

The Unz Review • An Alternative Media Selection

A Collection of Interesting, Important, and Controversial Perspectives Largely Excluded from the American Mainstream Media

The Spain–Morocco–Israel Nexus

A Challenge to Jared Taylor and Paul Kersey's Position

JONAS E. ALEXIS • AUGUST 6, 2026 • 6,000 WORDS • 167 COMMENTS



If there is any evidence that Israel is part of a diabolical strategy with radical consequences for the West, then the recent migration of large numbers of Moroccans into Spain represents a test case for people like Jared Taylor, his co-host Paul Kersey, and others within the white nationalist movement who have deliberately refused to address the Jewish Question and its consequences for the West in general. Their supporters, enthusiasts, and followers should demand answers to these fundamental questions if they really care about preserving Europe.

The familiar excuse that Taylor and others are simply choosing a strategic silence can no longer be sustained. Ignoring a central issue is not a serious analytical approach; as we shall see, it reflects poor journalism and deliberate malpractice, and intellectual dishonesty. Looking at the recent crisis in Spain and focusing only on the Moroccan migrants arriving at the border, while failing to examine the broader political and historical factors behind the situation, amounts to addressing only the visible symptoms while ignoring the deeper causes.

Just to recap. On July 31, approximately 60,000 Moroccan migrants crossed into the Spanish enclave of Ceuta. The unusually large crossing drew significant public and political attention and conflict. Just months earlier, Spanish Prime Minister Pedro Sánchez had become an outspoken critic of the Israeli government, particularly Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's military campaign in Gaza and the conflict involving Iran. Both conflicts have resulted in the loss of millions of lives, intensified regional instability, and contributed to wider economic chaos across the Western world, including disruptions affecting global energy markets and fears surrounding the security of the Strait of Hormuz.

The Ceuta scenario was predictable. For example, in September of last year, *The Jerusalem Post* reported that Sánchez “introduced nine new measures, including a full arms embargo on Israel and a ban on imports of goods from illegal Israeli settlements.”^[1] Sanchez declared:

“Spain, as you know, doesn’t have nuclear bombs, nor aircraft carriers, nor large oil reserves. We alone can’t stop the Israeli offensive, but that doesn’t mean we won’t stop trying, because there are causes worth fighting for even if it’s not in our sole power to win them.”[2]

For Netanyahu, that was a bridge too far. He reacted sharply to Sánchez’s remarks, taking to X to argue that the Spanish government had aligned itself with what he described as an anti-Israel position: “Spanish Prime Minister Sanchez said yesterday that Spain can’t stop Israel’s battle against Hamas terrorists because ‘Spain does not have nuclear weapons.’ That’s a blatant genocidal threat to the world’s only Jewish State. Apparently, the Spanish Inquisition, the expulsion of the Jews of Spain and the systematic mass murder of Jews in the Holocaust, is not enough for Sanchez.”[3]

If Netanyahu viewed Sánchez’s actions as posing what he described as a “blatant genocidal threat to the world’s only Jewish state,” then, as prime minister, he would have felt compelled to respond. The response came in an unexpected form.

What happens if Spain suddenly has to deal with an influx of roughly 60,000 migrants into Ceuta, a city of about 85,000 residents. Sánchez would be forced to devote his attention to a domestic crisis rather than continue criticizing Israel. Such a scenario would represent a calculated strategic move—indeed, a deeply diabolical one.

Commentators such as Mike Whitney have argued that Moroccan authorities, including members of the police, appeared to facilitate the migrants’ movement by directing them where to go. They also note that analysts such as Michael Rubin of the American Enterprise Institute had previously suggested that migration could become a source of political pressure on Spain. As Whitney, quoting the Israeli journal Ynet News, pointed out,

“In March 2026, Michael Rubin of the American Enterprise Institute.... called on the Trump administration to formally recognize Ceuta and Melilla as occupied Moroccan territory, branding Spain ‘a colonial power running colonies across the Strait of Gibraltar.’ Days later, Representative Mario Díaz-Balart, chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Security and one of Marco Rubio’s closest congressional confidants, declared publicly that the enclaves ‘are not in the geographic territory of Spain’ but rather in Moroccan territory, and that their fate should be ‘established, negotiated, and discussed between friends and allies.’ This was not the fringe speaking. This was the architecture of a coordinated strategic repositioning....

