

Lyndon LaRouches Oaseplan for Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten

Nu på dansk

Følgende 5 min. video om Oaseplanen er fra 2010:

2. Følgende uddrag med Harley Schlanger fra Schiller Instituttet, som begynder 12 min. inde i den øverste video:

Lyndon LaRouches Oaseplan for Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten

Et uddrag fra: At vinde krigen mod krigspartiet

Manhattan Project Dialogue, Saturday, October 21, 2023

HARLEY SCHLANGER: ... Jeg vil give jer en kort kronologi [af Lyndon LaRouches arbejde for fred gennem økonomisk udvikling i Sydvestasien/Mellemøsten]. Det er så stort et arbejde, at det ville kræve mange dage og konferencer, og det burde vi gøre. Men jeg vil bare give jer et kort indblik i, hvad han gjorde, og hvordan han formede denne kamp, og hvorfor det i dag er den politik, som han og vores organisation repræsenterer, der er alternativet. Lad os starte med et historisk øjeblik i april 1975. LaRouche blev inviteret til at deltage i en konference i Bagdad for Ba'ath-partiet. Og mens han var der, mødtes han med en række arabiske ledere og kom derfra med et forslag fra irakerne om at samle en udviklingsfond på 30 milliarder dollars til Israel og Palæstina. Da LaRouche præsenterede det for vores medlemmer, var det ganske forbløffende. Han fulgte op på turen til Bagdad med en pressekonference, hvor han annoncerede udgivelsen af sin Internationale Udviklingsbank, som var en opfordring til et nyt monetært system, der ville være sammenhængende med denne pakke af penge til udvikling af Israel og Palæstina.

Lad mig give jer en kort beretning om omfanget af dette. Lige

efter dette skete, bragte vi en overskrift i vores avis, hvor der stod: "Irak tilbyder Israel en fredsplan til 30 milliarder dollars." Jeg var sammen med en gruppe mennesker, der delte den ud ved en tale, som Moshe Dayan holdt på Wake Forest University i Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Der var hundredvis af mennesker, og vi var meget bange for, at hvis vi gik derhen og sagde, at Irak ønsker at afslutte konfrontationen og tilbyder penge, ville folk blive vrede. Men det vi fandt ud af var, at de var meget interesserede i det. Vi solgte hver eneste avis, vi havde, og efter Dayans tale rejste jeg mig op blandt publikum – José Vega-style – og sagde til Moshe Dayan: "Vi har et forslag, som Lyndon LaRouche har lagt på bordet fra Irak om en udviklingsplan til 30 milliarder dollars for Israel og Palæstina. Vil du støtte det?" Jeg forventede en tirade fra ham, for han havde ry for at være lidt af en hidsigprop, en hård militærleder. Det han sagde var fascinerende. Han sagde: "Det her er meget interessant. Det kan ændre alt. Jeg er meget åben for at høre mere om det." Det viste på det tidspunkt potentialet for LaRouches intervention – det var lige efter krigen i 1973, efter den arabiske olieembargo, efter det, der så ud til at være enden på enhver mulighed for at realisere ideen om en to-statsløsning for Israel og Palæstina.

Da LaRouche introducerede sin politik for Den internationale Udviklingsbank, sagde han følgende: "Med en IDB-politik i udsigt skulle den fredselskende fraktion i Mapai [som var et israelsk parti] snart blive herskende. Israelerne og de vigtigste arabiske stater kunne let blive enige om betingelserne for fortsatte forhandlinger om det palæstinensiske spørgsmål inden for rammerne af en øjeblikkelig fast aftale om samarbejde om udviklingspolitik." Med den tilgang holdt LaRouche møder i løbet af de næste par år, begyndende i 1975, hvor han havde et møde med den israelske leder Abba Eban for at fremme diskussionen om denne tilgang. I 1977 skrev LaRouche en artikel, som blev offentliggjort i et Paris-baseret israelsk nyhedsbrev med titlen: "Israel and Palestine; A Future for the Middle East".

Her er, hvad han sagde i den:

“Generelt, uden direkte forhandlinger mellem Israel og Den Palæstinensiske Befrielsesorganisation(PLO), kan der ikke blive nogen løsning i Mellemøsten inden for en overskuelig, umiddelbar fremtid. Vi kender alle alt for godt de underliggende forhindringer for sådanne forhandlinger. Vi burde vide, at vi hurtigt må fjerne forhindringerne for sådanne direkte forhandlinger.” Han henviser udtrykkeligt til idéen om, at man først skal have en politisk aftale og derefter gå videre. Det han siger er, at “det objektive grundlag for en løsning i Mellemøsten er den økonomiske udviklingspakke, vi har peget på. Enhver anden tilgang vil mislykkes; vil hurtigt blive nedbrudt til en farce. Men det er ikke blot materielle fordele i sig selv, der skaber grundlaget for fred. Det er det faktum, at regeringernes forpligtelse til at realisere betydelige videnskabelige og teknologiske fremskridt fremmer humanistiske holdninger i befolkningerne.”

Det var den idé, LaRouche havde om sit westfalske princip; om vigtigheden af økonomiske politikker, der viser, at hver side anerkender fordelene ved den anden, som grundlag for fred. Det var hans tema i mange andre artikler i den periode. Han gik imod strømmen, da folk sagde, at man ikke kan forhandle med Arafat, han er ikke villig til at forhandle. Hvad LaRouche skrev i december 1983: “Arafat er den etablerede leder af det, der faktisk er en eksilregering for de palæstinensiske arabere. Hvis vi skal have succes med at forhandle med det palæstinensiske arabiske folk, er det Arafats lederskab, vi skal forhandle med.” Derefter skrev han et politisk dokument, “Forslag om at begynde udviklingen af en langsigtet økonomisk udviklingspolitik for staten Israel.”

Kort tid efter, i april 1986, opfordrede Shimon Peres, som på det tidspunkt var Israels premierminister, til at afsætte en pulje på 25-30 milliarder dollars til at skabe en udviklingsfond for Mellemøsten for de næste ti år. Peres kaldte det en Marshallplan for Mellemøstens udvikling. Lyndon

LaRouche bakkede op om den og skrev flere artikler, hvor han forsvarede den. Men han påpegede det utilstrækkelige i tilgangen. Hvad han sagde på det tidspunkt var, at det, der er nødvendigt, er at tage fat på det mest alvorlige problem, der findes med hensyn til økonomien. Og hvad er det? Det er manglen på vand, og forholdet mellem det og manglen på strøm eller energi. Så mens LaRouche støttede Peres' Marshallplan, og i 1986 havde Peres øget det samlede beløb til 50 milliarder dollars, begyndte han at beskrive, hvordan man kan skabe mere vand til Mellemøsten. Dette er grundlaget for det, der senere, i 1990, blev kendt som hans Oase-Plan. Han sagde, at man var nødt til at have en menneskeskabt Jordan-flod, som kunne flyde og give mere vand til alle de områder, der grænser op til den; herunder Jordan, Israel, Egypten og Den Arabiske Halvø. For at gøre det, sagde han, har man brug for afsaltning. Man har brug for en række atomkraftværker på 300 MW, som giver strøm til afsaltningen. Det vil også give den elektricitet, der er nødvendig for industrialisering og avanceret landbrug. I 1990 skrev han et stykke med titlen: "En fredsplan i arabernes og israelernes sande interesse". Her skrev LaRouche, at vi har brug for "geografisk ingeniørkunst" til at føre kanalerne mellem Middelhavet og Det Røde Hav, og derefter Det Røde Hav til Det Døde Hav, for at skabe vandløb, som med atomdrevet afsaltning til at levere vandkraft og transport, ville give mulighed for industriel og landbrugsmæssig udvikling.

