

Israel on the Dangerous Path to International Isolation

Pnina Sharvit Baruch | July 4, 2024

Israel's strength is deeply tied to its integration within the international system, but this connection is currently under significant threat. The country is confronting an unprecedented international campaign that surpasses previous challenges in its scale and intensity across political, media, and public spheres. This sustained effort has resulted in a marked demonization of Israel and a notable decline in its global standing. Failing to effectively address this campaign poses risks to Israel's economy, national security, and ability to meet its military objectives, potentially setting back its progress on all fronts. Addressing these challenges requires fundamental changes in Israel's approach.

This document analyzes the ongoing campaign against Israel, its implications for the country's growing international isolation, and underscores the critical consequences of this trend. Additionally, it proposes a set of policy recommendations aimed at reversing these developments.

The International Campaign Against Israel

In the aftermath of the brutal attack by Hamas on October 7, Israel initially garnered widespread support from the international community, which recognized its right to self-defense. However, even at this early stage, certain elements within the UN found it hard to condemn Hamas and even justified its actions. As the conflict escalated, resulting in extensive destruction and suffering in the Gaza Strip and exacerbating the humanitarian crisis, this support shifted to sharp criticism and severe accusations against Israel.

During this critical period, years of strategic efforts by leaders of the international campaign against Israel came to fruition. By aligning with progressive factions, they successfully infiltrated influential Western institutions, including UN human rights bodies, other humanitarian organizations, academia, and the media, spreading anti-Israel narratives. These narratives have been amplified through social media, reaching global audiences.

Since the outbreak of hostilities, anti-Israel elements have intensified their efforts, playing a pivotal role in the international campaign against Israel. This multifaceted campaign, complementing the military campaign, aims to curtail Israel's diplomatic maneuverability and restrict its operational freedom. While the discourse within Israel centers on the October 7 events, the hostages held by Hamas, and casualties among Israeli security forces, the global narrative paints a starkly contrasting picture. Emphasizing the widespread destruction in Gaza, tens of thousands of Palestinian casualties, and a severe humanitarian crisis, international media, the UN, and human rights groups squarely attribute responsibility to Israel, portraying it as intentionally exacerbating the suffering and obstructing political resolutions to end the conflict. The central role of Hamas in leading to this situation is barely mentioned.

Part of the success of the anti-Israel campaign is rooted in the resurgence of antisemitic sentiments, coupled with broader global trends that polarize the world into oppressors and oppressed, portraying Palestinians as the ultimate victims deserving unconditional support. In this reality, factual accuracy often loses relevance (for instance, despite ample documentation, there persists a troubling denial of Hamas's crimes), and nuanced messages struggle to find resonance. Furthermore, social media algorithms cater content to users' existing beliefs, reinforcing echo chambers and hindering exposure to opposing viewpoints. These conditions create significant challenges in reversing Israel's declining international perception.

Recent Israeli government actions, particularly the growing influence of extremists and the adoption of policies that reject any prospect of resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, have further emboldened and amplified the anti-Israel campaign. The portrayal of Israel as a systematic oppressor of Palestinians has eroded its image as a democratic and liberal state, complicating efforts to garner international support.

Critiques against Israel revolve around two primary dimensions: First are allegations of its historical responsibility for Palestinian suffering since its establishment and ongoing violations of their rights. Critics characterize Israel as a colonialist, imperialist state and a perpetual obstruction to peace. Second, accusations pertaining to the conduct of the IDF during conflicts focus on two aspects: the methods of attack—accusing Israel of deliberate, indiscriminate, or disproportionate targeting of civilians and civilian infrastructure and forcibly displacing residents as collective punishment; and the humanitarian situation—alleging that Israel enforces conditions akin to starvation in Gaza and deliberately withholds basic necessities, including medical care, from Palestinians. While some

of the criticism against Israel is not without merit, the accusations go far beyond legitimate criticism, singling out Israel compared to other countries and entities. Successfully confronting these unfair accusations is extremely challenging.