“The Abraham Accords transformed Morocco from a quiet interlocutor with Israel into a formal military partner. In January 2026, Israel and Morocco signed a joint military work plan for the year during the third meeting of their Joint Military

Committee in Tel Aviv, which the IDF described as deepening cooperation with a ‘key partner for regional stability.’... This bilateral architecture gives Israel something it has rarely possessed in North African politics: direct strategic stake in Rabat’s regional success.”

Representatives of the Iranian government have also claimed that the mass migration from Morocco to Spain was effectively a gift from both Israel and the United States. Similar allegations have appeared elsewhere. Alex Jones, who spent years as a strong defender of Israel but has become increasingly critical of the Israeli government over the past two years, wrote: “Israel launched an Islamic invasion of Spain.”[4] Tarik Cyril Amar, a historian from Germany working at Koç University, Istanbul, has said that “many Spanish observers, including the Minister of Transport [Oscar Puente], believe Israel’s involvement is real in this assault on Spain’s territorial integrity and standing within the EU.”[5] After reviewing numerous reports from Israeli, Moroccan, and Spanish sources, Amar added:

“Yet there is substantial circumstantial evidence pointing to Israeli sabotage. For one thing, Israeli and Israel-linked think tankers, [such as Michael Rubin at the American Enterprise Institute](#) and Amine Ayoub at Ynet, have a record of suggesting to use US influence and Morocco to, in effect, storm the two Spanish exclaves with the help of civilian masses. Likewise, the son of Israeli Prime Minister and wanted war criminal Benjamin Netanyahu has urged [‘Arabs’ and ‘Muslims’ to ‘free’](#) the Spanish territories. In general, Morocco and Israel are indeed close de facto allies, connected [through security, intelligence, and arms production projects](#).

“The likeliest explanation for the Ceuta assault and its lethal consequences may well be a combination of factors. Yet the real question is not simply which causes contributed to this fatal outcome, but whether they came together spontaneously or by design. Was there a trigger or a catalyst? If there is one thing the genocide in Gaza should have taught everybody then it is that when Israel announces a crime, it will follow through and commit it. With that in mind, it is naïve to rule out the very real possibility that Ceuta was an Israeli psy-op against Spain, at the cost of dozens of lives no one in Europe seems to care about.”[6]

The Israeli government has portrayed the migrant influx into Ceuta as divine punishment for Spain.[7] Gabriel Rufián, the parliamentary spokesperson for the Republican Left of Catalonia, argued that the crisis served the interests of the United States and Israel by enabling Morocco to pressure and blackmail both Spain and the rest of Europe. Other Spanish commentators have reached similar conclusions.[8] Riccardo Fabiani, North Africa director at the International Crisis Group, has also observed a similar dynamic.[9]

This development should not come as a complete surprise, given the long history of relations between Israel and Morocco. As *The Times of Israel* reported in 2020, the two countries have maintained “more than 60 years of covert cooperation on intelligence, security and diplomatic issues. That collaboration has included the Jewish state helping Morocco acquire advanced military gear and weapons as well as the know-how to use it. It also allegedly helped Rabat assassinate an opposition leader.”[10]

What Jared Taylor and Paul Kersey Don’t—and Can’t—Tell You

What should a serious thinker do when confronted with information like this? Should such claims be dismissed without further examination, or should they prompt deeper questions about the relationship between Israel and Morocco?