Her er det, han sagde, som virkelig er interessant:

"Man kunne definere den rette tilgang til udviklingen af Mellemøsten, hvis der ikke boede nogen mennesker der i øjeblikket, som hvis vi for eksempel planlagde bosættelsen af Mars: en ubeboet planet, ved hjælp af kunstigt miljø, og så videre." Han fortsatte med at skrive, at opdelingen og fordelingen af vand og strøm skal organiseres, så den gennemsnitlige kvadratkilometer jord kan udvikles til at være produktiv på de nødvendige niveauer for forskellige typer af jordbrug – græsning, afgrøder, beboelse, industri og handel.

Ideen med de to kanaler og den overordnede tilgang til industriel udvikling blev betragtet som revolutionerende. Hvordan kunne man opnå en aftale på dette grundlag? Hvad der skete på det tidspunkt var, at Bush-regeringen forsøgte at gøre præcis det, som LaRouche havde advaret dem imod at gøre. For at forsøge at få en politisk løsning holdt de en konference i Madrid med repræsentanter for palæstinenserne og israelerne, men den førte ingen steder hen. De samme gamle argumenter, de samme gamle kampe, de samme gamle modsætninger; det faktum, at der havde været en række krige siden 1948, i '48 og '56 og '67 og '73, og fortsatte træfninger og terrorisme. Hvordan kunne man få de to sider til at mødes? Mens Madrid-konferencen stod på – og på det tidspunkt var det Yitzhak Shamir, der var premierminister – var der noget andet, der blev sat i gang, da Yitzhak Rabin blev premierminister året efter i 1992. Det var en diskussion bag kulisserne i Oslo, Norge, mellem repræsentanter, der var tæt på Shimon Peres, som var kommet med ideen om en Marshallplan for Mellemøsten, og repræsentanter for Arafat.

Det førte til en aftale i september 1993, kaldet Oslo-aftalen. Det vigtigste ved Oslo-aftalen, og de fleste fokuserer på det faktum, at Arafat og Rabin gav hinanden hånden, er, at de talte om at gøre en ende på fjendskabet. Det var her, Rabin kom med sin berømte udtalelse om, at for at gøre dette, må man have modet til at ændre aksiomer. Og det afspejlede de blot ved at mødes og give hinanden hånden. Det var et meget anspændt øjeblik, indtil de to greb hinandens hænder, kiggede hinanden i øjnene og derefter gik væk og udbragte en skål for hinanden. En skål for dem, der har modet til at ændre aksiomer. Men det, der lå til grund for dette potentiale, var netop LaRouches idé om økonomisk samarbejde og udvikling i de to økonomiske bilag, der var knyttet til Oslo-aftalen.

Jeg vil lige læse et par aspekter af dette. Det økonomiske bilag nr. 3: "Protokol om israelsk-palæstinensisk samarbejde om økonomiske og udviklingsmæssige programmer."

“De to parter er enige om at etablere en israelsk-palæstinensisk komité for økonomisk samarbejde, der blandt andet skal fokusere på følgende.

“1. Samarbejde om vandområdet, herunder et vandudviklingsprogram ...

“2. Samarbejde inden for elektricitet ...

“3. Samarbejde om energiområdet ...

“4. Samarbejde om det finansielle område, herunder et finansielt udviklings- og handlingsprogram til fremme af internationale investeringer på Vestbredden og i Gazastriben ...

“5. Samarbejde inden for transport og kommunikation ...

“6. Samarbejde inden for handel ...” og endelig,

“7. Samarbejde inden for industri, herunder industrielle udviklingsprogrammer, som vil sikre oprettelsen af fælles israelsk-palæstinensiske industrielle forsknings- og udviklingscentre...”

Så det var bilag 3. Bilag 4 befæster dette med ideen om: “Protokol om israelsk-palæstinensisk samarbejde vedrørende regionale Udviklingsprogrammer.” Den taler om et økonomisk udviklingsprogram for Vestbredden og Gaza, en mellemøstlig udviklingsfond og endelig en mellemøstlig udviklingsbank. Alt dette var muligt på det tidspunkt, og det ville have gjort præcis det, som LaRouche foreslog, nemlig at skabe et grundlag hvor folk i de palæstinensiske områder ville se en fordel i at samarbejde med Israel, og israelerne ville se en fordel i at samarbejde med palæstinenserne. Ikke bare for at stoppe drabene, men for at skabe et miljø med gensidigt fordelagtige produktive aktiviteter, som ville hæve levestandarden for folk på begge sider af konflikten. Og på det grundlag ville en to-statsløsning være mulig. Det er kernen i LaRouches ideer.

Hvad skete der med den plan? Tja, den blev først dræbt af

Verdensbanken, for i november 1993 sagde Verdensbanken, at de ikke ville kanalisere penge eller give midler, der kom fra donorer. Præsident Clinton forsøgte blandt andet at rejse midler til dette. Der var donorer, som var parate til at give penge, men Verdensbanken sagde, at de ikke ville give pengene til palæstinenserne, fordi de ikke stolede på dem på grund af "korrruption". Især var der modstand mod, at Arafat skulle have nogen mulighed for at modtage midlerne. Som et resultat var pengene der bare ikke. Det var et stort problem for opfølgningen. To år senere, den 4. november 1995, blev Yitzhak Rabin myrdet af en mand ved navn Yigal Amir, som var en del af bosætterbevægelsen og især havde været meget aktiv i Hebron, som var et af de største konfrontationsområder mellem de palæstinensere, der boede der, og de jødiske bosættere, som brugte den israelske stats magt til at rykke ind. Mordet på Rabin, oven i lukningen af potentialet for midler, afsluttede muligheden for succes for Oslo. LaRouche har specifikt udtalt i september 1993, efter håndtrykket i Washington, at det er presserende, at de første skridt til disse nye projekter bliver taget med det samme. Ellers var der fare for, at dette forslag ville drukne i begge parters blod. Han identificerede specifikt Sharon-netværkene i bosætterbevægelsen som truslen mod det. Og det var hvad der skete; en mulighed gik tabt.

Som vi ser, er det tilstrækkeligt at se på udviklingen fra 1995 til i dag. Palæstinenserne har stadig ingen stat; faktisk er de nu delt mellem to grupper, hvoraf den ene – Hamas, som Netanyahu nu sværger at udrydde – siden 2009 har Netanyahu og Israel givet midler til Hamas for at opbygge dem som en modvægt til Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre. Hvorfor det? Fordi Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre er en nationalistisk bevægelse, der repræsenterer palæstinenserens interesser som nation, i modsætning til Hamas, som er en religiøs bevægelse. Så længe man har Hamas, der kæmper mod Det Palæstinensiske Selvstyre, har man ingen samlet regering at forhandle med. Det er, hvad Netanyahu sagde; han pralede af at gøre det. Det anslås, at mere end 1 milliard dollars blev kanaliseret fra Israel gennem

Qatar til Hamas, som Netanyahu nu siger, at han vil udrydde og udslette.

