

LaRouche's 30-Year Efforts for Mideast Peace and Development

This timeline emphasizes Lyndon LaRouche's programmatic efforts with regard to the Middle East, which have always been based upon the principle that economic development in the mutual interest of all parties in the conflict ("the benefit of the other") is the only foundation upon which peace can be achieved. Of course, LaRouche has also focussed his fire against those who have sabotaged such potential—most notably the British and synarchist bankers, plus now, the insane Bush-Cheney Administration.

April 1975: Lyndon LaRouche, after travels to Baghdad, Iraq for meetings with Arab leaders, announces a proposal for Mideast peace based on economic development of the region, as part of his proposal for a new International Development Bank (IDB) reorganization of the world monetary system. The proposal details a plan for the industrial and agricultural development of the region stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, and from Syria to Afghanistan.

LaRouche states in that proposal: "With an IDB policy in the wind, the pro-peace faction of the Mapai should 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. . . . Within such a policy framework, the Near East Jew will tolerate no continuation of keeping any section of the Arab population in oppressed backwardness; this provides the positive basis for finally settling the Palestine issue to the satisfaction of Jews and Arabs generally, including of course, the Palestinian Arabs."

November 1975: LaRouche and associates organize a seminar in Paris to present his Middle East development plan to the Arab nations.

November 1975: LaRouche meets in New York with Israeli leader Abba Eban on his proposals.

1977-78: LaRouche holds several meetings with World Jewish Congress President Nahum Goldmann on his economic proposals in the Mideast.

August 1977: LaRouche writes an article, "A Future For the Middle East," which is published in Max Ghilan's Paris-based Israeli newsletter *Israel & Palestine*. "In general, without direct negotiations between Israel and the PLO there can be no Middle East settlement for the foreseeable immediate future. The objective basis for a Mideast settlement is the economic-development package we have indicated. Any

Features of the LaRouche 'Oasis Plan'



other approach will fail, will be quickly degraded into farce— and probable war.”

March 1978: LaRouche writes a strategic evaluation report titled “A Machiavellian Solution For Israel,” which emphasizes: “Without a massive economic development program for the Middle East, no political basis for peace exists in that region.” Addressing Israel’s criminal practices against Lebanon and the Palestinians, LaRouche says: “The test of the qualities of a shepherd is the power to look directly at the full measure of evil the Israelis have perpetrated in Lebanon, the Israelis’ willingness to plunge the world into Armageddon rather than be ‘forced’ to regard the Arab as a human being, and once seeing this in all its undiminished horror, nonetheless nod, and say that this solution we propose for Israel is all the more imperative.”

Spring 1980: LaRouche’s Presidential campaign circulates a white paper titled “U.S. Middle East Policy.”

December 1982: LaRouche representatives travel to Egypt to discuss economic development proposals. Egyptian Agricultural Minister Yossef Wali endorses *EIR*’s call to make Egypt into the “Japan of Middle East”; adds that “it is stupid to follow the IMF’s orders like the Bible or Koran.”

December 1983: LaRouche calls on Israel to work with PLO leader Yasser Arafat to bring peace to the region. “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.” LaRouche issues *Proposal to Begin Development of a Long-Range Economic Development Policy for the State of Israel*, which is circulated widely there by LaRouche representatives sent there for that purpose.

1984: Three trips to Israel by LaRouche representatives, who argue for his development proposals.

August 1986: LaRouche extends full support for the renewed proposal of Israeli leader Shimon Peres for a new Marshall Plan for Mideast-wide development. “What Mr. Peres, and also the authors of a parallel Egyptian proposal, have presented as a ‘New Marshall Plan’ policy, addresses two immediate problems suffered by both Israel and by moderate Arab nations . . . Egypt most notably: the depressive effect of a debt-accumulation that is no longer payable,

and the psychological impact of economic decay upon the populations and political stability of both Israel and Arab nations. . . . The problem has been aggravated to the extreme, by the lunatic ‘conditionality’ policies of the International Monetary Fund.”

August 1988: LaRouche’s Presidential campaign issues “A New Middle East Policy Is Urgent,” which is circulated widely in the region.

July 1990: LaRouche warns of British and Israeli efforts to trigger a new Mideast war; issues “Oasis Plan,” again calling for an emergency program to economically develop the Mideast.

