

against the Palestinians, are rising up against their governments, demanding that they break diplomatic relations, essentially undo the peace treaties, and join actively in the defense of those under fire. Students in Egypt and elsewhere have been demanding that the Arab countries neighboring Israel, open their borders, to allow volunteers to join the Intifada. At a demonstration in Cairo on April 3, students demanded that Egypt expel the Israeli ambassador. At the same time, American targets, such as McDonald's and Kentucky Fried Chicken, were stormed and vandalized.

The International Community Must Act

The approach of the Egyptian government to the demonstrations, originating from the universities, has been neither to sponsor them, nor to repress them, but rather to contain them, in hopes of preventing an explosion leading to anarchy and chaos. President Hosni Mubarak adapted to the demands of the population, by announcing that all government-to-government contacts with Israel would be cut—just one step short of severing diplomatic relations. Mubarak also addressed the nation on April 4, saying that the Israeli government's ignoring of international resolutions "makes it incumbent on the international community as a whole to take a decisive position that will return the Israeli government to sanity. . . . It is time for the Israeli government to courageously face up to its inability to provide security for its people with military might. It is also time for Israel to admit that its continuous presence in the Palestinian territories is an occupation and a usurpation of the legitimate rights of the Palestine people." Mubarak reported that he had written two letters to President Bush, urging the United States, which has a "special responsibility," to intervene.

In Jordan, demonstrations have broken out within the Palestinian refugee camps, as well as in the capital, Amman. Reportedly, on April 1, six ministers joined a crowd of 20,000 who marched to the Parliament to manifest their demands for action to stop the atrocities. While King Abdallah II was considering cutting ties to Israel, he sent his Foreign Minister, Marwan Muasher, to Washington on April 4, to demand that the United States, "the only side which can influence the Israeli government to withdraw from the Palestinian territories," intervene.

All this occurred prior to the speech delivered by Bush on April 4, in which he announced that he was sending Powell to the region the following week—i.e., that he was giving Israel the green light to continue the slaughter for another week. This outrageous act, immediately applauded in Israel, triggered another round of demonstrations, starting on Friday, April 5, the Muslim day of worship.

Governments throughout the Arab and Islamic world will be put under increasing public pressure, to support Arafat and the Palestinian cause, and denounce both Israel and U.S. policies. The advice given these governments by U.S. Presidential pre-candidate Lyndon LaRouche, is to do precisely that. Populations who oppose the Sharon-Bush madness, are

right, and should be given the support of their governments. If not, the rising popular resistance can threaten the stability of these governments, which will have lost their moral credibility. LaRouche's advice has been well received in the Arab world, where his analyses and proposals for action, have been gaining increasing attention in the mass media, whether Egyptian and Lebanese television, or the Arabic press overall.

Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit also condemned the Israeli actions. "Not only Arafat, but all of the Palestinian state is being destroyed step by step," the April 4 *Jerusalem Post* quoted him as saying. "In front of the world's eyes, a genocide is being committed. The Sharon administration has chosen the path of occupation and war instead of peace and dialogue."

Sharon's invasion of the Palestinian territories has unleashed a reaction which will not be short-lived, but will have very long-term effects. As Mubarak correctly noted in his speech, it will only deepen "the sentiment of hatred of some 300 million Arabs toward the state of Israel, and those who support its current policies."

Palestinian Diplomat Cites U.S. Patriot on Martyrdom

The following are excerpts from remarks by Hasan Rahman, Chief Representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian National Authority, to a press briefing by the U.S. Institute on Peace, in Washington, D.C. on April 4.

. . . I cannot not be emotional when I speak, because this morning I watched the news and I saw footages from Bethlehem, from Ramallah, from Nablus. I saw the footage of Khali Saad in Bethlehem, whose mother and brother were shot yesterday in cold blood—his mother who is 65, and his brother who is 38—after blowing up the gate on their home. And he had to spend 24 hours holding the hands of his assassinated mother and brother with his three children watching, because he was not allowed to bury his mother and brother.

I also watched the mass grave in the parking lot of Ramallah hospital where 27 bodies were buried because the Israeli Army, the army of the only "democracy" in the Middle East, would not allow people to bury their dead.

