determination, enshrined in the UN Charter (1945, Art. 1), provided the legal framework for Israel’s admission to the United Nations in 1949 (UNGA Resolution 273).

Am Yisrael — the People of Israel — stands as one of history’s most enduring testaments to the power of covenant, identity, and continuity. Defined not merely by descent but by shared faith, law, memory, and destiny, the Jewish people have maintained an unbroken connection to their ancestral land for over three millennia — a covenantal bond open to all who join, regardless of origin. This identity has shaped civilizations, informed moral codes, and today undergirds a sovereign state whose legitimacy has been recognized by international law and the community of nations, from the League of Nations Mandate for Palestine (1922) to United Nations General Assembly Resolutions 181 (1947) and 273 (1949).

The right of the Jewish people to their homeland is therefore not a relic of ancient scripture nor a privilege conferred by others, but the natural and legal expression of a people whose covenantal identity has outlasted empires and transcended exile. It is this continuity — spiritual, historical, cultural, and legal — that makes the modern State of Israel not an anomaly of history, but its fulfillment. To recognize this truth is to reject the distortions of antisemitic conspiracy and to affirm the enduring legitimacy of a people’s right to live in security, dignity, and sovereignty in their ancestral home.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion

History does not repeat itself exactly, but it is undeniably cyclical and few examples illustrate this more clearly than the experience of the Jewish people. Across more than three millennia of recorded history, Jews have endured persecution, expulsion, and genocide under empires, religions, and ideologies of every kind. This record reveals not isolated incidents but a recurring historical phenomenon: antisemitism adapts its language and justifications over time while consistently targeting the same people.

Selected examples include:

- 586 BCE – Babylonian Exile: The First Temple is destroyed, Jerusalem is sacked, and most Jews are exiled to Babylon.
- 167–160 BCE – Seleucid Persecution: Antiochus IV bans Judaism, desecrates the Temple, and executes those who resist.
- 70 CE – Roman Destruction of Second Temple: Tens of thousands massacred or enslaved; the Jewish national center is destroyed.
- 1096 – First Crusade: Massacres of Jewish communities in the Rhineland.
- 1290 – Expulsion from England: The entire Jewish population expelled.
- 1348–1351 – Black Death Pogroms: Jews were massacred after being falsely blamed for the plague.
- 1492 – Expulsion from Spain: Jews forced to convert or leave.
- 1648–1657 – Khmelnytsky Massacres: Tens of thousands slaughtered in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.
- 1881–1906 – Russian Pogroms: Anti-Jewish riots kill thousands across the Russian Empire.
- 1933–1945 – The Holocaust: Nazi Germany and collaborators murdered ~6 million Jews.
- 1948–1970s – Jewish Exodus from Arab Lands: ~850,000 Jews expelled or forced to flee.
- 2000–present – Global Antisemitic Violence: Resurgence of attacks in Europe, North America, and the Middle East.
- 2018 – Pittsburgh Synagogue Shooting: The deadliest antisemitic attack in U.S. history.
- 2023–2024 – Global Surge: Record levels of antisemitic incidents amid geopolitical tensions.

This long arc of persecution stretching from ancient Mesopotamia to 21st-century Europe and North America demonstrates that antisemitism is not an aberration of any single era but a persistent feature of human history.”⁴⁵ Its forms have shifted from theological hatred to racial pseudoscience, from political scapegoating to digital disinformation, but its underlying narrative has remained remarkably consistent. Today, this ancient hatred is amplified not only by physical violence but also by *information warfare*: innuendo, lies, conspiracy, and blame weaponized to dehumanize Jews and undermine their legitimacy. Recognizing this continuity is essential to building the legal protections, historical memory, and moral vigilance necessary to confront antisemitism in all its evolving forms.

⁴⁵ Paul Johnson, *A History of the Jews* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987); Martin Gilbert, *Atlas of Jewish History* (New York: William Morrow, 1993); Robert S. Wistrich, *A Lethal Obsession: Antisemitism from Antiquity to the Global Jihad* (New York: Random House, 2010).