Så løsningen her er, at man bliver nødt til at identificere, hvad problemet er. Problemet er ikke israelere og palæstinensere, selvom det måske er dem, der udfører de desperate handlinger. Men de handler ikke i egen interesse; de handler i de højere magters interesse, som ønsker at forhindre enhver form for brud med de gamle aksiomer.

På engelsk:

... HARLEY SCHLANGER: Thank you. As I'm sure almost everyone realizes now, we're facing a growing threat of an expanding war in Southwest Asia; at the same time, we have a continuing proxy war against Russia in Ukraine, and some of the neo-cons are pushing as hard as they can to get a war against China over Taiwan. This was made absolutely clear by Biden's nationwide address on Oct. 19th. He had just come back from meeting with Netanyahu and his war cabinet. He pledged eternal support of the United States for Netanyahu and the policy of exterminating Hamas. And then he came back and presented a speech to the American people where he made the link of Ukraine and support for Israel. Why did he do that? Because there's growing opposition to funding the war in Ukraine. This was part of the reason for the ouster of House Speaker Kevin McCarthy, and part of the reason they can't put together a new speakership now for the House. What Biden tried to do was a clever trick; link the two things together as one package. Here's what he said:

"Hamas and Putin represent different threats, but they share this in common: They both want to completely annihilate a neighboring democracy. American leadership is what holds the world together. American values are what makes us a partner that other nations want to work with. To put all of that at risk if we walk away from Ukraine, if we turn our backs on Israel, is not worth it." Then he went on to say, "[H]istory has taught us that when terrorists don't pay a price for their

terror, when dictators don't pay a price for their aggression, they cause more chaos and death and more destruction. They keep going, and the cost and the threats to America and to the world keep rising."

Now if you take that second part of the statement, you could apply it to the United States. Where has been the correct blame on the United States for the wars of aggression by America and NATO? The destruction of Libya, of Iraq, of Afghanistan, of Syria, of Ukraine. They have not been held accountable. People like George W. Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, or Joe Biden. So, to attempt to make this a question of standing up for democracy, this is precisely the line of the leading oligarchs through their Atlantic Council, which sponsored a Summit for Democracy to try and say the divide in the world is between democracies led by America, and authoritarian governments led by Russia, China, and now they throw in Iran, North Korea, and some others.

The attempt to connect these two funding situations—the war in Ukraine and the war in Israel—is an attempt to outflank those conservative Republicans who are opposing the new package Biden presented for Ukraine funding, initially a \$24 billion request. In the budget deal that was reached, they threw that out completely. But listen to what leading Democrats are saying about the importance of Biden's speech. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer applauded his plan and said, "We're going to do everything in our power to ensure the Senate delivers the support of Israel and the rest of the package," that is, Ukraine. Senator Ben Cardin, a Democrat who is head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, concurred with Schumer and said, "The linkage has bipartisan support, and is our best shot to get it done now." That's the intent to outflank the opponents of Ukraine funding; but more importantly, what's the real intent here? Permanent warfare to disrupt the potential of nations to break out from the unipolar order or the rules-

based order.

What we've been emphasizing, as you heard from Lyndon LaRouche just before, is that the drive for war comes from higher up; above the elected officials who parrot the demands coming from the think tanks and the corporate cartels. But it's the higher-ups you have to look at. Last week, in the Manhattan Project, I went through LaRouche's assessment, which is that both sides in the Middle East have been played; both sides. The Arabs and Palestinians, and the Israelis. This is something that didn't start just recently; it's an orchestration by the British Empire going back, as LaRouche talked about, for thousands of years, but in the more recent period, going back to the pre-World War I period, when the question was, "How do you replace the Ottoman Empire to make sure that it remains under the control of the British Empire?" That is, the geographical area which we now call the Middle East, but which is essentially Southwest Asia. How do you keep it under the control of the British Empire? This was part of the fight in World War I. The intention to keep Germany and Russia away from each other so that the Trans-Siberian Railroad and the Berlin-Baghdad Railroad did not cut out the power of the British Navy to control international trade and commerce.

In 1916, there was the Sykes-Picot Agreement, where the British and the French carved up the Middle East to make sure that there would not be a coherent plan for nations to develop, but that they could easily be pitted against each other based on national views, tribal interests, religious differences such as Shi'ite and Sunni, and so on. And in 1917, they added to that with the Balfour Declaration, promising a Jewish state in Palestine.

When you look at the developments in recent days and the war expanding in Southwest Asia, this is what LaRouche said is a result of geopolitics. You look at that area, and what's there? It's an automatic natural land connection between Asia

and Europe, and between Asia and Africa. It's a sea connection with the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean. These were areas central to British control, and that's what geopolitics is about. How do you manipulate governments so that there will be no opposition to a looting policy directed from above by the British Empire? That's the reason, LaRouche says, people are played there.

Let me just give you a brief sense of what I mean when I say the higher-ups involved in manipulation. There's a fellow called Frederick Kempe, who is the CEO of the Atlantic Council, which is one of the leading think tanks for the geopoliticians and the corporate oligarchs. The Atlantic Council is funded by the British government; it's highly integrated into British intelligence; and then it's funded also by corporate cartels from the City of London and Wall Street. Here's what Kempe had to say about Biden's speech Thursday night. He said:

"Historians may come to know U.S. President Joe Biden's speech to the nation as his 'inflection point address'," because Biden said this is an inflection point. Kempe goes on to say, "It was as eloquent and compelling as any he has delivered in his lifetime," which, by the way is not saying much. But then he goes on to say, "It has the potential to be the most significant of his Presidency, and it was choreographed to be seen as such. It was only the second time he has chosen to speak from behind the resolute desk in the Oval Office, and he did it with the backdrop of wars in Ukraine and Israel, and simmering tensions around Taiwan."

Now, to show you that Kempe actually understands what's going on, he does make the counterpoint that, as this was going on, "as if scripted by a grand dramatist, Chinese leader Xi Jinping and Russian President Vladimir Putin were meeting in China as Biden travelled to Israel; doubling down on their common cause to rewrite the rules of the global order." On

that, Kempe is absolutely right. They are rewriting the rules, because they don't accept the rules of the unipolar order dictated by the corporate cartels centered in London and Wall Street. They are, in fact, leading a rebellion against it, which includes most of the Global South. There are 150 nations at the Beijing conference of the Belt and Road Initiative. So, Kempe has a sense that he's speaking going uphill. But what he's identifying, and what Ursula von der Leyen, who is also very close to the Atlantic Council, said in her trip to Washington, what would happen if the U.S. role as the sole superpower is rejected? That's what Biden said also. The pivotal role of America as the indispensable nation as the murderous Madeleine Albright called it. Well, Lyndon LaRouche has been a primary intellectual force in the opposition to this globalist policy for his whole life. In the time I knew him, from 1972 until his passing in 2019, he gave many speeches, conferences, voluminous writings presenting an alternative to submitting to this order.

I'm going to give you a brief chronology. It's such a massive opus of work, it would require many days and conferences and we should do that. But I just want to give you a brief glimpse into what he did, and how he shaped this fight, and why today it's the policies that he and our organization represent that are the alternative. Let's start in one historic moment, April 1975. LaRouche was invited to attend a conference in Baghdad of the Ba'ath Party. And while he was there, he met with a number of Arab leaders, and came out of there with a proposal from the Iraqis to pull together a \$30 billion development fund for Israel and Palestine. This, when LaRouche presented it to our membership, was quite staggering. He followed the trip to Baghdad with a press conference announcing the release of his International Development Bank, which was a call for a new monetary system which would be coherent with this package of money for developing Israel and Palestine.