The Players and Tools in the International Campaign

Accusations against Israel are framed in legal terms and included in decisions, reports, and opinions of international organizations and bodies, primarily the UN and its institutions, namely the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Human Rights Council, as well as other agencies, committees of inquiry, and human rights organizations. Critical reports against Israel are regularly published and often perceived as objective by neutral experts, even when they are one-sided and issued by bodies with biases against Israel, such as the [UN Human Rights Council's commission of inquiry](#), which is known for its hostility toward Israel. Another example is the recently published UN Secretary-General's [Annual Report on Children and Armed Conflict \(CAAC\)](#) which included Israel's military on the annual blacklist of perpetrators who harm children in conflict situations, alongside Hamas, Russia, Sudan, ISIS, and Boko Haram. Israel published a [response](#) explaining the flaws in the analysis of this report.

It is worth noting that the UN, through bodies such as the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) plays an active role in disseminating facts and figures that portray Israel as conducting a policy of use of excessive force and of starvation of the Palestinians in Gaza in the current war. An analysis (that will be published soon) reveals that this body has been publishing misleading data, knowingly concealing the true figures of humanitarian aid entering the Gaza Strip and ignoring relevant developments such as attacks by Hamas against entry points or instances when Israel has opened additional crossing points. Similarly, the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) has published reports that have served as the basis to the accusation that Israel is starving the residents of Gaza. The reports were criticized by the [Famine Review Committee of the IPC](#) for professional deficiencies and subsequently revised.

Based on such reports, Israel has found itself under judicial proceedings before the two main international courts: the International Criminal Court (ICC), where an investigation regarding Israel has been ongoing since 2021, initially initiated in 2015; and the International Court of Justice (ICJ), where proceedings against Israel under the Genocide Convention were initiated by South Africa in December 2023. This is alongside a prewar process for an advisory opinion on the legality of the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories, requested by the UN General Assembly in December 2022.

The war accelerated the ICC's criminal investigation, and in May 2024, the ICC prosecutor [announced](#) that he would seek arrest warrants against Israel's prime minister and the defense minister for suspected war crimes related to the humanitarian crisis in Gaza. Simultaneously, the prosecutor sought arrest warrants against Hamas leaders for severe war crimes committed on October 7 and with regard to the hostages. If issued, these arrest warrants would obligate all 124 member states of the court to arrest the individuals named and transfer them to The Hague if they enter their territories. The investigation is ongoing, and additional arrest warrants may be requested, and some warrants could even be confidential and revealed only upon execution.

The ICJ has already [issued several interim orders](#) instructing Israel to refrain from committing acts of genocide or inciting genocide and to allow immediate humanitarian aid to Gaza residents. The court also determined that UN investigation teams should be allowed entry into Gaza. A final decision in the case is expected only after a lengthy period. The court emphasized that for issuing temporary orders, there is no need to conclude that there is a suspicion that Israel is committing genocide—a crime requiring an explicit intent to destroy a racial, ethnic, national, or religious group—but it is sufficient to determine that there is a risk of harm to the rights protected by the Convention.

The severity of this process does not necessarily lie in the fear of issuing court orders, whose enforcement depends on a binding decision by the Security Council, but in the fact that it creates a severe stigma against Israel, portraying it as committing the most serious crime possible—genocide. This crime, defined by a Jewish jurist and Holocaust survivor in relation to Nazi actions, carries profound historical weight. Claims of genocide against Israel have been made in the past but did not receive significant resonance. Nowadays, following this process, this accusation is prevalent in protests against Israel worldwide and appears across social networks, cementing the shocking and fundamentally false idea that Israel is akin to the Nazi regime.

The Rapid Spread of Anti-Israel Sentiment

A key characteristic of the current campaign against Israel is its widespread and rapid dissemination among the general public. The mass protests against Israel worldwide are unprecedented. This spread occurs through the media, both formal and especially social media, making Israel a global symbol of evil. The impact is particularly noticeable among the younger generation, who are primarily fed by information sources in the virtual world. Any internet search for negative terms such as genocide, torture, and destruction leads to Israel, with countless videos,

articles, and essays presenting Israel as a ruthless and brutal force, in numerous languages and countries. Israel is rapidly becoming a “pariah state.” These perceptions are spreading exponentially, making it very difficult to counter their harmful influence and put the genie back in the bottle. In many ways, today’s Israel is perceived as akin to apartheid-era South Africa—a fundamentally flawed state to be completely boycotted.

