

I turn such prayers to the Muslims, in the name of the merciful and almighty God. In the same way I direct myself and entreat the Croatians, in the name of Jesus Christ crucified and risen again, and in the name of His Mother, the Queen of Peace.

Croatia must take a position

To the degree that the Croatians of Bosnia and Hercegovina are guilty of this confrontation, they are also responsible for all the harm done to Croatia and the Croatian people in the field of international relations and the communications media. Croatia, itself a victim of violence and encumbered by thousands of refugees from Bosnia and Hercegovina, among whom the majority are Muslims, now is herself accused in the bloody clash between Muslims and Croats in Bosnia and Hercegovina. The government of the state of Croatia ought to take a position on this.

Moral law allows a person to defend his life and his rights, but only within the limits of ethical norms. Never is it allowed to commit crimes against the life, the property, the dignity of another person. Thus we condemn every crime, whoever committed it. Whoever commits a crime, makes war on himself and draws upon himself the curse of God.

Therefore I call upon all those responsible, for their conscience and for their children, for their property and for their future, to interrupt the confrontations and prepare their hearts for a just peace.

The cohabitation of Muslims, Serbs, and Croats in Bosnia and Hercegovina is the destiny of this state. Mixing and encounters are inevitable. Not even the provinces in the Vance-Owen plan solve this fundamental question. The solution is found in the conversion of the heart, in the willingness of each conscience, above all that of social and political authorities, such that every man will have the potential to be able to live in total freedom and security in his own house, in his own workplace. With others, even if they are different, we can only live as men in reconciliation, in the faithful acceptance of reciprocal relations, on the basis of the principle of God: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" (Matthew 7:12).

May you who fight each other in this great misadventure, which hurts everyone, fear God Who will judge every thought, word, and act. May the tears of children, of women, and of the elderly move you. May you be shaken by the many houses which were once quiet and are now burned down. May the many innocents who have been killed come before the eyes of your conscience.

I wish the good, peace, and freedom for everyone!

In the name of God I beg and entreat you, decide for the just peace for all! Choose freedom in respect for the rights of each and all. I pray to merciful God that He may enlighten the hearts and minds of all of you such that your option for peace may be sincere, lasting, and blessed!

'Toward a Durable Peace in Europe'

Hungary's efforts to stabilize the region

by Istvan Morvay

The following speech by Istvan Morvay was presented to a Schiller Institute conference, entitled "Toward a Durable Peace in Europe," held in Bonn, Germany on June 4-5. Mr. Morvay is the titular secretary of state, office of refugee and immigration affairs, of the Ministry of the Interior of Hungary. His speech has been translated from Hungarian into German by Tibor Koch, and from German into English by Rick Sanders. See our June 18 and June 25 issues for fuller coverage of the conference.

... I should like to concern myself with two themes. One is the refugee situation in Hungary, which is a consequence of the war in former Yugoslavia, and with which, because of my political work, I have to deal personally, and what Hungary has gone through because of the war in Yugoslavia. The other is the problem we inherited from the period before the system changed, in 1988-89, and in the transition phase toward free democratic elections in 1990. In other words, I conceive of the past three years as a transition phase.

I would like to second in many respects the presentation by Mr. [Zvonimir] Separovic [former foreign minister of Croatia; see his speech to the Schiller Institute conference in *EIR*, June 25, p. 24]. The process that can be seen in the Yugoslavian crisis since 1990, is also proved with us [in Hungary]. We have documented many cases of brutality and those things that Mr. Separovic has told us about. Here I am referring above all to the changing of borders by violence and the "ethnic cleansings," which seem to be approaching a portentous conclusion. We must unfortunately take note that this conclusion is occurring with the tacit agreement of the U.N.

The refugee crisis

We must be prepared for the fact that, after the "ethnic cleansings," the chances for the repatriation of refugees will also disappear. All the hope we had in 1990 that this crisis sooner or later would find an end, and that the refugees who fled to Hungary might be able to return to their homeland, seems to be a thing of the past. Since 1990, there have been 50,000 refugees who have come to Hungary; of them, only some 10,000 have allowed themselves to be registered.

