

EDITORIAL

Building a Bridge to Peace

by Jason Ross

Feb. 19—The possibility of achieving a peaceful resolution for Israel and the Palestinians can seem downright impossible. The saying “You can’t get there from here,” seems to apply here. Indeed, sometimes you can’t solve a problem without solving the bigger one of which it is a part. That’s the case today, where a new *paradigm* of international relations is required, a new geometry in which actions are taken, a new set of guiding concepts—that can work in a way that aiming to achieve specific actions cannot.

Consider the setting:

A supposed [peace deal](#) is reportedly being worked on by the U.S. and its regional “partners.” It is said to call for a Palestinian state, hostage release, and so forth. But the current U.S. leadership is not going to push Israel to make it happen, and much of the Israeli political leadership is dead-set against it.

Israel’s Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu had this to say about that:

Israel will continue to oppose the unilateral recognition of a Palestinian state. Israel outright rejects international dictates regarding a permanent settlement with the Palestinians.

Israel’s Minister of Finance, Smotrich, was even more blunt:

We will in no way agree to this plan, which says Palestinians deserve a prize for the terrible massacre they carried out against us: a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital. A Palestinian state is an existential threat to the State of Israel....

Meanwhile, the International Court of Justice in The Hague [responded](#) to a Feb. 12 request from South Africa for additional measures against Israel:

The Court notes that the most recent development in the Gaza Strip, and in Rafah in particular, “would exponentially increase what is already a humanitarian nightmare with untold regional consequences,” as stated by the UN Secretary-General. This perilous situation demands immediate and effective implementation of the provisional measures indicated by the Court in its Order of 26 January 2024, which are applicable throughout the Gaza Strip, including in Rafah, and does not demand the indication of additional provisional measures.

That is to say, the ICJ has already told Israel not to commit acts of genocide.

Turn to the other conflict of potentially civilization-ending scope—the NATO-Russia conflict playing out on the territory of Ukraine—a nation that has had the misfortune of being the recipient of nearly two years worth of “aid” and “assistance” from Anglo-American NATO leaders who plainly don’t care about the country’s future.

Ukrainian forces continue to lose men, matériel, and resources, and NATO-land is finding it difficult to maintain funding and supplies of weapons.

The reported [death](#) of Russian opposition figure Alexei Navalny will provide a new opportunity for finger-pointing and exclamations of false concern about Russian “autocracy.” Be prepared for many

of the same people only too happy to see multi-pronged lawfare against presidential candidate Donald Trump, the same people who will not act for the release of Julian Assange, make bold proclamations of principle on behalf of democratic values in Russia.

But this foolishness is not universal!

The LaRouche movement's promotion of the LaRouche [Oasis Plan](#) encapsulates the new paradigm in which a region of chaos and death can become a thriving area of development and connectivity. A new [video](#) depicting this alternative is now being distrib-

uted widely around the world, and has already been translated into French, Spanish, Italian, German, Danish, and other languages.

Demand more than an end to fighting. Demand radical changes in policy and outlook! The hegemonism of Anglo-American NATO comes partnered with its anti-growth Malthusianism, and the cultural tendency, even among people seeking to do good, to replace efforts to solve big problems with tiny improvements that are local in scope.

Sometimes you can only win the big fights. This is one of those times.