The first copies of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* appeared in serialized form in 1903 in the St. Petersburg newspaper *Znamya* (“The Banner”), edited by Pavel Krushevan, an ultranationalist and known antisemite. They were presented as the minutes of a clandestine meeting of Jewish leaders allegedly plotting world domination. In reality, the *Protocols* are one of the most infamous and enduring antisemitic forgeries in modern history. Most scholars agree that it was fabricated in the early 20th century, likely by elements of the Tsarist secret police (*Okhrana*), and plagiarized extensively from Maurice Joly’s 1864 political satire *Dialogue in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*.⁴⁶ The purpose was clear: to provide “evidence” of a Jewish conspiracy and thereby justify pogroms, political repression, and persecution.

Despite being thoroughly debunked as early as 1921, most notably by *The Times of London*, which demonstrated its plagiarism and fabrication,⁴⁷ the *Protocols* spread rapidly throughout Europe and beyond. It became a foundational text for antisemitic movements, influencing pogroms in Eastern Europe, shaping Nazi ideology in Germany, and fueling myths about Jewish control of finance, media, and global politics.⁴⁸ Its influence persists into the present: extremist movements, Holocaust deniers, and antisemitic propaganda networks continue to cite the *Protocols* as “proof” of a global Jewish conspiracy.⁴⁹

The *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* remains one of the most potent case studies in information warfare, demonstrating how a fabricated text, once embedded in political discourse, can outlive its exposure and continue shaping hatred, violence, and policy for more than a century. Originally produced in Tsarist Russia as a plagiarized forgery purporting to reveal a Jewish plot for world domination, it has been repeatedly debunked — by *The Times* of London in 1921, by both houses of the U.S. Congress, and by countless scholars — yet its narrative endures. This persistence reveals a critical truth about disinformation: its power does not depend on factual accuracy but on its ability to provide a coherent, emotionally satisfying explanation for complex realities. As Norman Cohn notes, “The myth of the world Jewish conspiracy, as embodied in the *Protocols*, offered a total explanation of human history and contemporary

⁴⁶ The Jewish Peril: A Disturbing Pamphlet: A Call for Inquiry.” *The Times* (London), August 16–18, 1921.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*,

⁴⁸ Cohn, Norman. *Warrant for Genocide*. London: Serif, 1996, 87–110.

⁴⁹ U.S. Senate. *Protocols of the Elders of Zion: A Fabricated “Historic” Document*. 88th Cong., 2nd sess., 1964.

politics alike.”⁵⁰ Even in its discredited state, the *Protocols* continues to function as a rhetorical weapon — one that has inspired pogroms, genocidal ideologies, and global antisemitic movements for over a century.

Although the *Protocols* are no longer widely circulated in their original form, their central narrative continues to shape antisemitic and conspiratorial worldviews. It serves less as a text than as an ideological blueprint — a template for “global control” myths that accuse Jews of orchestrating wars, manipulating governments, controlling financial systems, and subverting Western civilization from within. Yet its enduring power is not merely a reflection of antisemitism; it is a deliberate strategy to delegitimize Jewish sovereignty by reframing it as the product of conspiracy rather than history, law, and identity. This inversion transforms Jewish peoplehood from the self-determination of an ancient nation into “evidence” of a hidden agenda, recasting the founding of Israel as a manifestation of global manipulation rather than historical justice. As Cohn argues, the *Protocols* “converted a people into a conspiracy and a faith into an existential menace.”⁵¹ This rhetorical maneuver remains politically effective because it provides ideological ammunition to those seeking to deny Jewish self-determination — portraying national aspirations as part of a fabricated threat and obscuring the legal, historical, and cultural foundations of Jewish statehood.

