

Negotiating a Durable Peace

In September 1933, while still battling Jabotinsky and the Revisionists, Ben-Gurion held several meetings in Jerusalem with Moussa Alami, who had been chief public prosecutor, before becoming one of the leaders of the Palestinian Arabs. He was closely connected with the Mufti of Jerusalem and the leaders of Istiklal, the Arab Independence Party. Ben-Gurion and Moussa Alami took a liking to one another and talked freely. Ben-Gurion's proposal was that the Arabs accept the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine which would have a Jewish majority, but a large Arab minority. It would join a Middle East Federation, an economic bloc, in which all the Arabs of the region would participate. In addition, Ben-Gurion promised large-scale financial aid to improve the Arab economies. Alami was particularly interested in the idea of creating an economic federation for development and Jewish financial aid, and he secretly met with the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, who viewed the proposals positively. It was suggested that Ben-Gurion go to Geneva and secretly meet with the Committee of Syrian and Palestinian Arabs.

The trip was a disaster; not only would the Arab interlocutors not accept the idea that the Jews become the majority in Israel, they publicly leaked a report on the secret talks between Ben-Gurion and Alami in their periodical *The Arab Nation*. That ended Ben-Gurion's contact with Alami and the Mufti. Ben-Gurion did not flinch, and he sought out and began holding further meetings in secret with other Arab leaders — Auni Bey, Abdul Haddi, and Moussa Hussein.

These initial talks ultimately fell apart. In 1935, a record 61,000 Jews arrived in Palestine, and the Palestinian response was to launch a wave of terrorism on the Jewish holiday of Passover in 1936, in which Ben-Gurion found the hand of the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. The latter ultimately made his final thoughts on any possible agreement known, when he deployed to Berlin during the war to work for the Nazis. He was later arrested and held in France to be brought before a war crimes tribunal!

Nonetheless, this approach was to be the core of Ben-Gurion's outlook. He hoped that the entire Middle East could become nations which would be integrated into an economic bloc.

All other serious peace and economic development negotiations over the decades of Israel's existence have always been carried out by Ben-Gurion's closest allies including his personal protégés, who embodied the same outlook.

In 1947, when the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine put forward the creation of a Palestinian and Jewish State, which Ben-Gurion accepted, he sent the future Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir *incognito* to meet with King Abdullah of Jordan in secret, to secure his backing for the proposal. The latter's assassination, made possible by someone in his immediate entourage who knew of the secret talks, was seen by Ben-Gurion as a harbinger of what was in store for any Arab leader who was willing to talk to the Jewish leaders.

(Years later, Golda Meir was to meet in secret with Abdullah's grandson, King Hussein.)

Ben-Gurion sent overtures to Egypt's Naguib and tried several times to meet with President Gamal Abdel Nasser after he came to power, including through the "peace-loving" Soviets; but both turned their back on him. The real story of the first Camp David Accords in 1979, with Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, is that Moshe Dayan and Shimon Peres had been holding secret negotiations with Sadat for years, and the final accords were produced by Dayan, not the reformed terrorist Menachem Begin of the Likud, who was Israel's Prime Minister at the time. Shimon Peres was later the person behind the scenes who organized and orchestrated the Oslo Accords in secret.

Both Dayan and Peres were protégés of Ben-Gurion, going back at least to the 1946 Basel, Switzerland meeting of the World Zionist Congress. Dayan was then 31 years old, and Peres was 23. The three were intimate friends and colleagues, and worked together until Ben-Gurion's death in 1973. They formed the Rafi Party in 1967, when they thought that their Mapai party had lost its moral commitment to justice

Ending 30 Years of War: The Peace of Westphalia

On May 5, 1999, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the founder of the Schiller Institute, delivered a speech to an EIR seminar entitled "After the NATO Summit, What Next? The Post-Balkan War Perspective," in Washington, D.C. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche, who is the wife of former U.S. Democratic Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., described the Peace of Westphalia, of 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War, as the model for what the United States must try to accomplish in the Balkans. More recently, she has emphasized the same point for the Middle East. Her speech appeared in the May 21, 1999 issue of EIR. The following are excerpts.

The end of the Thirty Years' War was in 1648; it was a war which rampaged in waves, like tornadoes, for 30 years, involving many European countries, including Germany, the Hapsburg Empire, France, Sweden, Bohemia, and Denmark.