I watched scores of Palestinians this morning on NBC approaching an Israeli tank—young kids, age 5, 6, with their mothers walking half a mile away and confronting an Israeli tank, raising their hands in surrender. And I really thought to myself, what does this remind us of? Is it any different from the footages we saw during the occupation of Czechoslovakia in the Second World War, and where Jews stood in the front of Nazi tanks and had to raise their hands? And what makes me so mad about it, is that I do not see the outrage that we



LaRouche Presidential campaign representative and Senate candidate from Virginia Nancy Spannaus interviewed by Egyptian TV at April 1 Washington demonstration. Spannaus emphasized LaRouche's assessment that Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon must be ousted now, to protect U.S. national interests.

need to see when crimes are committed against civilians in this fashion; when you have every single Palestinian town, every single Palestinian man and woman or child unable to get out of their homes today because for the last week they have been imprisoned, and for the last 18 months living under siege.

And I don't see the outrage that our Jewish-American brothers and sisters are supposed to express. Because I assure you that Israel, by doing this, does not lay the foundations for peace in our region. On the contrary: They are pushing generations of Palestinians and Arabs to become enemies of the State of Israel and of the Israeli people. And let's be frank about it, because no one child who sees his father or mother humiliated in the way they are humiliated is going to love the Israelis. . . . This boy who stood with his grandmother that—this he's never going to forget, in the same way that Jews will never forget the Holocaust, and we don't expect them to. . . .

Some in this town say, "Well, the Palestinians deserve it. They brought it onto themselves, because they were offered a very generous deal in Camp David, and they rejected it." And this lie has been perpetrated so often in this town to the point where it has become a fact, or appears to be a fact. . . .

On the question of security, we said to Israel: Listen, we have two precedents before us. We have the Egyptian precedent and the Jordanian precedent. Let's deal with the issues of security in that way. We accept any arrangement for security of Israel, including the positioning of international troops, demilitarized zones, limitations on weapons, any procedure for security except territorial security. . . . We cannot accept the stationing of Israeli armed troops in the West Bank and Gaza, but anything else is acceptable to us. That was not acceptable to Israel.

Israel wanted to control the skies of the West Bank, the airspace; wanted to control the borders. . . . So what generous

offer did we have that we rejected? In exchange, we offered that Israel will accept the principle of withdrawal from the [post-June] 1967 boundaries. If there are any adjustments on the boundaries to accommodate Israel, it has to be reciprocal on both sides, because we feel that we have made the historic compromise when we accepted the right of Israel to exist on 78% of historic Palestine.

When I was born in 1944, there was no Israel. Yet we were willing to concede—and we did concede—78% of what, when I was born, was my country, in exchange for peace.

So by saying this, did we commit a crime? Nevertheless, we continued the negotiations with Israel, even after Camp David. We continued the negotiations in Oslo. We continued the negotiations in Stockholm, in Bolling Air Base, in Andrews Air Base, and in Taba and in Jerusalem.

The Israelis and their supporters in this town are saying that we walked away from Camp David and started the Intifada . . . notwithstanding that in my presence President Arafat told President Clinton, "Mr. President, we are not ready for a summit. Let's not go to a summit, because the gap is so wide. Allow us private negotiations with the Israelis for a few months, until we narrow the gap. When we narrow the gap, we can come and hold a summit and reach an agreement, because I know, Mr. President, if this summit fails, you are going to blame me." And Clinton, in my presence and Abu Ala and Abu Mazin's presence, said, "I will not blame you, Mr. Chairman." And every one of you knows what happened after that, that he did not blame Yasser Arafat.

We continued the negotiations. On Sept. 26 at the hotel Ritz Carlton in Pentagon City . . . we heard about the visit of Sharon to al-Aqsa mosque. We begged them, please Mr. Shlomo, please Mr. Dennis Ross, try, because you are the minister of police, don't let Sharon go to al-Haram al-Sharif. . . . That is going to trigger religious feeling. So please, don't

let him do it.

Yasser Arafat that night was dining at the home of [Israeli Prime Minister Ehud] Barak, in Quhav Ya'el in Israel. And he asked him the same question: Please, Mr. Prime Minister, don't let Sharon undo what we have achieved so far. Mr. Sharon went there, and he achieved what he set out to achieve, and that is to trigger what has become a very, very lethal and destructive confrontation between the Palestinians and the Israelis.

