

Permanent Settlement in the Middle East by October?

by Lyndon Hermyle LaRouche, Jr.

WIESBADEN, BRD, July 11 (NSIPS) — Our best information to date on the Middle East situation is that, provided that Senator Jake Javits and similar types keep their snouts out of the situation between now and the tentatively scheduled Oct. 10, 1977 Geneva conference, the world will quickly see the beginning of a permanent Arab-Israeli settlement emerging before the end of this year.

For various reasons, neither the Israeli government nor Arab leaders will publicly state the "bottom-line" arrangements establishing the peace settlement. Even U.S. Congressmen, such as Senator Robert Dole, are not fully at liberty to report confidences, since such reports would appear to be a direct leak of Israeli government thinking.

This creates a political problem inside the United States. If the Arabs and Israelis won't tell, and if briefed U.S. visitors such as Bob Dole are prevented by diplomatic considerations from telling the whole story if they were taken into confidence on this point, who is left to tell the so-called Jewish Lobby and other concerned U.S. citizens what the actual situation is.

So, I better let the United States public in on the basic facts of the situation.

The PLO is the Key

No matter what anyone tells you to the contrary, the key to a Middle East settlement is a direct negotiation between the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Israeli government. However, this must be brought off in the proverbial "certain way."

The idea of such a negotiation intersects such bitter prejudices both within Israel and among Arabs, that any direct, open meeting between — for example — Menachem Begin and Yasser Arafat will still require some preliminary political road-building with the aid of other parties before the fact of the meeting could become properly acceptable to a majority of Israelis and a key combination of Arab forces.

The key role of the PLO in a settlement is determined by the following considerations.

First, although the PLO is not the cause of Middle East war dangers — nor of the terrorism with which it is charged so frequently nowadays, the Palestinian Arab is the crux of the issue between Arabs and Israelis as such. Without a peace between Israel and the Palestinians, there will never be a peace worth the name between Israelis and any Arabs.

Second, Israel can not make peace with Palestinian Arabs in general: the kinds of proposals made by Moshe Dayan and others to this effect in the past are a mixture of propaganda and political imbecility. One can not make peace with a nation by walking up to various of its individual citizens on the street and getting signatures as for a petition. One can make peace only with governments which those governments' peoples accept as

credible. (Hence, Kissinger's proposed black puppet-show for Rhodesia could not possibly work.) The Palestinian Arabs (excepting the Assad-controlled Saiqa) regard the PLO as their only legitimate government-in-waiting. Thus, one negotiates with the PLO leadership or the negotiation is a useless side-show.

What Israel requires is an Arab "buffer state" between most of its borders and other Arab countries. Not an Israeli puppet-state, but Arab states which have a deeply principled basis for maintaining peace with Israel. Such a set of buffer states is represented by a stable Lebanon (substantially Arab) and a new Palestinian Arab state based on what are called "the occupied territories." However, if this is regarded simply as a real-estate operation, it does not function at all.

To make Lebanon and a new Palestinian Arab state stable countries on Israel's border requires an economic development program along the lines long recognized by the Israeli Mapam and other forces inside and outside Israel itself. My best rough estimate at the moment is that about \$20 billion in long-term credit for industry and agriculture will be needed to make a new Arab Palestinian State viable. Between \$2 to \$5 billion will also be required to restore Lebanon to the kind of economic condition in which that nation is politically stable. Israel itself will require over the foreseeable next few years a sizeable chunk of long-term capital for industrial development, and an immediate, substantial line of hard-commodity export credit to get itself out of the super-austerity and depression it is presently suffering.

None of these sums will be "charitable handouts." Israel has a highly developed labor-force which can readily multiply any reasonable amount of hard-commodity credit and industrial capital supplied. It has an insane foreign debt, built up significantly through military costs and related things, which must be variously written off in part and otherwise "frozen" until the economy gets back on its feet. A new Palestinian Arab state will rapidly emerge as an industrially oriented "economic miracle" if the right ingredients are supplied. A reconstructed Lebanon has a similar potential. Supplying these three nations with grants and credit is not to be compared with charity to some beggar-country. These nations, as sovereign, are eminently viable economic investments.

Arab Problems Generally

Although on particular issues, Arab politics are as diversified as those of any nation, the Arab world has three distinct principal philosophical currents, whose interplay must be understood to understand the kinds of problems an Israeli government — and others — confront in the process of seeking and maintaining a Middle East settlement.

The cultured Arab humanist is in the tradition of the great Arab renaissance — Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina (Avicenna), Ibn Rushd (Averroës) and Ibn Khaldon. He is essentially an Islamic neo-platonic humanist, whose

political-economic outlook would not be alien to Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, Henry Carey and Abraham Lincoln. This cultured Arab (and other Islamic leaders of the same impulse) represents that stream of culture on whose influence the 12th through 16th century European Renaissance based the development of modern science and humanist republican conceptions. These humanist Arabs (and other humanist Islamic currents) are an Israeli government's potential principal partners in reaching a durable peace settlement.

The second category is made up of Arab politicians of purely mercenary conscience. Too mercenary to be bought, they merely can be rented, under rental contracts which last only until payment on a better offer is delivered to them. This includes certain Arab figures who were officially Nazis working in fact for British or U.S. intelligence before and during World War II. This layer of Arab politicians was the key to Kissinger's Middle East games. These mercenary creatures can, however, be handled as long as the market for Middle East politicians itself is kept under strict control.

The third Arab philosophical influence is in the tradition of the irrationalist Mongol agent and fanatic Al-Ghazali.