Let me give you a brief anecdotal report on the magnitude of

this. Right after this happened, we put out in our newspaper, a headline stating, "Iraq Offers \$30 Billion Peace Plan to Israel." I was with a group of people who distributed this at a speech given by Moshe Dayan at Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. There were hundreds of people there, and we were very much afraid that if we went there and said Iraq wants to end the confrontation and offers money, people would be angry. But what we found out is that they were highly interested in it. We sold every single newspaper we had, and then after the speech by Dayan, I stood up in the audience—José Vega-style—and said to Moshe Dayan, "We have a proposal that Lyndon LaRouche has put on the table from Iraq for a \$30 billion development plan for Israel and Palestine. Would you support that?" I was expecting a harangue from him, because he had a reputation of being a bit of a hothead, a tough military leader. What he said was fascinating. He said, "This is very interesting. This could change everything. I'm very open to hear more about it." It showed at that time the potential for LaRouche's intervention—this is just after the 1973 War, after the Arab oil embargo, after what appeared to be an end to any possibility of realizing the idea of a two-state solution to Israel and Palestine.

When LaRouche introduced his International Development Bank policy, he said the following: "With an IDB policy in the wind, the pro-peace faction of the Mapai [which was an Israeli party] should soon become hegemonic. The Israelis and key Arab states could readily agree on durable terms of continued negotiation concerning the Palestinian question within the context of immediate firm agreement for cooperation in development policies." With that approach, LaRouche conducted meeting over the next few years, beginning in 1975 when he had a meeting with Israeli leader Abba Eban to further the discussion of this approach. In 1977, LaRouche wrote an article which was published in a Paris-based Israeli newsletter called "Israel and Palestine; A Future for the Middle East." Here's what he said in that:

“In general, without direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, there can be no Middle East settlement for the foreseeable, immediate future. We all know all too well subjective obstacles to such negotiations. We ought to know that we must rapidly eliminate the obstacles to such direct negotiations.” He’s referring specifically to the idea that you should have a political agreement first, and then move on. What he says is that “The objective basis for a Middle East settlement is the economic development package we have indicated. Any other approach will fail; will be quickly degraded into farce. However, it is not mere material advantage in itself which provides the basis for peace. It is the fact that the commitment of the governments to realize high rates of scientific and technological progress fosters humanist outlooks in the populations.”

That was the idea LaRouche had of his Westphalian principle; of the importance of economic policies that show each side recognizing the benefit of the other as the basis of peace. This was his theme in many other papers during that period. He went against the tide when people were saying you can’t deal with Arafat, he’s unwilling to make a negotiation. What LaRouche wrote in December 1983: “Mr. Arafat is the established leader of what is, in fact, a government in exile of the Palestinian Arabs. If we are going to deal successfully with the Palestinian Arab people, it is with Mr. Arafat’s leadership that we must deal.” He then wrote a policy paper, “Proposal To Begin Development of a Long-Range Economic Development Policy for the State of Israel.”

Shortly after this, in April 1986, Shimon Peres, who was at that time Israeli Prime Minister, called for a \$25-\$30 billion pool of money to create a Mideast Development Fund for the next ten years. Peres called it a Marshall Plan for Middle East Development. As far as it went, Lyndon LaRouche backed it, and wrote several articles defending it. But he did point out the inadequacy of the approach. What he said at that time

was that what's necessary is to address the most serious problem that exists in terms of the economy. What is that? It's the lack of water, and the relationship of that to the lack of power or energy. So, while endorsing Peres' Marshall Plan, and by 1986, Peres had upped the total to \$50 billion, what LaRouche did is, he started writing about how you can create more water for the Middle East. This is the basis of what became known later, by 1990, as his Oasis Plan. What he said is that you need to have a manmade Jordan River, which could flow to provide more water for all the areas that bordered it; including Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and the Arabian Peninsula. He said to do this, you need desalination. You need a string of 300MW nuclear plants that give you the power to do the desalination. It will also provide the electricity needed for industrialization and advanced agriculture. In 1990, he wrote a piece called "A Peace Plan in the True Interests of Arab and Israeli." What LaRouche wrote in this is that we need "geographic engineering" to run the canals between the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea, and then the Red Sea to the Dead Sea, to create water courses which, with nuclear-powered desalination to provide water power and transport, would allow for industrial and agricultural development.

Here's what he said that's really most interesting:

"One could define the proper approach to development of the Middle East, if no persons lived there presently, as if, for example, we were planning the settling of Mars: an uninhabited planet, by aid of artificial environment, and so forth." He went on to write, the division and distribution of water and power must be organized to develop the average square kilometer of land to be productive at needed levels for different types of land-use—pastoral, crop, residential, industrial, and commercial.

This was idea of the two canals and the overall approach to industrial development was seen as revolutionary. How could you get an agreement on this basis? What happened at that

point was that the Bush administration tried to do exactly what LaRouche had warned them not to do. To try and get a political settlement, they had a conference in Madrid, which included representatives of the Palestinians and Israelis, but it was going nowhere. The same old arguments, the same old fights, the same old antagonisms; the fact that there had been a number of wars since 1948 in '48 and '56 and '67 and '73, and continued skirmishing and terrorism. How could you get the two sides together? While the Madrid conference was going on—and at the time it was Yitzhak Shamir who was the Prime Minister, there was something else that was launched when Yitzhak Rabin became Prime Minister the next year in 1992. It was a back channel discussion in Oslo, Norway, between representatives who were close to Shimon Peres, who had come up with this idea of the Mideast Marshall Plan, and representatives of Arafat.

This came to fruition in the September 1993 agreement called the Oslo Accord. Now, what's most important about the Oslo Accord, and most people focus on the fact that Arafat and Rabin shook hands, they spoke about putting an end to the enmity. This is where Rabin made his famous statement that in order to do this, you must have the courage to change axioms. And they reflected that merely by meeting together and shaking hands. It was a very tense moment until the two of them grabbed each other's hands, looked in each other's eyes, and then moved away and did a toast to each other. A toast to those who have the courage to change axioms. But what was underlying this potential was precisely LaRouche's idea of economic cooperation and development in the two economic annexes that were attached to the Oslo Accord.

I'm just going to read a couple of aspects of this. The economic annex #3: "Protocol on Israeli-Palestinian Cooperation in Economic and Development Programs."

"The two sides agree to establish an Israeli-Palestinian Continuing Committee for Economic Cooperation, focusing, among

other things, on the following:

"1. Cooperation in the field of water, including a Water Development Programme ...

"2. Cooperation in the field of electricity ...

"3. Cooperation in the field of energy ...

"4. Cooperation in the field of finance, including a Financial Development and Action Programme for the encouragement of international investment in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip ...

"5. Cooperation in the field of transport and communications ...

"6. Cooperation in the field of trade ..." and finally,

"7. Cooperation in the field of industry, including Industrial Development Programmes, which will provide for the establishment of joint Israeli-Palestinian Industrial Research and Development Centres...."

So, that was Annex #3. Annex #4 consolidates that with the idea of the "Protocol on Israeli-Palestinian Cooperation Concerning Regional Development Programs." It talks about an economic development program for the West Bank and Gaza, a Middle East development fund, and finally, a Middle East Development Bank. All of this was possible at that time, and this would have done precisely what LaRouche was proposing, which was to create a basis where people in the Palestinian territories would see a benefit in cooperating with Israel, and the Israelis would see a benefit in cooperating with the Palestinians. Not just to end the killing, but to create an environment of mutually beneficial productive activity which would lift the standard of living of people on both sides of the conflict. And on that basis, a two-state solution would be possible. That's at the center of LaRouche's ideas.

