

Israel's attack on Qatar: The Impact

This is the transcript of a webinar presented by Just World Educational on September 11, 2025, with the goal of starting to explore the impact on Gaza, on West Asia, and on the global order as a whole of the attack that Israel undertook against the Qatari capital, Doha, on September 9. You can see the video of the event [here](#). A short summary, that includes more information about the presenters, is [here](#).

[Helena Cobban]

Hello, everybody. My name is Helena Cobban.

I'm the president of Just World Educational, a nonprofit organization committed to providing educational resources to help build a more just and peaceful world. I'm very pleased today to present on behalf of Just World Educational a special webinar in which we'll be starting to assess the impact that Tuesday's Israeli assault on Gaza. I'm sorry, on Qatar might have on many dimensions of our present international order.

Today is, of course, 9-11. I'd like us to remember the twenty eight hundred people killed that day and the hundreds of thousands of people killed in the US led war on terror that was unleashed on that same day. I am delighted to be joined here by a number of great colleagues and experts who agreed at short notice to help lead this conversation.

First, I must recognize my colleague on the Just World Ed board, Rami G. Khouri, a leading Palestinian American analyst and writer, who was also co-presenter with me of the project we did last year, "Understanding Hamas and Why That Matters", which was a major attempt to cut through the demonization of Hamas, the Islamic resistance movement in Palestine. The demonization that has been so widespread in the Western world for years now, and most especially since October of 2023.

That project, by the way, resulted in the creation of the book under the same title, which is available worldwide. And if you have not read it, I urge you to do so. One of the five experts featured in the book was the London based Palestinian thought leader, Dr. Azzam Tamimi. And we're delighted to have you with us here today to Dr. Azzam. And another was Dr. Khaled Hroub, who is with us from the eye of the storm in Doha, Qatar today. So super happy to have you with us, Dr. Khaled. We are also honored to have here with us Craig Mokhiber, the veteran Lebanese American human rights expert, who in late October 2023 ended his 30 year career as a senior official in the office of the U.N.'s High Commissioner for Human Rights by resigning because of the failure of that U.N. body to come out strongly against what it was already by then quite clear was an unfolding Israeli genocide in Gaza.

And our final panelist here is another colleague from the Just World Ed board, Rick Sterling, a veteran California based peace activist, who has been a longtime leader of the Mount Diablo Peace and Justice Center. Just a couple of quick words on process before we dive in. We hope we'll have time for Q&A at the end of today's session, but we might not because we have such wonderful guests and panelists.

But be assured that we'll be continuing to focus on this subject of the impact of the attack on Qatar. And we'll likely soon be presenting additional webinars to develop this theme. And we'll be sending to all of you a form through which you can share your suggestions, questions and feedback with us.

In the meantime, if you have any technical questions here, please send a message to our colleague and helper, Mustapha Mohammed, who is working behind the scenes to give us and all of you any support you need here. Big thanks to you, Mustafa. Also, a note to our great panelists here.

I'm asking all of you, all of us, to try to keep each batch of our remarks as succinct as possible so we have good time for interaction and for exploring many different aspects of this topic. Finally, there are so many dimensions of this topic and we have so many great experts here that I'm going to ask my colleague Rick to step in from time to time to co-moderate this discussion. So my first question is specifically for Dr. Azzam. How do you see Tuesday's Israeli attack on Qatar affecting the prospects for a Gaza ceasefire? Do any prospects remain at all? You're muted.

[Azzam Tamimi]

Thank you very much, Helena. Thank you for taking the initiative. I think it's timely and very important.

It's really difficult to tell. We haven't heard from the most important concerned party, that is Hamas, about what they're likely to do. But my own understanding is that the priority for Hamas is ending the war in Gaza and securing the withdrawal of the Israelis from the entire Gaza Strip.

If that can be achieved through negotiations, then the door for negotiations will remain open. However, over the past almost two years now, slightly less than two years, the Israelis have proven beyond doubt that they are not interested in reaching a deal of any sort. Hamas has repeatedly accepted the terms offered to it, whether by the US administration or by the mediators or even by the Israelis themselves.

But it was Netanyahu, eventually, who refused to go along. Now, so long, I mean, today was the first public statement by Hamas regarding what happened in Doha. But we haven't heard anything yet that might give the impression that, from Hamas's point of view, the door for negotiations might be closed.

I think this is highly unlikely from Hamas's point of view. However, what some experts are talking about today is that the recent attack on Qatar and the worldwide anger, even by many of Israel's allies in the West, regarding what happened might bring pressure to bear for a change on the Trump administration so as to perhaps pressure Netanyahu into some sort of a deal. Because the failure of the, I mean, had the assassination attempt succeeded, probably this would not be what we expect from the Trump administration.

But because the operation has failed, and now we suspect that the Americans knew about it all along and probably were hoping that it would succeed in eliminating the Hamas leadership. But since it has not succeeded, and Trump came out and distanced or tried to

distance himself from it, that perhaps this is an opportunity for the Americans to change course a little bit and stop being subdued by the Netanyahu administration. Another factor that is likely to play a role here is the expected Arab-Islamic summit in Doha.

We will wait to see. There's some strong rhetoric coming from Riyadh. There's condemnation coming from all various parts of the Arab world and the Muslim world.

As well as the world at large. But if this summit arrives at concrete measures, diplomatically and politically, I'm not talking here about any sort of military action because that's highly unlikely. It's just on the diplomatic and political level, if they come out with some concrete measures that may add, hopefully, to the pressure on the Trump administration.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you. Those are really important points. And you mentioned, obviously, this Arab-Islamic summit that's going to convene in Doha this weekend, Saturday, Sunday, I believe.

So, Dr. Khaled, you are there in Doha, if you could unmute. And let me know what you think the prospects are for that summit. And also your view on why the United States retains its mediating role in this whole thing.

Why wouldn't it be the United Nations that mediates? Sorry, that's a big set of issues, but there you go.

[Khaled Hroub]

Yeah. First of all, there has been deep shock and disbelief across the whole country, expectedly. Nobody anticipated this.

This is, you know, the place, this is the theater, basically, where all the diplomacy, mediation and all the efforts that were hoping to end this genocide taking place. So to kill the mediator, to kill the messenger, that was something, I guess, beyond our thinking and everyone here and even beyond. I couldn't think of anybody expected this.

Also, we all know that Hamas's presence in the country is approved, if not even encouraged by the US. So this is a well-established fact as well. Now, that the US has exclusive monopoly over the whole process, this is, again, another established fact.

The UN, the EU, China, if you like, for that matter, and so many other kind of parties, they have been neutralized, basically. This is the playground of the United States and Israel, unfortunately. Very bitter facts, and I really wonder what even this Arab-Islamic summit could do.

