

mysteriously in the last days after the coming of the Messiah.

But the fundamentalists try to accelerate this event by human means. It is something that Judaism would define as un-kosher, impure. Thus these are heretics, very powerful heretics. One could quote against them the prophet Isaiah when he assaults those who want to accelerate the coming of the Lord by human means: They will fall suddenly like a cracked wall. For the Christians and the Catholics in particular, this would be an incomparable blasphemy. This is what the Gospel calls the "abomination of the desolation." In the Gospel this is an allusion to the "coming of the Antichrist" who is introduced into the world through a sacrilegious act of immense relevance, because it is the fundamental act of the three monotheistic religions that is performed in an evil way for an aim of power instead of religious piety.

And these fundamentalists are doing this using exactly that rock where Abraham was going to sacrifice his son, that rock that could be the symbol of the concord among the three monotheistic religions. They are transforming it into the rock of scandal.

EIR: What do you think about the statements by the vice president of the European Parliament, Roberto Formigoni, that the life of the Pope has been threatened?

Blondet: Formigoni spoke of threats and insults expressed privately. The life of the Pope has been already threatened. There are enemies of the Pope who would be ready to kill him. I must say that these revelations of Formigoni came after a very violent campaign against the Pope launched by leaders of the Italian Jewish community. As soon as the Pope began talking against the war, which is his duty as well as his right, these characters began in an artificial and artful way to press the demand that the Church recognize Israel. Now how the two things are connected, we can only guess. This reminded me of the campaign launched indirectly against the Pope and directly against the Polish Church two years ago, when U.S. rabbis orchestrated the scandal in the former Auschwitz concentration camp, to the point of accusing Cardinal Glemp of anti-Semitism! This is difficult to understand, because in Auschwitz more Catholics died than Jews. It is unclear why this was done, except to create troubles for the Catholic and nationalist faction of Solidarnosc and to favor instead the so-called secular, radical wing.

In this story there are too many things which are incomprehensible. The U.S.A. is waging a war that if anything, Israel should have waged with all the risks involved, so as to neutralize a country that could be a danger only for Israel. The Pope is being abused and threatened because he calls for peace. According to some sources these threats are coming both from Jewish circles and from very high U.S. circles. A conspiracy? A sort of conspiracy to implement the new world order, of which we see the alarming effects exactly with this war?

World outrage at conduct of Gulf war

The following is a sampling of some of the international statements of opposition to the genocidal Persian Gulf war.

Europe

The Vatican daily Osservatore Romano, Feb. 26:

The heroism of making peace . . . [is] more demanding than the courage to make war. . . . It is true, the way of negotiations is more difficult than the way of weapons: The path of peace appears less full of glory, but substantially more heroic and effective than the way of war. History teaches that the footsteps of the builders of peace are lasting and clear, also because they are few; the footsteps of the builders of war are many and confused among themselves. . . . [Today] the pride of power has prevailed over compassion for man and for the helpless civilian populations. Now we all live between the memory of the days of hope and the concreteness of all the terror to come.

Jean-Louis Dufour, in the French newspaper Libération, Feb. 27:

The considerable weakness of the Iraqi Army could not be admitted. It was absolutely necessary to prevent the world from recognizing the fantastic disproportion between the most powerful coalition ever put together since the Second World War and the army of a developing country whose population is only equal to two-thirds of Yugoslavia's and whose GNP hardly amounts to one-thirtieth of France's.

Appeal by a faction of the French Socialist Party in Paris, associated with former Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevènement, issued Feb. 20:

We don't believe that massive bombings of cities or bloody battles will in any way bring democracy to the Iraqis. We do not believe that in the Near and Middle East . . . a war in which Westerners intervene, under the pretext of law, alongside dictators, to topple another dictator, can create favorable conditions for a just and global peace. We must reject the extreme hardline policy of the Bush administration.

Edward Pearce, in the London Guardian, Feb. 27:

There is no glory to be recorded there. How do we describe the unmenaced mowing of men like grass? . . . The conquest of Iraq, following smaller excursions like Grenada and Panama, intimates an America, trammelled by neither home politics nor by Soviet counterweight, seeking interna-

tional command authority. This action will have successors. The arrogance of the power-worshipping men in outer offices will look for, and find, fulfillment.

[The Third World] hears Mr. Bush's Presbyterian whimper of good intent with a derisive snarl. The Americans can of course live down such scorn. Such people have no resources, no B-52s and no precision sights for constructive dialogue. Their scorn is largely returned in a U.S. where shots are called by Perles and swine. But the Third World knows that America struck at Saddam through conscript soldiers, water and sewage supplies, and also civilians in the way.

America is triumphant and we run behind her, but America is broke and extended in countries where she is candidly abominated. Mr. Bush may feel a warlord-like Churchill but he is entering fearful toils, toils which could leave him looking like the least, most calamitous of Presidents, Millard Fillmore in spurs.