Both Jared Taylor and Paul Kersey deliberately avoid examining Israel’s potential role in the broader geopolitical situation. Rather than exploring whether any form of cooperation or strategic alignment exists between Israel and Morocco in relation to the migrant crisis, Kersey argued that the Spanish government should take a harder approach to border enforcement, referring to Israel’s policies toward migrants and border security in the region. Kersey stated: “Whatever you have to do to protect your borders. It doesn’t have to be humane. The Israelis, we know what they do. They fired live rounds...”[11] In other words, Kersey is advocating for a model similar to Israel’s approach to border security while not considering the possibility that the Israeli government itself may have a role in the broader situation he is criticizing.

What we are seeing is that Kersey and Taylor are once again running away from the real issue. Their attention remains focused primarily on the Moroccan migrants, while at the same time they make the Israeli actors and forces shaping the political landscape invisible. In this ideological struggle, Taylor and Kersey are directing their followers toward a losing battle. If one cannot correctly identify the forces and real enemy shaping a conflict, then it becomes impossible to develop an effective response.

In other words, without understanding the full range of the Israeli regime involved, any movement risks fighting the wrong battle. It can be argued that the Israeli regime would have little reason to object to the position promoted by Taylor and Kersey, because their analysis leaves Israel largely absent from discussions of the geopolitical forces influencing these events.

This criticism is especially directed at Taylor, who has had numerous opportunities to examine these issues. Instead, he has avoided the central question and has maintained for decades that Jews, as a group, should not be viewed as enemies of the West. This position has been a defining feature of Taylor’s commentary since the early years of the *American Renaissance*, and it was precisely again why white nationalists and racialsists like David Duke had to attack Taylor’s position.

Following the controversy of 2006, Taylor’s decision to exclude David Duke from the American Renaissance conference became a significant point of criticism among some of his former allies and opponents. That decision significantly damaged Taylor’s movement, particularly because

Duke had long identified with racist and white nationalist ideas—the very criteria that Taylor had emphasized for decades as central to his organization’s identity.

So excluding Duke suggested that participation in the American Renaissance movement was not based solely on racial identity or racist beliefs, but also involved additional ideological criteria. Duke’s exclusion revealed an unspoken standard for determining who was considered acceptable within the organization.

Discussions involving the Jewish Question represented a dividing line, and individuals who raised such topics risked being excluded from Taylor’s platform. Taylor’s approach has been to analyze major political and social events without placing the Jewish Question at the center of his ideology, even when it is relevant to the discussion.

In that sense, neither Taylor nor Kersey is actually helping the very people they claim to defend if they fail to examine all possible sources of influence behind these developments. Avoiding difficult questions does not provide a meaningful strategy for addressing the challenges they seek to confront.

As I have argued repeatedly, Taylor in particular has had access to a wide range of scholarly works and political analyses concerning immigration, foreign policy, and the role of Jewish organizations and the Israeli government in shaping migration trends in Europe and America. Yet he has chosen to interpret these issues in a way that would make any serious thinker shake his head in disbelief.

Taylor’s position cannot simply be explained by a lack of historical knowledge or intellectual sophistication. He has embraced a particular ideological position despite all the evidence to the contrary. How can these people expect serious thinkers to take them seriously?

The larger issue in this ideological conflict is straightforward: when someone presents a serious argument against your position, the worst response is to ignore it for years as though no substantial criticism exists. Serious thinkers who value logical deduction and induction should make every effort to answer criticism on a philosophically sound and logically consistent foundation. If that foundation does not even appear to rest on logic and practical reason, it therefore cannot remain intellectually relevant in any serious discussion.

This is one of my longstanding criticisms of white advocates such as Kevin MacDonald. He does even consider the possibility that encouraging people to embrace Darwinism without careful reflection or serious caution could ultimately undermine the very civilization he claims to defend and preserve. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that MacDonald and his followers succeeded in establishing a whites-only enclave. Let us even assume that the United States somehow became an exclusively white nation. MacDonald knows that Darwinism does not merely operate between species with the principle of survival of the fittest; historically, it operates within species by advocating the elimination of those they regarded as “unfit” while preserving those they considered intellectually or biologically superior.