I hope some concrete steps and action could be coming out of this. But I think there is a sense of a drunken sense of power across not only the Israelis, but also the Americans. And I think over the past two years, we have witnessed this, that Israel, as if they were kind of testing the water, okay, we can expand, we can destroy Rafah.

Everybody said, no, no, no, no, nobody can even, this is unexpected, they wouldn't do it. So they did it. And then since that moment, I think, Benjamin Netanyahu and his junta, if you

like, discovered this green light that has been granted to them, that basically you can do whatever you like.

And then it has expanded, not only within the Gaza Strip, they have done every single aspect of the classical genocide, without any restriction, without any real concrete opposition from the outside world, primarily the US. Then they went even beyond that to South Lebanon, not only bombing South Lebanon and Syria later on, but also occupying a new territory of these two countries. And then beyond that, of course, we know in June, striking Iran, the continuous striking against Yemen.

And just one day before the strikes in Qatar, they targeted one of the airships, the convoy in Tunisia, and then Qatar. So in fact, in the last two days, in a span of only 48 hours, Israel carried out strikes against six Arab countries within 48 hours. This doesn't happen.

This is in fact beyond imagination. So you can think of that there is a blank, there is a permission by the US, the only superpower of today, telling Benjamin Netanyahu basically you can do anything. You can even hit our closest ally in the Arab region.

That is Qatar, the country that again was the theatre for all mediation. So there is an arrogance and brutality, thuggishness, if you like, that goes beyond any political analysis. You can't have any process of analyzing any action in a logical matter.

You have elements of the case and you can put them together, then you can conclude a logical outcome. This doesn't go along these lines. Neither the lines that I studied at the university, doing my PhD in international relations, nor even what I teach my students.

We are kind of puzzled. So we are in this kind of juncture, I think, where the whole now region feels under threat. And this is one maybe newly emerging factor that is with this discourse expressed by even the speaker of the Knesset on the other day, bragging about the attacks and saying this is a message to the inter-Middle East.

So you have to get in line. So I think, yeah, this could be a turning point, I think, regionally. I hope some again action collectively could be done by the Arab countries.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you so much, Khaled. So I think this brings us right to the question of the United Nations and its role. Given that as we speak, the United Nations General Assembly is convening for its 80th meeting, 80 years since this body was created with the goal, you know, if you read the UN Charter, the goal is to end international lawlessness, aggression and war.

So Craig Mokhiber, I'm coming to you to ask whether you think that what's happening, what has happened in Doha and what is continuing to happen throughout the region, throughout West Asia, what impact is that going to have on the United Nations, especially at this year's General Assembly?

[Craig Mokhiber]

Well, I think first Khaled is right. If the Americans and the Israelis are drunk, what they're drunk on is impunity. And what happened in Doha is just the latest in a long chain of gross violations of international law, not just violations of international law, but this kind of treacherous, profiteous crime that has become so common with the U.S.-Israeli axis, very reminiscent of the killing of Nasrallah in Beirut, who was there to agree a ceasefire when the Israelis murdered him. The U.S.-Israeli attack on Iran, where they pretended to be negotiating in order to carry out a sneak attack, just as they did in this case in Doha, because nothing is more threatening to the Israeli regime than negotiations. They see that as a very inconvenient obstacle to the nefarious plans for completing the genocide in Palestine. Now, of course, all of this is a serious violation of international law.

This is the crime of aggression under the U.N. Charter. It's a grave breach of humanitarian law. It's a crime of murder, violation of human rights law.

It's an extrajudicial execution, a series of them and so on. But it's also very much an attack on international law itself, not to mention an attack on the idea of diplomacy. The basic rules of the international order have been swept aside by these two countries, daring the rest of the world to do something to stop them.

And this is very much the product of decades of absolute impunity, underwritten by the West, especially the U.S. Israel doesn't deny its crimes. It brags about them. This was, you know, this was clear again here.

And this was also a clear case of U.S. complicity. The U.S. drew the negotiators to Qatar and armed their assassins. It greenlit the killings, I'm sure.

And it stood down its U.S. air defenses based in Qatar to allow the strikes to take place. I think, you know, politically, this reveals the Faustian nature of the deal into which these Gulf states have entered with the U.S.-Israel access. And I don't think any of them expected that this would happen so quickly, be thrown under the bus by the U.S., standing down its military defenses and so on. But I think if they don't respond in a meaningful way and if the international community, either inside or out the U.N., doesn't do so, then we can expect more of the same. This is a regime, after all, that is carrying out genocide in Palestine, occupation of Palestine, Lebanon, Syria, transnational terror attacks with booby-trapped pagers in Lebanon, attacks on Iran and Iraq and Syria and Lebanon and Yemen, these humanitarian boats in Tunisia, not to mention a whole series of abuses outside their own borders across the across the West as well. So, you know, I think there is an opportunity in the U.N., although in some sense, I think, you know, looking at questions of international law when you're talking about Israel in the United States is like, I don't know, you know, turning to a blacksmith to talk to you about high tech projects at Google. International law is completely irrelevant in a situation of absolute impunity. And either the international community will stand up to that impunity and demand that the parameters of international law be respected, or that law itself and those institutions themselves in the long term will not survive. What can the U.N. do? The U.N. can do a lot. But will it? That's a question of political will.

We have entered a stage now where hiding behind the U.S. veto and the Security Council is no longer convincing anyone, because we know that the General Assembly is empowered to

act under the Uniting for Peace resolution when the Security Council is blocked by a veto, such as in this case from the United States. It could do a lot of things. It could declare sanctions.

It couldn't enforce them, but it could declare them. It could monitor them. It could expand them.

It could establish a criminal tribunal to hold Israeli perpetrators accountable. It could deny the credentials of the Israeli regime. You know, it could establish a military embargo and economic and other sorts of sanctions.

It could reactivate the anti-apartheid mechanisms. And as we've been talking about in recent months, it could mandate a multinational protection force to deploy to Palestine to protect civilians, to facilitate humanitarian aid, to preserve evidence of Israeli crimes, and to begin the process of reconstruction. None of that would replace the long-term struggle against this lawless regime through, you know, boycott and divestment and sanctions and protests and prosecutions and all the other things that have been happening.

But what it could do is it could, you know, force a change in the incentive structure, in the calculus, the political calculus of these regimes that have been so lawless so far. The only question is, having brought this to this diplomatic discussion into the public light, you know, is there enough mobilization of shame to compel delegations in the United Nations to do what they are empowered to do? Or will they leave this possibility on the table without trying every power that they have to try to stop what is a genocide and a lawless regime that is wreaking havoc across Western Asia and beyond?

