



ISRAEL NEWS

*A collection of the week's news from Israel
From the Bet El Twinning / Israel Action Committee of
Beth Avraham Yoseph of Toronto Congregation*

Quote of the Week...

Melissa Lantsman's Statement on PM Carney's Recognition of a "Palestinian State"

"In the short term, this reckless decision destroys Canada's credibility, shreds the international rules-based order, and abandons the Western values we once proudly defended.

"In the long term, the consequences are obvious: Hamas is rewarded, terror is legitimized, hostage-taking is vindicated, and the violent mobs who block streets, vandalize businesses, target synagogues, and even shoot up schools are handed a victory they don't deserve. Canada just recognized a Palestinian state whose current "government" literally pays salaries to terrorists for killing people. That makes them a state sponsor of terror by Canada's own definition.

"Canada is weaker, smaller, and more isolated from our allies. Mark Carney's vacuous foreign policy based on "pretend conditions" is cold, calculated, and done entirely for votes.

"The Prime Minister has just written a cheque to terror and all its victims —everywhere." - Hon. Melissa Lantsman, MP (Thornhill) (X.com Sep 21)

Commentary...

There Is No Palestinian State to Recognize By Mike Pompeo

The recognition of the so-called Palestinian state by Britain, Portugal, France, Canada, and Australia this week was nothing short of perverse.

It was practically absurd, morally reprehensible, and will only prolong the danger to Israel and the anguish of everyday Gazans. Perhaps worst of all, it distracts from the real problem preventing peace: the Iranian regime, which provides terror groups with the money and arms needed to carry out their most horrific attacks.

Far from advancing the cause of peace in the region, the move has thrown a lifeline to Hamas at a time when the civilized world should be uniting in support of Israel's efforts to defeat the terror group once and for all. It likewise disincentivizes Gaza's leaders to agree to a ceasefire, let alone release the remaining hostages, dozens of which remain in Hamas captivity.

Make no mistake: The decision by these countries to treat "Palestine" as an independent state ratifies the logic of the terrorists who, nearly two years ago to the day, perpetrated the worst attack on the Jewish people since the Holocaust. The twisted logic that this move will somehow isolate Hamas by empowering the illegitimate, unpopular, terror-supporting Palestinian Authority is beyond fanciful. As the perpetrators of the October 7, 2023 attack, Hamas—which has already lauded the move as "a deserved outcome of our people's struggle"—will continue to claim that achieving statehood was their doing. And they will be right. Far from damaging Hamas, it will empower them, while broadcasting to the Middle East and the world at large that terrorism gets results.

The actions taken by these countries represent the worst kind of diplomatic fantasy. Diplomats must be in the business of dealing with the world as it is, not as they'd like it to be. That's not what they're doing here.

Recognizing a Palestinian state where none exists is not only a bad idea because of its practical implications for security; it fails at the first hurdle, as the most basic requirements of sovereignty are absent. What will the borders of this so-called Palestinian state be, and how will that

be settled? How can the Palestinian Authority—which has not held elections in 20 years—be considered a legitimate governing authority in any sense of the word? Who signs the documents, makes the laws, and

controls the military? No one has been able to answer these baseline questions amid their preening and pontificating.

When I served as Secretary of State in the first Trump administration, we recognized that neither the Hamas-led government in Gaza nor the corrupt, terrorist-supporting Palestinian Authority in the West Bank had any interest in a peaceful two-state solution. With the historic Abraham Accords, we took a new approach that isolated bad actors and incentivized constructive engagement and recognition of Israel as the path to regional peace.

The path being pursued by our allies in Europe and elsewhere does the exact opposite: rewarding the terrorists and kleptocrats who seek to destroy Israel, and who keep their own people oppressed and immiserated.

Genuine peace will only come with the total defeat of Hamas and its most important backer: the Islamic Republic of Iran.

For decades, Iran has used its proxies throughout the region to encircle Israel within a "ring of fire," keeping the world's only Jewish nation in a state of permanent existential peril. They've sent hundreds of millions to Hamas and other terror networks, such as Palestinian Islamic Jihad and Hezbollah. And they've done all this while feverishly trying to build a nuclear arsenal that would pose an intolerable threat to Israel and imperil American forces across the region.

October 7 showed the Israelis that this intolerable situation could not continue. Thanks to Israel's military actions against Iranian proxies across the region and the degrading of Iran's covert nuclear program by Israel and the U.S., the Islamic Republic is arguably weaker than it has ever been. The move to recognize a Palestinian state where none exists did not just reward terror groups. It was also a boon to a faltering regime in Tehran desperate to repair its standing among Iranians after its decisive defeat in June's 12-Day War.