Anyone who doubts this need only consult the scholarly literature on Social Darwinism.^[12] Historical studies document that advocates of Social Darwinism often extended evolutionary

concepts to human populations, using them to justify inhumane forms of social engineering. The standards used to identify the supposedly “unfit” were frequently subjective, inconsistent, and vulnerable to political manipulation and was never based on so-called “science.”

This helps explain why MacDonald largely avoids addressing these implications in his book *Individualism and the Western Liberal Tradition*. As I have argued elsewhere, the criteria historically used to classify people as “unfit” were often so vague that they could easily be manipulated for ideological purposes. In some cases, the traits cited included a lack of sympathy for others or habitual dishonesty. If such standards were applied consistently, would they not also implicate many political leaders? Would they include figures such as Donald Trump, George W. Bush, Benjamin Netanyahu, or Antony Fauci? Are we really supposed to believe that people like Fauci are less dangerous or less psychopathic than the people Darwin called the “imbeciles” and the “maimed”? If the answer is yes, then shouldn’t the criteria be more clearly defined instead of relying on vague statements that can be, and have been, used for political purposes? These questions illustrate how elastic and politically selective such criteria can become when detached from a coherent, consistent, and metaphysical philosophy and practical reason. As far as I have been able to determine, no serious thinker has been able to offer a satisfactory answer to this puzzling dilemma.

This is precisely the issue MacDonald does not adequately confront, because doing so would call into question one of the central philosophical assumptions underlying his conception of white identity politics—namely, Darwinism as a political framework. He needs to be intellectually honest and admit to his followers that he does not represent all white people, even though his writings often give that impression. You cannot consistently support Darwinism and at the same time claim to advocate for all white people. To maintain these two contradictory positions, MacDonald avoids discussing the historical and moral implications of Darwinism in any of his books.

James Fetzer, by contrast, has acknowledged that Darwinism does not provide an adequate moral foundation and adopted a deontological framework during my debate with him. Whether one agrees with Fetzer or not, his willingness to recognize the philosophical limitations of Darwinism illustrates the kind of engagement that this discussion requires. Rather than ignoring these foundational questions, supporters of MacDonald’s position should critically examine the metaphysical assumptions on which his political ideology rests. Only then can they determine whether those assumptions are logically coherent, metaphysically defensible, and internally sustainable.

Similar internal contradictions can be found in Taylor’s ideology. To maintain his position, he has had to remain almost completely silent about the Jewish Question. As a result, he often makes ludicrous claims while avoiding the broader historical context. One example comes from an interview later published in a book by Cambridge University Press, where Taylor stated unequivocally:

“Now since you raised the question of Jews, I might quote to you Yitzhak Rabin. Not long before he was assassinated, he told U.S. News & World Report that he had

done many things as a leader of Israel of which he was proud, but the thing that he cared most about was that Israel remain at least 80 percent Jewish. Well, what he's saying is that the character of Israel is dependent on its people. Israel, in order to be Israel, must be Jewish, and to the extent that Israel ceases to be Jewish, it will not be Israeli in the sense that's meaningful for him. By the same token, in my view, the United States of America as founded by my ancestors is a white nation, and as it ceases to be white, it will change in ways that are as unacceptable to me as it would be unacceptable to Yitzhak Rabin should Israel cease to be Jewish.”**[13]**

Out of the many political figures in the West whom he could have cited, Taylor instead chose an Israeli leader. The choice is noteworthy because Rabin has been widely described by historians as having participated in militant Zionist organizations that carried out acts widely characterized as terrorism during the British Mandate period. Moreover, Rabin was explicit during Operation Dani in the summer of 1948, stating unambiguously, “The inhabitants of Lydda must be expelled quickly without attention to age.”**[14]**

By any ordinary definition, this describes the forced removal of a civilian population—what is commonly referred to as ethnic cleansing. To examine the issue further, it is worth turning to Israeli Zionist historian Benny Morris, who writes:

“A Jewish state would not have come into being without the uprooting of 700,000 Palestinians. Therefore it was necessary to uproot them. There was no choice but to expel that population. It was necessary to cleanse the hinterland and cleanse the border areas and cleanse the main roads. It was necessary to cleanse the villages from which our convoys and our settlements were fired on.”**[15]**