Now, what happened to that plan? Well, it was first killed by the World Bank, because by November 1993, the World Bank said

they would not funnel money or provide funds that came from donors. President Clinton among others was trying to raise funds for this. There were donors who were prepared to give money, but the World Bank said they would not extend that money to the Palestinians because they didn't trust them because of "corruption." In particular, opposition to having Arafat having any possibility of receiving the funds. As a result, the money was just not there. This was a major problem for the follow through. Then, two years later, Nov. 4, 1995, Yitzhak Rabin was murdered by a man named Yigal Amir, who was part of the settlers' movement and in particular had been very active in Hebron, which was one of the major areas of confrontation between the Palestinians who lived there and the Jewish settlers who were using the power of the Israeli state to move in. The assassination of Rabin, on top of the shutdown of the potential for funds, ended the possibility of the success of Oslo. LaRouche has specifically stated in September 1993, after the handshake in Washington, that it's urgent that the earth start being moved for these new projects immediately. Otherwise, there was a danger that this proposal would be drowned in the blood of both sides. He specifically identified the Sharon networks in the settlers' movement as the threat to it. And that's what happened; an opportunity was lost.

As we see, just project from 1995 to today. The Palestinians still have no state; in fact, they now are divided between two groups, one of which— Hamas, which Netanyahu is now vowing to exterminate—since 2009, Netanyahu and Israel have been providing funds to Hamas to build them up as a counter to the Palestinian Authority. Why? Because the Palestinian Authority is a nationalist movement that represents the interests of the Palestinians as a nation, as opposed to Hamas, which is a religious movement. As long as you have Hamas fighting with the Palestinian Authority, you have no unified government to negotiate with. That's what Netanyahu said; he bragged about doing that. The estimate is that more than \$1 billion was

channeled from Israel through Qatar to the Hamas, which now Netanyahu says he's going to exterminate and wipe out.

So, the solution here is that you have to identify what the problem is. The problem is not Israelis and Palestinians, though they may be the ones who carry out the desperate actions. But they're not acting in their own interests; they're acting in the interests of those higher up, who want to prevent any kind of break with the old axioms. We're seeing this happening around the world. Why did this happen right now? Well, I can't speak for the decision-making process of Hamas, but the timing on this is certainly worth looking at. You have the breakdown of support for the Ukraine war in the United States Congress. You have the Ukraine war going terribly. The counteroffensive fizzled out. You may be providing more weapons to Ukraine, but as Putin pointed out, that just means that there will be more deaths of Ukrainians.

The second point is that you have the emergence of a new counter pole to the unipolar order; namely, the BRICS. The emergence of the Global South with the commitment to the kind of development projects that Lyndon LaRouche has been writing about for 50 years; which means against the International Monetary Fund, against such projects as the Great Reset and the global Green New Deal, and so on. So, if you look at this from the standpoint of a Frederick Kempe and the Atlantic Council, and the people who bankroll that, a peace settlement in the Middle East would be a horrible for them. Just as a negotiated settlement of the Ukraine war, in which what Putin proposed for the last eight years—security guarantees for both Ukraine and Russia, and a recognition for the potential for the two nations to work together—this represents a threat to the continuation of what Blinken calls the rules-based order. And so, that's why it's so revolutionary and important to grasp what LaRouche is saying; both in terms of who's manipulating this, what's the hand above the scene that's playing the two sides against each other? And secondly, how do

you defeat that? You have a movement in the Western nations—the United States and Europe—that rejects the unipolar order and the so-called rules-based order and reach out their hands to the Global South to work on joint development projects in the benefit of the other.

So, there is a solution. Those who say there is no solution are just the victims of the psychological warfare which is designed to make you depressed. But the solutions rest with what we've been trying to do; what we've been working on for years, and which is coming together now in the International Peace Coalition and the overall movement of the LaRouche Organization. We can make these solutions happen, but it depends on we, the people; not elected officials who have proven to be too corrupt and too intellectually small to take up the task at hand.

That's my presentation for today.

**POLITISK ORIENTERING den 26.
oktober 2023:**

**Stop folkemordet i Gaza inden
vi får en storkrig. Formand
Tom Gillesberg.**

Lydfilen:

<http://schillerinstitut.dk/si/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/tg-1-26.10.23-final-mp3.mp3>

Erklæring fra Jacques Cheminade om den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt

Den 16. oktober 2023 (EIRNS) – Forfatteren er formand for det franske politiske parti Solidarité et Progrès. Han har været officiel præsidentkandidat i Frankrig tre gange, i 1995, 2012 og 2017. Han er lederen af LaRouche-bevægelsen (og Schiller Instituttets samarbejdspartnere) i Frankrig.

– *“Fra den stærke [kom] noget sødt.” (Dommerne 14:14)*

– *Bed om natten, så folk kan sove. (Hadith)*

Paris, 10. oktober 2023.

Situationen i Mellemøsten er en skændsel for alle. En skam, fordi ingen virkelig har kæmpet for at afslutte den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt. Vi har tilladt et folk, der lever og føler sig omgivet af fjender, at omringe et andet folk, der lever i et fængsel under åben himmel. Ud af denne ondskab, som har eksisteret så længe, må vi i dag, mod alle odds, sikre, at der kommer et større gode ud af det.

Ethvert menneske kan kun blive chokeret over billederne af de israelske ofre for Operation Al-Aqsa Flood og den behandling, som palæstinenserne har været udsat for af de skiftende israelske regeringer. Ud over ofrenes forfærdelige lidelser er vores udfordring at finde en løsning, der vil sætte en stopper for dette. Det er en udfordring, der vedrører os alle, fordi denne lille del af verden er et vigtigt centrum for civilisation, som ikke kan overlades til barbari.

Det værste er gidseltagningen af alle, af Hamas, men også af de virkelige racistiske angreb på Vestbredden, og drab på civile under særligt grusomme forhold.

Det første, vi kan gøre, er at inspirere disse fjender til at tænke og til at sætte sig i den andens sted, uanset hvor smertefuldt det måtte være. Martin Luther King guider os i denne indsats ved at forklare, hvorfor vi skal elske vores fjender for at forvandle dem til venner og for at forvandle os selv.

Disse refleksioner vil utvivlsomt virke utopiske og virkelighedsfjerne for dem, der søger modsætninger uden at søge fred. På den anden side kræver denne refleksion to ting: at granske sin samvittighed og at forestille sig et større gode ud over betingelserne for den nuværende tragedie.

Denne samvittighedsundersøgelse er en opfordring til palæstinenserne. Vi kan ikke opnå fred ved at proklamere udslettelsen af jøderne og ødelæggelsen af Israel. Målet helliger aldrig midlet, og terrorismens midler ødelægger ikke kun den anden, men også en selv. Fanatisme fører til uhæmmet terrorisme. De områder, der rammes af Hamas, er således dem, hvor mange aktivister fra den sekulære israelske venstrefløj, der går ind for fred uden besættelse, bor. Det er værre end en forbrydelse at ødelægge dem, man en dag skal tale med.