Any leader who genuinely desires peace should instead seize the historic opportunity to continue to diminish the Iranian regime and empower the forces across the region that seek a constructive relationship with Israel.

History shows that peace has never been secured through appeasement—a lesson one would have thought our European and Anglosphere allies would keenly appreciate. Israel does not have the luxury of forgetting that lesson, and so they will continue to hold the line against barbarism, even if their supposed friends in the West will not. (The Free Press Sep 23)

Thank You, Premiers Starmer, Carney and Albanese

By Avi Abelow

On Sunday, British Prime Minister Keir Starmer, Canadian Prime Minister Mark Carney and Australian Prime Minister Anthony Albanese announced that they formally recognize a Palestinian state.

I just wanted to say thank you.

Thank you for making it crystal clear that the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia now stand with a genocidal death cult. That they reward the barbaric atrocities of Oct. 7, 2023, with diplomatic prizes. That morality, memory and justice have been officially sacrificed on the altar of Jew-hatred, woke politics and Islamic appeasement.

Let's stop pretending this has anything to do with peace, rights or law. Starmer's plan is not about "justice." It's not about a "two-state solution." It's not even about Palestinians. It's about one thing only: Punishing the Jewish people for surviving.

Supporting the recognition of a state called "Palestine" is a

reward for Hamas. The bloodshed of Palestinians in Gaza by Hamas has already started, just hours after the news.

Almost two years ago, Hamas committed the worst massacre of Jews since the Holocaust. They raped women, beheaded babies, burned families alive, mutilated corpses and livestreamed it to the world. They still hold on to more than 40 of our hostages.

The announcement comes with no insistence on the freedom of our hostages; no demand that the International Red Cross or the United Nations visit our hostages, who are being starved and tortured in Gaza by Hamas.

Instead, they declare: “Yes. You deserve a state.”

You don’t give statehood to people who glorify genocide, unless you support it.

You don’t give diplomatic recognition to a political entity that:

- Doesn’t control its own territory.
- Does not hold democratic elections.
- Is split between Hamas and the PLO, both of which fund and incite terror.
- Refuses to recognize Israel’s right to exist.
- Still has a charter calling for Israel’s extermination.

According to the U.N.’s own rules, Palestine does not meet the requirements to be recognized as a state. But since this move isn’t about law, is not about peace, it doesn’t have to. It is an expression of global antisemitism in a new form, “progressive,” diplomatic and dripping with moral hypocrisy.

Starmer, Carney and Albanese know this. They know that after Oct. 7, Israel now understands what a “Palestinian state” means. It means turning our biblical heartland, Judea and Samaria, into Gaza 2.0. It means rockets on Ben-Gurion International Airport, snipers on Israel’s main Highway 6, and terror tunnels into Jerusalem. It means another Holocaust, this time with the blessing of the so-called “civilized world.”

That is what these prime ministers are doing intentionally. Israel will have no choice but to treat all three as what they are quickly becoming: a strategic liability.

This will, of course, end all intelligence cooperation with Britain, Australia and Canada.

Israel doesn’t share intelligence with countries that fund and recognize its enemies. We don’t trust allies who help build the infrastructure for our next massacre. And most importantly, we don’t ask for permission to defend ourselves.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, the world has shown its cards. They are not neutral. They are not honest brokers. They want a Palestinian state not because they care about Arabs, but because they can’t stand a proud, strong Jewish state that defends itself as any Western country would.

So let’s act accordingly: Apply full Israeli sovereignty in Judea and Samaria. Restore full Jewish governance across our biblical homeland. Offer local autonomy to local tribes who want to live in peace with Israel, like the Hebron Sheikhs, and otherwise, implement Trump’s emigration plan for those who support terror against us.

No more waiting. No more appeasing. No more illusions.

As for Starmer, if you’re so eager to recognize Palestine, do the world a favor: Set it up in London. Because, frankly, that’s what London is becoming anyway.

When you ignore grooming gangs, terror threats, radical mosques, and Islamic antisemitic million-man marches on your streets, while trying to carve up our land, maybe it’s time you focus on your own.

We’ll handle ourselves, thanks.

The Jewish people are not going anywhere. Not from Judea. Not from Samaria. Not from Gaza. Not from Jerusalem.