One of the most troubling aspects of the current reality is that expressing support for Israel has become problematic, even dangerous. Intellectuals, cultural icons, businesspeople, journalists, and other influential figures know they will pay a price if they express positive views about Israel, so they choose to remain silent or even join the critics. Consequently, the anti-Israel narrative, considered the “appropriate” narrative, dominates the discourse. In contrast, opposing voices are dwindling, with most open support for Israel coming from Israeli or Jewish sources, which are seen as biased, or from the far right, whose connection further alienates the liberal public from Israel.

Actions Taken Against Israel Following the International Campaign

The dominance of the anti-Israel narrative is reflected in the various steps that have already been taken and threats of additional measures.

Since the outbreak of the war, several countries have announced the severing of diplomatic relations with Israel or the recall of their ambassadors, including Bolivia, Colombia, and Chile. Many countries have issued hostile statements, launched initiatives against Israel, or voted in favor of decisions against Israel. Various countries, including the United States and European nations, have imposed sanctions on Israeli entities, particularly on Jewish extremists suspected of violence against Palestinians. The European Union has [even threatened](#) sanctions against Israel itself. Beyond this, actions that undermine Israeli interests have been taken, such as official recognition by different countries, including Spain, Norway, and Ireland, of the State of Palestine.

In addition to these diplomatic measures, trade restrictions with Israel have been imposed by various countries. A notable case is [Turkey](#), which has completely restricted its trade with Israel. This step has significant implications for Israel, particularly due to the heavy reliance on imports from Turkey for essential construction goods. While Israel’s economy can cope with the Turkish boycott, the realization of threats to impose economic boycotts by additional countries could cause significant economic harm, potentially leading to a prolonged economic crisis. A worrying step is the decision by French President Emmanuel Macron to prevent Israeli defense companies from exhibiting at an important defense

industry exhibition, exacerbated by a [French court ruling](#) banning any Israeli participation in the exhibition. In this case, the French Supreme Court [intervened](#) against the boycott process, but its symbolic and threatening significance remained intact.

Furthermore, various countries, including Canada, Italy, Spain, and Belgium, have imposed restrictions on the export of weapons to Israel and even threaten to expand these restrictions to products that broadly support combat. For Israel, the main danger is the imposition of restrictions on the delivery of military equipment from the United States, which could have severe implications for the country's military capabilities. While these moves to impose such restrictions have been halted at this stage, attempts to initiate further actions against Israel continue.

The Impact of the International Campaign on Non-State Actors

Beyond influencing governments in different countries, the campaign against Israel affects significant non-state actors, including commercial companies sensitive to the sentiments of consumers and investors, as well as academic, cultural, and sports institutions.

According to the representative of the Manufacturers Association at a State Control Committee meeting in the Knesset in June 2024, there has been a sharp increase in the number of cases where various international entities avoid, and even boycott, business activities with Israel. There is also a noticeable trend of reduced investments in Israel, cancellation of deals with Israeli businesses, avoidance of inviting Israeli businesspeople to business events, and consumer boycotts of Israeli products. The continuation and expansion of these trends will severely damage the Israeli economy. Severe economic damage, beyond its direct impact on the standard of living in the country, will also harm the ability to fund necessary expenditures for national security.

Simultaneously, cases of declared or implied boycotts against Israelis are increasing. This phenomenon is particularly felt in the academic and cultural worlds but extends to other areas as well. Dozens of universities from various countries [have announced](#) that they are halting or reassessing their relationships with Israeli academic institutions, withdrawing investments, or canceling cooperation agreements with Israeli universities. Others have stated that they are considering these steps. Additionally, various academic organizations worldwide have [expressed support](#) for the boycott. Alongside this, there are increasing reports of individual, non-institutional boycotts, manifested in actions such as withdrawing invitations to Israeli researchers to lecture abroad, freezing or canceling research collaborations, and rejecting publications by Israeli scholars.

According to [a report](#) by the Ministry of Innovation, Science and Technology, important academic collaborations between Israel and institutions in Europe have significantly decreased. According to the [head of the medical school](#) at Tel Aviv University, there is a creeping boycott against Israel in the medical field, including non-invitations to conferences and avoidance of accepting Israeli doctors for internships abroad.

Similar distancing from Israel is also visible in the cultural and sports fields. One [prominent example](#) is the call to ban Israel from participating in this year's Eurovision song contest by artists, politicians, and media figures from various European countries. Some media figures even refused to cover or work in the context of the contest. There are also pressures on sports associations and organizations in various fields to not allow Israel to participate in different competitions.