September 1990: In an *EIR Special Report* titled “Bush’s Gulf Crisis: The Beginning of World War III,” LaRouche stresses again that “without a policy of development, the Arabs and Israelis have no common basis for political agreement; no common interest.”

April 1991: LaRouche's Presidential campaign widely circulates a pamphlet titled *Demand Development in the Middle East! Stop Bush's Genocidal New World Order*.

September 1991: Under the direction of Lyndon LaRouche and his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, the Schiller Institute issues a policy proposal titled "For a True Fourth UN Development Decade: A Concrete Solution to the World Economic Breakdown Crisis; a Discussion Paper for the 46th Regular Session of the UN General Assembly." LaRouche's "Oasis Plan" is prominently featured.

March 6, 1992: A full-page advertisement by LaRouche's campaign committee appears in the *Washington Times*, titled "LaRouche Was Right; Great Projects To Develop the World." Among the 18 Great Projects referenced is the Mideast Oasis Plan.

July 1992: LaRouche representatives in Jordan distribute LaRouche proposals on regional economic development.

September 1993: Responding to the announcement of the Oslo Peace Accords, LaRouche hails this event as "monumental as the fall of the Berlin Wall." "The urgent thing here, is that we must move with all speed to *immediately* get these economic development projects, such as the canal from Gaza to the Dead Sea, going, because if we wait until we discuss this out, enemies of progress and enemies of the human race, such as Henry Kissinger and his friends, will be successful, through people like Ariel Sharon's buddies, in intervening to drown this agreement in blood and chaos."

April 1994: LaRouche addresses the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow on his Oasis Plan.

June 2002: LaRouche addresses a conference at the Zayed Center for Coordination and Follow-Up, in Abu Dhabi, devoted to the question of "Oil and Gas in World Politics." In his speech, entitled "The Middle East as a Strategic Crossroad," LaRouche deals with the ecological, economic, and strategic aspects of the petroleum-rich Southwest Asian region, from the standpoint of its potential role as an economic crossroads in a world economy revitalized under a new world monetary system.

June 2003: LaRouche travels to Turkey, where he speaks of reshaping the Southwest Asian region for peace. One of his speeches, entitled "Eurasia: New Key for Global Development and Peace," deals with the role of this region in the Eurasian Land-Bridge project.

April 17, 2004: LaRouche issues a policy statement, "Southwest Asia: The LaRouche Doctrine," published in *EIR* of April 30, 2004. See also www.larouchepub.com.

May 14, 2004: LaRouche gives a webcast speech to a Washington audience on "The Keys to Peace" for Southwest Asia, emphasizing the need for an approach based on the Treaty of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years' War (1618-48)—an approach that would uphold the sovereignty of the nation-state, while halting religious warfare without retribution or revenge.

The Promise of Oslo, And Today, Lies in LaRouche's Oasis Plan

by EIR Staff

Adapted from EIR, Nov. 26, 2004.

From 1976 forward, economist Lyndon LaRouche had argued that the only possible route to a lasting, or developing, peace between the Palestinians and the Israelis, would be through the adoption of an economic development plan that would demonstrate to both populations that the conditions of peace and cooperation were to the benefit of themselves, and their posterity. Over time, LaRouche's proposal came to be known as the "Oasis Plan," especially because it revolved around the development of new water resources for the now water-starved region. This plan was the subject of intensive organizing activity with Israelis, Palestinians, and representatives of other nations as well.

The potential for its realization appeared most likely at the time of the announcement of the Oslo Accords, which were made public at the beginning of September 1993. For not only did those accords lay out provisions for political accommodation, but they included economic annexes (III and IV), which defined areas of cooperation in the fields of water, electricity, energy, and transportation, among others. The second annex also proposed cooperation on regional development programs.

