Editorial

'Geneva Peace Moves Are Important'

Asked by an American Muslim newspaper journalist how he would "right the wrongs" of United States Mideast policy, Democratic Presidential candidate and *EIR* Founding Editor Lyndon LaRouche told his live audience and those listening to his Oct. 22 webcast, "As President, I'll have no problem in dealing with this. I will get the support of enough people in the world that we'll stop it." LaRouche pointed to the current Geneva non-governmental peace meetings of Israelis and Palestinians as important for governments to support.

Abdulla el-Amin of Detroit's *Muslim Observer* asked, "Mr. LaRouche . . . how do you propose to deal with what obviously is an extremely powerful lobby in the United States, in order to be fair in the treatment of the Palestinian people?

LaRouche's forceful answer is worth quoting at length: "First of all, there is a meeting in Geneva—with [Yossi] Beilin and others involved, whom I've had some cooperation with indirectly in the past on this question—which is an attempt to revive the Israeli-Palestinian dialogue. This is important. I think that governments and others around the world should support it. Not that it, by itself, is going to succeed, but an effort in that direction opens up the question of what is required to succeed. If you can establish that the intent exists, then I think it can succeed.

"Now, the other side is that Israel has no future under the present policies of Sharon. . . . If Israel were to pursue this course, which has been assigned to it by the friends of Dick Cheney, the neo-conservatives in the United States principally—it's a part of Cheney's policy, it's a part of the preventive war policy. Sharon is a patsy for Cheney, or for whoever takes Cheney's place in playing that role. In reality, as every sane Israeli knows—and every concerned Jew around the world who's well-informed knows—if Israel goes this road, Israel will cease to exist. Maybe other people, too, will cease to exist, but Israel cannot live with the present policy.

"It is in the interest of the United States that the Middle East war end!" LaRouche said. "It is in the interest of the United States that there be peace among the peoples of the Middle East. It is in the interest of the United States that there be justice for the Palestinians. Therefore, the United States President must express that interest. . . . He would have to say, as I would say, 'Hey, Sharon, I've got news for you. Your water is shut off. You don't get a nickel from the United States from this moment on, until you stop this nonsense. You're not getting anything from us.'

"We are on the side of the Palestinians, because they're the victims in this process. Oh sure, they kill back; but everyone who understands this process, understands that when you push a people to the brink, you will get irregular warfare. You set the fire: Don't complain about the flames. When you abuse people, you deny them justice for two generations, you treat them as inhuman for two generations, they give up hope, and they're willing to commit suicide to fight you, then you are wrong, wrong. You don't do that to the human race. And the United States has to take a clear position on that. . . .

"On the other hand, we have people like Beilin and others, who know that peace is essential. . . . And the policy of the United States, for its own part, should be, 'We will tolerate nothing but peace. . . . We could get support from other nations for such a policy. But what we're not doing, on the Israeli side, is, we are not putting our support to those people whose interests and whose actions do correspond to our interest. Beilin typifies those who correspond to U.S. interests. Therefore, we should be supporting the Geneva process, not because it's a guaranteed success, but because it's keeping alive the only thing that will get the Middle East out of this mess. At the same time, we have to defend the rights of the Palestinians, in the way the United States should defend the rights of the Palestinians, not like a bull in a china shop, but consistently. And, if we were serious about it, it would help."

72 Editorial EIR October 31, 2003