In addition to these measures, Israelis may find themselves exposed to legal proceedings in various countries. This follows initiatives by state or private entities in different countries to initiate proceedings against soldiers and security personnel, with a focus on those with dual citizenship.

The end result is that Israelis are beginning to feel unwelcome around the world. Disturbingly, non-Israeli Jews are also under attack worldwide, following an unprecedented wave of antisemitism.

Evaluating the Long-Term Impact of Measures Against Israel

The question arises whether the array of measures against Israel and its citizens is a passing trend, similar to those Israel has experienced in the past, which will cease at the end of the military campaign, with its negative effects being remedied later. Although it is impossible to give a definitive answer, it seems that the current phenomenon differs in its intensity and scope from previous cases of political attacks on Israel during military operations, and there is significant concern that it is not a wave whose effects will dissipate at the end of the war.

One difference is that the current wave connects to broader social processes unrelated to Israel itself. Additionally, the campaign leaders have established influence centers and have created an extensive and efficient network for spreading their messages, which they can continue to operate in the future. Furthermore, the war itself has been ongoing for many months with no end in sight. Israel may continue to operate in the Gaza Strip for years to come, in ongoing friction with the population there, with the possibility of escalation in the West Bank and the opening of an additional front, with many casualties, vis-à-vis

Hezbollah in the north of Israel. As the war drags on, the image of Israel as a pariah state becomes more entrenched and will be harder to shed. This is especially true if there is no dramatic change in Israeli policy.

Moreover, some of the measures have long-term implications, particularly if actions to withdraw investments or impose boycotts and sanctions against Israel intensify. The professional damage to Israeli researchers in science, technology, and academia will also have lasting effects. The economic harm from current actions, such as avoiding investment in Israel and the brain drain abroad, will be felt for years to come. Among other things, it will be difficult to maintain Israel's status as a startup nation in light of these processes. Returning to this status in the future may be impossible.

This means that immediate and prompt actions must be taken to halt the campaign and not rely on the unfounded assumption that the campaign and its damage will pass at the end of the war.

The Consequences of Isolation

The demonization of Israel, which has permeated the general public worldwide, is not merely an issue of an “unflattering image” of the country but has the potential to significantly affect decision makers in various countries.

One of the reasons Israel is considered an asset to the United States and the Western world is its perception as a democratic-liberal entity in a region that does not share the same values. For these countries, strong ties with Israel were based on the understanding that Israel is the only liberal democracy in the Middle East, with the rule of law and an organized government that can be trusted for its stability and responsible behavior. As such, it is a natural partner in the Western camp. However, if Israel is no longer seen as sharing those values, these relationships will weaken and become primarily dependent on shared interests.

As public pressure in various countries opposing Israel increases, Israel may be perceived by different nations and their leaders as more of a liability than an asset, with political costs for supporting it. As a result, they may distance themselves from Israel, even to the extent of severing ties at various levels. The political cost could lead to distancing from Israel, even if there is logic in maintaining relations with Israel based on the objective interests of the country. The fact that internal politics outweigh national interests is a global phenomenon.

In other words, the spread of Israel's delegitimization and its transformation into a pariah state worldwide push it toward a reality of international isolation. There

are certain elements in Israel who believe that isolation from the world is a positive thing, which will help neutralize external influences and pressures on Israel. This view is dangerous for several reasons and on multiple levels.

The Necessity of Global Connections

First, connection to the world is essential to ensure the state's vital interests. Isolation and disconnection from the world will lead to severe economic damage, a significant drop in the standard of living, and harm to national security. The notion that Israel can successfully deal with all its security threats on its own is irrational and impractical, based on messianic ideas.

The recognition of the importance of belonging to the international camp increased after Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022 and the intensification of the global division into camps. Beyond the fact that Israel fundamentally differs in its values from Russia and China, these countries, more or less explicitly, clearly stand against Israel in the current war. This means that if Israel loses its connection to the camp of Western countries, it will be left alone, without any camp. Such isolation would severely damage Israel's deterrence. The importance of the alliance with the United States was decisively proven in the war, both in the Biden administration's immediate support for Israel after October 7, which helped deter Iran and its proxies, especially Hezbollah, from fully joining the campaign, and in the response to the Iranian attack on April 13, which Israel would have struggled to handle alone, and in blocking anti-Israel decisions in the Security Council. Israel's dependence on American weapons systems is an open secret.