So, can any serious observer argue that Taylor was being historically and intellectually honest by citing approvingly a figure who participated in acts as ethnic cleansing and violent terrorism? When Taylor was asked, “So you don’t see any problem with Jews integrating into American society?” he elaborated:

“I think if they — if European Jews wish to assimilate — I think many of them have and do. I don’t see any particular problem there. I think it’s unquestionably the fact that, by and large, Jews tend to be more liberal on the kinds of questions that we’ve been talking about. I think there are all sorts of historical reasons for that, but I don’t think Jews, simply because they are Jews, are necessarily going to be not part of a European nation.”**[16]**

Should any serious thinker take this argument seriously? Taylor does not even appear to exercise caution in formulating his response, presenting it as though there is no possible problem with the position he has advanced. Yet history itself completely contradicts what he has proposed. Out of the dozens of examples that could be cited, I will present just one, as I do not want to make this article any longer than it already is.

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in Germany, particularly between 1870 and 1914, several German intellectuals, including Heinrich von Treitschke, argued that Jews should either assimilate into German society or emigrate. Assimilation was understood as adopting and respecting the German culture, identifying with the nation's historical and intellectual traditions, and contributing to its social cohesion. This historical approach differs from some contemporary interpretations of assimilation. For example, Jews like Ben Shapiro, despite presenting themselves as defenders of the United States and Western civilization, prioritize the interests of Israel over those of the countries whose traditions they publicly champion.

Treitschke viewed Jewish separatism as a threat to German culture and as a potentially explosive force in the nation's cultural conflict. Even intellectuals such as Theodor Mommsen, who was generally more sympathetic toward Jews, acknowledged that Treitschke had raised concerns that could not be easily dismissed.

What pushed Treitschke toward an even more defensive position was his belief that many German Jewish intellectuals and historians regarded themselves as culturally and intellectually superior to the Germans. He pointed to figures such as Heinrich Graetz and Moses Hess as examples. Historian Albert S. Lindemann of the University of California observes that "Graetz had written much that was stunningly offensive to the German sensibilities of the time and that would have offended even more self-confident peoples."**[17]**

In a letter to his friend Moses Hess, Graetz described Christianity as a "religion of death." Treitschke, an atheist, did not view Christianity that way. On the contrary, he argued that Christianity was part of Germany's historical tradition. Hess replied to Graetz's letter that people like himself should find pleasure in "scourging Germans." In the same correspondence, Graetz likewise wrote, "I am looking forward with pleasure to flogging the Germans and their leaders—Schleiermacher, Fichte, and the whole wretched Romantic school."**[18]** Throughout their writings, both Graetz and Hess expressed ideas that reflected a belief in Jewish racial superiority. According to this interpretation, both men recognized that these views were fundamentally at odds with German culture and tradition.

It was therefore inevitable that the racial worldviews of Graetz and Hess would come into conflict with German intellectuals such as Treitschke. Even Lindemann acknowledges that Treitschke's hostility toward figures like Graetz stemmed not only from the belief that some Jewish intellectuals regarded themselves as superior to the Germans, but also from the perception that they despised and, at times, ridiculed German and broader European traditions.**[19]** Some observers, including Theodor Mommsen, argued that Graetz's historical work was deeply rooted in Talmudic thought. For that reason, his scholarship also came under criticism from a number of Jewish historians.**[20]**

Lindemann notes that “there is little question that the sense of Jewish superiority [is] expressed” in Graetz’s writings, which were widely read among German Jews.^[21] Treitschke portrayed German history as fundamentally generous in spirit, particularly in its treatment of relations between Jews and non-Jews and in its assessment of their respective strengths and shortcomings.^[22] It was therefore inevitable that Treitschke and Graetz would find themselves engaged in a struggle over the interpretation of German history and tradition. Graetz argued that European civilization suffered from a “morally and physically sick” identity, a view that provoked strong criticism from Treitschke and others.^[23]

What is significant here is that Treitschke believed that if one of the most prominent Jewish representatives of German intellectual life portrayed German history in a negative light, then there were meaningful differences between Jewish historical traditions and values and those of German and European civilization.