About 3,000 of them still today live in camps. The majority of them are Bosnians, about whom we can closely follow and document the process of ethnic cleansing, i.e., systematic expulsions, which began in 1991.

I was probably the first who made public and emphasized to the world that the tacit agreement of the European countries—which by their mute acceptance of the expulsions are helping Serbian efforts, are indirectly supporting these actions—was untenable. That is a politically unacceptable standpoint. We have thus been successful in effecting, by way of the Refugee Committee of the U.N., unified interna-

I was probably the first who made public and emphasized to the world that the tacit agreement of the European countries—which by their mute acceptance of the expulsions [of non-Serbians] are helping Serbian efforts, are indirectly supporting these actions—was untenable. That is a politically unacceptable standpoint.

tional action against the systematic expulsions. Thus, we have managed to hold this process, in the short or longer term, within bounds. If we had not intervened decisively at that time, events would have taken on such a magnitude that they would have had incalculable results, both for those directly affected by the war, and for those countries that lie further removed. Indeed, it can already be seen today what kinds of tensions are being created even in Germany; and recent events have proved that here also, a kind of closing of the doors to the refugees has begun.

This untenable standpoint threatens the moral foundation of Europe, should we not be able to arrest this process on the territory of the former Yugoslavia. During 1992, this process gained strength and already began to threaten the Hungarian ethnic population in the rest of Yugoslavia—in particular, in Vojvodina. As a result, about 25,000 refugees came to Hungary who did not dare to register with the Hungarian authorities, for fear that registration of any kind might lead to reprisals for their failure to do military service.

We know, and would like to make the world public take note, that if the situation gets worse, we can expect another 50-100,000 refugees in Hungary.

In this respect, I should like to report to you that in the past years, we have carried out a many-sided approach, in

order to promote the possibility of cooperation with neighboring countries with all the means at our disposal. I can say with joy that in Croatia, Slovenia, Austria, Ukraine, later in Russia, Poland, and also in other distant lands, we have found good partners. Our cooperation with the Czechs and the Slovaks has not yet reached the level wished for, but we hope that here also, with time, progress might be made.

This cooperation includes naturally also the domain of migration and the question of refugees. We came in contact first with Croatia, and in the framework of regular talks, we discussed the principal question of jointly putting up refugees.

Our standpoint was that after the end of the conflict, the original ethnic composition would be restored. Our hopes, however, slowly faded. Thus, we must begin the preparations for the settling and integration of the Hungarian refugees who came from Croatia—for many of them no longer have any hope of return, since their villages have already been occupied by Serbian settlers. We have achieved broad cooperation with the U.N. and the U.N. Commission on Refugees, and we pass them all the documents and evidence bearing upon the violation of human rights and political or ethnic rights. Unfortunately, our initiatives have caused no consequential steps on the part of the international organizations. In spite of this, I must note that Hungary is committed to do all in its power to act as a stabilizing factor in a region loaded with tension and plagued with crises and wars. This stability, however, in my view, is very unstable, and I can quite identify with the worries of those who spoke before me here today.

Hungary in transition

Now I would like to turn to my second theme, the problem of the transitional phase of the Hungarian system. I should like to point to the hidden landmines which made the process of change more difficult, for today it is abundantly clear that this change was pre-programmed, not by us, but by our predecessors. The peaceful surrender of power, by the laying of these mines, was made more difficult. Allow me to give you a few examples.

The first was the discrediting, the destruction of the authentic democratic parties, about which my friend, Janos Denes, has also spoken. Infiltrated agents, by creating internal conflicts, using dictatorial means, and pulling in extreme directions, have from within disturbed the process of the transition of power. This intervention was directed above all against the democratic parties of the center, including the Small Business Party, with its 60-year democratic past, and against the social democratic parties. I myself was expelled by dictatorial means from the Small Business Party.