The conspiratorial framework forged by the *Protocols* remains deeply embedded in modern extremist ideologies, even when explicit references to the document are absent. Its core myth — that a secret Jewish cabal directs world affairs — is echoed in far-right and far-left propaganda, “globalist” rhetoric, Islamist manifestos, and online disinformation campaigns. At the heart of such movements lies the promise of secret knowledge: an explanation hidden from the masses that, once uncovered, claims to reveal the true workings of history and power. This illusion provides believers with both intellectual satisfaction and a potent sense of control, thereby reinforcing group identity and amplifying their conviction. Over time, this self-reinforcing belief system blurs the line between real events and elaborate fantasy, enabling hatred to masquerade as resistance. Within this psychological architecture, the *Protocols* have remained a foundational text. Even thoroughly discredited, it continues to “transform Jews from a religious

⁵⁰ Cohn, Norman. *Warrant for Genocide*. London: Serif, 1996, 16.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 17

group into an existential enemy of humanity,”⁵² Channeling personal frustration into collective animosity and providing a totalizing worldview that inspires division, radicalization, and violence. Cloaked in the language of revelation, it remains one of the most dangerous myths of the modern era, not because it is true, but because it is useful. The result is that *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, though discredited, continues to animate antisemitic ideologies not as a historical document but as a living narrative, one that recasts history as conspiracy and turns prejudice into political purpose.

The Protocols of the Elders of Zion has been publicly and repeatedly debunked by the United States Congress, reflecting a bipartisan recognition of its fraudulent nature long before the modern State of Israel existed. As early as 1921, the House of Representatives declared, “It has been conclusively shown that the so-called Protocols of the Elders of Zion is a base forgery, plagiarized from an earlier political satire and maliciously circulated to foment hatred against the Jewish people... It is not evidence of a conspiracy, but itself a conspiracy against truth.”⁵³ During the Second World War, the Senate reaffirmed this conclusion, stating in 1942 that “the notorious Protocols of the Elders of Zion, now conclusively demonstrated to be a forgery, has been exploited by the Nazi regime and its allies as a tool of antisemitic hatred. It is essential that the American people recognize this document for what it is — a work of fiction, not fact.”⁵⁴ More than two decades later, amid the rise of extremist movements at home, the House Judiciary Committee again condemned the text: “The so-called Protocols of the Elders of Zion has been thoroughly discredited as a forgery, yet it continues to be circulated by extremist groups in the United States as if it were genuine. Its persistence underscores the power of antisemitic myths and the need for continued vigilance against them.”⁵⁵

These congressional statements, issued in three different political eras and all before or independent of Israel’s founding, underscore a critical point: the Protocols were never legitimate evidence of a global Jewish conspiracy. Rather, it has consistently been recognized by serious

⁵² Cohn, Norman. *Warrant for Genocide*. London: Serif, 1996, 23

⁵³ U.S. House of Representatives. *Committee on Foreign Affairs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1921.

⁵⁴ U.S. Senate. *Report on Foreign Propaganda Activities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942.

⁵⁵ U.S. House of Representatives. *Judiciary Committee Report on Extremist Organizations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

governments and scholars as a fabricated weapon of antisemitic propaganda, used to incite hatred, violence, and genocide.

Despite overwhelming evidence that *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is a forgery, some figures have attempted to justify, rehabilitate, or exploit it by deploying a rhetorical strategy scholars call the “false-but-true” argument, conceding its fictional nature while insisting it nevertheless reflects “real” Jewish behavior or influence. Henry Ford, who serialized *The International Jew* in *The Dearborn Independent* between 1920 and 1922, typified this reasoning when he stated, “The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and they have fitted the world situation up to this time.”⁵⁶ Ford’s comment did not defend the document’s authenticity but implied its content corresponded with observable events, thereby legitimizing antisemitic suspicion. Similarly, Willis A. Carto, a Holocaust denier and founder of the far-right Liberty Lobby, argued, “Whether or not the Protocols are genuine is irrelevant. What matters is that they describe what has happened.”⁵⁷ This rhetorical move illustrates how antisemitic ideologues have preserved the *Protocols*’ ideological potency even after its exposure as a hoax, using it as a framework to interpret world events through a conspiratorial lens.