Because the Israeli project is spilled over, as I say, even into Western countries, where students and human rights defenders and peace activists and dissidents and voices speaking out against genocide are being persecuted in the name of an oppressive foreign regime somewhere. Everyone has something at stake in this struggle, and we will know in the next couple of weeks whether the UN will stand up to at least attempt with the powers that it has to make a meaningful intervention or if it will stand down in deference to the U.S. Empire and to Israeli impunity. And if it does, I dare say it is the beginning of the end of these institutions.

[Helena Cobban]

Really important. I want to hold this idea of the UN for a moment because we'll come back to that one. I mean, it's a huge issue.

I want to ask Rami what his view is on the precise nature of U.S.-Israeli interaction over this attack in Qatar. Because my understanding is that basically U.S. CENTCOM, the U.S. military air force, controls the skies over this whole region. And it's not just that they stood down, as Khaled said, their air defenses in the Al Udeid base in Qatar, but they actually facilitated the air bridge that the Israelis used.

And I want to say there's a lot of other Arab countries in between Israel and Qatar, including, of course, Saudi Arabia. So how did those attack planes get there in the same way

that the Israeli attack planes got to Tehran back in June? So, Rami, what do we know about the U.S.-Israeli relationship? What have we learned about it from this latest attack?

[Rami Khouri]

Thank you. I'm honored to be with such a distinguished group. I would say that what we're witnessing today across most of the region, but particularly in the Israel-Palestine conflict, the conflict between Arabism and Zionism and relations with the West, especially the United States, what we're witnessing is an acceleration and an aggravation of trends that have been there virtually for an entire century.

This includes the Zionists assassinating people like Count Folk-Bernadotte, the U.N. mediator in 1948, dozens of Palestinian and Lebanese and Arab political leaders, especially resistance leaders. This means the relationships between the state of Israel and the great Western powers. It was initially the British and the Zionist movements in the first half of the last century that created this situation, and now it's the state of Israel with the United States.

That combination, militarily, is stronger than any combination of Arab powers. Of course, there weren't Arab states back in the 30s, many of them. There are a lot of Arab states today, but most of them are not able or willing to act.

But what we're seeing continues a legacy of an entire century that's reached a much heightened form, which several of our colleagues have talked about here with different attacks all over the place. I spoke at a conference. I'm in New York, and I just spoke at an annual conference on terrorism and security threats.

And with very, very serious, experienced, high-level people from the United States and other countries, security officials, scholars, analysts. And I was here when 9-11 happened in the U.S. I was a fellow at Harvard. And it's clear to me that in the last 24 years, the United States has not—the political elite in the United States has never grasped the idea that if you want a stable, mutually beneficial relationship with the people in the Middle East, you have to engage with the ordinary people of the Middle East, Arabs, Iranians, Turks, and others, not only with the Israeli government.

There's still this focus on making Israel secure, and then maybe things will happen. It's kind of the Dennis Ross philosophy gone out of control. So the situation now is that the U.S. and the Israelis don't actually have a clear policy. Neither of them has a clear strategy for what to do in Palestine. The U.S. has never had a clear strategy. It's always, since 1950s or so, it's always— but really since 1967, it's always had this contradictory role of trying to promote bilateral relations, promote peace between Israel and the Arab and the Palestinians, and promote the well-being of Israel and American security and economic interests.

Those contradictions have exploded now. And so the situation is that we really have three big tests now underway. The first test is the test of Arab sovereignty.

Do we have any sovereign Arab states that can take sovereign decisions in response to what's happened? Because all of the Gulf people are worried, all the Arab people are worried, because they realize now, and from what Israel has done, and the U.S. helping,

anybody can be attacked. There's no safe place, either in Gaza or in the entire West Asia or the Arab world.

So sovereignty has to be asserted by the Arab countries in a way that they haven't been able to. And this could follow what Azzam said, which is they might force a policy on the U.S. and the West of extreme pressure to bring about a negotiated Arab-Israeli peace, a Palestinian state, and a calm situation. The second one is the issue of security and well-being for all the people in the region and the U.S. and the Western world who interact. How can they have relations that benefit both of them, economic, political, military? And the third one is the question of the definition of Zionism. Zionism has to be defined and contained.

Everybody agrees that an Israeli state, Jewish-majority state, is legitimate, can exist now. We've all accepted it. The Arabs, Palestinians have accepted it.

Hamas is willing to coexist with it under certain conditions. And the question of Zionism, which has become the state of Israel, can it be defined? Can it be contained geographically, militarily, and politically?

The process that's been going on for the last few years under Trump has been to make the Arabs become Zionists through the Abraham Accords, and that's a losing battle. You have to have a defined Zionist entity, a state of Israel, that lives peacefully with a Palestinian state. So those are the three huge challenges, and what sums them all up is, are we at the beginning of a new phase of Western colonialism, or are we going to end the last century of Western colonialism, where the British and the French attacked the Arabs, helped the Israelis, the Zionists, and now the U.S. is playing that role? So is colonialism a resurgent, or is it going to finally be put away? Because the Palestinian struggle is the last global anti-colonial struggle, and that's why the whole world, the South especially, supports it. People understand in their bones that this is to end colonialism.

Apartheid ended, but colonialism didn't end.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you. Great. I want to come to Dr. Azzam now and pick up on many of the themes we've had about the global balance. So, Dr. Azzam, do you think that either at this year's United Nations or very soon, we might see a global coalition coming together, as some of the panelists have already said, to challenge or even dismantle U.S. hegemony, especially in West Asia? I mean, it is a fact that Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries already have expanded their relationships, to include relationships with the BRICS and with China and with other countries. They're no longer just the kind of the exclusive domain of Americans at the economic and political level, but until now they kind of have been at the military level.

Are things changing? What do you think?

[Azzam Tamimi]

Well, the world is definitely changing since the 7th of October. Rather, the world looks so much different than any time I remember before. The recent attack on Doha might convince

some Arabs for a change, that they cannot continue to rely on their alliance with the United States of America, that America is incapable of providing them with security guarantees, and it would be healthier for them to enter into alliances with others as well in the world.

However, I'm not very optimistic about the UN and what's likely to happen under the umbrella of the UN, and that is simply because of the way the UN is structured, and because of the inability of any of its institutions to act in a manner that could serve justice, not only in Palestine, but elsewhere in the world. Unfortunately, the UN was created and designed in order to preserve the best interests of the powerful, those who won the war in the Second World War. But I am really optimistic about what we are seeing of changes among the people themselves across the world, and within a few years, probably several years, this might translate into important changes at the level of decision-making here and there.

And we've seen, as a result, that many of Israel's traditional allies in the West came out clearly denouncing the attack on Qatar, and an increasing number of people in the West, not just the artists, the musicians, the students, the seaport workers, but also people in government, whether former or current, speaking a language that was not familiar. And therefore, I'm really optimistic that we are heading not anymore toward a two-state solution. We are heading in the direction of recognizing that Zionism is a threat to the world, exactly just as apartheid one day was recognized as a threat to humanity.