Canada

The Toronto daily Globe and Mail, Feb. 25:

Overwhelming, undeniable, grind-it-in-your-face triumph is what the White House wants and is the goal it has set for the U.S.-led ground attack that began at 8 p.m. EST on Saturday.

Iraq's acceptance of its defeat, implicit in Baghdad's agreement to leave Kuwait under terms negotiated with the Soviet Union, was not enough for a United States determined to ensure that Saddam Hussein loses all credibility as a pan-Arab figure. . . .

Officially, the administration was still clinging yesterday to its position that an Iraqi wave of terror in Kuwait and the burning of that nation's oil wells forced the land war. . . .

How far beyond the United Nations resolutions the United States intends to press is still unclear.

Africa and the Middle East

Iranian Speaker of Parliament Mehdi Karrubi, Feb. 24, while on a trip to Pakistan:

The consequences and the anger aroused among the Muslim people of the region and the Iraqi people will give more incentive to struggle against the United States, and the crisis will become more complicated. . . . Now that the ground war has been launched, the human and material resources of the region are badly disposed, but we are going to defend Iranian territory and our revolution.

Rami Khoury of the Jordan Times, heard on BBC Feb. 24:

I was intrigued to hear Henry Kissinger a few minutes ago talking about the destruction of the military force of Iraq. . . . The point is that the Iraqis were getting out of Kuwait on Aug. 4 and Aug. 5, and only when the Americans and the British brought the troops in, did we shift into this total confrontation. . . . When the Americans and the British put on their Rambo hats and their Lawrence of Arabia gear and

came into this area, we moved into this awful confrontation between the West and the Arabs. It was totally unnecessary; it will be extremely destructive; it will now exacerbate and accelerate.

Algérie Républicain, an Algerian daily, Feb. 24:

History will retain the name of Bush as it has that of Hitler.

Appeal by Iraqi scientists, writers, artists, and professionals living in the United States and Europe, in particular, Feb. 27, published in the London Guardian:

[We are] astounded and shocked by the savage and brutal destruction of our country and the killing of helpless civilians, including women and children, on a scale never witnessed before except during the invasion of Genghis Khan in the Middle Ages. The air sorties against Iraq exceeded 100,000. Bombs ten times the size of the Hiroshima nuclear bomb were dropped on a small country of no more than 18 million people.

Our agony for the shocking devastation of our beloved country and its people is heightened, as we see the countries that we have lived and worked in and for which we had respect, based on what we thought was their sense of civilized human values, participating in this awesome act. This agony makes us feel the ugly irony seen in justifying the aggression on Iraq because its government violated all these laws combined, with the press boasting that Iraq has been bombed out of the 20th century. Moreover, the war which was based on the U.N. Security Council resolutions threatens to wipe out, ironically too, a country which is a member of the U.N. . . .

The destruction directed against Iraq not only threatens, irreplaceably, priceless landmarks in the history of mankind, but also the opportunities of its present and future. It threatens the historic developments which started in Eastern Europe and which revived our aspirations for getting similar opportunities for peace and democracy in our country and the whole of the Middle East. Such destruction is also directed against a new just order, which humanity hopes will make the world a better and more humane place to live in by the turn of the century.

We demand an immediate halt to all military operations whose method and those conducting it confirm the opinion of several prominent Western figures, that it is a manifestation of a "new imperialist" order. We also call upon United Nations agencies, other humanitarian organizations and world opinion, to shoulder their responsibilities in organizing a worldwide campaign to supply the Iraqi people with medical and food aid to stop the spread of epidemics and unnecessary loss of life.

Algérie Actualités, Feb. 7-13:

Nobody truly appreciated the consequences of the collapse of the Warsaw Pact. . . . Trained by habit to think in

terms of balance of forces, the world only considered that the Malta order which replaced that of Yalta . . . was of a more humanized nature, but functioning according to the same principles: the balance of power. False! It is a fundamental imbalance that we see at this point. . . . The lovers of détente imagined that the Malta order would allow the international community to play a new role, driven by a Security Council, itself led by an American-Soviet duumvirate. The error is tragic. The Security Council is no longer anything but an apparatus in charge of giving a sort of “impri-matur” to the imperial decision, that of the United States. To the equilibrium of Yalta succeeds only the present imbalance, with the United States and only it at the front of the scene. It is the Korean script, with the enormous difference that in the beginning of the '50s, the united socialist world was at the height of its power. Today the U.S.A. bombards Iraq with all the more impunity since it does so in the name of a U.N. resolution. . . . America accuses Iraq of being a dictatorship. . . . The question is, who, Iraq or the U.S.A., is imposing a dictatorship? . . .

