

paring suicidal “counterattacks.”

In this degenerating environment, what happens when Jewish zealots blow up the Al Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem, as they have repeatedly attempted to do? What happens if the Hindu zealots of the Israeli-linked BJP party destroy more mosques in India, as they did in Ayodhya, leading to riots that killed hundreds? For one thing, the strategic planners in the U.S., Britain, and France are already talking about a regional nuclear war. “A nuclear war in the region in five years,” was the forecast and threat of Harvard University’s Samuel Huntington, who is expected to get a significant post in the Clinton administration. One apparent plan is to provoke a nuclear war between India and Pakistan, or to provide the pretext for an Israeli nuclear assault on a neighbor. The control maintained by Britain of so many of the violently competing political, religious, and ethnic movements of the Indian subcontinent, makes the possibility of a Hindu-Muslim war especially grave.

### **Bernard Lewis’s plan**

While much of the thinking behind such policies is never revealed publicly, important features of the plan have been made public by its primary author, Bernard Lewis. Writing in the fall issue of the Council of Foreign Relations’ *Foreign Affairs* journal, Lewis puts forward how this plan, which he had drafted in the 1970s, should be revised and updated for implementation in the current “post-cold war period.” Lewis calls for a policy of “Lebanonization,” referencing the 17-year civil war set up by former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The war, which pitted Catholic, Palestinian, Shi-ite Muslim, Sunni Muslim, Druze, and Greek Orthodox populations against each other, resulted in the de facto partitioning of Lebanon by Israel and Syria.

“The eclipse of pan-Arabism,” Lewis writes, “has left Islamic fundamentalism as the most attractive alternative to all those who feel that there has to be something better, truer and more hopeful than the inept tyrannies of their rulers and the bankrupt ideologies foisted on them from outside.”

Elaborating on the subversive capacities of that variety of fundamentalism run by Britain, he adds: “In a program of aggression and expansion these movements would enjoy, like their Jacobin and Bolshevik predecessors, the advantage of fifth columns in every country and community with which they share a common universe of discourse. There is also the possibility that they might have nuclear weapons, either for terrorist or regular military use.”

“Most of the states of the Middle East,” he gloats, “are of recent and artificial construction and are vulnerable to such a process. If the central power is sufficiently weakened, there is no real civil society to hold the polity together, no real sense of common national identity or overriding allegiance to the nation-state. The state then disintegrates—as happened in Lebanon—into a chaos of squabbling, feuding, fighting sects, tribes, regions and parties.”

## **John Paul II rejects anti-Islamic crusade**

by Umberto Pascali

“States no longer have a right to indifference. It seems clear that *their duty is to disarm this aggressor.*”—Pope John Paul II, speaking on Bosnia.

“They insist that the pope should be the chaplain of the new world order, they insist that he lend himself to a sort of anti-Islamic crusade. No way!” The Roman observer talking to *EIR* is indignant. By “they” he means the Anglo-American and U.N. elite that is promoting the wars against Bosnia and against Iraq. Father Vadoslav Halambek, who is in charge of the Croatian department of Vatican Radio, similarly rejects any suggestion that Bosnia is an “Islamic fundamentalist country.” “Bosnia is the most secular country you could find. But someone is interested in creating this fundamentalist scenario to help Serbia’s conquest.” Unfortunately, while the Serbians are preparing to attack Kosova and Makedonija using the pretext of the “Islamic danger,” leaders such as Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and Bulgarian President Zhelyu Zhelev are giving credence to that false charge.

It is thus of crucial importance that over the last weeks, Pope John Paul II has made a special effort to clarify not only that he and his church reject that “Islamic danger” hoax, but that he is calling for a just and adequate defense of Bosnia’s rights.

On Jan. 19, Archbishop of Sarajevo Vinko Puljic announced that the pope had accepted his invitation to visit the besieged Bosnian capital of Sarajevo. “I invited him with all my heart because the Holy Father has shown so much interest in Bosnia and our problems, especially at the present moment,” Puljic said in an interview with the *Il Messaggero* Italian daily. “The pope and [Vatican Secretary of State] Cardinal Sodano have assured me that the invitation has been accepted and they are now studying concrete possibilities for the visit. The pope is ready to come to visit us.”

