

Israelis, PLO agree: Keep Kissinger out!

by Scott Thompson

From March 11 to 13 in New York City, a conference was held that brought together members of the Israeli Knesset and Palestine National Council (PNC) for the first time ever in the United States, entitled "The Road to Peace." This conference, which was the fourth such peace conference in a series, was sponsored by the Jerusalem Palestinian daily *Al Fajr* and the Israeli monthly *New Outlook*, with support from the Friends of Peace Now and the American Council for Palestine Affairs.

Not only was this the first such meeting in the United States, but it was also the first time since 1975 that members of the PLO's parliament had been granted unrestricted visas to travel in America so that they could not only attend the conference, but proceed to Washington as part of a joint Israeli-Palestinian delegation to meet with members of Congress and the Bush administration on the heels of Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens. The visa decision also came less than a week after Secretary of State James Baker told a European foreign minister that the U.S.-PLO dialogue would continue, despite opposition from Israeli hard-liners.

Perhaps the clearest statement of commitment to a peace process that recognizes the sovereignty of both Palestinians and Israelis was made in the March 11 keynote speech by Gen. Yehoshafat Harkabi, who was a former head of intelligence in the Israeli Defense Forces and who had himself been a major opponent of peace until three or four years ago. General Harkabi praised the PLO for its historical development to embrace "the principle of a two-state formula," noting that it was ironic that this had originally been the position of the Israelis, who now call for "only one state." "The roles are now reversed," General Harkabi observed. Warning that

"the balance of world opinion will shift from support of Israel to the PLO," General Harkabi added, "One state is the wrong line, and it relegates Israel to historical irrelevance."

General Harkabi especially decried the "infamous Israeli law" that would not even permit an Israeli citizen to meet with a PLO leader, "which ought to be an elementary human right to meet and talk." He continued: "The Palestinians must be sure that a sovereign state will be the end of negotiations, which increases the necessity for them to accept the two-state principle. . . . Ultimately, we will have a common homeland, but two states in it. . . . Further along in the process, there may be an eventual Common Market or confederation. . . . Let us create two model states in a common homeland. We must not have a Zionism of acreage, but Zionism of quality. As Zionists, we should have an urge for excellence."

Kissinger: 'the most harmful'

One area where *EIR* found the greatest unanimity between the Israeli and PLO leaders was in their opposition to the appointment of Lawrence Eagleburger, the former president of Kissinger Associates, to be deputy secretary of state. Henry Kissinger is universally hated in the Middle East. Israeli military leaders have informed *EIR* that they blame him for the failure of the United States to warn Israel about the 1973 Yom Kippur Arab surprise attack. PLO leaders hate Kissinger not only because he rejected any peace dialogue with the PLO, but because he gave the American "green light" to the partitioning of Lebanon between Greater Syria and Greater Israel, which drove them from their bases and led to the massacre by Kissinger's friend, Gen. Ariel Sharon,

of the Palestinians in the Shabra and Shatilla refugee camps.

Approval for the 1982 Sharon-led invasion of Lebanon, which derailed even the minimal Camp David peace process, can be laid directly at the doorstep of two Kissinger associates, then Secretary of State Alexander Haig, who had served under Kissinger at the National Security Council in the Nixon administration, and Undersecretary of State for Policy Lawrence Eagleburger, who began working for Kissinger at the NSC and then followed him to the State Department. Moreover, representatives of the Israeli peace movement have reported to *EIR* that Kissinger was involved with Lord Harlech (David Ormsby-Gore) in the surreptitious purchase of land on the West Bank of the Jordan by Arab intermediaries for more Israeli settlements there. Not surprisingly, neither National Security Adviser Gen. Brent Scowcroft nor Lawrence Eagleburger, who both worked with Kissinger Associates, have reported on the conflict arising from this "Landscam" in their financial disclosure forms.

Questioned about the Eagleburger appointment, Dr. Nabil Shaath, the head of the Political Committee of the PLO, said, "There are several people in the Bush administration who have worked in Kissinger Associates, and Kissinger has been the most harmful to any real peace in the Middle East."