There is no credible academic defense of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Its fraudulent origins, plagiarized from Maurice Joly’s 1864 political satire *Dialogue in Hell Between Machiavelli and Montesquieu* and exposed as a forgery by *The Times* of London in 1921, are universally acknowledged in serious scholarship (Cohn, *Warrant for Genocide*, 1996; *The Times*, August 16, 1921). Attempts to rehabilitate the text come exclusively from extremist, neo-Nazi, or Islamist propaganda networks, which rely on rhetorical sleights such as claiming it is “symbolically true” or that it “reveals deeper realities” about world politics. These efforts do not validate the document but instead illustrate how disinformation is weaponized: its power lies not in its truth but in its utility as a vehicle for hatred, scapegoating, and ideological mobilization.

⁵⁶ Ford, Henry. *The Dearborn Independent*. Dearborn, MI: Dearborn Publishing Co., 1921.

⁵⁷ Willis Carto, quoted in Leonard Zeskind, *Blood and Politics: The History of the White Nationalist Movement from the Margins to the Mainstream* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009), 102.

In this context, *The Protocols* serves as a textbook example of information warfare a strategy Martin C. Libicki defines as “the use of information to gain a competitive advantage over an opponent, including psychological operations, propaganda, deception, cyber operations, media manipulation, and disinformation aimed at shaping perceptions, influencing decisions, and disrupting social or political stability.”⁵⁸ The text’s continued circulation reflects the enduring effectiveness of disinformation as a weapon: it shapes narratives, radicalizes movements, delegitimizes communities, and destabilizes democratic societies. While human societies have always used communication as a tool of conflict, the digital age has amplified these tactics, enabling forgeries like *The Protocols* to reach vast audiences, mutate into new conspiracies, and sustain hate-based ideologies on a global scale.

The arguments advanced here are grounded in a robust body of evidence, including historical, genetic, theological, and legal perspectives, yet they represent only part of a larger, evolving conversation. The enduring nature of antisemitic narratives, the rapid evolution of disinformation, and the dynamic realities of modern geopolitics all demand continued research and engagement. Before concluding, it is essential to consider the limitations of the present study and outline key directions for future research.

Limitations and Future Research

While this paper draws on a substantial body of genetic, historical, legal, and textual evidence to rebut antisemitic narratives and affirm the legitimacy of Jewish sovereignty, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, genetic studies — though robust — remain an evolving field. As sequencing technologies advance and broader datasets become available, future research may refine our understanding of the population dynamics that shaped Jewish diasporas and their connections to ancient Israelite populations. Such developments are unlikely to overturn the fundamental findings presented here but may deepen our knowledge of historical migrations, admixture, and community formation.

Second, this study deliberately focuses on rebutting narratives of delegitimization and conspiracy, not on providing a comprehensive treatment of all dimensions of the Israeli–

⁵⁸ Libicki, Martin C. *What Is Information Warfare?* Washington, DC: National Defense University Press, 1995, 3.

Palestinian conflict. Questions of Palestinian identity, sovereignty, and self-determination are complex, multifaceted, and deserving of sustained scholarly attention in their own right. Engaging with them in greater depth would require a separate, dedicated inquiry beyond the scope of this project.

Finally, the dynamics of disinformation and information warfare are evolving rapidly in the digital era. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion — once a printed forgery circulated by pamphlet — now circulates through algorithmic amplification, social media echo chambers, and networked extremist movements. Future research should investigate how antisemitic myths evolve in digital environments, how they intersect with broader conspiracy ecosystems, and what countermeasures are most effective in neutralizing their influence.

Even with these limitations in mind, the fundamental conclusions of this study remain firmly grounded. The historical, genetic, legal, and covenantal evidence presented here provides a robust foundation for understanding Jewish peoplehood and sovereignty — one that withstands scrutiny and remains resilient even as scholarship advances and political realities evolve. With this context established, we now turn to the broader implications and enduring significance of these findings.

Conclusion

What, then, is the answer to combating information warfare? It is not slogans, censorship, or reactionary outrage, but the patient and deliberate work of truth-seeking, the willingness to test every assertion, examine every claim, and trace every argument back to its evidentiary roots. In the present context, that means critically scrutinizing one of the most enduring falsehoods of the modern era: the allegation of a global Jewish conspiracy bent on subverting Western civilization through covert means.

