UNSC trapped in 1945: Keeping India and Japan out is self-defeating

written by Joseph Rozen | 01.11.2026
As the Security Council struggles to respond to global conflicts, New Delhi and Tokyo are pressing for structural reform. Israel has an opportunity to join their effort.

The Intifada in France is a warning to America, a reminder of Israel’s value

written by Meir Ben Shabbat | 01.11.2026
As violent unrest grips France and pro-Palestinian activism spreads across the West, Israel’s fight against radical Islam offers a warning to the US and Europe. Meanwhile, Hamas’ influence in Gaza casts doubt on ambitious plans for deradicalization.

United Nations Reform Is not Just Israel’s Concern

written by Joseph Rozen | 01.11.2026
India and Japan’s push to reform the Security Council offers Israel an opportunity

to build partnerships against the structural failures that undermine the UN.

Why Does Terrorism Surprise Us? Incitement as a Case in Point

written by Prof. Zaki Shalom | 01.11.2026

To break the cycle of enemy surprises, Israel must understand the ideology behind terrorism and combat the incitement that prepares the next generation.

Japan’s territorial dispute with Russia poses a strategic dilemma for Israel

written by Prof. Zaki Shalom | 01.11.2026

As Tokyo grows more assertive over islands seized by Moscow after World War II, Israel faces a difficult choice: Support a key US ally or risk undermining arguments central to its own territorial and security claims.

Trump-Xi meeting in Washington:

Managing tensions, not resolving them

written by Joseph Rozen | 01.11.2026

It was round two of a show that opened in Beijing in May. And it delivered exactly what round one should have taught anyone to expect.

UK-Israel crisis: A watershed event?

written by Prof. Zaki Shalom | 01.11.2026

The current crisis between Israel and Britain may deserve to be regarded as a watershed event in the history of Israeli diplomacy. Israel's response reflects a striking departure from its traditional diplomatic conduct.

Historically, relations between Britain and Israel have often been difficult. After Israel's establishment, Britain was reluctant to accept fully the territorial reality created by the 1948 war. During the 1950s, British policy included support for initiatives requiring Israeli territorial concessions. At one point, British military planning even considered the possibility of Royal Air Force action against Israeli air bases.

Yet throughout most of its history, Israel generally responded cautiously when confronted by pressure from major Western powers. It tried to minimize damage without turning a dispute into an open confrontation.

This time, Israel has behaved very differently.

A harsh Israeli reaction

British Foreign Secretary Ed Miliband announced a ban on imports from Israeli settlements and a new sanctions regime targeting companies and individuals involved in their expansion. He also declared the occupation illegal and accused elements among the settlers of "ethnic cleansing."

Israeli Foreign Minister Gideon Sa'ar responded in unusually harsh language, describing Miliband's statements as "outrageous lies." More importantly, he

articulated what appears to be a new Israeli doctrine:
“The message to every government seeking to harm us is clear: Whoever acts against Israel, Israel will act against them, and they will lose their influence and relevance in the region. Measures against Israel will not go unanswered.”
These were not merely rhetorical threats.
Israel announced the closure of the British Consulate in East Jerusalem, the removal of British representatives from the American coordination center dealing with Gaza, the termination of British participation in training Palestinian security forces in Ramallah, and a ban on the entry of 12 British public figures.
Diplomatically, these are extraordinary measures. Israel is telling Britain – a permanent member of the UN Security Council, a nuclear power, and a member of the G7 – that hostile action against Israel will carry a direct price.

British response to Israel’s measures

The British reaction is revealing. Miliband called Israel’s measures “regrettable and damaging,” but was quick to emphasize his confidence that intelligence and security cooperation between the two countries would continue.
That point is important. Britain has benefited for years from Israeli intelligence concerning Iran and terrorist threats. The present crisis therefore demonstrates that the relationship is not one-sided. Britain, too, has interests that could be harmed by prolonged confrontation.
The American response adds another important dimension. US Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee called the British measure “irrational” and warned that it could have serious consequences for British companies operating in American states with anti-boycott legislation.
Republican Congressman Randy Fine of Florida was even more explicit: “If you boycott Israel, we boycott you.” He warned that British companies participating in a boycott could face restrictions in dealing with public bodies in Florida. Texas also has anti-BDS legislation, although there is no basis at present for claiming that Texas has already imposed punitive measures on British companies.
Secretary of State Marco Rubio likewise made clear that the United States would “obviously” not join the British initiative.
In the background came President Donald Trump’s unusual statement supporting Irish reunification. There is no evidence that this was a direct response to Britain’s policy toward Israel. Yet symbolically, it reminds London that territorial and national disputes also exist within the United Kingdom itself.
This is what gives the present crisis its historical significance.
Israel is no longer merely trying to minimize the damage caused by pressure from a major power. It is signaling that political or economic pressure against Israel may generate political, regional, and economic costs for those applying it.

If this becomes a lasting pattern, the Israeli-British crisis of September 2026 may be remembered as the moment Israeli diplomacy moved from containment and caution toward reciprocity, deterrence, and the deliberate imposition of costs. Moshe Sharett, the father of Israeli diplomacy, might well have smiled.Published in The Jerusalem Post, September 29, 2026.*The opinions expressed in Misgav publications are the authors' alone.

Durban's enduring dangers

written by David M. Weinberg | 01.11.2026
Time to discard the UN and start over from scratch.

The UN's Anti-Israel Ecosystem

written by Dr. Adi Schwartz | 01.11.2026
Mapping the Institutions, Mechanisms, and Resources Behind the Campaign Against Israel.

Pacific partnership: India, Japan and Israel

written by Joseph Rozen | 01.11.2026
India and Japan's relationship has come of age. Israel's should, too.