Mideast Peace and Development
Versus British Geopolitics

The New Middle East, by Israeli Foreign Minister and former Prime Minister Shimon Peres, gives us a first-hand account of the background to the Israeli-Palestinian peace accords by one of the principal architects. The accords, agreed to on August 20, 1993 in Oslo, Norway and made public in September, were one of the best-guarded diplomatic secrets. Peres’ account of the events and, most importantly, the thinking behind the efforts, gives us a key insight into the changing dynamic in the world which led to this monumental development.

The Israeli foreign minister indicates his growing realization that an economic development plan, modelled on the post-World War II Marshall Plan for Europe, was the only hope for durable peace in the region. His earlier, 1987 efforts in London, when an agreement of this sort was almost reached with Jordan’s King Hussein, had been sabotaged by the Likud Party.

Increasingly, Israeli leaders saw a dual strategic threat: one from modern weapons, especially nuclear; the other from extremist ideologies, from the black hoods of terrorists, sanctioned and encouraged by the white robes of religious fanaticism, and fed by the age-old religious hatred of the region.

Peres’ vision was to go in the direction of a European Economic Community, to avoid turning the Middle East into another bloody Yugoslavia. Peres reviews the lessons of the 1967 Six-Day War, in which he says nothing was gained but the setting of the stage for future conflict. The 1973 Yom Kippur War, he says, could have been Israel’s last war were it not for Israel’s later tragic and unnecessary 1983 venture into Lebanon. They learned, he says, that Israel was here to stay, as were the Palestinians and the Arab world. War was futile. Neither of the parties could achieve total victory.

Israel was saddled with territories no longer strategically important, and with populations increasingly hostile. The idea of a territorial buffer, to stop Arab incursion from the East, was soon outweighed by the threat of internal terrorist activity and missile attacks, which rendered irrelevant the 30-50 kilometers of “strategic depth” gained by the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. Add to this that P.L.O. Chairman Yasser Arafat had no successors, and that regional poverty and conflict would further feed Khomeinism and the growth of the Iranian-backed Hamas movement. Thus, Peres and others found themselves taking the bold step.

Peres outlines the steps toward peace. He calls for lowering the arms budget, increasing investment in education, building regional energy and desalination plants, constructing state-of-the-art infrastructure for communication and transportation, and developing industry, agriculture, and tourism.

Following earlier models where the demilitarization of the Sinai eventually led to the Camp David accords, Peres envisions soft borders and the demilitarization of the West Bank and Gaza. He sees a Jordanian-Palestinian federation for political affairs and a Jordanian-Palestinian-Israeli “Benelux” arrangement for economic matters.

Economic Development Key
By negotiating with Arafat, and insisting that the peace plan be initiated based first on economic cooperation, followed by increased political understanding and eventual stability, Peres’ approach represented a significant departure from previous negotiations.

Physical economist Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. has been one of the few voices, since 1975, actively calling for a large-scale regional development plan as the precondition for a political agreement, coherent with Peres’ approach, and has been in correspondence with circles around Shimon Peres.

LaRouche’s plan, however, places a greater emphasis on large-scale infrastructure and nuclear energy, while rejecting the free-market/enterprise zone concept that comes in as a minor point in Peres’ discussion.

The importance of LaRouche’s analysis becomes clearest, however, when he examines the current and historic geopolitical enemies of the Peres plan. While Peres implicitly describes the geopolitical enemies of the peace process, LaRouche goes more directly to the heart of the opposition.

At the Schiller Institute’s semi-annual conference on February 20 in Washington, D.C., LaRouche developed the thesis that Britain’s Lord Palmerston and Anglo-Italian Freemason Giuseppe Mazzini set in motion ethnic liberation movements in the mid-nineteenth century that would be used by the British Empire to ensure its perpetual domination of the globe through free-market policies and “divide and conquer,” balance-of-power politics. The February 25 Hebron massacre, a modern Mazzini-
style operation, was designed to obliterate the Peres-Arafat accords. Assassin Baruch Goldstein's “Committee for Safety on the Roads” is one of a network of U.S.-funded Jewish Defense League-affiliates currently deployed to blow up the peace accord.

**British Manipulations**

In a 1986 special report, “Moscow's Secret Weapon: Ariel Sharon and the Israeli Mafia,” the LaRouche-associated magazine *Executive Intelligence Review* detailed the collaboration of British and Soviet intelligence, together with such British agents-of-influence as former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, in deploying exactly this network to provoke war in the region. This is the same group of interests which had attempted on several occasions since the early 1980's to dynamite the Temple Mount mosque, on behalf of a Freemasonic effort to rebuild Solomon’s Temple on the site.

The highest level of the conspiracy, according to *EIR*, is found among the British oligarchical patrons of the United Grand Lodge of England's Quatuor Coronati Lodge. Since its inception, the lodge has been dedicated to seizing control of the holy places in Palestine. The lodge’s affiliated publication, *Biblical Archeological Review*, has popularized the effort to destroy Islamic holy places.

The Kach/Temple Mount efforts are one coloring in a spectrum of deployable forces that the British establishment has amalgamated to keep the Middle East in perpetual crisis over the past century, from the Sykes-Picot accords that carved up the region in the aftermath of World War I, to the 1990 “New World Order” plan put into motion by Margaret Thatcher and George Bush. Peres' book is an excellent remedy, especially when the British geopolitical dynamic in the region is added in and understood.

—Mel Klenetsky

**Peace, Natural Law, and the Individual Mind**

These two books by Jasper Hopkins are especially helpful to those of us attempting to find a true basis for peace among different religions and cultures. The first, which is the second edition of a book originally released in 1990, includes his translations of “De Pace Fidei” (“On the Peace of Faith”) and “Cribratio Alkorani” (“An Examination of the Koran”); the second includes three critical essays on the approach taken by Nicolaus of Cusa in this latter work on the Koran and also includes new English translations of four works: “On the Hidden God,” “On Seeking God,” “On Being a Son of God” and “Dialogue On the Genesis [Of All Things],” translations of which previously appeared in this reviewer’s book *Toward a New Council of Florence*, together with this reviewer’s translation of “On the Peace of Faith” and the Prologues and Table of Contents of “An Examination of the Koran.”

Those who claim that, in quest of peace with Islam, Cusanus in “On the Peace of Faith” resorted to a “lowest-common-denominator” approach which effectively denied the unique truth of the Christian religion, are necessarily provoked by his “An Examination of the Koran,” where he argued that the Koran is true only to the extent that it coheres with Christianity. Such critics have tried to explain away the latter by claiming that Cusanus’ approach is contradictory, based upon mistranslations of the Koran, or upon the belligerent relations between Christianity and Islam at the time.

The answer lies elsewhere, however. For, if one reads both works in light of Hopkins’ essay, “The Role of Pia Interpretatio in Nicholas of Cusa’s Hermeneutical Approach to the Koran,” one comes to the inescapable conclusion that, for Cusanus, the diversity of religious rites expressed in different religions all presuppose the religious theology of Christianity, as truly defined.

In his introduction to the first book, Hopkins writes concerning “On the Peace of Faith”: “So Nicholas takes as his task the showing to Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and others that their religions either presuppose or implicitly contain the truth of all the essential doctrines of Christianity. Accordingly, in his attempt at evidencing how Christianity