At this stage, the public campaign against Israel is already causing various Western countries to pronounce a lack of support for Israel's military actions and demonstrate their efforts to stop the "crimes" it is committing. This is the reason for the significant pressure on Israel from the American administration and other countries to limit military actions that could harm civilians and to provide as broad a humanitarian response as possible to residents in the Gaza Strip. It can be assumed that similar pressures will be applied to any future action in Lebanon that could harm Lebanese civilians or civilian infrastructure. Therefore, it seems that Israel currently lacks legitimacy for action in Lebanon that would lead to such results.

Relations with Moderate Regional Countries

Second, international isolation will also damage Israel's relations with moderate countries in the region. The connection to the West, and especially the United States, is a central component in the motivation of these countries, such as Saudi

Arabia, to create and establish peaceful relations and ties with Israel. Without this connection, this motivation will decrease significantly. Furthermore, portraying Israel as carrying out serious crimes against Palestinians affects its image among the publics in Arab countries, increasing and expanding the hostility that already exists toward Israel. Harm to Lebanese civilians would exacerbate the situation even more. Although most of these countries' regimes are not democratic, complete disregard for public sentiment could harm regime stability. Therefore, when considering Israel as an asset or liability, the leaders of these countries take into account its image in their public's eyes.

Impact on Israeli Citizens

Third, international isolation directly harms the individual interests of Israeli citizens. Boycotts against Israelis are increasing. Once the floodgates are open, this starts becoming the norm, and inviting Israelis will become the exception that requires an explanation, rather than not inviting them. The boycott of Israelis across various fields—medical, scientific, technological, business, academic, cultural, and personal—causes significant harm to individual Israelis, both professionally and personally. It could even lead to people leaving the country. Moreover, it severely impedes the country's development. To be a developed and advanced nation in these fields, Israel must have connections with the wider world. Without these connections, Israel will find itself regressing.

Threat to Democratic and Liberal Character

Fourth, disconnecting from the world, with its implications for the economy and security, would be a death blow to maintaining the democratic and liberal character of the state. Israel would become a poor and backward country. This reality would lead to the departure of elites, the adoption of isolationist narratives, and the strengthening of nationalist and extremist elements within the country. It is no coincidence that political elements in Israel who hold such world views seem to be deliberately working to accelerate the isolation process.

The Complexity of Addressing the International Campaign

The grim conclusion is that the campaign against Israel has spiraled out of control, and Israel is currently being defeated on the international stage. This raises the question: Is there anything that can be done about this situation, or is the whole world against us, making any action or statement by Israel futile as the world will oppose it anyway?

The answer to this question, first and foremost, is that Israel cannot afford to abandon this battlefield, just as one cannot abandon a military front even when the enemy has the upper hand. Beyond that, even though the campaign against Israel is far from fair, how Israel conducts itself is significant. Therefore, changing Israel's conduct, both in terms of military and political actions and in managing efforts in the international arena, can help halt the campaign and mitigate its damages.

To address the campaign, it is essential to distinguish between entities that are inherently hostile to Israel, whose stance cannot be changed, and those who are not fundamentally anti-Israel. Additionally, attention should be given to the group of Israel supporters who are under attack and find it challenging to stand by Israel.

It must be acknowledged that the extensive casualties, destruction, and severe humanitarian crisis in the Gaza Strip, with images constantly disseminated in the media and on social networks, have turned Israel in the eyes of many into a cruel entity relentlessly pursuing helpless Palestinians. The complexity of the conflict and Israel's explanations do not manage to counter these images. Moreover, there have been repeated incidents where many civilians or aid workers were harmed. Even if it is clear to us in Israel that these were mistakes and not indicative of malicious intent, this is how they are perceived globally. Therefore, Israel should initially intensify efforts to avoid actions that lead to such damage and strive to minimize harm to Palestinian civilians. It is also crucial to allow humanitarian aid and address the humanitarian needs in the Gaza Strip.

Additionally, one cannot ignore how statements by Israeli officials fuel the campaign against Israel. With the outbreak of the war, senior Israeli government and coalition members, as well as certain security forces personnel, both senior and junior, made problematic statements that played into the hands of Israel's critics who used them to demonstrate Israel's supposedly malicious intentions to kill, starve, and expel Palestinian civilians. Even though such policies were not in fact implemented, these statements were used as useful ammunition to those fighting against Israel on the international stage. While such reactions were understandable in the initial stages of the war due to the horrific massacre of Israeli civilians, as time passes, it is expected and required to conduct and express oneself more responsibly.