What likely pushed Treitschke further was Graetz’s opposition to Jewish assimilation and his rejection of Reform Judaism, which Treitschke supported. As already indicated, although Treitschke was not himself a Christian, he viewed Christianity as compatible with European culture rather than a threat to it. By contrast, he believed that Graetz sought to “shatter” the foundations of Christian civilization.^[24]

Lindeman therefore notes that “there was some substance to Treitschke’s charges” against Graetz.^[25] Moreover, while many Jews saw that Treitschke made some solid point, “They repeatedly expressed concern as to just how much more of their sense of Jewishness would have to be abandoned to satisfy people like Treitschke.”^[26]

If Taylor is correct in asserting, without qualification or caution, that “European Jews are Europeans,”^[27] then does that definition also apply to figures such as Heinrich Graetz, Moses Hess, Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Béla Kun? By the logic of Taylor’s own definition, it would. If so, the fact that some of these individuals became associated with violent revolutionary or politically consequential movements would simply be treated as an unfortunate historical coincidence rather than as something requiring further analysis. Is this really a serious way to approach this historical question? Or could it be that Taylor’s ideology has essentially crippled him from seeing the obvious?

From a historical perspective, Jewish intellectuals and major organizations have challenged or rejected the dominant cultures that had accepted them, creating conflicts over identity, tradition, and social values. Similar issues emerged in the United States, where major cultural changes—including shifts in attitudes toward pornography, multiculturalism, DEI policies, immigration, and Hollywood standards—can be attributed to the influence of particular Jewish intellectuals and organizations.

This is the perennial issue that Jared Taylor has been unwilling to address directly, because doing so would ruin the ideological principles of the American Renaissance. In 2006, Taylor stated that the American Renaissance “has deliberately avoided taking positions on questions about which racially conscious whites are likely to disagree.”^[28] Pay close attention to Taylor’s

use of the word “deliberately,” as it sheds light on a central feature of his ideological approach. Taylor made his position unambiguously clear when he went on to say:

“The role of Jews in a society, the morality of abortion, the influence of Christianity, the appropriate foreign policy, and the place of homosexuals should all be discussed openly in a free society, all in their appropriate places. AR is not that place. We cannot afford dissension that distracts us from our goal. We have vital work to do. Our civilization, our way of life, even our continuity as a distinct people depend on whether we succeed or fail. It is a distraction from our proper work to hunt for culprits, to blame others for our own loss of will.”[29]

Once again, is anyone in the American Renaissance movement paying attention? Shouldn't Taylor be pressed with further questions on these vital issues? Consider an analogy. Suppose someone strongly condemns black Americans for relying on DEI or even affirmative action to gain admission to colleges or to secure academic positions. Wouldn't it also be reasonable to ask who created and institutionalized DEI or affirmative action in the first place? How can one give those who designed and promoted the policy a free pass while directing criticism primarily at those who took advantage of it?

Consider the recent case of Jason Arday, who has been accused of plagiarism and misrepresenting his academic credentials. Arday has been one of the leading advocates of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), known in the United Kingdom as equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI). In his essay, “Talking about a Revolution: Diversifying the Knowledge Canon in the Academy,” Arday adopts much of the language associated with the Jewish revolutionary traditions that helped shape the modern DEI movement. In fact, in his broader work Arday cites approvingly and sometimes indirectly the work of Jewish academics and intellectuals, including Judith Butler, Herbert Marcuse, Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Zygmunt Bauman. Arday essentially took ideas developed by these people and applied them to questions of race.

The assault on the West by Jewish academics through various ideological movements long predates Arday and others like him. For example, when I was in graduate school back in 2004, I encountered Martin Bernal's *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*, published by Rutgers University Press. Who was Bernal? He was Jewish, and his book became highly influential among proponents of Afrocentrism. Variants of Afrocentric thought have been promoted in some educational settings and segments of black communities since at least the 1970s and 1980s, just a few years after the civil rights movement. Arday is a product of that ideological environment, and DEI is part of the broader ideological organ from which it emerged. The question, then, is quite simple: Who initiated these ideological movements, and what motivations shaped their development?