### **There is no right to indifference**

*The following remarks are from the annual New Year’s address to the diplomatic corps accredited to the Holy See, delivered by John Paul II on Jan 16. He addressed the 145 ambassadors in the Regia Hall of the Apostolic Palace and reviewed conflicts and political situations all over the world—Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Ibero-America. His strongest words concerned the situation in Bosnia.*

“The international community ought to show more clear-

ly its political will not to accept aggression and territorial conquest by force nor the aberration of 'ethnic cleansing.' . . . Today as in the past, despite the more or less compelling documents of international law, man and his needs unfortunately continue to be threatened, to such an extent that in recent months a new concept has emerged, that of 'humanitarian intervention.' . . . Once the possibilities afforded by diplomatic negotiations and the procedures provided for by international agreements and organizations have been put into effect, and that, nevertheless, populations are succumbing to the attacks of an unjust aggressor, states no longer have a right to indifference. It seems clear that *their duty is to disarm this aggressor*, if all other means have proved ineffective.

"[Europe's] institutions are being ignored. All peace efforts of recent years have been, as it were, destroyed. . . . The whole of Europe is being humiliated. . . . Humanitarian law, a laborious achievement of this century, is no longer being respected. . . . The most elementary principles governing social life are being scoffed at by veritable hordes spreading terror and death.

"Finally, those who indulge in such actions and those who excuse or justify them, will answer for it not only before the international community, but still more before God."

John Paul II offered four principles to world leaders and to those who "have in their hands a weapon in order to attack their brothers and sisters." Three of the principles were that a war of aggression is not worthy of man, the moral and physical destruction of the enemy or stranger is a crime, and practical indifference in the face of such forms of behavior is a *culpable omission*.

*The following excerpts are from a homily at the ecumenical Prayer Vigil organized by John Paul II "to pray and fast for peace in the Balkans and Europe," on Jan. 9 in Assisi.*

"This is the second part of our Vigil. It is taking place, for us Christians, in the Upper Basilica of Saint Francis. The representatives of Islam have gathered in another part of this Sacro Convento as have some representatives of Judaism. . . . How can hostility continue to exist in the world? How can hatred continue to exist? . . . These are the questions which tonight we feel we must ask everyone, including ourselves, in the face of the tragedy of Bosnia-Herzegovina. . . . Are not all these disasters the reflection of that battle that opposes good and evil, which sets up a society based on selfishness and greed against the civilization of love? . . .

"Is it even possible to deprive a man of the right to life and security because he is not one of us, because he is the 'other'? To deprive a woman of the right to her integrity and dignity because she is not one of us, because she is the 'other'? And again to deprive a child of the right to a sheltering roof and the right to food because this child is on the side of the 'other'? . . . Are we not all children of one God? . . .

"How is it then that there is so much violence around us

. . . ? What have we done with the Lord's gift, with his precious inheritance? Have we preferred a peace 'as the world gives'? A peace consisting of the silence of the oppressed, the powerlessness of the vanquished, the humiliation of those individuals and peoples who see their rights trampled upon? . . . Peace on earth is our task, a task for men and women 'of good will.' . . . Each of us is called to follow that path . . . proclaiming the rights of each and all; affirming the dignity of every man and woman of whatever ethnic group, color of skin, or religious denomination; denouncing acts of violence and oppression . . . these are some of the steps which tonight, as heir of Jesus's peace, we commit ourselves to taking."

To convey the seriousness of his intention most forcefully, the pope offered himself as the leader in this commitment. Quoting the opening of the famous prayer by St. Francis, in whose city of Assisi the service occurred, he prayed, "Lord, make me an instrument of your peace."

## Vojvodina fears a Serbian pogrom

by Tibor Kovats

*Dr. Tibor Kovats is a spokesman for an interparliamentary working group, New Europe—Peace through Development, based in Budapest. He is also a leader in the Hungarian Association of Former Political Prisoners. The following article appeared in the Dec. 25, 1992 issue of the French bi-weekly Nouvelle Solidarité and has been translated from the French.*

The war in former Yugoslavia which has grabbed the attention of the world for several months has already caused over 10,000 deaths and a million refugees. But it will not stop there; there are other peoples and other regions which are in a situation analogous to that in Croatia, Slovenia, and Bosnia, and which are at risk of sinking into oblivion, and their problems are neither less important nor less immediate.

This is what is going on in Vojvodina, a region in the north inhabited by Hungarians and Germans, and in Kosova, a region in the south, the majority of whose population is of Albanian origin. These peoples are oppressed and discriminated against, and the Serbs are making a mockery of their fundamental rights.

Let us look at the history of the problem. The region today known by the name of Vojvodina is an artificial creation: It was formed after the First World War by the violent conquest of territories (among them those populated solely by Hungarians), under the pretext of restoring to Serbia those regions