Immediately the next day after, on Sept. 29, the Palestinians living at al-Haram al-Sharif demonstrated. Eight of them were killed, the next day 13. There were 49 Palestinians killed in the first week of the Intifada before one Israeli was fired at. So, who started this confrontation between the Palestinians and the Israelis? Is it the Palestinians? Who for a whole week did not fire one shot at the Israelis, while 49 of them were killed by the Israeli Army? . . .

Today, what is the objective of Mr. Sharon? I believe that Mr. Sharon has a two-fold objective. One is to dismantle the Oslo process and, consequently, the Palestinian National Authority. And the second objective, which is—which goes parallel to it, and that is to defeat the Palestinian people militarily—in other words, break their will—so they will accept his plan for, as he calls it, long-term arrangements. . . . Mr. Sharon . . . is absolutely wrong. No Palestinian is going to be with Mr. Sharon on those bases.

There is only one way to solve this problem, because if Mr. Sharon succeeds in his objective of destroying the Palestinian Authority and trying to break the will of the Palestinian people, he is opening the gates of hell wide open in our region. And we are going to go back, not to what happened after '67, but what happened after 1948: in other words, radicalize the whole region. And what's going on today in the streets of Cairo, Amman, Beirut, Sana'a, is an indication of what is going to happen in the future.

I see acquiescence to Mr. Sharon, acquiescence; because if Mr. Sharon is able to tell General Zinni that you cannot visit Yasser Arafat and Washington cannot say much about it; and if Mr. Sharon can prevent Javier Solana, the envoy of the European Union, from visiting Arafat, and Europe cannot do much about it, then Mr. Sharon is the leader of the only superpower in the world, because he can defy Washington and he can defy Europe; he can humiliate the Palestinians; he can defy the Arab world. He does not give a damn about anybody else, and he can get away with it.

If this is the case, then again, we are in big, big trouble. Everyone—Israelis as well as Palestinians. . . .

We have the God-given right to live as a free people, and we are not going to give up on that. . . . We offered Israel a compromise with the hope that they will behave as neighbors with us, that they will respect our humanity and our dignity, not to perpetually control us and deprive us of every right that every one of you take for granted.

In this 21st Century, colonialism and denial of rights of

people to self-determination is not acceptable. It should not be acceptable. No one should tolerate it.

Listen, maybe what I'm saying does not sound good academically or politically. But let me tell you, that is the heartfelt position of every single Palestinian today.

And if Israel wants to live in peace with the Palestinian people, they are welcome, and there is a formula to achieve that. And that's what Ambassador Abboud spoke about, and that is the Arab League initiative which calls on Israel to withdraw from the 1967 boundaries and have peace and normal relations with the Arab world.

But if Mr. Sharon wants to keep his Jewish settlers in the Palestinian territories, and he wants to castrate the Palestinian people, that's not a formula for peace. It is not going to work. Even if I accept it—and other people—future generations of Palestinians are going to reject it.

There is a great deal of responsibility on the shoulders of Washington, not only because it is a superpower. No, because Israel is protected by Washington, and when the United States paralyzes the work of the only international organization that is in charge of peace and security, namely, the Security Council of the United Nations, then Washington has the responsibility to achieve that objective. Otherwise, no one is going to accept any claims from Washington that they are for peace or for equality or for progress, because peace cannot be for one people at the expense of the other people. Justice cannot be for one at the expense of others.

Peace is the respect of the rights of others. It is just as simple as that. And if the rights of the Palestinian people are not going to be respected, I am afraid to tell you that there is not going to be peace in our region.

We are at a very critical juncture today. Either Sharon succeeds or peace will succeed, because Sharon today is not only bulldozing the streets of the West Bank, but he is dismantling the edifice and the foundation over which peace can be established in our region.

Q: . . . The spiritual concept of martyrdom appears to have become a driving force for some of the violence in the Middle East right now. . . .

Rahman: First of all, nothing in our religion or culture asks you to be a martyr for the sake of being a martyr. No one wants to become a martyr just for the sake of being a martyr. You are a martyr only if you die in the defense of your country, in the defense of your family, or in the defense of your property.

For the average Palestinian, for every single Palestinian and Arab, there is an illegal Israeli occupation that violates your right to life, your right to property, and your right to your country. So to say that I want to fight and die for my country, I think this is the battle cry of—I have here a quote from Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." . . . That was the battle cry. So why is it good for Patrick Henry and it is not good for Yasser Arafat?