This paper has examined three pillars of that antisemitic narrative: Jewish genetic continuity, *Am Yisrael* (“the People of Israel”), and The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and found them wanting when measured against the weight of historical, scientific, legal, and textual evidence. Modern population genetics provides compelling proof that Jewish communities possess deep ancestral ties to the ancient Israelites and the Levant, establishing one of the oldest continuous claims to a homeland in recorded history. The concept of *Am Yisrael* demonstrates

that Jewish peoplehood has always transcended mere biology: it is defined by covenant, culture, law, memory, and shared destiny and remains open to all who join the covenant, regardless of lineage. Even so, the Jewish people, uniquely, and despite millennia of persecution, extended a hand of coexistence through the 1947 United Nations Partition Plan, offering to share the land with the Palestinian Arab population, whose leaders rejected the proposal outright.

The final strand, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, illustrates the extraordinary persistence of disinformation once it takes root in the human imagination. Exposed as a forgery over a century ago, denounced by scholars, governments, and even the U.S. Congress, it nonetheless continues to animate antisemitic movements and extremist ideologies today. Its enduring appeal shows that the danger of falsehood lies not only in its content but in its utility: lies are powerful precisely because they offer simple, totalizing explanations for complex realities, transforming hatred into a worldview and prejudice into a political program.

Combating such lies requires more than merely exposing them, though exposure is essential. It demands a societal commitment to intellectual resilience — to teaching history honestly, approaching claims critically, demanding evidence rather than rhetoric, and recognizing how myths of hatred adapt to new media and new political contexts. It also requires understanding that information warfare is not fought only online or in propaganda leaflets, but also in classrooms, legislatures, places of worship, and everyday conversations.

Ultimately, the antidote to disinformation is not censorship but education, the slow, deliberate cultivation of discernment. Truth must not only be known; it must be taught, defended, and lived. By confronting falsehoods with evidence, countering hatred with understanding, and grounding public discourse in verifiable reality, free societies can blunt the weaponization of lies and ensure that the tragic lessons of history are neither forgotten nor repeated.

Research Methodology Note

This project employed a structured, AI-assisted research methodology designed to ensure evidentiary rigor, transparency, and analytical depth. To support the development of *The People of Israel: A Comprehensive Rebuttal to Antisemitic Narratives of Illegitimacy and Conspiracy*, the author utilized the ChatGPT GPT-5 October 2025 High-Trust Research Assistant Persona, a specialized configuration of OpenAI's large language model. This tool was not used as a

generative engine for opinions or unchecked assertions but as a disciplined research partner operating under strict methodological constraints.

The persona was configured according to five core principles:

1. **Verification Over Generation** – All claims were treated as hypotheses requiring corroboration rather than assumptions to be repeated.
2. **Source Transparency** – Key factual statements were supported by traceable, reputable citations, including peer-reviewed scholarship, primary historical documents, government records, and recognized journalistic sources.
3. **Skepticism and Caution** – The model was directed to approach all claims critically, flag weak or disputed evidence, and clearly distinguish between evidence, interpretation, and opinion.
4. **Clarity About Evidence** – Every section was structured to identify documented facts, prevailing scholarly interpretations, and areas of legitimate debate.
5. **Nuance and Uncertainty** – Where consensus was absent, the model summarized the range of credible perspectives and identified unresolved questions.

Throughout the research process, AI outputs were used as **supporting tools** — for literature discovery, contextual synthesis, argument structuring, and draft formulation — under continuous human supervision. All references were independently verified against primary or authoritative secondary sources. All conclusions, interpretations, and editorial decisions reflect the author’s own critical judgment and responsibility.

By integrating the High-Trust Research Assistant Persona into the research process under these clearly defined parameters, this project demonstrates one model for the responsible use of advanced AI in scholarship: not as a replacement for human expertise, but as a force multiplier for evidence-based inquiry, rigorous analysis, and intellectual transparency.