Denne granskning af samvittigheden er ligeledes en opfordring til israelerne. At tillade en del af befolkningen, især bosættelserne, at behandle palæstinensere som hunde, i strid med Israels egne love, er en næsten daglig forbrydelse. At gøre Gaza til en udendørs fangelejr fremprovokerer uundgåeligt vold og fortvivlelse blandt indbyggerne. Endnu værre er det, at det er en vederstyggelighed at ville belejre det fuldstændigt. Ved at hævde: "Ingen elektricitet, ingen mad, ingen gas, vi kæmper mod dyr, og vi handler derefter," overtræder den israelske forsvarsminister Yoav Gallant, desværre i kølvandet på mange andre, de grundlæggende principper i jødedommen og

menneskerettighederne. Den totale belejring af Gaza-striben (og vi må nu tilføje: intet vand!) er forbudt ifølge international humanitær lov. Ved gentagne gange at erklære, at "Den Palæstinensiske Myndighed er vores byrde, Hamas er vores mulighed", har finansminister Bezalel Smotrich, ligesom alle israelske embedsmænd før ham, der har støttet Hamas, kynisk leget med ilden for at miskreditere de legitime repræsentanter for den palæstinensiske sag. Vi formoder, at det var disse tvivlsomme spil, der i det mindste delvist førte til, at de israelske myndigheder ikke kunne beskytte en grænse, der ikke desto mindre er fyldt med sensorer, kameraer og vagter.

En offensiv af denne art kan sammenlignes, ikke med 11. september, som mange gentager uden at tænke over det, men med "Tet-offensiven" under Vietnam-krigen, og man må afveje de forfærdelige konsekvenser, den vil få, hvis der ikke findes rimelige kompromiser for at undslippe dilemmaet.

I virkeligheden kender vi den formelle løsning: Stop blodsudgydelserne med en retfærdig og varig fred, med oprettelsen af en palæstinensisk stat. De to folk kunne så, om ikke komme tættere på hinanden, så i det mindste respektere hinanden, om ikke institutionelt, så gennem økonomisk samarbejde i hele Sydvestasien. Men denne løsning kan ikke anvendes i en kontekst, der er begrænset til selve konfliktområdet, fordi begge parter opfatter den anden som en eksistentiel trussel. Eksterne påvirkninger forværrer konflikten mellem to folk, der betragtes som eksemplariske, men reduceres til "kort", der skal spilles i en stedfortræderkrig. Først Storbritannien, så USA og alt for ofte Frankrig har spillet et dobbeltspil for at kontrollere regionens olieressourcer og på det seneste de tekniske færdigheder i Israels avancerede industrier. Det er derfor primært en destruktiv udenlandsk indblanding, der skal ophøre og omdannes til en katalysator for udvikling og gensidig sikkerhed, som skaber betingelserne for en løsning og garanterer, at den opnås for begge parter.

Frankrig alene kan ikke spille denne rolle. Men Kina har netop præsenteret en erklæring om et "globalt samfund med en fælles fremtid", og præsident Putin har under Valdai-diskussionen den 5. oktober fremmet betingelserne for en "retfærdig multipolaritet: hvordan man sikrer sikkerhed og udvikling for alle i et nyt globalt system".

Global Times, den halvofficielle kinesiske regeringsavis, påpegede, at "enhver plan med geopolitiske motiver er i sigens natur dømt til at mislykkes, når det gælder om at fremme en gensidig og fredelig udvikling i Mellemøsten. Det er muligheder, der skal gribes, især fordi de russiske og kinesiske interventioner indtil videre har udvist reel moderation.

Men vi må gå længere. Eftersom den israelsk-palæstinensiske konflikt kun er ét element i en global økonomisk krise, vil vi kun kunne løse dette blodige dilemma ved at inkludere det i en international løsning, ligesom det gælder for at afslutte krigen i Ukraine.

Landene i det Globale Syd ønsker ikke at blive trukket ind i krige, hvor de har alt at tabe, og derfor ønsker de at slippe ud af den koloniale og neokoloniale fælde.

Ved at tage et skridt i deres retning kan Frankrig spille en hidtil uset rolle i ånden fra den Alliancefri Bevægelse i Bandung, som er ved at genopstå i dag, og i ånden fra general de Gaulles afspænding, forståelse og samarbejde. En enorm opgave? Naturligvis, men uden en ny international sikkerheds- og udviklingsarkitektur i hver nations interesse kan sammenbruddet af det nuværende vestlige finanssystem kun føre til et sammenstød mellem blokke og i sidste ende til en verdenskrig, først økonomisk og derefter militær. Operation "Al-Aqsa Flood" ville i så fald kun være den første storm.

Frankrig skal vise politisk vilje til at leve op til sin historiske rolle, og med ryggen mod muren giver det, der sker

i Israel og Palæstina, os paradoksalt nok en sådan mulighed.

Det er op til os at genopdage en "borgerånd" for at ændre magtens retning herhjemme, synkront med det, der skal ændres i verden. Ved at gå sammen med andre på vejen til en kollektiv løsning. For at gøre dette må vi hver især løfte debatten ud over Mellemøsten, som er dens prøvesten.

I dag går mine tanker til min ven Maxim Ghilan (1931-2005), direktør for International Jewish Peace Union, digter og chefredaktør for Israel & Palestine, ven af Nahum Goldmann, Pierre Mendès-France og Abou Nizen.

Retfærdighed for landene i Sydvestasien (Mellemøsten). Tale af Hussein Askary, Schiller Instituttets Sydvestasien koordinator den 22. maj 2021

På engelsk:

This sections starts at 24:20 in the video above:

Regarding Palestine: We have a major presentation which will be done by Hussein Askary in just a few minutes on this.

But I just want to point out the following to you concerning Lyndon LaRouche. Back in 1983, looking at and anticipating the kinds of problems that we're seeing today in Gaza, East

Jerusalem, and the West Bank, Lyndon LaRouche wrote a proposal with respect to Israel. I think we have a view of that. "A Proposal to Begin Development of a Long-Range Economic Development Policy for the State of Israel." As I said, that was back in 1983. Subsequent to that, we've done much work from both *Executive Intelligence Review* and from the Schiller Institute to promote this conception of development that he puts forward. A bit about the subject and why this segues us into talking about the real issue of Palestine and the real issue of Israel.

We're talking about an area which is about 27 miles long and about 7 miles wide. We're talking about an area that has 2 million people inside of it, in which you have the borders completely controlled. Nothing can move in or out. On one side is Egypt, on the other side there's Israel. You're talking about 96% of the drinking water being unusable; 50% unemployment; 75% youth unemployment. 50% of the people are under 18 years old. The internet is controlled; electricity is controlled. Movement of food or any other commercial capability is controlled. And some Israeli activists have referred to Gaza in particular as the largest open-air prison in the world. Baruch Kimmelman, who is I believe deceased now, back in 1983 wrote a book called *Politicide* in which he talked about this as being a form of concentration camp. And he knew what he was saying; he was very clear about what he was saying. He was a professor at a university in Israel at the time when he made those statements. People found him very controversial then, but the fact of the matter is, that when you're looking at this issue of the control of population, whether we're talking about Mark Carney in the case of Africa, or we're talking about the case of Palestine, or we're looking around the world in other ways, this matter of the Great Reset so-called, the great First Global Revolution as Alexander King called it, this takes us into a different province. And it's this province that we are going to discuss with you today concerning both the issue of Southwest Asia as a whole, not

merely Israel in particular, but more importantly, this concept of the method of the Committee for the Coincidence of Opposites.