After 30 years, there was enormous destruction — on average, 40% of the population and wealth, taken together, in Germany, were destroyed. Some areas were more than 66% wiped out. . . . This destruction had ravaged Europe for a long time. This was a so-called religious war, Reformation against Counter-Reformation. The hatred on both sides was enormous.

and the nation.

Peres gives a description of Ben-Gurion of the 1930s in his autobiography, *Battling for Peace*, which is worthy of including in this report.

Noting that Jabotinsky and Begin were influenced by the Poland of Pilsudski and by the Italy of Garibaldi and Musso- lini, Ben-Gurion was quite different.

“Opposing them stood the mainstream Zionist-socialist party, Mapai, led by David Ben-Gurion and Berl Katznelson, both of whom were firmly anti-Marxist, anti-Communist, and anti-Stalinist. They set out to fashion a new form of socialism that was neither imported from the outside nor translated from foreign sources. They believed that the original heralds of socialist morality had been the prophets of ancient Israel: Amos, who tongue-lashed those who ‘Swallow up the needy . . . [and] buy the poor for silver’ (Amos 8:4-6), and Isaiah, whose sublime vision of a peaceful and just society has rarely been surpassed in world literature. Ben-Gurion regarded the Biblical injunction, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself’ (Leviticus 19:18), as the essence of Judaism.

“The political movement he headed for decades was pro-

elled by a genuine desire to turn the vision of the prophets into a modern-day reality. Its vision was of a revived Hebrew language and a revitalized Israeli homeland, in which the moral message of the prophets would once again mold the national ethos.

“Throughout his life, and regardless of the changing political circumstances, Ben-Gurion always remained, in my eyes, a statesman and leader of genius. He was one of those rare figures in history whose policy and personality were inseparably melded into one consistent whole. . . .

“Ben-Gurion sought political independence for the Jews not only so they could become a nation like any other, but also so they could fulfill their historic mission as an ‘eternal nation’ by setting a universal example to the whole of mankind. The Biblical phrases ‘a light unto the nations’ and ‘a precious people’ were his watchwords.”

Science and Liberation

In 1960, Israel organized and hosted the International Conference on Science in the Advancement of New States. The conference took place at the Weizmann Institute of Sci-

The Peace of Westphalia, when all the war parties came together, was the first time that a European community of sovereign states was established. And it was only possible because all of its members recognized each other as having equal legal standing, and guaranteed each other their independence. They had to recognize their international legal treaties as binding, if they wanted to be an international community of law.

It was clear that this not only required good will, but a minimum of efficient guarantees. Most important, was the idea that the *raison d'être*—the reason for its existence, the identity of this new alliance—of this community of states, could never be only its self-preservation. It would be morally justified only if it realized ideas and principles which had a higher unifying purpose than just the states themselves.

There is a precedent for this kind of thinking in American history; namely, the idea of John Quincy Adams, that the United States must work toward fostering a community of principle among nations of the world. . . .

Such principles exist in the treaties of 1648. Some were expressed for the first time in history. These negotiations lasted for four years, during 1644-48, and in the end, Protestants, Catholics, monarchies, and republican forms of government, were treated as having equal status in negotiations and in the treaty. . . .

I want to read you—and please forgive me for the somewhat awkward language, because I tried to translate it straight from German without going through an official editorial board. . . .

Article I of the peace treaty starts like this: “A Christian, general, and permanent peace, and true and honest friendship, must rule [among the many parties]. . . . And this Peace must be so honest and seriously guarded and nourished that each part furthers the advantage, honor, and benefit of the other, and that both form [a peace], from the side of the entire Roman Reich with the Kingdom of France, as well as the other way around, from the Kingdom of France with the Roman Reich. A faithful neighborhood should be renewed and flourish for peace and friendship, and flourish again.”

This is a very precious idea. It is essential to have peace. It is the idea of Nicholas of Cusa, which he had in the Fifteenth Century, that peace in the microcosm is only possible when you have the development of all microcosms. You can only have peace among different nations if each nation develops itself fully, and regards as its self-interest to develop the others fully, and vice-versa.

It is like the idea of a family, where each member of the family wants the other members of the family to have the best possible life.

You need to realize that the whole world wants President Clinton to be such a passionate lover of the international community of peoples. President Clinton could emerge to seize this historical moment, and do what all the poor, beaten-down countries in Africa and Ibero-America, and many parts of Asia, wish him to—to love the idea of an international community of peoples. And it needs passion. It needs passion for this, without which it will not be realized.