During the period of the Crusades, the humanist forces in Europe, including the Hohenstaufen and their relatives the ruling house of Castile (Toledo) were effectively allied with the Ismaili-Fatimid Arab forces. The anti-humanist currents tending to take control of the Papacy during that time had been allied with the Mongol hordes (Genghis Khan, et al.) against the humanist Arab Caliphates and the Egyptian Fatimids.

The case of Frederick II, the Hohenstaufen humanist ruler of the Holy Roman Empire is exemplary. For factional reasons, the current Pope, an anti-humanist, sent Frederick off to a crusade to take Jerusalem. Frederick outwitted the Pope by making an agreement with the Egyptian Fatimids (his friends) through which Jerusalem was opened up.

This connection between Arabs and humanist currents in Europe was not new during the period of the Crusades. It dated from the time of Charlemagne and Harun Al-Rashid. As the humanist versus anti-humanist controversies erupted in Europe, factional alliances developed across Mediterranean religious lines of division. The Papal alliance with the Mongols against the Baghdad Caliphate was characteristic of the centuries from Charlemagne into the 15th century.

Al-Ghazali, a dominant figure of the late 11th century, was a typical "Maoist" for that time: he was an agent of the Mongols built up for their purposes as a figure to attempt to weaken Arab culture from within. He was especially directed to attempting to destroy the influence of the person whose influence was most hated and feared by the Mongol barbarians, Ibn Sina. It was Al-Ghazali, the Mongol agent, who organized the burning of most of the books of Ibn Sina, in the guise of a movement of "zero-growth" "religious purification" against the influences of science and philosophy.

Al-Ghazali's "constituency" — like British agent Marat's — was the "mob," the urban lumpen and rural backward masses. To this day, Mongol agent Al-Ghazali, the anti-science fanatic, lives on in tradition wherever

the degrading influence of backwardness and bitter poverty prevail among Arabs, and wherever there are corrupt Arab leaders who prey upon such poor people as political merchandise. The current conduct of Sudan's Numeiry exemplifies this tradition, the tradition of that evil poison which destroyed the besieged Arab culture of the past from within.

In consequence of this spectrum of Arab forces, Israel's potential security in the Middle East compels it either to be a client-state (a virtual puppet) of a great power, or to establish an alliance in principle with the humanist currents and potentials within the Arab populations. This means that there must be a Middle East economic-development program based on high-technology policies. By unifying the Palestinian Arab leadership (PLO) on the basis of such an economic-development program and practice, we must give substance to the Arab humanist impulse, to ensure that Arab humanists have predominant political control of the Arab world as a whole.

That is the only workable approach to a Middle East peace settlement.

*Why Carter is Anti-Arab
And Anti-Israel*

We in the United States must clearly understand that the Carter Administration's efforts to appear pro-Arab one day and pro-Israel the next reflect the fact that the Administration is in fact both anti-Arab and anti-Israel. That is why we must keep Brzezinski's, Schlesinger's, Jake Javits's and Humbert Humphrey's snouts out of the Middle East.

The essential difference between the Likud and the Mapai leaderships is that the Mapai leadership has been effectively a puppet of the United States National Security Council, with aid of U.S. intelligence-controlled European channels of the international social-democracy. The Likud represents an effort by industrially oriented forces within Israel both to end the destructive austerity ruining the nation and to finally establish Israel as in fact an independent nation in the Middle East. Because the Mapai was massively discredited through its U.S.-dictated Schachtian-like austerity measures in Israel, the Likud was able to pull off an electoral victory, and is now working to attempt to free Israel from the last vestiges of puppet-status in its relationship to the Carter government.

Many of us are working to help create the environment in which the Likud's efforts will be successful. The establishment of the private International Development Bank in the Mediterranean by this writer will supply the final, indispensable link in the combination of actions needed to bring that effort off.

Although the Soviet-led Comecon's IBEC banking system is already functioning as the beginnings of a new world monetary system along the lines proposed in the International Development Bank proposal, it is clear that a monetary system controlled by the socialist countries is not the acceptable, workable alternative to the IMF. The private IDB provides the kind of vehicle required both to replace the bankrupt IMF and World Bank and to apply the proper functions of banking to solving problems such as those of the Middle East and southern Africa.

With a bank capable of funneling new lines of hard-commodity-credit both to Israel and a new Arab state, we shall have exactly the combination for freezing the Israeli external debt and moving all the other financial elements essential to implementing Arab-Israeli agreements.

Without that key link in the chain of circumstances, a durable Middle East peace settlement is not possible. Carter is violently opposed to this — at least, Brzezinski informs Carter he is opposed to this. Thus, Carter is moving to launch genocide against the PLO in Lebanon and is launching a wave of terrorism and other dirty operations aimed at destabilizing the Israeli government, assassinating responsible leaders in Lebanon and the Arab countries, and similar atrocities along those lines.

Naturally, for reasons which ought to be obvious enough, very few Israelis and few Arabs could discuss the situation in the way I have reported here. No matter. A sound United States foreign policy depends upon

reachable workable solutions consistent with national and world vital interests, solutions which may differ from what parties state they desire. That is the ABC of diplomacy to date. The United States should adopt and stick to the policy perspective I have outlined and maneuver in such a way as to aid both Israelis and Arabs in regarding the objectively acceptable elements of a workable solution as subjectively acceptable to a sufficient portion of their constituencies to make the package work.

I warn you of this. Unless you clean up this lunatic Carter Administration, and force action toward a solution along the lines I have indicated, there will be a war in the Middle East. Such a Middle East war probably would trigger a general thermonuclear war, and would at best so foul up the Middle East situation that even I would have difficulty pulling the United States quickly out of the deep depression into which we are now being plunged. So, act accordingly.