

After Assad's fall, Iraq may break free from Iran's grip

written by Elie Klutstein | 26.12.2024

The US pressured Baghdad to disarm the pro-Iranian militias, and shortly afterward, these militias announced: we'll stop attacking Israel. Is Yemen now the only remaining outpost of Tehran in the regional conflict, and what are Tehran's options regarding its influence on Iraq?

The next big thing: Floating nuclear power plants

written by Elie Klutstein | 26.12.2024

Nuclear power plants are being built in Egypt and Turkey, while Iran and the UAE already benefit from nuclear energy in their electricity grids. Israel cannot yet join the celebration and may need to seek solutions at sea.

Why is the US selling weapons to Tunisia?

written by Elie Klutstein | 26.12.2024

Despite concerned statements from the US and European Union, despite the persecution of candidates and the huge election gap - the White House hasn't really condemned Tunisia's government.

Trump, Israel must realize that Assad's fall will change the reality in Iran

written by Dr. Yossi Mansharof | 26.12.2024

The dramatic changes in Syria harm Iran's strategic assets in the region, including the Al-Bukamal border crossing between Iraq and Syria.

How Amnesty International Became a Joke

written by Arsen Ostrovsky | 26.12.2024

This week, Amnesty International released a 296-page report, accusing Israel of committing "genocide" in Gaza. This charge, no less than a modern-day blood libel, is just the latest attack in Amnesty's longstanding campaign of lawfare against and vilification of the State of Israel, having previously accused the Jewish state of the equally unfounded charge of apartheid.

To be sure, this report, written under the guise of international law and human rights, is utterly baseless, replete with malicious lies and gross distortions of fact, as well as wholesale fabrications of law. The crime of genocide, coined in 1944 by the Polish-Jewish jurist Raphael Lemkin to describe the systematic extermination of Jews by the Nazis, is one of the most serious accusations that can be leveled in international law. To accuse Israel of "genocide" in Gaza is a grotesque and egregious subversion and weaponization of the very term itself.

It is important to recognize that genocide is very clearly defined under Article II

of the Genocide Convention of 1948, to mean “*acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.*” The commission of genocide has nothing to do with the number of civilian casualties that occur in a conflict; the key element here is the need to possess relevant “intent.”

Whatever criticism one may have of Israeli policies or Israel Defense Forces (IDF) actions in Gaza, at no stage has Israel been seeking to destroy the people in Gaza, whether in whole, in part, or in any manner whatsoever.

Israeli leaders are directing military policy in accordance with the decisions of the War Cabinet, and Prime Minister Netanyahu, the Defense Minister, and the IDF Chief of Staff have been unequivocal: The intent of the operation in Gaza following October 7 is to eliminate Hamas by destroying its military and governing capabilities and to rescue the hostages. These are both entirely legitimate military objectives under the laws of armed conflict.

That there have been civilian casualties in Gaza is tragic, but it is also the inevitable consequence of Hamas using its own people as human shields and embedding its military operations in schools, hospitals, kindergartens, and homes. Notwithstanding the complex challenge of operating in such difficult environment, the IDF has gone to extraordinary lengths, not seen in modern warfare, to abide by the principles of International humanitarian law and avoid harm to civilians in Gaza. This has included implementing historic measures to prevent civilian harm, such as advanced alerts to provide early warning and temporary evacuations, daily pauses of fighting, distributing maps to civilians, using precision weapons, as well as facilitating daily provision of aid.

In fact, to demonstrate just how utterly ludicrous Amnesty’s accusation of genocide is, one only needs to see that, according to the CIA World Factbook, the population in Gaza has actually increased 2 percent in the last year. This is the very opposite of seeking to destroy, in whole or in part or in any way, a group of people.

Perhaps knowing it doesn’t have a legal leg to stand on, Amnesty has resorted to manufacturing its own definition of genocide. Amnesty claims that the universally established and the sole accepted legal definition as outlined in the Genocide Convention of 1948 which requires the existence of intent is an “overly cramped

interpretation of international jurisprudence and one that would effectively preclude a finding of genocide in the context of an armed conflict.”

It’s not just Israel that finds this redefinition ridiculous. In an absolutely scathing rebuke, even Amnesty’s own Israel office has totally rejected Amnesty International’s report, saying it was a “predetermined conclusion” based on “biased” and “artificial” analysis of the situation in Gaza and “motivated by a desire to support a popular narrative among Amnesty International’s target audience.”

If anyone is guilty of genocide here, it is Hamas. Not only does Hamas openly state that the destruction of Israel is its ultimate goal, as evidenced in their Charter, it acted out on those intentions on October 7, when Hamas massacred over 1,200 Israelis in a rampage that included raping, burning, mutilating, executing and abducting women and children. We’ve stood in the kibbutzim and communities in the south of Israel and saw first-hand the death and destruction. That is where the real attempted genocide occurred.

In an interview last year, shortly after the massacre, senior Hamas official Ghazi Hamad admitted that the terror group would repeat the October 7 massacre “again and again” until Israel was “annihilated,” openly admitting the group’s genocidal intentions. But Amnesty has completely disregarded this, instead absolving and whitewashing the heinous actions of Hamas.

The incoming Trump Administration should declare Amnesty a hate-group and adopt blistering sanctions against them, including withdrawing financial support and any cooperation with government agencies.