Zionism simply cannot be remedied, cannot be rehabilitated, because it's an ideology that justifies theft, that justifies murder, that justifies deception, that justifies all sorts of crimes that involve violations of human rights, of international law, of whatever norms people agree upon around the world. I'm really delighted to hear people across the spectrum, everywhere in the world, associate Zionism and the Zionists and Israelis with racism, with Nazism, with fascism, because that's what it is. There'll never be a two-state solution in Palestine, simply because that's rejected by the Zionists themselves.

They never accepted it. I remember, and probably Khaled remembers that too, that in the early 90s, there were so many opportunities that when the Arabs went to Madrid, that when Oslo happened, when Wadi Araba was concluded between Jordan and Israel, people like us, we were much younger at the time, we thought that was going to be the end of our hope of seeing Palestine free again. But actually, the Zionists continued to make sure that this hope remains there, because they've refused every other solution thrown on the table that the Arabs could have accepted, and the Palestinians, or some of them, did actually accept.

So now the world has changed, and I think there's a radical shift in the way people view Palestine, the Palestinian problem, and interestingly, young students everywhere are going back to the libraries. They're checking textbooks, and they're looking for the roots of the conflict that the Zionists tried to hide away from everybody's eyes, that this is another colonial project by the West against us in Palestine and in the rest of the world, and that unless it is recognized as such, you can never tackle it. I'm really very interested also in the shift among or within world Jewry.

An increasing number of Jews are recognizing this as well, and this is a very good sign because at the inception of Zionism, the majority of the Jews were opposed to Zionism.

Hopefully, we're seeing a reversal trend, an increasing number of Jews, both Orthodox as well as secular, are now coming out, distancing themselves from Israel, and also denouncing Zionist policies. This is what I see happening.

[Helena Cobban]

Oh, so much to build on there. One first impression that I have is, Dr. Azzam, you say that change is coming, but it's not going to come during this General Assembly session, which I tend to agree with, but we can always hope. But if it's going to come in three years' time, Gaza will be finished.

Our friends, our brothers, our sisters in Gaza will all be dead, and I don't know how to deal with this idea that that is a possibility. But secondly, you're talking about essentially the death of the two-state formula, which I think is very important to discuss, and there's probably quite a lot of disagreement amongst the people on this panel. Disagreement is always good, if it's done in a spirit of collegiality and trying to find solutions.

So, Craig Mokhiber, what do you think about specifically the prospects from this General Assembly? Do you think that the fact of this earthquake in Doha occurring at the beginning of the General Assembly session may actually open a lot of doors at this General Assembly session for other powers, for the global majority to step forward?

[Craig Mokhiber]

Well, I actually think that Azzam's comments are a good bridge into both halves of that. One is that if you're waiting for the U.N., or by the way, the Americans to come and save you, you are going to be waiting in vain in the long term. There's no question about it.

People still talking about the U.S. as being the only ones who can solve this problem. The U.S. is an enthusiastic participant in the genocide of the Palestinian people, and that is Republican, Democrat, that is Congress and the presidency, that's the national security state, that's the Congress. The U.S. is an enthusiastic participant in genocide, and it is not going to suddenly find morality overnight and to come in and to save us. And the U.N. has capacities, and I will talk about that, Helena. But first to say that the only thing that is going to save Palestine and the Palestinian people is internally resistance and steadfastness by the Palestinian people, externally, the solidarity, the global solidarity movement that has been building by all of us in the rest of the world, and potentially some form of intervention, which is the piece that doesn't get talked about because it's presumed to be impossible.

And on all of those areas, you see reason for hope. The global movement, solidarity movement in favor of Palestine, has grown by leaps and bounds just during this upsurge in genocide. The world has spoken, and it is overwhelmingly in support of the Palestinian people and opposed to the Israeli-Zionist project in Palestine.

And the fact that that absolutely includes the younger cohorts in all of our societies across the West and across the globe means that change is coming, no question about it. But that change is too slow to end the genocide that's happening now, and it's too slow to save the lives that need to be saved. With all of the assaults of that genocide, both the bombs and bullets and the starvation and denial of medical care and so on.

The long-term framing of this is that Zionism has to be dismantled. I don't think Zionism on the moon is one thing, but Zionism that is premised on the destruction, the displacement, the erasure and the replacement of an indigenous people is not something that can be sustained in this world. And so, you know, many people in the pro-Palestine, I don't like that phrase, by the way it sounds like a football game, but in the solidarity movement, have long recognized that this is our anti-apartheid movement, that we need to deploy every pressure available to chip away, erode the Israeli regime and ultimately to dismantle it and to replace it with a new dispensation based upon human rights and equality and an end to the horrors of the past almost 100 years now. So the last piece of that was this idea of external intervention, and we know that, you know, two years of absolute slaughter, the only entity that has really intervened is Ansar Allah-controlled Yemen, which has intervened in solidarity for all the right reasons, and I have argued had an absolute legal right to do so.

Indeed, there is a legal obligation on the part of all states to intervene to stop this genocide, but none of them have either the principle or the courage to do so. And so the question becomes, can you give diplomatic, multilateral, political cover to encourage more states to take concrete steps in order to do so? Now, you know, ask anyone inside the UN, they will tell you that my profile there was principally as a critic, including and especially those moments at the UN was an extension of the US empire rather than, you know, an obstacle to US empire, which I believe it has the capacity to do.

But I've never been willing to throw out the baby with the bathwater because I am old enough to remember that the UN was a tool that was used to some import by the liberation struggles of the 1960s and 70s, the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, and the Palestinian struggle until this monster of Oslo reared up and showed its head and then served for 30 years as a smokescreen for further Israeli oppression and normalization leading ultimately to genocide. So there is a UN out there. It's not the UN of the Security Council, which is controlled by the P5, and especially by the US.

It is not the Secretary General, whose deference to Western power is, I think, shameful. It's not the other senior officials who have refused to actually take a principled position on the genocide and instead have hidden behind the language of both sides and armed conflict and humanitarian aid, never addressing the reality on the ground of oppressor and oppressed, occupier and occupied, genocide there, and victims, colonizer and colonized, and never even calling out by name the crime of genocide. It's not there. But there is another UN, which is manifest in the very courageous and principled work of our UNRWA colleagues, 360 of whom have been murdered, many along with their families, for doing their job, or the humanitarians who have continued from the UN system to try to provide relief to the Palestinian people, or the independent human rights mechanisms of the UN, like Francesca Albanese, who has faced death threats and harassments and U.S. sanctions and personal attacks of every kind, and has continued to do her job in documenting the situation, calling out the perpetrators, standing with the victims on the basis of UN norms and standards, not on the basis of her own political opinion, but on the basis of those norms and standards that also belong to the UN. And so the question, the political question is, can we, as did the national liberation movements in the 60s and 70s, take hold of the United Nations and use it for the cause of justice rather than for the cause of empire? And what are the mechanisms available to us to do that, not being naive, not thinking that there's a panacea or a magic

bullet available, not thinking that we're going to succeed against all of these obstacles, but knowing that we have a moral obligation to try and maybe in the process, this new geopolitical alignment that is emerging with the Hague group, for example, with the BRICS, for example, with the newly assertive G77 plus China, for example, and feeling the pressure from below, or I would say from above, of civil society and social movements and their own publics, not to allow this situation to continue.