With me today are Hussein Askary, who is the Southwest Asia director of the Schiller Institute, and also Diane Saxe, who is a candidate for United States Senate, running in 2022 against Chuck Schumer of New York. So, we're going to go right to Hussein, whose presentation is called "Justice for the Nations of Southwest Asia."

HUSSEIN ASKARY: Thank you very much, Dennis. Hello to Diane. I'm very happy to be with you, and thank you for the nice introduction you just made.

As Lyndon LaRouche said in the clip you saw, you don't have any problem in this region especially which is not created by the British Empire. This is a classic case of geopolitical manipulation of religion and politics and geography to pit nations against each other, peoples against each other. Before the British Empire got its nose into this region in 1917, we didn't have any problems between Jews and Arabs and Christians and so on. This is a very classic case, but also it's a tragic situation in which, as you just mentioned, the situation in Gaza, for example, is a horrendous situation where the living conditions are similar to an open prison. Now you have the lying Western media talking about Xinjiang in China being an open-air prison and a concentration camp, which is a complete lie, but they are completely blind to the fact that what the Palestinian people—especially in Gaza—have been subjected to is prison camp or concentration camp conditions.

The thing with tragedies is that the people who are inside the tragedy are not able to solve the problem per se, because they are locked into a dead end. Both Hamas and the current Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu are into a game which they believe has nothing to do with anything else than their own goals. The reality is that there is a much bigger picture in

which we, who are outside the tragedy so to speak, can situate this problem and find a solution to it. So, the problem does not come from the Palestinians or Jews or anybody, although they are now in the news media the major players. The Israelis are shooting rockets, so the Palestinians are shooting rockets and so on and so forth. But that's not really the real story.

Last week on your show, Harley Schlanger did a fantastic job of explaining the historical background for this. I'm just going to touch on a very few things on that issue, because as I mentioned, there is this British game which continues up to today. The people who planned this knew it was going to continue. But the thing which is important for us today is to situate these events in Gaza of today and in Southwest Asia in the larger context. When and where these things are happening. This is something we have learned from Lyndon LaRouche, because we cannot understand any event by itself without looking at the larger context. And we won't be able to find a solution for that. Now, these attacks, and I wrote a few weeks before this on Facebook that there are very interesting moves in the region, that can point to a different direction than what we have seen in the past six—we count the years by how many American administrations there have been—so we had two Obama administrations and one Trump administration. That's the diary, and during these three administrations we had a terrible situation in the region, but recently we had very important developments taking place concerning countries in this region. But also it involves Russia and China. The new Biden administration, if you remember the first foreign policy declaration by President Biden is that the United States is back. Now, that was a terrifying message as I recollect when I heard it. The thing is that what Biden means is that what the Trump administration did in this region by disengaging from many issues there, for example, regime-change wars and launching new wars, that made the United States to lose its leadership in the region and in the world. And therefore, the United States should take the leadership in this region back

from whom? From China and Russia, because according to the Biden administration, the vacuum created by the lack of U.S. leadership was filled by Russia and China, but it was filled by Russia and China for a good reason with a good policy.

Recently we had the possibility of the 5+1—the 5 permanent members plus Germany—reopening the negotiations with Iran for the nuclear deal, the JCPOA, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Lifting the sanctions against Iran and having Iran cooperate with the international community so to speak, on its own nuclear program to limit Iran's possibility to produce a nuclear weapon, although Iran never had that intention. In any case, these negotiations were going well, it was also still going on in Vienna, and at the same time, Iran and China signed a very strategic and economic joint agreement for 25 years, mostly on economic development along what the Chinese now call the Belt and Road Initiative, the New Silk Road. Iran and China will work intensively to build infrastructure, develop industry, technology transfer, and other strategic and military cooperation. We had at the same time Saudi Arabia and Iran, who are rivals in this region, the big Sunni-Shi'a rivals, starting negotiations in Baghdad, the Iraqi capital to ease the tension and find ways of ending their so-called proxy wars in other parts of the region. We had the prospect of Syria re-entering the Arab League again, and ending the war there in which Russia has played a key role. We also the prospects of a possibility of having a new Yemen envoy to the UN instead of the British diplomat who has been actually playing a dirty game in Yemen in the last few years. A new envoy who will start negotiations. The Iran-Saudi negotiations will have a positive effect on solving the horrible situation in Yemen, which you have discussed many times in your shows, and Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche has made an issue of lifting the blockade and sanctions on Yemen, which is genocidal. At the same time, we had the Libya situation becoming calm due to interventions by many nations, but especially Russia, Egypt, and Turkey working together to stabilize the situation. Egypt

and Turkey which have been rivals for the past 10-12 years are now re-approaching each other diplomatically.

So, you had a situation in the region where things were going in the right direction, and suddenly we had the increase of tension in Palestine and Israel, with East Jerusalem first with the Sheik Jarrah neighborhood, which was about to be taken over by Israeli Jewish settlers from its Arab inhabitants. But the core decision was delayed, but then you had all the rioting and the treatment by the Israeli police of the Palestinians. And Hamas, from Gaza, intervening with its rockets. So, we had this development which everybody saw on the news.

The problem is, there are people who, if we don't look at the general context, if we don't look at the history of this conflict, there are certain fallacies which people push out. For example, that Israel and Palestine are treated as equal, but Israel is one of the strongest military powers in the world. It's backed by the most advanced military power in the world—the United States. They have the most advanced weapons and intelligence and everything. The Palestinians don't have that. The other thing is that the Palestinians don't really have a state. So, you cannot demand from the Palestinians to take certain actions when they are living in a state-less condition and being oppressed both in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. People say, "Why can't the Palestinians live in peace with the Jews and the Israelis?" The problem is, the Palestinians are not treated as equals, they are not treated as humans, even. Also, what they are seeing—and this is something which Harley Schlanger discussed last week—that we have an ideology in Israel, especially in the right wing like Netanyahu's party, the Likud and other extreme so-called Zionist political parties and religious groups, who really don't consider the Palestinians or the Arabs as somebody whom they should live with and exist there. We remember Ariel Sharon's old slogan that "Jordan is Palestine." His idea was

that the Palestinians should be moved, transferred to Jordan where they can have their Palestinian state, but not on the so-called Holy Land. Therefore, we have many issues that are not resolved; but solving them could become easier if we look back at the history of the situation. There are UN resolutions that can give the Palestinian people and the Arab countries a fair solution to this problem, and make sure that the moderate forces in the Arab world and in Palestine are the ones who have the upper hand, not the extremists.

Just to recall, one thing we have discussed and developed, the LaRouche movement and *Executive Intelligence Review*, that Hamas, for example, has its own agenda. It's part of the international Muslim Brotherhood movement, and it does not do things just for national interest. The problem with the Muslim Brotherhood is they have been the creation of the British Empire, and have been manipulated, including by the CIA, to oppose the nationalist anti-imperialist forces in the whole Southwest Asia region and the Arab world. So, Hamas itself, and I'm making myself unpopular now in the Arab countries, has its own agenda; exactly as Benjamin Netanyahu and his people have their own agenda.