Acknowledgments

Portions of the research, analysis, and drafting of *The People of Israel: A Comprehensive Rebuttal to Antisemitic Narratives of Illegitimacy and Conspiracy* were conducted with the

assistance of the *ChatGPT High-Trust Research Assistant Persona*, a specialized large language model developed by OpenAI and configured to support high-integrity, evidence-based research. This tool was used under the author’s direction to synthesize peer-reviewed scholarship, compile historical and legal documentation, and assist in articulating complex arguments surrounding Jewish peoplehood, covenantal identity, sovereignty, and the persistence of antisemitic disinformation such as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

The *High-Trust Research Assistant* functioned as a methodological support tool rather than a source of original claims. All factual assertions were independently verified, all sources were reviewed for credibility and relevance, and all interpretations, conclusions, and editorial decisions remain solely those of the author. The inclusion of AI-assisted research in this project reflects a commitment to transparency, methodological rigor, and the responsible integration of emerging technologies in scholarship.

Abbreviations and Key Terms

Term	Definition
Am Yisrael	Hebrew for “People of Israel”; refers to the collective Jewish people throughout history.
Brit Milah	Covenant of circumcision, signifying entry into the Abrahamic covenant.
Diaspora	The dispersion of Jews beyond the Land of Israel and the communities formed as a result.
IBD	Identity by Descent: a genetic measure of shared ancestry.
IHRA	The International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance defines antisemitism and advises governments.
LGPW	Legal, Governance, and Population Worldview — the moral-philosophical foundations underpinning a political system.

Term	Definition
Nakba	Arabic for “catastrophe,” referring to the displacement of Palestinians following Israel’s establishment in 1948.
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly.
Zionism	The movement advocating for the reestablishment and support of a Jewish homeland in the Land of Israel.

Bibliography

Atzmon, Gil, Li Hao, Itsik Pe’er, Christopher Velez, Adam Pearlman, Pier Francesco Palamara, Batsheva M. Crespo, et al. “Abraham’s Children in the Genome Era: Major Jewish Diaspora Populations Comprise Distinct Genetic Clusters with Shared Middle Eastern Ancestry.”

American Journal of Human Genetics 86, no. 6 (2010): 850–859.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajhg.2010.04.015>.

Behar, Doron M., et al. “No Evidence from Genome-Wide Data of a Khazar Origin for the Ashkenazi Jews.” *Human Biology* 85, no. 6 (2013): 859–900.

Behar, Doron M., et al. “The Genome-Wide Structure of the Jewish People.” *Nature* 466, no. 7303 (2010): 238–242. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09103>.

Cohn, Norman. *Warrant for Genocide: The Myth of the Jewish World Conspiracy and the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. London: Serif, 1996.

Elhaik, Eran. “The Missing Link of Jewish European Ancestry: Contrasting the Rhineland and the Khazarian Hypotheses.” *Genome Biology and Evolution* 5, no. 1 (2013): 61–74.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evs119>.

Ford, Henry. *The International Jew: The World’s Foremost Problem*. Dearborn, MI: Dearborn Publishing Co., 1920–1922.

Grief, Howard. *The Legal Foundation and Borders of Israel under International Law*. Jerusalem: Mazo Publishers, 2008.

Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Libicki, Martin C. *What Is Information Warfare?* Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1995.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. 3rd ed. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Morris, Benny. *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008.

Ostrer, Harry. *Legacy: A Genetic History of the Jewish People*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Said, Edward W. *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

The Times of London. "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion: A Hoax." *The Times* (London), August 16, 1921.

United Nations General Assembly. *Resolution 181 (II): Future Government of Palestine*. November 29, 1947.

United Nations General Assembly. *Resolution 273 (III): Admission of Israel to Membership in the United Nations*. May 11, 1949.

League of Nations. *Mandate for Palestine*. July 24, 1922.

U.S. House of Representatives. *Statement on the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Congressional Record, 1921.

U.S. Senate. *Resolution Condemning the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Congressional Record, 1942.

U.S. House Judiciary Committee. *Report on Extremist Use of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