Is there something that can be done? And in this General Assembly, where they've adopted a historic resolution, I wish it was a revolution, a historic resolution one year ago, in which they set a specific deadline, which is on or about the 18th of September, coming up in a couple of weeks, for further measures to be imposed upon Israel explicitly, backed by the International Court of Justice, and with this massive movement all around the world, it is not ideal, but it's the best chance we've had to get the UN, in the General Assembly, where there is no veto, and where the global majority is on our side, to do something they have not done before, including those five elements that I mentioned before. They may not do it. They may be distracted by these calls for an Oslo 2.0, a new smoke screen to push for Israeli normalization and the continued suffering and erasure of the Palestinian people. They may fall for what I think is the trap of the Saudi-French proposal, which is not about protecting Palestinians from genocide now, but from normalizing the genocide perpetrator in the wake of genocide and keeping an eye on the Palestinian resistance. I mean, they may fall for that trap, or they may just hide behind meaningless rhetoric and adopt another resolution calling for a ceasefire, but with no practical measures, like sanctions, like a criminal tribunal, like a protection force, like the apartheid mechanisms, like the denial of Israel's credentials. They could do all of that.

They won't do any of it if they're allowed to talk about that in the shadows. There is at least a small chance that they will do some or all of it if we force that conversation into the light with public scrutiny and public pressure. If they don't, you will see me carrying a sign for the dismantling of the UN, because they have a lot to answer for in their failures, not just over the last two years and not just in Palestine.

Some of it's by design. You can forgive them for the Security Council veto for the time being, but some of it is by abdication. You cannot forgive them for not doing what they're empowered to do.

[Rick Sterling]

Yeah, Craig, if I could ask, for people who are watching this webinar, I'm wondering if you have any specific suggestions. Where are the contacts that you think might be useful, or is it public protest at the UN? What do you suggest?

[Craig Mokhiber]

Well, there is a global campaign going on as we speak that's been reaching out with calls and letters and meetings to delegations at the United Nations, starting with the Palestinian delegation, which has its own ideas, but also with delegations that have rhetorically supported Palestine. You know, the Hague Group, South Africa, Namibia, Colombia, Ireland, Slovenia, Spain, all of those that have rhetorically committed to this. You've had heads of

state, like the president of Colombia, calling for it, and Colombia has been doing more than just calling for it.

They have been looking very seriously at how to make it happen. You have the president of Ireland who has called for it, although the president of Ireland obviously doesn't have the same influence that the president of Colombia does under their system, and many other voices who have been calling for this. And there is this movement that is centered around Palestinian civil society with PINGO and others, but that includes civil society, social movements, labor unions, advocates and others from all around the world who are beating this drum and intervening for that purpose.

There are demonstrations that are planned to try to bring this into the light as well. The 18th of September has been called as a day of global action. You can expect all around the world demonstrations on that day, including in front of the United Nations that are being organized.

I mean, as close as they can get to the United Nations. I don't know if that will be Dag Hammarskjold Plaza or somewhere where they are allowed to do so. You know, press conferences and interviews on media programs and so on, all for the purpose of trying to make sure, as we repeat it for the third time, that this conversation is pushed into the light of public scrutiny, because we know damn well if it's not, they will go for the easiest way out, which is something rhetorical and meaningless or something that could actually be harmful and could be imposed on the Palestinian people potentially and is not in their interest, or even something that could represent a proxy occupation. And I'll say that if none of these things happen, you know, as insane as the delusions of Donald Trump and his Riviera great program of a privatization of a genocided land and turning it into some sort of casino for his private gain, as crazy as that sounds, in the world in which we're living, it's not interesting. There should be no vacuum that can be filled by madmen in Palestine.

And that means more of these principled actions have to be pressed in solidarity with the Palestinian people.

[Helena Cobban]

Yeah, I'm interested, Rick, from your perspective in Northern California, do you think that people, I mean, Northern California is well known for being full of like social justice liberals and whatever. Do you think that there's really a big movement in support of the Palestinians there, as there are in some parts of the country, mainly Detroit, perhaps Michigan, but how is it seeming up there in Berkeley, California?

[Rick Sterling]

There is a lot of public protest and definitely there's a widespread, there's really a change in the tide. Opposition to the Israeli government is pretty widespread now. Across the US, I think the polls are showing 57% have a negative view of Israel.

In the Bay Area, it's much higher than that. There's a lot of support for Palestine. There are actions happening all the time.

There are protests at the nearby Air Force Base, which is shipping parts to Israel. There's protests happening at the Oakland airport, because that is also being used to send parts to Israel. And there's an organization that does a street protest in front of the Israeli consulate in downtown San Francisco, making as much noise as possible.

And it's a lot of noise. Against that, the pro-Israel lobby has mounted a very strong campaign to try to control education throughout the state. K-12, there's an assembly bill that's being, they're trying to ram it through right now.

Last night there was a hearing, and that will basically outlaw education about Palestine in all public and private schools in California. This is K-12. There's a lot of opposition to almost all the education groups, both teachers at high school level and university level as well, are coming out opposing that.

But they're proceeding to try to ram it through nonetheless. So it's really a critical thing. I think in a way, of course, the core of their argument is that criticizing Israel is anti-Semitic, which of course is absolute nonsense.

The most famous scientist of the 20th century, Albert Einstein, would be considered an anti-Semite today under this kind of law. Of course, Albert Einstein denounced Zionist terrorism. He compared them to fascists, said they were Nazi-like in a public letter, a famous public letter in 1948 to the New York Times.

This is, and it's like Professor David Klein says, by conflating anti-Semitism with criticism of Israel, they've turned anti-Semitism into something that's admirable. So it's really a bizarre situation, and there's a lot of public protest and growing awareness of what's going on. I think the truth, I mean, as other people have commented, the terrorist core of Zionism has been there from the start with the assassinations that took place in the 1940s, the Deir Yassin massacre.

But it's really reaching its culmination right now with the genocide, with the apartheid. And so it's coming to a head. And so I think all of the efforts that Craig has been talking about, I think we need to do everything that we can to, and use all the levers, press on all the levers that are possible to bring about a change.