While Taylor and the American Renaissance are deliberately unwilling to examine these broader questions, the scholarly literature is readily available for anyone prepared to

investigate it. Many of these movements were promoted by Jewish intellectual and revolutionary activists as part of a larger effort to reshape—or undermine—traditional Western institutions and values.

Sigmund Freud, for example, likened himself to Hannibal, the military commander who challenged Rome. Through sexual corruption, Freud believed that he could change Western culture. Likewise, those who have successfully influenced segments of the black community through initiatives such as DEI have contributed to the social and cultural upheaval across the West.

The recurring problem is that many commentators readily criticize figures such as Jason Arday but stop short of examining the ideological origins of the movements they represent. Rather than investigating the individuals and ideas that helped shape those movements, they focus on their most visible advocates while leaving the underlying ideological architects largely unexamined. That is a glaring inconsistency that deserves serious examination, and it lies at the very heart of Taylor's American Renaissance project. As far as I am concerned, neither Taylor nor his supporters have been able to resolve these contradictions, largely because they have consistently refused to address the central issues.

As I have reported elsewhere, David Duke raised similar concerns, which contributed to Taylor's decision to excommunicate Duke from his white nationalist movement.

The Jews who joined Taylor's American Renaissance have also resisted discussions of these topics. As I argued in another article, this dynamic contributed to the conflict between Michael Hart, a Jewish astrophysicist who participated in American Renaissance conferences, and David Duke. Hart, who proposed racial separation in the United States, quickly called Duke "a fucking Nazi" when Duke attributed the real ethnic group that is pushing conflicts and chaos in the United States and much of the Western world, including the Middle East. Rather than maintaining a broader internal debate which could have been healthy for Taylor's American Renaissance, Taylor ultimately sided with Hart and formally severed ties with Duke.

In other words, if Taylor must choose between siding with a white nationalist such as David Duke and siding with Jews like Michael Hart, Taylor will abandon the white nationalist movement and align himself with the very group that has been a thorn in the flesh of virtually all Western societies and in the Middle East.

This is another reason Taylor is intellectually crippled when it comes to addressing some of the major issues that have contributed to instability in the Middle East and even the West. For example, who is actually responsible for the recent war involving Iran? Was it the United States, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, India, Islam itself, the blacks in the United States, or Israel? Which country has the greatest influence over U.S. policy in this situation? And what has been the cost of this conflict? Can Taylor seriously address these questions? I would argue that he cannot. If he does address them, he will likely avoid discussing Israel's role or leave it out of the political analysis. That is when a serious thinker must conclude that Taylor is simply an ideologue. If his followers cannot recognize this, then what hope is there for them?

Matters worsened for individuals such as Taylor when Kentucky Republican Thomas Massie linked the United States' \$40 million allocation to Morocco two weeks before the migration crisis.[30] Massie declared:

“Republicans paid \$40 MILLION of your tax dollars to Morocco to invade Spain. And then they all pretended like borders matter and clutched their pearls like invasions are offensive. R's and D's are the same and the Uniparty has put us in \$40 T in debt and Americans LAST.”

Massie stated that he had been the only member of Congress to oppose the allocation of \$40 million in U.S. funding to Morocco. He added that Republicans were now expressing surprise over the migration crisis, despite having supported the funding that he had opposed.

The fundamental question, once again, is this: Whose interests were those Republicans serving when they supported the funding? Were they acting independently, or were other geopolitical considerations at play? One possible line of inquiry is whether their support was connected to Spain's criticism of Israel's conduct in Gaza. More specifically, is it possible that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu or the Israeli regime sought to persuade Republican lawmakers to approve millions of dollars in funding for Morocco?

