

U.S. and Israel, now out of control. I don't know who is directly responsible for this, but somehow it is the price for U.S. behavior in the past."

Escalation To Nuclear Weapons?

The next day, Sept. 13, saw intense discussion in Russia, about the consequences of possible U.S. military operations against alleged terrorists and countries accused of supporting them. The former head of the Russian National Security Council, Andrei Kokoshin, created a sensation by talking about the possibility, that the U.S. might even use *nuclear weapons* in such an operation. In a live interview with the radio station Ekho Moskv, Kokoshin was asked, if he thought the United States might employ weapons of mass destruction. Kokoshin answered, yes, they could. "It's not an abstract possibility, since there are various types of nuclear weapons. There are small nuclear warheads, and ultra-low-yield warheads, with various sorts of destructive effects. Therefore, hypothetically they could certainly use them. And there are no bans against this, neither in international law nor in American military doctrine."

To avoid disaster, Kokoshin urged, the UN Security Council should be called in. "I think this is not simply an American affair, but concerns the international community as a whole. . . . I am afraid that the Americans will not respond in an appropriate way. In the words of their leaders, already, they have declared that they will decide everything themselves. . . . But you see that the consequences have already taken on a global character. . . . The effects could become even bigger, if the American reaction is out of proportion, not thought out, and if it disregards leading states and institutions of international relations. Therefore . . . the U.S.A. should consult with the leading nations of the world, and the response should be adopted in a certain degree of agreement, at least with the Permanent Members of the UN Security Council."

Asked by the Russian press service RBK to comment on Kokoshin's statement, the chairman of the Duma Defense Committee, Andrei Nikolayev, warned that U.S. reprisals "will have a scale comparable to what the U.S. suffered," and that "the Americans will bring their entire power into play."

Duma International Affairs Committee head Dmitri Rogozin stated, "I fear that an attack on Afghanistan is completely possible." He noted that the political pressure on Bush is high. "But such an act could threaten danger to Russia, due to our close proximity to the region." Indeed, a reckless U.S. military intervention into Afghanistan could easily set fire to the whole Central Asia region.

All Russian observers reached by *EIR*, showed "electric" interest in LaRouche's call for rationality and calm, and for close contacts and deliberation between the U.S. Administration and Putin. There is much good will in Russia, for a United States that were ready to listen to Reason.

Ariel Sharon and Israel's Honor

by Theo Klein

Theo Klein is a lawyer and honorary President of the Representative Council of Jewish Institutions in France. His letter was published in the Paris daily Le Monde of Sept. 6, 2001, and translated by EIR.

Ariel Sharon, if I have decided to address this letter to you publicly, as head of the government of Israel, by way of *Le Monde*, it is because I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to say loud and clear that Israel's policy of *réplique* [response] has reached its extreme point of absurdity.

This is no longer a policy — which would imply thinking, and an objective considered possible — it is a tragic brawl which is, unfortunately, engulfing all our moral values.

Yes, this action is absurd, because it only fuels passions and hatred, because it rallies the Palestinian population around those they consider to be their fighters, and because it holds the Israeli population in the illusion of a false security.

When will you admit that it is Israeli tanks and missiles that stir up the winds of revolt which is daily fed by fighting, searches, and a systematic mistrust that gives our neighbors the impression of being constantly suspected of being terrorists, simply because they are not Israelis? How can you not understand that even this so-called security action, if it is done every day, ends up being an element of insecurity?

This understandable, but insanely carried-out action — which is necessarily brutal given the lack of appropriate men and means — has become a goal in itself, and repeating it again and again arouses, among the youth, an even stronger will to fight and to sacrifice.

How could we, who, through pain and suffering, learned how to survive against brutal force, forget that a people never bows down without fighting? You, who claim to represent the Jewish tradition, should remember the words of our prophets: "For it is not force that makes the conqueror," Samuel said; whereas Zacharias stated some centuries later: "Neither by force nor by the army, but by the mind."