And I do think it's possible because like probably everybody here, we were part of the movement against apartheid in South Africa, and we saw some measure of success with that. And I do think that that's possible. It's necessary right now with Palestine or with Gaza.

[Helena Cobban]

Yeah. Dr. Khaled, I want to come back to the Gulf, because those little statelets up and down the Gulf were kind of created by the Brits back in the day. They're very different from the Arab states of the Mashreq that had national liberation movements back in the 20s and 30s.

And so now we have this Israeli-American attack on Qatar. And I think I'm quite happy to call it an Israeli-American attack, because it would never have taken place unless CENTCOM, the U.S. CENTCOM had actually participated in it. So we're going to have this summit

meeting this weekend, led by the emir of Qatar and with probably the crown prince from Saudi Arabia and the president of the United Arab Emirates.

And might they come out with a new vision for how to secure the interests of their emirates, their kingdoms, their Gulf states in a way that is not reliant on U.S. power, given that U.S. power now looks toxic?

[Khaled Hroub]

Yeah. Well, first of all, let me agree with you on the Israeli-American strike on Qatar, because I really do believe that this would have never happened without the American green light in this and even logistical support and all of that. So this is, if you like, a double act of great deception and betrayal at the highest level, from Israel and from America to one of America's allies in the region.

Now, that point aside, back to the Arab-Islamic summit in Doha, I think there is some maybe glimpses of hope, because the level of anger and the frustration that I can see and that has been accumulating over the past couple of years and even before, I think since even 2019. Since 2019, when the Aramco oil facilities were struck by whoever, either Iran or the Houthis, and then Trump's first administration, they just looked at the other way, saying, well, this is your business, sort it out, and we do nothing, basically. So that somehow exposed the whole theme of regional security that was somehow entrusted in the hands of the Americans really greatly.

So these Gulf states invested trillions of dollars in armaments, in kind of mandating, if you like, the Americans with the security and the stability of the region. This is the main hub, the main global hub of gas and oil. So there was this kind of sense of security, if you like.

And again, as you said, the region lacked any, I would say, revolutionary spirit. The trajectory of independence took a different form than other Arab countries, though with one exception in Oman and Dhofar, there was a revolution in the late 1950s, 1960s, that was subdued by all the monarchies in the region, supported by the British back then. The Shah of Iran, the king in Jordan, and the British and the rest of it.

Anyway, so I think there is now a deep sense within the Gulf and elites of betrayal, and that we need to take things in our hands. And there are some kind of discussions, debates, maybe very still shy at the very beginning. Myself, I just finished today, submitted my op-ed in Arabic, I might do it in English, saying, well, the time maybe has come for the Gulf region to think twice about this alliance with America and to invite China, and then to go elsewhere.

Because you can't simply just rely on American military, the same military, the same technology that goes to Israel, yet in that case, in the Israeli case, you have the, what do you call it, the QME, I think, which is the military edge, that is the quality military edge.

[Helena Cobban]

Oh, yes, qualitative military edge, QME.

[Khaled Hroub]

... that basically guarantees Israel this kind of military edge over all others in the region. So even if you take, even if the United Arab Emirates, let's assume, managed to get the F-35, this F-35 is different than the one that is given to Israel. So all the time you have this kind of gap, technological gap, intelligence gap, between what Israel has and what the Arabs would have.

So this is, it makes no sense. Another kind of idea that is thrown here and there, and some people, you know, started, that is to start seriously building your own localized defense industry. And let us take 10, 20 years, long-term project, but instead of relying on X power or Y power, this and that, what about all these billions and hundreds of billions and the trillions?

Invest them in defending yourself. And this is, I think, a very legitimate question, because all this spending is basically useless when it comes to serious danger facing Saudi Arabia or Qatar or any other country. So the bigger question, I think, that has been somehow debated, maybe again in a very shy corner here and there, but on the rise and emerging, that is, we need to talk frankly about wasting maybe all these investments and money in return basically of nothing.

So America would simply leave us on our own if there is any danger. And again, it happened time and again in the region. So what's another proof we need after the strike in Qatar?

So Qatar pledged to invest \$1.4 trillion, just a few months back. A few months back, they pledged to invest this enormous amount of money, and then in return they had this stab in the back, basically. So you have all this kind of bitterness and debates.

So one would expect this could take things a few steps further and maybe kind of exploding in new directions and charting new areas.

[Helena Cobban]

Yeah, don't forget the big airliner that the Qataris gave to Donald Trump as well! I mean, I've thought for a long time that the main function of the purchases by GCC states of U.S. military equipment has been to essentially prop up the U.S. military industry, which otherwise, I mean-- it's just like markets. And even now, that's not really succeeding, as we saw, for example, in the India-Pakistan fight, when was it, six weeks ago, where the Chinese military aircraft seemed to outsmart the Western military aircraft.

And the world is changing at a lot of different levels. I'm not sure that you need to think of creating a military industry in the GCC countries, but maybe just demilitarizing them and engaging in productive economic relations with the whole of the world would be another way forward. But I'll look forward to seeing your op-ed!

[Khaled Hroub]

I may add something quickly, quickly, because there has been something that is inactive within the GCC countries, which is, you know, the collective security, some sort of

agreement within the GCC. So this is stipulated at the core of this union, if you like. And now people ask, what's about this kind of collective security pact, which basically, if there's an attack on one country, this means this is an attack on everyone within the GCC.

And we have another one at the level of the Arab countries with the Arab League, the collective security pact. So people now started to talk within these two days. I can read some stuff in Arabic.

People say, well, maybe the time has come to revive these pacts because the matter is very serious and the greater Israel is expanding and not leaving maybe any one of us behind, not sparing anybody.

[Helena Cobban]

Great points. We've actually covered a lot of ground in terms of the UN and regional security. I want to bring this back to Gaza as well, because Gaza is always, as the People's Conference here in the United States underlined last weekend, Gaza is the compass for-- and it's been the crucible, it's the turning point for a lot of these things happening and the resistance in Gaza, the steadfastness of the resistance, where you even see people in Gaza City today having mass meetings and mass processions. Their kind of social organization has not been totally destroyed in spite of all the genocidal attacks, and it's so inspiring for me to see that.

So Rami, as my co-author of the book, *Understanding Hamas*, what do you think about the future of Hamas, given that this attack against a number of their leaders, but not all of their leaders, appears to have failed?

I think, you know, was it Azzam who said that that gives Hamas more power right now because of the failure of the attack? But Hamas and the Palestinian resistance in Gaza as a whole, the broader Palestinian resistance, have been under just horrible assault. How do you see things changing or developing over the weeks ahead?

[Rami Khouri]

Well, I remember in, I think it was 19, no, 2000, and when was it, when Khaled Meshel was, they tried to assassinate him in...

[Helena Cobban]

1998, was it?

[Azzam Tamimi]

1997.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you, Azzam.