Regrettably, Amnesty International, once a storied human rights organization, has lost all credibility, becoming nothing more than a propaganda mouthpiece for the murderers and rapists of Hamas.

The article was written together with John Spencer is chair of urban warfare studies at the Modern War Institute (MWI) at West Point

Published in Newsweek, December 05, 2024.

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

They are hunting Jews in Amsterdam. Canada could be next

written by Arsen Ostrovsky | 26.12.2024
Ottawa must act now to stamp out Jew-hatred.

Who is running the Foreign Office? Lammy or Corbyn?

written by Arsen Ostrovsky | 26.12.2024
Opposition Leader Sir Keir Starmer (pictured) appeared unequivocal in his solidarity with Israel, vowing the Jewish state “has the right to defend herself” and “do everything that it can to get those hostages back safe and sound”.

The West must play to win against terrorism

written by Arsen Ostrovsky | 26.12.2024
Following the exploding Hezbollah pagars in Lebanon and the elimination of the terrorist organization’s senior leadership in the last week, there is a sense that Israel is shifting from a strategy of containment to one of decisive action. This paradigm shift moves beyond merely managing the threat toward a bolder objective: pre-emption and total victory.

As President Isaac Herzog said, “we don’t want war, but if it’s waged against us, we go all the way.”

Israeli leaders have long understood the existential danger posed by Iran and its proxies, Hamas and Hezbollah. Yet over the last two decades, instead of eliminating these threats, Israeli policies — at the West’s insistence — have often emboldened the rise of these powerful non-state militias. The policy of limited warfare has allowed these groups to survive, grow and become more entrenched.

This strategy is not unique to Israel. Since the end of World War II, Western powers have consistently avoided all-out victories, often choosing containment and appeasement or limited engagement over total warfare and the crippling of these terror networks. The result? Persistent, unresolved conflicts which, like the Korean War, linger to this day with continued threats.

If the West had allowed Gen. Douglas MacArthur to fully deploy his military strategy against North Korea and its Chinese backers — including a blockade of Chinese ports and decisive action to cut off supply lines — the outcome could have been quite different. As matters stand, we are left with a North Korean regime that continues to destabilize global security to this day.

The Vietnam War presents another example of limited warfare’s long-term costs. President Richard Nixon eventually escalated U.S. actions with the bombing of Haiphong and incursions into Laos and Cambodia, but by then, it was too late. Had the U.S. taken these decisive steps earlier or used the full force of its military to block the Ho Chi Minh Trail from the start, the course of the war might have shifted. Instead, Vietnam became a symbol of American defeat.

Fast-forward to today, and the West is repeating this pattern of half-measures.

In Ukraine, the incremental and conditional aid provided to President Volodymyr Zelensky in his battle against Russian aggression evinces the same mindset. Instead of immediate, overwhelming support, Western nations trickle in aid and impose restrictions on its use.

Sanctions, too, are often enforced unevenly. For example, sanctions on Iran are easily circumvented, with Iranian oil still finding buyers worldwide, undermining the impact of economic penalties.

As history has shown, authoritarian regimes and non-state actors understand and respond to one thing: ruthless power. Whether military, economic or political, decisive action has proven to be the only language understood by those who seek to disrupt global stability.

Western nations learned this lesson the hard way during World War II, when British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement failed spectacularly. Chamberlain's ill-fated agreement with Hitler, meant to ensure "peace for our time," only delayed the inevitable. As Churchill scolded him, "you were given the choice between war and dishonour. You chose dishonour and you will have war."

Ultimately, it was not diplomacy but total military defeat that ended Nazi Germany's threat to Europe. To use Churchill's words again, when asked what was Britain's policy, he said "victory, victory at all costs."

Yet since its establishment in 1948, the Jewish state has been the only democracy repeatedly denied the right to achieve total victory against enemies who have time and again initiated wars and pogroms, seeking no less than its very annihilation.

Even though it was Israel attacked by Hamas on Oct. 7, it was also an assault on the West and the principles it claims to uphold — freedom, democracy and the rule of law. If the West truly seeks to uphold these sacrosanct values, then it must finally abandon the strategy of limited warfare and throw its full weight behind Israel as the frontier of Western civilization.

This is not the time for half measures. Hamas, Hezbollah and their sponsors in Tehran must be decisively defeated, not contained.

As Ronald Reagan warned in 1964, during his "A Time for Choosing" speech in the peak of the Cold War, "a policy of accommodation is appeasement, and it gives no choice between peace and war, only between fight or surrender."

The bad actors of today — China, Russia, Iran, North Korea and their proxies — do not negotiate from a place of weakness or fear international opinion. Instead, they project power without concern for identity politics or public sentiment.

In short, the West must play to win in order to defend freedom.

The article was written by Arsen Ostrovsky in collaboration with Businessman Rick Ekstein, founder of Phaze 3 Associates, advocates for the Jewish community and improving Canada through political engagement.

Published in The Hill, September 26, 2024.

PM Netanyahu should address the UN General Assembly this week

written by Lahav Harkov | 26.12.2024

Netanyahu can use the timing of his address to effectively make the case that Israel needs to strongly defend itself from the threats of the Shiite jihadist group on its northern border.

Post Sheikh Hasina's exit, can Bangladesh's democracy be salvaged?

written by Joseph Rozen | 26.12.2024

.As the Islamists regain their place in Bangladeshi society and politics, fears loom over the safety and freedom of Hindus