Despite this, some public figures continue to make problematic statements and express dangerous ideas, such as encouraging Palestinian emigration from the Gaza Strip, reasserting Israeli control over the Strip while renewing settlements there, declaring that there are no innocent people in Gaza, that all civilians there

are targets, and opposing any humanitarian aid. While these ideas are not being implemented it is important to clearly condemn such statements. This is not sufficiently done by the state and military leadership, nor do they provide enough clear and unequivocal statements about the duty to respect the law and act morally. Such statements could help balance, at least to some extent, the overall picture.

A major factor influencing the international campaign is Israel's approach to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. As long as the Israeli government presents extreme positions that completely disregard Palestinian rights and adopts a policy of seeking perpetual control over Palestinians without attempting to end such control, it is seen as an obstacle to peace and responsible for the conflict's continuation. This stance makes dealing with the international campaign almost impossible. Conversely, presenting a political horizon on Israel's part can greatly assist in halting the campaign. An Israeli initiative aimed at lowering tensions and reducing conflicts with a view to ending the conflict, would shift the burden to the Palestinian side and expose the difficulties its inflexible positions impose on resolving the conflict.

Addressing the International Campaign Against Israel

Beyond the substantive level, Israel's manner of dealing with the international campaign against it is fundamentally flawed. The habitual reactive tendency to label all criticism against Israel as antisemitism and resort to personal attacks plays into the hands of those running the campaign against Israel. This approach makes it appear that Israel has no substantial response to the allegations made against it. It also pushes critics, who are not necessarily hostile to Israel, into the anti-Israel camp, losing the ability to influence their stance even partially toward Israel.

The absence of a coherent policy and professional management of the counter-campaign on Israel's part is apparent. The impression is that in Israel, both at the leadership and public levels, the severity of the problem is not fully understood. The government does not take this campaign seriously and does not invest the necessary attention and resources. The situation is particularly severe against the backdrop of the deliberate, long-standing weakening of the Israeli diplomatic corps, reducing its scope and resources. The notion that the campaign can be addressed solely by improving Israel's "public relations" is disconnected from reality.

Recommendations for Action to Halt the Campaign

To halt the dangerous international campaign against Israel, both substantive steps related to state conduct and measures to improve the management of the campaign are required.

Necessary Steps in Conduct:

1. **Integrate Legitimacy Considerations:** Legitimacy considerations should be an integral and important part of decisions made during wartime that might harm civilians or affect important interests in the eyes of the international community, especially regarding the maintenance of civilian infrastructure in Gaza or the stability of Lebanon. This means that there are circumstances where restraints on the use of force must be imposed, even beyond legal requirements. If the damage to Israel's interests from the consequences of the action on international legitimacy outweighs the military benefit, restraint should be exercised.
2. **Reject Isolationism:** Adopt a clear policy rejecting the idea of Israel's international isolation as a positive goal. Neutralize the harmful influence of elements within Israel, some within the government, who deliberately work to deteriorate Israel's international relations.
3. **Promote Legal and Moral Adherence:** Officials within the government, military, security forces, and professional ranks should explicitly state the importance of adhering to legal and moral restrictions during combat.
4. **Avoid and Sanction Unethical Statements:** Officials should avoid making statements that encourage or praise actions not aligned with international law and Israel's commitment to minimizing the damage of war. Junior officers and soldiers should also adhere to this standard. Take action against unethical statements, including strict measures against the dissemination of videos with unethical messages and actions, addressing both the actions themselves and their dissemination.
5. **Maximize Humanitarian Aid:** Efforts should be made to maximize humanitarian aid to the Gaza Strip and prevent a humanitarian crisis, involving local and international professionals in the process. Improve the presentation of Israel's actions on this issue, publicly disseminating professional and reliable data. Currently, biased UN reports serve as the main tool by which Israel is judged, without effectively presenting counter-data.