Asked what he thought of the strategy report that Eagleburger had prepared for President Bush as part of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy's Presidential Study Group, entitled *Building for Peace*, Dr. Shaath said: "I'm troubled by any U.S. official who does not see the urgency of peace based on the rights of the Palestinian people and of Israel. Any U.S. official is playing with fire who thinks that we can be put on the backburners for a few years until they solve the problems of armament, and their problems of Central America, and so on. We have an urgent problem at hand. Any U.S. official who does not realize how serious our problem is, I have fears about. . . ."

"The thing is, many politicians are really slaves of defunct ideas. These are defunct ideas. These are ideas that were developed during a time when the Palestinians were being chased around the place, when we had no coherent peace plan, and when there was no *Intifada* [uprising]. . . . You [now] have an *Intifada* in the occupied territories which says 'no' to the occupation, and it makes its voice heard. And, you have a Palestinian movement which sets its goals clearly on peace. Things have changed. You cannot really go back to old ideas, which have become defunct because the world has changed. You can't stick to them and hope to get any results out of them."

Gen. Mattityahu (Matti) Peled, who was a member of the Knesset for the Progressive List for Peace until September 1988, had similar harsh words for Eagleburger's nomination and for Eagleburger's Washington Institute "peace" plan:

"Well it [the plan] is very narrow-minded, very superficial. It lacks even the smallest original idea. What it really does is discuss the Middle East . . . from the standpoint of

the traditional American attitude that Israel is the main concern, and everything else must fall into line with this concern.

"So, they discuss the Palestinian problem. They don't even mention the refugees. . . . They speak about the threat of chemical weapons concentrated in the Arab countries without mentioning the nuclear weapons in Israel. It is very, very one-sided. And, the end result of their analysis is that the PLO should, in fact, be eliminated some way or another. Israel should make a deal with Jordan, and the deal with Jordan would be that Israel retains part of the occupied territories. The other part is given over to Jordan. And the part which will remain in Israel, the population should be given some kind of autonomy without specifying which. All this is, of course, is just nonsense, complete nonsense.

"Everybody knows that King Hussein does not want anymore to be involved in that, that the PLO are not likely to be eliminated from the scene, and that the Palestinian people are not likely to participate in any election which will end up in their autonomy. But all this doesn't seem to bother Eagleburger's group. They will go with their own ideas, which are absolutely irrelevant to the present situation. And, on that basis they are proposing a Middle East policy for the President. I think it is really a very poor show on the part of Eagleburger."

Disagreement on 'Bush plan'

While there was wide agreement among Israeli and Palestinian participants on the need for a "two-state solution," for urgency in steps toward peace, and for an emphatic "no" to the policies of Lawrence Eagleburger, there was wide-ranging debate on certain substantive proposals, reportedly from "a senior administration official," that appeared in a March 12 *New York Times* article by Thomas L. Friedman.

Basically, the "senior administration official" stated that visiting Israeli Foreign Minister Moshe Arens and the PLO delegation in Tunis would both be presented with a plan for winding down the *Intifada* in exchange for concessions that would ease the military and economic conditions of the occupation. Dr. Nabil Shaath strongly denounced the demands that would be placed upon the PLO, noting that the Palestinians are the only people in the world under occupation whom the American government would seek even to prevent from the "distribution of inflammatory leaflets."

However, Rita Hauser of the Wall Street law firm of Stroock, Stroock and Lavan, told the participants: "I am a member of the Establishment and a Republican, and I strongly endorse these policies of the Bush administration." From another standpoint, General Peled told *EIR*: "While the PLO cannot possibly afford to accept the conditions that are being demanded of it, at least it moves the U.S.-PLO dialogue onto substantive issues, which the PLO has complained are so far lacking. This means that the Bush administration has rejected demands of Prime Minister Shamir that there be no peace dialogue whatsoever that involves the PLO."