We’ve returned home and we’re staying. No matter how many Western leaders try to turn back the clock.

So once again, Prime Ministers Carney, Albanese and Starmer: Thank you. You’ve reminded every Jew that we can never rely on the U.K., where reality is ignored. And that our destiny, like our defense, is in our hands alone. (JNS Sep 22)

The Illusion of Recognition By Elya Cowland

As the U.N. General Assembly meets, leaders from across the globe are lining up to announce recognition of a Palestinian state.

French President Emmanuel Macron has led the charge, urging the Saudis and others to enshrine the two-state solution as the only path to peace. Governments from Canada to Australia to the United Kingdom have already followed suit, formally recognizing Palestine.

It may feel historic to those in the room. Palestinian activists will post triumphant slogans. Supporters will believe their governments have brought Palestine closer to freedom. But in Israel, and even in the newly “recognized” Palestine, we know better.

We see this ritual for what it is: a performance staged for Western audiences, where declarations carry no cost and no risk. A fantasy in which peace is conjured with a press release, while the war outside rages on.

As the cheering fades abroad, the reality here remains unaltered: Israelis still praying for hostages in Gaza, still bracing as the second anniversary of Oct. 7 approaches. Palestinians will remain trapped between Hamas’s iron grip in Gaza and a corrupt authority in the West Bank. No borders drawn. No government built. No weapons surrendered.

Because these recognitions are not about Palestine at all.

They are about Western leaders recognizing themselves, their virtue, their relevance and their ability to declare an outcome without doing the hard work of securing it. And, lest we forget, a way to appease growing Islamist blocs whose votes mean power can be kept a little longer.

But theater has consequences. For Hamas, it is confirmation that violence pays. Why compromise when patience alone brings international rewards? The moment that recognition was dangled, negotiations lost their meaning.

For the Palestinian Authority, it is yet another escape hatch from responsibility. Why build transparent institutions or prepare the public for coexistence when foreign parliaments will declare a state on their behalf? Recognition without reform is not liberation; it is a license to remain stuck.

For Israel, it is a message that allies will overlook its security in favor of easy headlines. A betrayal dressed as statesmanship, leaving the Jewish state more isolated at the very moment it faces existential threats.

Each declaration claims to advance peace. In practice, each one makes it harder. Never has lasting peace been forged by outside impositions with zero dialogue between the people in conflict. Real peace—from South Africa’s transition out of apartheid, to the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland, to Rwanda’s post-genocide reconciliation—was not declared by outsiders. It was negotiated, painfully and directly, by the parties themselves.

Outside powers can help. They can mediate, pressure and support. But they cannot substitute the hard work of adversaries choosing peace. When outsiders try to impose solutions without dialogue, they fail, from Vietnam to Bosnia, from Afghanistan to Syria. Declarations without buy-in are not solutions; they are distractions, often dangerous ones.

Those who promote unilateral recognition as a way of advancing the “two-state solution” ignore this lesson. Israel has, in fact, offered two states before: in 1947, in 2000 at Camp David, and in 2008 under Ehud Olmert. Each time, the offer was rejected. Not because of imperfect maps, but because acceptance would mean recognizing a Jewish state alongside a Palestinian one. That refusal, not Israel’s unwillingness to compromise, is what has kept two states from becoming a reality. No conference, no announcement, no recognition will change that.

Every time the world indulges in fantasy, it pushes real peace further away. Israelis don’t feel safer. Palestinians don’t feel closer to freedom. The only ones celebrating are politicians, who mistake gestures for progress, and extremists, who know the performance props them up.

The truth is harsh but simple: Peace will not be imposed from

abroad. It will not arrive through symbolic recognitions or foreign applause. It will only come when Israelis and Palestinians themselves decide to build it. Until then, the ovations of the once great halls of the United Nations are just noise, loud abroad, but here, drowned out by the silence of another obstacle to peace. (JNS Sep 25)

Laser-Focused: What Iron Beam Means for Israel, its Enemies, and the US By Mike Watson

Amid the new offensive in Gaza City, repeated Russian encroachments into NATO airspace, and China's relentless drive toward artificial intelligence domination, the American-led order is under intense strain. So Israel's latest technological breakthrough could not have come at a more opportune time for the United States and its allies.

On Wednesday, Israel's defense ministry announced its "Iron Beam" laser air defense system has completed testing and will be operational by the end of this year. Israel is on the cusp of solving one of the thorniest dilemmas in modern warfare. It is also showing how rapidly military technology is changing, and why it is vital that the Trump administration's defense reforms succeed.