[Rami Khouri]

And then I talked to him a few days after he got out of hospital or, you know, he was saved, and it's fascinating, and I heard him discuss many things, including the usual resistance position, which all Hamas leaders agree on, and then also saying we're prepared to discuss with Israel coexistence, non-aggression under certain conditions. So the reality of this situation is that over the last 100 years, the Israelis have assassinated many leaders of Arab resistance movements and civil movements or tried to put them out of business, as they're doing now by using the U.S. to sanction human rights groups and stuff like that, and none of this works. None of this works in the long run.

And the reason is because Hamas is strong not because of its weapons. It's strong because the ideology of Palestinian national resistance, reconciliation, self-determination, and statehood is a policy that is widely supported among the masses of Palestinian people. So Hamas is a consequence of Palestinian sentiments, not the other way around.

And if Hamas, if the leaders were to be killed, Israel can kill all of these leaders eventually if it's shown that it has the capabilities, and then it'll destroy whatever it has to, Arab capitals, whatever. That won't make a big difference in the long run. In the short run, it'll set back the struggle for self-determination.

But I think the important point is to try as quickly as possible to move into a political negotiation with the Israelis, a diplomatic process, which the Palestinians can't do on their own. The PLO doesn't exist. The Palestinian Authority is not a credible movement at all, has very little support.

So there has to be new forms of governance, and maybe this will emerge after the fighting stops and they try to rebuild Gaza. But the more important point is the only way the Palestinians are going to move ahead is, I think Craig said, resistance on the ground, but also mobilizing the tremendous support you have all over the world. And the Gulf, Khaled has talked about the Gulf GCC, people working together.

But what the Arabs need to try to do is something they've never done before, which is to, a little bit they did it with the oil boycott in 19, whatever that was, 93. But the Arabs need to bring together all of their political resources, combine these with existing movements around the world, the Hague group, the China-Russia group, the Shanghai group, et cetera, all these other movements around the world that are starting to take form, and together make a deal with the Americans, force the Americans to accept a deal that they can't refuse in a sort of Nixon to China moment. The Americans need to be convinced that their current policy of supporting Israel above all is not going to achieve them what they want and will only create more problems for them in the future.

But if they can be convinced that a political resolution is possible, which the Israelis and the Palestinians have to work out themselves, you can't have any of this Jared Kushner or Tony Blair nonsense of this idea, but the Palestinians and the Israelis are able, can negotiate, and we've seen this in many track two negotiations that I've been involved with and others, that they can negotiate a mechanism to live together, but it has to contain and define Zionism

and assert Palestinian equal and simultaneous rights to the Israelis. Until those two things are done, nothing's going to happen, and that's what happened in South Africa.

So I believe that we may be approaching a moment in the next year or two when the Arab leaders find the confidence to move ahead and reclaim their sovereignty. We don't have any self-determined Arab citizenry. We don't have any truly sovereign Arab states.

This is a terrible, terrible verdict of the modern Arab experience in the last century, but it's the reality. We have wonderful people, wonderful societies. We have some leaders who have done great things in educating women and training labor, whatever, but they haven't achieved what the citizenry of our region want, and what Hamas is calling for.

The reason Hamas is popular is not because of its military actions. Some people like that, but it's because it asserts a political position based on equal rights, the rule of law, international norms, and the decency that has to define relations among any people in the world. So this is where I think we shouldn't focus too much on the leaders of Hamas.

We should focus on what does Hamas represent, and how can we then take that position and move it into a political negotiation that resolves this conflict once and for all equitably for all people concerned.

[Helena Cobban]

Thanks. Actually, we've nearly gotten to 75 minutes, and I think it's time to move toward wrapping this up. I've seen some really good questions in the Q&A box.

Some of them have already been answered by our very prescient panelists here. What I'm proposing to do is to have one last go-around, so if each of you panelists could think of the two-minute thing that you want to leave this webinar with. I'll just start with a quick reaction to what Rami said about the possibility of building what sounded like a world alliance against the United States, which is kind of an intriguing concept.

I grew up in England during the collapse of the British Empire, so for me, being here now as an American and being eyewitness to what I hope will be the collapse of the American Empire, it's a very familiar place to be. It's not the end of the world when your empire collapses. In fact, it makes the world for everybody a much better place.

So, Rick, what are the kind of the two-minute quickie thing that you want people to go away from this webinar with?

[Rick Sterling]

First of all, it's been very interesting to listen to everybody. I think when Israel was admitted to the United Nations in 1949, they promised to be a, quote, peace-loving state. And it was admitted with significant opposition, but they managed to get the two-thirds majority among the states at that time.

And what we've seen is the exact opposite. It's been a state of violence, a state of continual terrorism and attacks nonstop since that time. So, in a way, what we're seeing today in Gaza is really the culmination, the total exposure of the big lie that it's a peace-loving state.

Of course, now, as people have pointed out, they've been bombing six different countries in the region over the last period. So, it's been a continual period of terrorism where they eliminate one leader after another, but yet it continues because the opposition, because the nature of the conflict is they can't eliminate the Palestinians by eliminating one or another Palestinian leader. So, I think today is 9-11, of course, and it's worth recalling that when Benjamin Netanyahu asked how he thought 9-11 would affect U.S.-Israeli relations, he said, quote, it's very good. And so, I think we've seen the change of government in Syria. We've seen the change of government in Libya. We've seen all of these things happen.

It's all been bad, but I think, in a way, Israel is drunk with power, but I think it may implode, and the sooner the better for all the people of the region.

[Helena Cobban]

Thanks, Rick. I'll come now to Craig Mokhiber. Two minutes.

What do you want people to take away from the webinar?

[Craig Mokhiber]

Well, look, I respect all the points of view today and was really happy to be involved in this conversation. I think the moment of the two-state solution is over, and I think the moment of expecting the Palestinian people to negotiate for their rights with their oppressor is over. The International Court of Justice has said as much in its advisory opinion, and I think that we need to move past that.

I don't think it is about looking toward a two-state solution or a one-state solution. There is one state. It is controlled by a Zionist regime that is determined to get rid of the Palestinian people and to build a supremacist state from the river to the sea on top of the ruins of what is Palestine.

I don't think that the two-state solution offers anything to the Palestinian people except for one or more Bantustans disempowered along the margins of a powerful state of Israel. It offers nothing for the rights of Palestinians from inside the Green Line. It offers them no right to return or compensation or reparations or equal rights or equal status.

Those are all an impossibility. So I look at this situation and I see apartheid South Africa for the long-term struggle. That means to isolate and to weaken and to defeat and to dismantle the Israeli regime and to replace it with a new dispensation based upon equal human rights for Christians, Muslims, and Jews across all of historic Palestine, the right for all Palestinians to return, the right to compensation, no compromise on the human rights of the Palestinian people, no negotiating with their oppressors for those rights.