It is up to you as leader of a state — with all its history and the creativity of its citizens, it is up to you to make the political gesture which would end the hopeless spiral of violence. It is incumbent upon you to take the difficult but necessary initiative. Stefan Zweig wrote, "For intelligent

To Theo Klein, For The Sake Of Peace

Jacques Cheminade released the following letter on Sept. 7. He is president of the French movement Solidarity and Progress, and a pre-candidate for the 2002 French Presidential Election.

I have just been informed of the letter addressed to Ariel Sharon by Theo Klein. . . . It deeply moved me by its tone of truth, which evokes the Jewish tradition and the words of the prophets, not only in order to judge one's own acts, but to understand others. A truly elevated point of view is always expressed in simple terms.

"Your duty is to offer them, as equals, the dawning of a new era, in which both peoples can live and develop within the borders of their state." Indeed, peace can be born through a project, by defining a future ahead of us, and not by establishing a power struggle which is, by its nature, immoral and transitory. I would, however, add that such a project must go further than sharing what exists; it

must be based on mutual development, on sharing a task to be accomplished together.

Great treaties which managed to establish peace in apparently desperate situations, such as the Edict of Nantes or the Treaty of Westphalia, all defined a will to live together. For the Middle East, this community of purpose must be based on economic development plans of mutual interest, starting with water and infrastructure policies. Shimon Peres belongs to a generation that had a certain idea of this approach, which my friend Lyndon LaRouche has elaborated for the past 30 years; he must now find the courage to present and defend it.

On this issue, peace in the Middle East goes beyond Israelis and Palestinians, and is also our responsibility, as Europeans and Americans. Instead of giving lessons, we should contribute human and financial resources to supply a concrete basis for this peace, one of regional great projects by which the living standards of the Palestinians can be raised to conditions of human dignity.

My answer to Theo Klein is thus to say to our European states and their people: "What are you ready to do for peace? What manpower and what financial means are you willing to come up with? If your words are not followed by acts, you will be as dried fig trees."

minds, ending a conflict by arms can never be moral."

May I reaffirm the conviction that I had the privilege of telling you personally, on the eve of your election: the first step to be taken, one that is both a historical necessity and, above all, a moral imperative, is to recognize that the Palestinians have the freedom to proclaim their state. It is necessary to go even further and claim for Israel the privilege of being the first state to recognize the legitimacy of this State of Palestine: A state with which Israel must share common land.

The representative authorities of both states must negotiate a cease-fire: then, later, the drawing of the border. The Palestinian nation was born on the same upsurge as the one that allowed the birth of the Israeli nation. Putting an end to the fratricidal struggle that sets the two inheritors of the same land against one another can only be accomplished by a fair division. Jerusalem, to which we have never stopped looking and which we have longed for, must become the symbol of a shared future. We must stop this blind confrontation, which feeds on blood, suffering, and hate.

Today, you alone carry on your shoulders, voluntarily, the supreme responsibility. Your problem is not to measure the credibility of the leader of the Palestinians—that is their business. Your duty is to offer them, as equals, the dawning of a new era, in which both peoples can live and develop within the borders of their state. Israel's honor, which you are

responsible for, must be to offer peace, without subjecting it or abandoning it to the good will of extremists.

What about terrorism, you might ask? It can only be fought, as you well know, within each people—once they no longer consider it as a form of combat. If a terrorist is supported by the people, he becomes a combatant.

As you well know, in order to impose a return to "absolute calm for seven days" on a Palestinian Authority whose structures have been destroyed, requires recognizing the state whence that authority must issue.

This historical role imposed on you by Israeli democracy can only be assumed if you realize that the decision can only depend upon you alone.

You know it, you have told me so: It is neither tanks nor missiles that provide a solution to this deadly conflict, rife with fear and hatred. You are no longer that daring general. You are not crossing the Suez Canal for a second time! Today, Ariel Sharon, you are responsible for the history of Israel; its honor is at stake. Tear down the wall of hate, overturn the barriers of rejection, go and offer the Palestinian people, in the name of the Israeli people, the bread and salt of peace and good-neighborliness.

Yes, I admit it, my words do not have the same apparent solidity as military action. They run the risk of being misunderstood, but all of human history teaches us that only intelligence can conquer violence. Be firm and courageous.