Iron Beam can destroy incoming rockets, mortars, drones, and manned aircraft, and it has already proved its worth in the campaigns against Hezbollah and Iran. Israel plans for it to complement Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow, which use missiles to destroy threats to the Israeli homeland. In 5 to 10 years, Rafael chairman Yuval Steinitz predicts, "nothing hostile will fly in the air—no aircraft, no drones, no cruise missiles, no shells, no bombs—because the laser will completely clear the air of anything detected, anything seen."

This technology will partly reverse the most significant global transformation in military technology of this century, one that has already had a major impact on American national security. In 2000, few countries could match America's ability to identify faraway targets and hit them with precision. But in the past two decades, America's adversaries have learned how to make their own precision-guided munitions, often in the form of long-range missiles and, more recently, drones. They can, at relatively little expense, threaten everything not buried deep underground.

Israel was in the crosshairs of this transformation. In 2006, Israeli forces were surprised by how effectively Hezbollah used guided anti-tank missiles. Since then, Iran's minions have almost continuously lobbed guided missiles, more ungainly rockets, and mortars at Israeli civilians.

Americans, Israelis, and their allies have made significant advances in air defense technology to address this threat. With American assistance, Israel developed the Iron Dome system that swats down many of the shorter-range threats. David's Sling and Arrow handle bigger missiles. Americans have developed world-class defenses against more potent threats. Vladimir Putin bragged that his hypersonic Kinzhal missiles were "invincible"—Ukrainians proved him wrong with American-made Patriots. With American and allied help, Israel has weathered three massive waves of Iranian missile and drone attacks since Oct. 7 with relatively little damage.

Western missile defenses are top-notch, but they are also expensive. The roughly 200 interceptors American and Israeli forces launched in June cost about \$1.5 billion. This is certainly better than the alternative of hostile missiles raining down on civilians, but it is unsustainable over a long war. The Ukrainians have resorted to using shotguns and machine guns against Russia's massive arsenal of drones to save their scarce supply of air defense missiles.

Iron Beam solves that problem. Instead of firing an interceptor—or in some cases, several—to shoot down a missile that costs a fraction of the interceptor, Iron Beam fries the incoming weapon with lasers at about two bucks a shot. In other words, air defense can be not only effective, but also cost effective.

Laser defenses will be particularly helpful for small, compact countries like Israel. The United States and many of its larger allies cannot fully secure their skies with laser weapons, but they can protect

key targets. If, for example, American laser systems become powerful enough to stop China's long-range missiles from hitting aircraft carriers and key installations in the Pacific, then many of China's vaunted "assassin's mace" weapons will be much less valuable.

Other technological transformations will follow in short order. Armed drones were highly unusual only five years ago, and now the Russians and Ukrainians field millions of them. Iron Beam and related technologies will make many of these drones unusable, which will prompt militaries to find new ways to attack their enemies. American companies like Anduril, Epirus, and Saronic are already peering beyond this technological horizon to develop the sci-fi gizmos that will dominate battlefields in the future.

The U.S. military depends on its technological edge to deter and, if necessary, defeat its enemies, but that edge has been blunted. The Trump administration is trying to force the Pentagon to move at the pace of technological change. For example, War Secretary Pete Hegseth has directed the Army to purchase and field new capabilities with utmost speed.

America's national security depends on the success of this effort. The ongoing wars in Europe and the Middle East show that many old technologies still have their value. But the slow get left behind—and die there. (Washington Free Beacon Sep 20)

Why Trump Let Netanyahu Strike Hamas in Doha

By Michael Doran

On Monday, Qatar hosted an emergency Arab-Islamic summit to address Israel's attack on Hamas leaders in Doha. Qatari prime minister Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman Al Thani denounced the strikes as "barbaric" and called for an end to the "double standard" applied to Israel. Arab League Secretary-General Ahmed Aboul Gheit added that "silence on a crime is a crime."

In the United States, Vermont senator Bernie Sanders last week called for ending U.S. military aid to Israel. "Netanyahu's extremist government is completely out of control," he posted on X. "Not only are they starving children in Gaza, they are now breaking international law by dropping bombs on Qatar, a U.S. security partner."

For President Donald Trump, however, Israel remains the security partner of choice in the Middle East, and the attack on Qatar has done nothing to change that status. Although Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu both issued statements insisting that Israel acted alone in striking Hamas leaders in Qatar, their denials of coordination strain belief.

