

Sitting out World War III

written by David M. Weinberg | 19.03.2026

Listen to the snotty statements coming out of Bonn, London, Ottawa, and Paris since the start of World War III – the assault launched this month by the US and Israel against the globe’s top exporter of terrorism, against a nearly nuclear radical Islamic hegemon that seeks to destroy Israel and bring the US and the West to its knees.

In a first stage of reactions to operations Epic Fury and Roaring Lion, Western leaders took to the high hills of condescension against the US and Israel.

President Emmanuel Macron stuck his nose up in the air in typical French diplomatic fashion to distance himself from US President Donald Trump and Israel Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, whom he views as hotheads. He said that France would remain “calm, composed, and determined” – meaning superior, aloof, and disengaged.

British Prime Minister Keir Starmer also took refuge in ersatz “high principles” to rebuff the US-Israel offensive. “We stand by principles, which I believe are shared by the British people, to base our decision on a calm, level-headed assessment of the British national interest” – meaning that London rejects the interests of Washington and Jerusalem as feverish and foolish.

Behind this is perverse denial of the 47-year war waged by Iran against America, the West, and Israel; irritating fealty to something nebulous and immobilizing called the “rules-based international order”; bitter hostility to Trump and to the State of Israel; and disintegration of national identity and purpose.

In a second stage of reactions, these Western leaders bent a tad to begin talking about “the defense of allies in the region,” basically meaning Gulf states but not Israel.

On March 1, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom said that they were “appalled” by the indiscriminate and disproportionate missile attacks launched by Iran against countries in the region, *including those who were not involved in initial US and Israeli military operations.* I read this as “especially” or “mainly” those countries not involved in striking Iran – again, specifically excluding Israel.

France added that it “would be reliable with our allies,” clearly meaning Arab allies. Paris got a little hot under the collar when Iranian fire hit French forces in Iraq and the UAE. And then Paris along with Bonn got particularly perturbed mid-week when Israel struck Iran’s largest gas facility and Iran assaulted oil facilities in Qatar and Saudi Arabia. That got their cahoonas into gear – not 500 massive and deadly ICBMs fired by Iran into Israel.

On March 15, the UK Ministry of Defense highlighted Britain’s role “in air protection over the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, and Cyprus in defense of British people and British interests, and to support our allies across the region.” Again, no mention of Israel and no recognition of the suffering of Israelis or the damages incurred by Israel throughout this war.

In fact, nobody in London has felt the need at any time over the past three weeks to talk about defending Israel. Maybe because Britain no longer truly considers Israel an “ally”?

In truth, Israel does not need or want these countries to physically defend the Jewish state. We will settle for recognition of the justice of the war against Iran, some acknowledgement of the sacrifice of Israeli civilians and heroism of Israeli pilots, and a modicum of rehabilitation relief for battered Israel – say, one-one-hundredth of the massive European and Canadian humanitarian assistance for Lebanese citizens.

Do any of the above-mentioned leaders even know that 3,500 Israelis have been made homeless by Iranian missile attacks, and almost 4,000 Israelis injured?

Canadian Prime Minister Mark Carney also has discounted the broad context of the necessary war and its strategic aims, muttering only about “defending Canadians” and “defending our allies when it makes sense” – whatever that means.

What about helping to eviscerate Iran? No way. Carney harrumphed that “Canada will play no offensive role against Iran,” and averred that Ottawa is bravely focused on getting Canadians out of the region and assuring that the Canadian Armed Forces remain out of harm’s way.

Not to be rhetorically outdone by her prime minister, Canadian foreign minister Anita Anand huffed and puffed: “We were not consulted on the offensive military

operation. We did not participate in the offensive operation. We have no intention of participating in the military operation period.”

Under pressure from Washington, Carney’s defense minister, David McGuinty, allowed that Canada is “leaving the door open” to military support in the region, meaning that “the question of assistance to Gulf countries is one that we’re considering.” (Again, no thought of assisting Israel).

And in a striking moment of honesty, McGuinty admitted that neither strategic principle nor tangible commitment to allies stands at the core of Canadian policy but rather the question of how Ottawa maneuvers around, about, and over Trump. “We will continue to consult, but we’ve always managed to find a way to manage our relationship with the United States, and we will manage our way through this as well,” McGuinty gulped without a smidgeon of embarrassment.

ALL THESE “leaders” have withstood pressure from Trump to join an international naval coalition to force open the Strait of Hormuz, even though Europe is much more dependent on oil from the Arabian Gulf than is the US.

Essentially, they say: Iran is not such a threat to global peace and security. Israel and the US may be the greater shared threat. Therefore, this is not our war. We will only defend our narrowest-of-narrow interests a bare bit.

German Chancellor Friedrich Merz has sought to wrap repudiation of the US and Israel in highfalutin diplomatic terms. “We lack a mandate from the United Nations, the European Union, or NATO for the war,” he said. “Diplomacy and deescalation” are the preferred route for handling Iran, he predictably added.

Yeah, sure. As if “mandates” from impotent international edifices are more important than winning the war that has been engaged. As if European-led diplomacy ever has effectively defanged or dissuaded Iran from pursuing its path of genocidal aggression.

I say that such studied neutrality in the great struggle against Iran is collusion with the enemy. All the “calm and level-headed” excuses for sitting out this war (of course, excepting “defensive assistance” to several oil-rich Gulf countries) is a grand collapse of Western spine and principle.

I also cast-off anodyne sentiments about “heartfelt feelings for all victims of

conflict in the region” and other such throwaway international statements. Without determination to quell Iran – and again, without specific expressed concern for Israel and Israelis too – these mushy musings equal profound moral failure.

Indeed, the frostiness exhibited by the “leaders” described above recalls the adage that you rudely discover who your true friends are (and are not) when the chips are down.

ALAS, the ethical limpness and political animosity described here regarding struggle against Iran is of a piece with the rotten global standard in relation to Arab-Israeli conflict, going back decades.

The response of UN and EU leaders to every Palestinian-Israeli conflagration long has been to condemn the “continuing cycle of violence” (and then press for endless negotiations while boosting Hamas blood libels about Israeli war crimes). As if Israel and the Palestinians each were cavalierly engaging in murder just for fun or out of comparable burning hatred. As if “both sides” were “suffering casualties” and equally responsible for the “cycle” of warfare.

What is missing from the above comments in relation to both the Iranian and Palestinian fronts is no-nonsense diagnosis of enemy aggression. Few are willing to reference Tehran’s almost five-decade-long record of assault against non-Shiite Arab, Western, and Israeli interests. Nobody has the guts to remark upon the death-glorifying political culture of Palestinians that repeatedly chooses war and terrorism over peace negotiations.

This nonalignment keeps the storyline in a neat, supposedly non-judgmental, and purportedly “level-headed” comfort zone – bereft of any right-minded backbone, free from any commitment to explicitly recognize and concretely fight evil. Alas, such detachment is tantamount to betrayal of Israel and the US, and is perfidy against the future of Western civilization.

Published in The Jerusalem Post 20.03.2026.

*The opinions expressed in Misgav publications are the authors’ alone.