

## Editorial

### *World-strategic significance of Mideast talks*

Even many otherwise intelligent people, are underestimating the global significance of the efforts of President Clinton and Israeli Prime Minister Barak to realize a Middle East peace. Look at it from the standpoint of *EIR*'s "Storm Over Asia" videotape, narrated by London LaRouche. If you understand "Storm Over Asia," along with other elements to be supplied in the next issue of *EIR*, the picture will be clear: What Clinton and Barak are doing now, is much more important than simply peace in the Middle East, as important as that is. What they are doing has global strategic implications of a profound character, relating to the issues of war and peace over the next decade and beyond.

In fact, the prospects of Middle East peace threaten the London game—a game which involves creating conflicts there, in the Caucasus, in Central Asia, and beyond. Witness British stooge Samuel "Crisis of Democracy" Huntington, who wrote in the Dec. 16 *New York Times*: "The war in Chechnya has to be placed in its contemporary and historical contexts. It is one of many conflicts along the borders of the great Islamic bloc stretching from Morocco to Indonesia. There has been violence between Muslims and non-Muslims in Bosnia, Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, Chechnya, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, Kashmir, India, the Philippines, Indonesia, East Timor, the Middle East, the Horn of Africa, Sudan and Nigeria. . . ." Here you see the situation the British are trying to create, and what Clinton and Barak are fighting to stop.

The President Clinton who led these talks, is not the pragmatic Bill Clinton who allows himself to waffle on many other principled questions, or the Clinton who polluted his administration with low-lives like Al Gore and Mad Madeleine Albright. This is President Clinton the statesman, who seized a strategic opportunity to dam the worldwide impulse, by which growing numbers of "little wars" are dragging the world willy-nilly into strategic conflict.

Preliminary talks in Washington concluded on Dec. 16, after two days, to resume on Jan. 3, probably for a much longer period. Parts of the opening statement of Syrian Foreign Minister Sharaa communicate what is

at stake. He said, "It goes without saying that peace for Syria means the return of all its occupied land, while for Israel, peace will mean the end of the psychology of fear which the Israelis have been living in as a result of the existence of occupation, which is undoubtedly the source of all adversities and wars.

"Hence, ending the occupation will be balanced for the first time by eliminating the barrier of fear and anxieties, and exchanging it for a true and a mutual feeling of peace and security. Thus, the peace which the parties are going to reach will be established on justice and international legitimacy, and thus peace will be the only triumphant [party] after 50 years of struggle. . . ."

Similarly, on Dec. 15, Israeli President Ezer Weizmann warned: "The issue under discussion is war or peace. Our entire lives can be changed in this or in that direction. It is a scenario I hope we won't face: back to the vicious cycle of war. That would be very bad." He also said, "Whoever is interested in a normal life here, should support [the peace talks]." The next day, Weizmann brushed aside criticism of his remarks, by declaring that the issue is "the future of Israel. We are facing moments of peace and war. That's my view, and I'll do what I think is right." He said that his policy is simply to do "what I think is best for the people of Israel."

Behind both President Clinton's and Prime Minister Barak's awareness that the peace effort simply must succeed—that there is no room for failure or hesitation, however good the excuse for it might be—is the figure of murdered soldier-statesman Yitzhak Rabin. This martyr for peace was, in different ways, the trusted older friend, mentor, and personal model for both of them. A military hero who had many times ordered the torture and assassination of Palestinians, he came around to see the necessity of peace, and "bit his lip," as he himself put it, to shake hands with his enemy Yasser Arafat on the White House lawn. In the end, he gave his life for principles which he had bitterly rejected only a few years before.

For there is no true statesmanship, without the ability and willingness to change completely, at those great moments when such change is necessary.