Israel's Channel 12 news reported on Monday that, according to Israeli officials, Netanyahu did inform Trump before giving the order to launch missiles at Qatar. "Israel would not have attacked if it believed Trump was opposed," the officials said.

Forcing Israel to abort an ongoing bombing mission is not a hard thing for the American president to do. Trump did just that three months ago, in the final hours of the 12-day war. When Trump learned of ongoing exchanges of fire between Israel and Iran, he spoke in anger to reporters at the White House. "We basically have two countries that have been fighting so long and so hard that they don't know what the fuck they're doing," the president said. Shortly thereafter, he posted on Truth Social: "ISRAEL is not going to attack Iran. All planes will turn around. . . . Ceasefire is in effect!"

With the memory of Trump forcing him to recall the fighter jets while they were in the air, Netanyahu would not strike a U.S.-allied country—home to a major American military base—without consulting the president. If an Israeli bomb were to kill Americans manning a Patriot battery, or if an American missile were to down an Israeli F-35, the consequences for Israel would be catastrophic.

Trump claimed he learned of the attack on Doha only when the U.S. military informed him at the last minute, too late to intervene. This raises a major question. To reach Qatar, Israeli jets likely crossed Syrian, Iraqi, and Kuwaiti airspace and flew near the U.S.

Fifth Fleet headquarters in Bahrain. Did both the planning and the early execution of this operation elude the detection of American signals intelligence? If so, the episode constitutes a major American intelligence failure.

The political distance that Trump struck from Netanyahu fits a familiar pattern. The two leaders have developed a good cop-bad cop routine. On June 13, 2025, Israel reportedly hit Iran, and Trump's team insisted Israel acted alone. "Tonight, Israel took unilateral action against Iran," Secretary of State Marco Rubio declared. "We are not involved in strikes against Iran." Four days later, Trump reportedly authorized Operation Midnight Hammer, in which U.S. B-2 bombers and submarine-launched missiles struck Iran's nuclear sites at Fordow, Natanz, and Isfahan.

Still, the Trump-Netanyahu routine is not mere theater. Israel often acts without guarantees, and when its bets fail, it suffers the consequences alone. Trump embraces the wins and distances himself from failures. Asked about the Doha operation on the evening after the strikes, he offered studied displeasure: "We want the hostages back," he said, "but we are not thrilled about the way that went down." At that moment, reports already indicated Israel likely missed its main targets—giving the phrase "the way that went down" a pointed double meaning.

Netanyahu launched the strike in immediate response to a terror attack the previous day at Ramot Junction in Jerusalem, where two Palestinian gunmen, claimed by Hamas's Al-Qassam Brigades, killed six Israelis and wounded 21. Additionally, an operational opportunity arose when Hamas leaders, including chief negotiator Khalil al-Hayya, assembled in Doha to discuss a U.S. ceasefire proposal, prompting Israel to act swiftly. But contextual factors, while significant, were not the primary strategic drivers of the operation.

Israel's ability to go on offense places it in a rare category among U.S. allies. Most lack the will or capacity to wage war independently. Critics like Tucker Carlson depict Israel's independence as a liability, dragging America into fights that don't serve its interests. Trump sees the reverse: Unilateral Israeli military operations spare American forces and serve U.S. strategic goals. In just two years, Israel has blunted Iran's nuclear ambitions, hammered Hezbollah, neutered Hamas, and weakened the Houthis—achievements many Americans view as enhancing their own security.

Like Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger before him, Trump understands that Israeli military power elevates U.S. global status—and, by extension, his own. Only Trump can rein in Netanyahu. Those seeking to moderate the Jewish state must petition him. The public distance he strikes from Israel fools no one, nor does he intend it to. He is signaling, simultaneously, an acquiescence in Israel's actions and a willingness to restrain Israel, provided doing so is made worth his while.

If Trump and Netanyahu are better coordinated than they let on, what was the point of the attack in Doha? There were five major strategic goals, the first of which was to convince Hamas that only the Trump plan holds any prospect of ending the Gaza conflict.

On September 7, Trump announced a Gaza peace proposal, claiming Israel's acceptance, which demands Hamas release the remaining 48 hostages (about 20 of whom are presumed to be alive), disarm, and cede power in exchange for a ceasefire, a prisoner swap, and U.S.-led reconstruction. Hamas rejected the plan, viewing it as surrender, and sought amendments for a permanent Israeli withdrawal and retention of political dominance in Gaza. The Israelis perceive significant differences between Hamas in Gaza and Hamas in Doha. Gaza's leaders—second- and third-tier figures elevated by the deaths of their commanders—show greater readiness for compromise than Doha's leaders, some of whom are close to Iran.