The second landmine was the restrictive monetary policy, which was continued in Hungary after the old regime

had grabbed and looted everything, and in the process amassed \$20 billion in debts. This internal and external indebtedness made all the steps of the new government heavier, and made a truly independent economic decision impossible. No political power in Hungary today can free itself from this pressure. In October of last year, together with my colleagues who had also been expelled from the Small Business Party, I began to found a new party. We tried, all of us, as our duty, to seek ways in which we could free ourselves from these shackles.

The third landmine is the nature of the privatization as it is being effected in Hungary. This privatization had unfortunately already begun under the old system, in a so-called "spontaneous privatization process," when the former regime created for itself, with the words "free-market economy" and through the implementation of free-market economic reforms, the capability of rapidly acquiring state property. A situation was created where the new democratic government would not be able, would not have the power, to pull the plug on the economic transformation toward the free market that was begun by the deposed regime, because they would have to violate the principle of the free market economy. At the time, however, we were already prisoners of this ideology, and the privatization that occurred based on this ideology can no longer be reversed. The best state-owned enterprises ended up in private hands at ridiculous prices, and a process began to be delineated, which other participants here have called a "downward spiral." This "downward spiral" is also taking place in Hungary. The devaluation of all state property, increasing unemployment, corruption gone out of control, and the collapse of production are all symptoms, which are to be seen in Hungary.

National security crisis

Let me mention the fourth landmine, the situation surrounding Hungary's national security: the security vacuum which was brought about by the proclamation of the Antall government and the concomitant dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. After the disappearance of the Soviet "defensive shield," Hungary no longer has the military might sufficient for national defense, and that has brought about a loss of self-confidence and a decline of national pride. That signifies a danger to the security of this region, for it gives courage to all kinds of extremists who would exploit the economic difficulties, who would revive the ethnic tensions that have existed for decades already in this region, exploit them for creating artificial conflicts.

It must be emphasized that not all the countries of the region are involved in this, but there are a few in which one can see that the old system is alive and well. They are characterized by the following: Power is wielded by narrow circles, and abused, and people's misery and ignorance are exploited for base purposes. This situation threatens the Hun-

garian population living just outside our borders, and makes our work extraordinarily difficult.

Whenever we speak of this, we have to explain the peace dictated after the two world wars. We are always confronted with the fact that Hungary was declared one of the "guilty nations," and became a sacrifice to certain bloc-politics of the Great Powers. This must be made clear, and was made clear by the Hungarian government, but our means are very limited. We should not like the arguments to become twisted against us, but there are such efforts. Hence, all we can do is to commit ourselves in favor of the collective rights of all national minorities. That has not yet been recognized by today's European politics. We are, however, firmly convinced that this is the only way that guarantees can be given to the minorities. That is the only possible solution to the problem affecting, in Central Europe, a definitive and enduring stabilization.

Proposals to stabilize Europe

Allow me to lay before this conference, proposals for a resolution:

First, to solve the crisis in Central Europe, the collective rights of national minorities should be recognized with all speed. You know what I am thinking here: the freedom to use the mother tongue, the right to education in the mother tongue, and political rights and the right to vote. Let us take a stand! If you will support us in this, then you do it in the spirit that characterizes the state-to-state agreement between Hungary and Ukraine discussed by Mr. Denes, which, unlike him, I hold to be very positive in many respects. I should also like to reassure our Ukrainian friends: The lack of mention of a changing of borders, even a peaceful one, has admittedly led to internal debate; on the other hand, those parts of the treaty dealing with the human rights of minorities, are independent and serve also for us as an example. Regarding those sections, we should be fortunate, indeed could we conclude such treaties with our other neighbors.

Second, the condemnation of the extreme liberal international materialistic ideology. Let us condemn the spread and application of this ideology! Let us condemn also its appearance in political life!

Third, let us direct an appeal to the democratic parties of the countries of the former communist bloc, which find themselves on the road to changing the system. Let us draw their attention to the responsibility of exercising and guaranteeing political rights, the defense of the right to own property; the significance of continuous self-restraint; shunning the practice of deporting people, and shunning claims to exclusivity in these parties—for these make harmonious the process of democratic transformation. Let us exhort them to continuous renewal, without which our goals—a unified Europe, world peace, and universal development of mankind—are not to be reached.