6. **Conduct Professional Investigations:** Conduct professional and sincere investigations into allegations made against Israel. This will allow reliance on the principle of complementarity in criminal proceedings at the ICC and state courts worldwide. According to this principle, the state concerned is given priority to investigate itself. If it is a professional and genuine investigation, there will be no external intervention. In appropriate cases, prosecution should be considered if there are deviations from the law. Israel's professional and independent legal system is an important asset in this campaign. Such investigations will help not only in criminal proceedings but also in presenting well-organized responses to allegations to professional bodies and foreign government officials.
7. **Initiate a Process Toward Ending the Conflict:** The way out of the current war necessarily requires political arrangements. Statements from Israel recognizing the need to strive for resolving the conflict with the Palestinians can greatly help in halting the campaign against Israel. Israel has the full right to set the conditions it deems appropriate for any future deal, so the statement itself does not mean any concession on important Israeli interests.

Necessary Steps in Managing the Campaign:

1. **Recognize the Threat:** The diplomatic campaign should be treated as a central front, with the threat of isolation being recognized as a tangible danger that could severely harm the most important national interests.
2. **Formulate a Coordinated Policy:** A coordinated policy must be developed to promote a counter-campaign, involving all relevant ministries. This campaign requires the full attention of the Prime Minister and the security system. The Israeli diplomatic corps around the world needs to be strengthened, appropriate spokespersons must be trained, and suitable budgets must be allocated. Efforts must be made across all levels, including social media, to effectively and professionally communicate Israel's positions.
3. **Develop a Professional Response:** A professional and serious approach should be taken toward the criticism directed at Israel. Structured documents in English and other languages should be prepared, with detailed and relevant responses to the allegations.
4. **Adopt a Proactive Approach:** Against hostile elements fueling the campaign, a proactive approach should be taken, including filing lawsuits,

acting against their sources of funding, and exposing some of their connections to terrorist organizations and entities seeking to harm Western countries. Efforts should be made to reach out to the “drifters,” those who support anti-Israel messages without fully understanding what they are supporting, to persuade them to doubt the claims made.

5. **Engage Constructively with Critics:** Israel should act positively to influence the positions of those who are not anti-Israel but have certain criticisms. Personal slander and accusations of antisemitism against every critic should be avoided.
6. **Strengthen Supporters:** Systematic efforts should be made to engage Israel's supporters, both within Jewish communities and beyond, to assist in the campaign. These supporters should be strengthened, protected from attacks, and provided with strong arguments and materials to help them defend Israel's positions.
7. **Recruit Opinion Leaders:** Efforts should be made to recruit opinion leaders to openly express pro-Israel views and to persuade others who are hesitant to publicly support Israel to follow their lead.

Conclusion

Since its establishment, Israel has sought to create alliances and connections with countries worldwide, understanding that these relationships are essential for its existence and prosperity. Over the years, a strong alliance has developed between Israel and the United States, serving as a cornerstone of Israel's security strategy. Beyond the United States and its security support, Israel has numerous ties with Western countries and sees itself as part of the Western bloc.

The international campaign against Israel aims to isolate it, portraying the country as a lawless, oppressive, and racist state with no place among Western nations, ultimately seeking to weaken it to the point of collapse. As the war progresses, Israel has reached a state of almost complete loss of legitimacy, becoming a pariah state. This phenomenon is especially evident in academia and among the general public, particularly young people worldwide, but also affects the attitudes of world governments and non-state actors toward Israel.

The severe decline in Israel's international standing is already causing serious repercussions for the state and its citizens in political, economic, business, academic, and cultural spheres, significantly harming national security. It also

severely limits Israel's freedom of action and its ability to continue the military campaign, especially in expanding it to other fronts.

Furthermore, there is considerable concern that the trend of isolation, dangerous for Israel's economy and security, will continue and intensify. Isolation and disconnection from Western countries will also erode Israel's democratic and liberal values. These values are intrinsically important to many in Israeli society, but their absence could also lead to the loss of the state's qualitative edge over its enemies.

A policy that sanctifies isolation while ignoring the state's national interests is very dangerous, as all Israeli citizens pay the price. Moreover, this behavior could eventually lead to the victory of Israel's enemies in both the political and military campaigns against it.

While the international campaign against Israel poses a significant challenge, it is not insurmountable. A combination of strategic military and political conduct, alongside responsible communication and humanitarian efforts, and a professional and dedicated management of the counter-campaign, can help mitigate the damage and restore Israel's standing on the global stage.