I just want to share with you a few things on the historical background to understand how the British manipulated the situation. While World War I was going on, you had young people dying on the Western Front so to speak. Germans, French, and even Americans were involved later, by the tens of thousands. The British were planning, together with the French, other things somewhere else in the world. We have described it as the Sykes-Picot Agreement. The British and the French would divide the territories of the old Ottoman Empire, which also includes what is today Palestine, Israel. It was still under control of the Ottomans, the Turks, until that point. So, they were planning that, and then they had also at the same time—November 1917—the British presenting what is historically called the Balfour Declaration. The Balfour

Declaration was a letter sent by Lord Arthur Balfour, the Foreign Secretary of Britain, to Lord Rothschild, who was the head of the UK-based Zionist organization. In that letter, the British, as you see in the text, are willing to have a Jewish Zionist state in Palestine. This is an admission that there was a such a place called Palestine, but the British wanted to offer that as a homeland for the Jews in Europe.

The thing is, what the British set up is actually a trap, both for the Jews and for the nations of the region. Because prior to that—it's a bit humorous how some of these Jewish organizations in the 19th Century and even the early 20th Century were thinking where their future Jewish state should be. And you can find it on the internet if you look for proposals for a Jewish state. There are about 10-11 proposals, none of them include Palestine. These are places in the U.S., there is a place in Uganda, there was one in Russia, Japan, Madagascar, in Guyana, Ethiopia, and so on. But the British chose to have Palestine because they had their own plans how to divide and conquer this region and also use it because it is the crossroads of the continents and the oceans. So, the British can control that region forever. Or manipulate others like the United States is being manipulated now into supporting Israel in whatever Israel does so that the conflict continues. There is no way out of such a conflict. This is one of the sinister things the British created like you have in Kashmir and so on, which is a big problem.

So, the problem is now, how to get out of that situation. We cannot get out of that problem by rolling back history. You cannot negate the existence of the Israeli state; you cannot either ask the Palestinians to leave for Jordan as Sharon wanted to do to have their own state. We should follow certain steps, make certain compromises to allow the Palestinian people to have their own state. Because without the Palestinian state, you would have this continuous problem where the Palestinians continue to lose territory and power,

and they will have to resort to either rioting, or as we have seen now recently, rocket attacks on Israel. Hamas knows it cannot defeat Israel with military means, but what they want to show Israel is that they cannot be safe being there and exerting that kind of force and policy against the Palestinians. Which is correct. It's not only the Palestinians. You cannot exist in that region where you have 100 million Egyptians, you have 40 million Iraqis, millions of Jordanians, 30 million Syrians, 5 million Lebanese, and so on. And you think you can live like an island of peace and tranquility in the midst of a hell you are contributing to create. Like Israel played a key role in the war on Syria in recent years; also in Lebanon. So, there are certain ways of getting to diplomatic ways of resolving the Palestinian issue. We have United Nations resolutions, which clearly mark where the Palestinians could have their own state, and the Israelis could have their state. There is UN Resolution 242, which came after the 1967 War, in which Israel occupied the West Bank and Gaza and Golan Heights and other parts and the Sinai Peninsula. This is a resolution which was voted unanimously by the United Nations Security Council, including the United States. But people have been dragging their feet on that.

This is an old map of the partition plan of 1947, before Israel was officially established. The first Arab-Israeli war, where in the blue you have Israel. The UN Partition Plan was supposed to solve the problem at the time. Remember, President Roosevelt was very active in the last year of his life, when he met with leaders of the region. In his discussions with the Saudi king, Abdul Aziz ibn-Saud, he suggested the king intervene with the other Arab leaders to resolve the problems created by the British in the region in this Palestinian area. Because Roosevelt was sensing that he had to stop this British game in the region, but also that there were moves inside the United States to entangle the United States into this conflict through what we saw later emerging, especially under Harry Truman; so-called election considerations forced the United

States to side completely with the Israeli side. Roosevelt was trying to get the Arabs to accept a compromise to establish this so-called Two-State Solution and stop the British geopolitical manipulation. But that did not happen. Roosevelt died; the British continued to control there. But then the British pulled out and allowed the Israelis to take even more of the Palestinian land, as you see in the pink and green colors. These were taken in 1949, but also later the green zones, the West Bank and Gaza were taken in 1967, including eastern Jerusalem.

This is the United Nations demarcation plan after the war in 1967, which marks where the different territorial claims of the different parties would be. And then, what has happened since then is that the Israelis have been building illegal settlements in these occupied areas, like you have in the dark red areas. So, the Palestinians are living in these enclaves in the West Bank which are cut off by a series of settlements by the Jewish settlers, and also walled off. They had walls built between the different parts of the West Bank. The Palestinians see their land shrinking more and more, and their rights disappearing. The Palestinians are told they should stop complaining, and accept whatever they are offered. The problem is that the Palestinians having looked at this history, and their country shrinking, their water being stolen from them, and every other right. And they know that Netanyahu and his supporters have no intention of establishing a Palestinian state. Actually, even the Arab Israelis, there are Arabs inside Israel who are Israeli citizens, who are also being targetted right now. Last year the Israeli Knesset removed Arabic language from existence inside Israel; they decided there shouldn't be any Arabic language. So, the Arabs in Israel also see themselves threatened. They are the ones who are making lots of demonstrations in the previous weeks. They are Israeli citizens, but they have Arab ethnic background.

Asking the Palestinians to stop complaining is like asking the woman who is beaten by her husband the whole time, that she should stop complaining so her husband stops beating her. The problem is, the husband continues beating her, because he's a sociopath; he's an insane person. Somebody comes with a statistical study like we see all the time—people like Jared Kushner is typical. The theory is that the more the woman complains, the more there is abuse. Therefore, complaining is counterproductive. So, the Palestinians should stop complaining, because that creates the problem. So, you have that enormous injustice, and the Palestinians can see that they are not being treated, that their future is threatened. There is no future in the view to see, and there are major powers who are against them, and they have no allies. That's what creates the enormous frustration among the Palestinians who see no other way than fighting back. That's really terrible.

The other thing which I think we should discuss, besides these diplomatic solutions I mentioned—either a two-state solution going back to the Oslo Agreement, going back to these United Nations' solutions. We need to have a solution for the whole region, which is the issue which Lyndon LaRouche has been fighting for since the 1970s. The only way out of these wars is economic cooperation, economic development; especially in terms of water resources, transportation, power, electricity, education, and health care. I think this is the important issue to discuss now, because if we don't take whole so-called Palestinian issue back to the big powers, as Helga Zepp-LaRouche has mentioned, we should have a summit of the major powers. LaRouche called it the Four Powers—the United States, Russia, China, and India. We can also discuss the United Nations Security Council powers and others, to have a discussion about establishing peace in this whole region with economic development. I think the best solution which we have had, which has worked, is achieving things on the ground, is what China is doing with the Belt and Road Initiative, the New

Silk Road. Building infrastructure, health care, and so on. Russia is also playing a key role in providing specific technologies like nuclear power to nations in the region; to Iran, now Egypt. We have also with other African nations. So scientific and technological cooperation, economic cooperation is the solution. It has been since LaRouche announced that in the early 1970s, and it continues to be in the future. I think this is one of the big issues that has to be put on the table for people, so we don't get entangled into these ethnic, religious matters. There was no real ethnic or religious problems between Jews and Arabs before the British Empire stuck its nose into this region.

I stop here, and I allow more matters to be discussed in the discussion period.

SPEED: Thank you a lot for that Hussein. There are going to be several questions. There's a lot of ways we can take this.

NYHEDSORIENTERING MAJ 2021: Vores moralske sammenbrud råber på et nyt paradigme

Download (PDF, Unknown)