That is a long-term struggle as it was in South Africa. It will be here too. We all have a role in working in solidarity with the Palestinian people toward that end.

But there is the immediate question of what do we do now to save lives in Palestine as a genocide is raging across not just Gaza but also the West Bank. And that means that solidarity with the resistance and with the Palestinian people, all of that, absolutely. But it also means we have to at least try to form some kind of an intervention from the outside to mobilize the international community, those who have some level of commitment to international law and to international human rights.

And we may well fail in doing so. But if we don't try, it's our sin. If we try and they don't do it, it's their sin.

And then we know what the focus of the movement needs to be. So I think that's where we are. I'm very happy to have been involved in this conversation.

Thanks, Helena.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you, Craig. So Dr Khaled, what is the two-minute thing that you want people to take away?

[Khaled Hroub]

Only one minute. Only one minute. I think we have spoken about so many things.

But again, back to square one, which is Gaza. So I think I will just emphasize what Craig has ended up with. That is, this is the immediate and very urgent kind of demand.

And I have really some reservation about all these kind of efforts. They are good, maybe incrementally good, the Saudi-French initiative and this and that. But I can feel some sort of escapism, that you can't do the priority.

The priority is to end the genocide. Just for God's sake, gather and collect this concerted effort in this direction. And then the two-step solution, whatever that you wanted to do, can wait.

It waited for 33 years. We are happy to wait for 10 years even. But the immediate thing is, I think, for the Palestinians in Gaza to be saved and for the genocide to be ended immediately.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you. Dr. Azzam?

[Azzam Tamimi]

Well, thank you very much. I, too, agree with everything that was said this evening. Now, two points.

First, I do recognize that there are so many efforts around the world to help Palestine and probably to bring pressure to bear so as to stop the genocide in Gaza. I've recently been invited to the Gaza Tribunal in Sarajevo. The next meeting is going to be in Istanbul.

So many groups everywhere. There are people who are making efforts. But none of this is helping an immediate pose to the genocide.

And that is simply because of two corrupt orders, a regional order and the world order. They are the ones that are shielding Israel and that are providing it with the space and the time to continue to kill the Palestinians. Yet, I do commend all the efforts, and I think it's about time that all these efforts come together to form a global movement against Zionism.

This is my short-term dream, actually. Now, the second point is that this is not about Hamas. Yes, Hamas is spearheading the resistance today.

It is today the Palestinian National Movement. But before Hamas, there was Fatah. And before Fatah, there was al-Jihad al-Muqaddas that was led by Abdel Qadir al-Husseini.

Before that, there was Izz al-Din al-Qassam. It's the idea that matters. And the idea is that Zionism has no place in Palestine.

That's it. Full stop. My mother understood this.

My father understood this. My grandparents understand this. And today, my children and my grandchildren understand this and will continue the struggle until there is no more Zionism.

So, my two minutes are up. So, no matter what they do to Hamas or to Gaza, the idea will live on.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you very much. So, Rami, your final two minutes.

[Rami Khouri]

Well, again, you know, being the last speaker in this group is like being the last book in the Bible to having to follow. But all these thoughts are terrific and correct, and it shows the complexity of what we're dealing with. My suggestion is that we need to, first of all, liberate ourselves in the Arab world.

The voices of ordinary Arab men and women need to be heard. And not just the voices, but their impact on policy somehow. This is very difficult, because we don't have any really democratic or self-determinant Arab states.

But there has to be more public voices from the Arab world to show this is what we all want. We have it in public opinion polls and things like that, so we know what people want. So, I think it's organizing across the Arab world and then coordinating with like-minded people all over the world.

I've mentioned many of these movements and states and stuff that's going on. And take that force and use it to impact American policy. Because in the final analysis, as we've all said, it's the U.S.-Israeli link that lets this genocide continue and prohibits any expansion of Palestinian rights. It's going the other way around. It's destroying the Palestinians, not in terms of their rights, but in their livelihood, and making it a criminal act to be a Palestinian. Here in the U.S., it's being criminalized. So, we have to impact the American system, let's say. And we see it already where electoral movements are getting the attention of political leaders, the primary of the New York mayor, the noncommittal movement, and the last primaries in the presidential election. There's a link now between Gaza as a moral political issue and the attitudes of huge numbers of people, especially young people, but also coalitions across all sectors of American society, churches, Jewish progressives, labor unions, etc.

So, that combination of serious coordinated public action that is joined with Arab governments and some mechanism that forces, engages the Americans to come up with a resolution that's good for the Arabs, Palestinians, good for the Israelis, good for the Western world. We can't have a win-win situation. And this takes a lot of leadership, which we haven't seen yet in the Arab world, but maybe it's going to come now because they're all scared.

[Helena Cobban]

Thank you for that. So, this really is the time when I wrap this up. I'll just have one little comment from me, going back to my experience of the decolonization, the collapse of the British Empire.

Honestly, I think my father and his generation could not have imagined a world without the British Empire. But then in that very short period of time between 1945, let's say in 1956, when actually President Eisenhower put the final nail in the coffin of the British Empire during the Suez Crisis, it just, like the whole thing, India, everything, it all collapsed from the point of view of the British Empire.

I think we need to remember that the American public, the American demography, we're only 4% of humankind. It's not foreordained that the American Empire is going to rule the whole world forever. And I think we're at a key turning point right now.

Just on the Suez Crisis as well, something that I've thought a lot about. On that occasion, Eisenhower put the nail in the coffin of the British and French imperial grandiosity through economic means, by threatening to pull the plug on those two, French franc and the pound sterling.

And that may well be what happens now with the American Empire, that it's not overcome by a military coalition, but rather economic power is brought to bear against dollarization, and that is already starting to happen.

So for all of you watching this, I want to thank you. We've had a wonderful number of attendees at this webinar, especially given that I didn't send the invitations out until 5 p.m. Eastern time yesterday. So we assembled this just wonderful, rich panel. Of course, it was a

little like our ideas were all over the place, which is where ideas should be. And many, many wonderful, very productive ideas were discussed here.

So I know we didn't get to the Q&A. There were, I think, 10 or 12 questions, really good questions asked. But we will be in touch with everybody who attended this, people who signed up and couldn't attend, and with everybody on our mailing list with the results of this very important and timely webinar.

The video of the webinar will be posted very speedily by our great friend and collaborator, Mustapha, who is in the background here. We will be in touch with everybody. There will be further webinars.

We'll figure out, you know, some way to organize this maybe a little bit better. But thank you all for being with us today.

Oh, and fundraising: Just World Educational relies on donations of the general public. We have no big backer. So if you can go to our website, www.justworldeducational.org, and throw whatever money you can our way, that would be great. And see you all again soon, very soon, I hope. Inshallah. Goodbye.