Journalist Caroline Dupuy of the *Middle East Eye* reports that, by the middle of last month, Morocco became the first African country to deploy military personnel in support of Israel's operations in Gaza under President Trump's so-called “peace plan.” Dupuy writes:

“The ISF was originally planned to deploy 500 Moroccan military officials to a refugee camp in the southern city of Rafah. The figure has now been reduced to just 200 Moroccan soldiers, Al Jazeera reported. The force is expected to work in collaboration with the Israeli military.”[31]

Morocco has also been accused of using Israeli-supplied weapons in operations that have killed civilians in Western Sahara in 2024.[32] The strategic relationship between Morocco and Israel therefore extends well beyond diplomacy. Given the depth of their military and political cooperation, there is little doubt that the two countries were working in concert during the mass migration crisis in Ceuta. These are issues that warrant careful examination as Israel is plunging America into more debt, more deaths in the Middle East, and more economic chaos. Will Taylor have some intellectual courage to finally address this issue?

Based on his previous public statements, one can reasonably conclude that, when faced with a choice between criticizing Israel as a major contributor to the problems facing the West and

maintaining the approval of Jews such as Michael Hart, Taylor would choose the latter. Indeed, he has previously suggested that Israel is a light to the nations.

Any continued silence on this issue, or any analysis of the migration crisis that fails to examine Israel's potential role, would likely be interpreted as evidence that Taylor is effectively supporting the very forces that continue to undermine the very principles on which Western civilization was built. In that sense, Taylor is nothing but a traitor, and the *American Renaissance* serves less as a vehicle for defending the West than as a shield for the enemies of all mankind. Therefore, supporters of the *American Renaissance* movement may conclude that Taylor no longer represents their interests and should no longer be regarded as a credible advocate for their cause.

Notes

[1] "Netanyahu accuses Spain's Sanchez of 'genocidal threat' after nuclear weapons comment," *Jerusalem Post*, September 11, 2025.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] "US and Israel staged Spain migration invasion – Iran," *Russia Today*, August 2, 2026.

[5] "No spontaneous combustion? Regarding the causes of the Ceuta migrant surge, look who's gloating," *Russia Today*, August 1, 2026.

[6] Ibid.

[7] "Zionists celebrate Spanish migrant invasion," *Russia Today*, July 31, 20126.

[8] "Spanish commentators accuse Israel and US of involvement in Ceuta crisis," *Middle East Eye*, August 1, 2026.

[9] Barney Jopson, "Spain pushes last migrants out of Ceuta as locals suspect US role in influx," *The Irish Times*, August 2, 2026.

[10] "A look at Israel's decades-long covert intelligence ties with Morocco," *Times of Israel*, December 11, 2020.

[11] <https://www.amren.com/podcasts/2026/07/ceuta-new-camp-of-the-saints/> .

[12] See Jonas E. Alexis, "Why Eugenics Fails: A Philosophical and Historical Challenge to David Skrbina," *Unz Review*, August 30, 2025.

[13] Carol M. Swain and Russ Nieli, eds., *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 103.

[14] Quoted in Benny Morris, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 207.

[15] Ari Shavit, "Survival of the Fittest? an Interview with Benny Morris," *Haaretz*, January 9, 2004

[16] Swain and Nieli, eds., *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America*, 103.

[17] Albert S. Lindemann, *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 141.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid., 141-143.

[20] Ibid., 140.

[21] Ibid., 139-140.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Swain and Russ Nieli, eds., *Contemporary Voices of White Nationalism in America*, 103.

[28] Jared Taylor, "Jews and American Renaissance," *American Renaissance*, April 14, 2006

[29] Ibid.

[30] "US Congressman Thomas Massie links \$40 million in US funding for Morocco to Spain's Ceuta migration crisis," *Business Insider*, August 3, 2026.

[31] Caroline Dupuy, "Morocco's Gaza deployment is reshaping its ties with Israel," *Middle East Eye*, August 4, 2026.

[32] "Morocco accused of using Israeli weapons to kill civilians in Western Sahara," *Middle East Eye*, March 22, 2024.