Israel's attack aimed to eliminate this intransigent wing. Reports indicate senior Hamas leaders like al-Hayya and Khaled Meshaal survived, with al-Hayya reportedly stepping out to pray just before the strike. Five lower-level Hamas members, including al-Hayya's son and one Qatari security official, were reportedly killed.

The second goal was to fulfill an Israeli promise. "Every member

of Hamas is a dead man," Netanyahu said after October 7, 2023. International calls for a ceasefire—from French president Emmanuel Macron, UK prime minister Keir Starmer, or Senator Bernie Sanders—pressure Netanyahu to renege on that commitment. But destroying Hamas aligns with the Netanyahu Doctrine: no monsters on Israel's borders. Before October 7, Israel allowed groups like Hamas and Hezbollah to grow, believing deterrence and diplomacy could manage them. That assumption no longer holds.

Netanyahu's goal of eradicating Hamas enjoys stronger backing from Trump than many realize. Together with former British prime minister Tony Blair, Trump and Israel are working on a plan for an interim governing body, supported by regional powers under U.S. oversight, allowing Israel to withdraw militarily while preventing Hamas's return. Israeli security services would retain "overarching rights," including buffer zones along Gaza's borders. Trump and Netanyahu hope to implement this plan soon, possibly within months.

An offensive to take Gaza City, the essential prelude to the plan, is already underway. Netanyahu intends to divide Gaza into two sectors: one governed by Hamas and one by the interim authority. Once a non-Hamas sector exists, Israel expects Gazans to flee the Hamas-run sector for safer conditions. If Hamas accepts the Trump plan, the offensive would be unnecessary. The failure to kill Doha's leaders does not derail the plan, and Israel's resolve may yet convince Hamas leaders and Gazans that Hamas has no future.

The third goal was to signal to Iran that there is no return to business as usual. Since the 12-day war, Iran's Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei has remained defiant, rejecting accommodation with Trump, who demands zero uranium enrichment. Khamenei claims a "decisive victory" over Israel and the U.S., dismisses U.S. strikes as ineffective, warns of "irreparable damage" if pressure continues, and pursues indirect European negotiations to divide the West.

The fourth goal, as many analysts have noted, was to convince Qatar, host and funder of Hamas's political leadership, to change its behavior. But this goal, expressed openly by Netanyahu, conceals a broader strategic concern: signaling resolve to Turkey.

A key Hamas supporter, Turkey seeks to expand its military presence in Syria. On September 8, Israel reportedly struck a warehouse in Homs, Syria, destroying Turkish-made missiles and air defense equipment. The Doha strike followed the next day, demonstrating Israel's ability to hit targets anywhere, even in a U.S.-allied state like Qatar.

However, like Israel, Turkey is among the elite U.S. allies with the will and capacity to act independently. Trump has developed a new model of alliance management, treating Israel not as a client but as America's right arm against Iran and its proxies. The results are evident: Washington and Jerusalem have dealt blows to Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis, and Iran's nuclear program.

But a superpower must also manage friends, especially those who dislike each other. The Trump-Netanyahu routine may serve against Iran, but Turkey is another matter. Turkish president Recep Tayyip Erdoğan brings his own ambitions and leverage, and neither Washington nor Jerusalem can simply cow him. What is needed is not more pressure but deft diplomacy—above all, a strategy that turns Syria into a buffer between America's two most capable allies. Without such a buffer, the rivalry between Jerusalem and Ankara could slide into open conflict, undoing Trump's successes. To paraphrase Robert Frost, good buffers make good neighbors.

In sum, the Doha strike was not just about killing al-Hayya, changing Hamas's calculus, or reorienting Qatar. It was about shaping a new regional order. Trump and Netanyahu are rewriting the rules of alliance politics in the Middle East: Israel as America's sword arm, Turkey as its restless partner, Iran as the common enemy. The good cop-bad cop routine has bruised Iran badly, but shaping a durable order will require sustained diplomacy as well as force. Nixon and Kissinger showed that even in moments of strength, power had to be joined to diplomacy. If Trump wants his new model of alliance politics to endure, he would do well to follow their example. (The Free Press Sep 16)