Not surprisingly, these areas were precisely the ones which LaRouche had specified for years, and he threw himself, and his supporters, into an emergency mobilization to realize the opportunity. LaRouche, who was in prison at that time, responded to the news of Oslo by insisting that crucial projects had to begin—ground had to be broken for them—by the end of September, in order to create and preserve the momentum behind the Accords. In an interview Sept. 8, 1993, LaRouche said:

"The urgent thing here is that we must move with all speed to *immediately* get these economic development projects, such as the canal from Gaza to the Dead Sea, going, because *if we wait until we discuss this thing out, enemies of progress and enemies of the human race, such as Kissinger and his friends, will be successful, through people like Sharon's buddies, in intervening to drown this agreement in blood and chaos.*"

Israeli-Palestinian Agreement

There were leading factions on both the Israeli and Palestinian sides who agreed with LaRouche. Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, who crafted the agreement on the Israeli side along with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, had been campaigning since 1985 for a Marshall Plan for the Middle East, on the order of magnitude of \$50 billion. In September 1993, he called for implementing the economic agreements, in order to “convert the bitter triangle of Jordanians, Palestinians, and the Israelis into a triangle of political triumph and economic prosperity. . . . Let us build a Middle East of hope, where today’s food is produced and tomorrow’s prosperity is guaranteed, a region with a common market, a Near East with a long-range agenda.”

Peres’s words were effectively seconded by PLO Executive Committee member Mahmoud Abbas, known by his *nom de guerre* Abu Mazen, who had been the chief negotiator for the accord on the Palestinian side. He said: “Economic development is the principal challenge facing the Palestinian people after years of struggle, during which our national infrastructure and institutions were overburdened and drained. We are looking to the world for its support and encouragement in our struggle for growth and development which begins today.”

Astute observers will note that this Abu Mazen is the very same individual who is at the head of the Palestinian Authority today, having participated, with Yasser Arafat, in the peace process for more than a decade. Such a continuity contrasts sharply with developments on the Israeli side, where Oslo architect Yitzhak Rabin was assassinated by an Israeli extremist in 1995.

In fact, the definitive blow that was delivered against the rapid economic development plan envisioned in the Oslo Accords, came neither from the Israelis nor the Palestinians. It came from the international community, which not only refused to step forward with the necessary resources and credit, but also threw its support behind the plans of the World Bank. The World Bank, which held a conference on Sept. 20, 1993, refused outright to fund the heavy infrastructure projects, especially in the field of water and energy, which were absolutely required for progress to be made. As a result of the failure to implement an economic development plan, economic conditions have worsened in the region, “proving,” particularly to the Palestinians, that peace does not pay.

The Oasis Plan

As LaRouche has argued consistently, there is no possibility for the peoples of the Israel-Palestine-Jordan-Syria area to live in peace, unless there is development of *new* water resources. The Jordan River Valley, on which all these nations depend, has a water flow that can support less than *half* of the people living the region, and it is getting more inadequate all the time.

Thus, the core of LaRouche’s plan consists of water development and management programs, buttressed by projects for transportation, energy production, and industrial and agricultural growth. The supply of water must be drastically increased, through the creation of what LaRouche called new “man-made River Jordans.” This, he argued, depends absolutely upon the use of nuclear energy, for both energy and desalination.

These projects include two canals, one linking the Mediterranean with the Dead Sea, and another linking the Red Sea to the Dead Sea. These links require large-scale desalination through the use of fourth-generation meltdown-proof high-temperature nuclear reactors, which would simultaneously provide abundant electrical energy for the people of the region.

Such waterways would be vital for improvement of transport as well, and along the canals and reservoirs, LaRouche proposed building “nuplexes,” complexes of nuclear power and industrial-agricultural production. Complementing them would be the construction of railroad lines, necessary for the movement of people and freight.

LaRouche’s Oasis Plan also included a “soft infrastructure” component, involving the provision of housing, health care, education, and all manner of social infrastructure. But such improvements in living standards would be absolutely impossible to sustain, without the agro-industrial base fed by *new* and adequate water resources. In turn, the provision of those resources absolutely depends upon the use of nuclear power.

Such plans for the region were not unique to LaRouche. Back in the 1950s, the men who successfully established the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States, had worked up a plan for the Jordan Valley Authority, which they presented to the nations of the region and the UN. The political combination required to fund such projects, was never realized at that time, and in the later “post-industrial” period, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and international bankers exercised their veto.

Today, with the whole of the Southwest Asian region exploding, there is a new urgency for putting the Oasis Plan on the table. A commitment from *outside* the region, to fund and otherwise support such projects is a *sine qua non* for reversing the pessimism of both the Palestinian and Israeli people, and building the basis for stability, which could grow into lasting peace and prosperity.

See www.schillerinstitute.org for details and maps.

**To reach us on the Web:
www.larouchepub.com**