The Third World can no longer procrastinate. It has to transcend the spirit of Yalta. Non-alignment was never understood by the founding fathers as a simple political or strategic equidistance from the two camps of that era, but rather as the least painful way of avoiding their influence. It was a tool for emancipation and an instrument for the independence of our peoples. That same reasoning must be applied today: How, by reorganizing ourselves, can we avoid the diktats of unilateral decision? What Iraq does goes geographically and historically beyond the geographical area of that country. That confrontation is the anticipation of the world of tomorrow . . . either Egyptianization, or death. The nature of the fight within and against the Arab world is the concentrated concept of the international relations that await us. Iraq would have been attacked whether or not it had annexed Kuwait. . . . The new “non-alignment” must exist and define itself against alignment with the New Washington Empire. . . . One of the first attempts must be, in the heat of the action, to revive Iraq by exerting the strongest possible pressure so that the U.S.A. stops its genocidal war against that country. In its own way, Iraq showed the way and nobody can speak against them the slightest criticism for having paid a heavy toll. They have shown the way to others. Others have now to find the right method.

Ibero-America

Mexican daily El Sol, Feb. 25:

[The U.S. purpose is] to eliminate Saddam Hussein at all cost; to devastate all of Iraq; and, finally, to impose new conditions not only upon that region, but to write new rules of the game regarding oil control and supply. Whoever says different is either ingenuous or playing the part, and doing so very well. The world is moving toward a new international order that should fill one with terror.

Mexican daily El Día:

Today it is equally clear that the end of the East-West confrontation was not the beginning of peaceful coexistence, but the point of departure for wars of domination launched by the highly industrialized countries, who make up the multinational force, against countries of the South, to seize their natural resources—whether it be the Isthmus of Panama, or the oil of Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia—and to extinguish any attempt at rebellion or self-determination by the peoples of the Third World.

Montalvo Segui, in the Mexican daily Ocho Columnas, from Guadalajara, Jalisco, Feb. 14:

In the West, the religion of ecology more vigorously defends the lives of animals than of humans. . . . Is the life of a whale worth more than the life of a human being? This antinomy is false, but it dramatizes the distortion of values of the “New International Order” whose advocates mourn over the oil spillage in the Persian Gulf, but say nothing about the ongoing genocide the U.S. is carrying out against the Iraqi people. . . .

The U.S. and Great Britain—plus Israel—never wanted peace; the supposed negotiations to obtain Iraq’s withdrawal from Kuwait were in truth nothing but the stall tactics necessary to win time—as has been acknowledged—to mount its destructive machine in Saudi Arabia and to prepare for launching their attacks against Iraq. This fact, together with other evidence embarrassing to the Wise Men of the West, reveals that they never wanted peace and that Bush always wanted war to destroy Iraq and defend Israel. . . .

Is the life of a cormorant worth more than that of an innocent Iraqi child?

Rafael Poleo, editor of the Venezuelan daily El Nuevo País, writes Feb. 25 about the vulnerability of Venezuela’s oil wealth:

The worst thing is that after Iraq and Kuwait, Bush will come for us.

Héctor Cornejo Chávez, a Peruvian Christian Democrat, in a commentary in the Lima daily La República Feb. 24, headlined “With the defeat of Saddam, has the policy of the ‘Big Stick’ returned?” :

Once upon a time someone suggested—more in jest than seriously—that whenever a war breaks out somewhere between two small countries and the U.N. intervenes, the war ends; if the conflict involves a powerful country versus a weak one and the U.N. intervenes, the weak country disappears; and when the war is unleashed between two powerful states and the U.N. intervenes, the U.N. disappears. In light of what is currently going on in the Middle East, the picture would have to be completed—more seriously than in jest—with a fourth hypothesis: When the only superpower in the world confronts a medium-sized state and the U.N.

intervenes, the middle state is crushed and the U.N. is cast aside. . . .

A serious question is raised before the entire world: What will be the role of the U.N. from now on, and what the role of the U.S. . . . ? Following the lesson dealt to Saddam Hussein, and without a political, financial, and military counterweight to that of the United States, what awaits the rest of the countries—at least those of the Third World? Perhaps a new, large, and improved edition of the old policy of the “Big Stick” from the Theodore Roosevelt era.

Carlos A. Romero, in the Colombian daily *La Prensa* of Feb. 21:

The United Nations has lost its objective of mediating to prevent wars and guarantee peace throughout the planet. Its direction has been dangerously distorted and altered. . . . What happened [in the Gulf] was a race orchestrated by secret diplomacy and by impositions intended to give legal foundation to an interventionist war bearing the label or letterhead of the international organization, but which in reality did nothing more than cover for the role of international gendarme assumed by the United States after the depolarization resulting from the crumbling of the socialist camp. . . . It is strange and extravagant that after such a deployment of bombs, which have caused tens of thousands of deaths and the destruction of civilian objectives, including milk factories and shelters for the unarmed population, the United Nations Organization remains immobile.

Asia

Vietnam's Quan Doi Nhan Dan, Feb. 23:

Heedless of Iraq's positive response and the diplomatic moves by the Soviet Union and other countries, the U.S. launched a large-scale ground attack, trampling upon and brutally eliminating a very practical and rare chance to resolve the conflict through a peaceful solution. . . . Contrary to their much-publicized argument that the objective of the Gulf war is to serve a noble cause . . . the U.S. ruling circles simply want to destroy Iraq, eliminate the Hussein administration, and reestablish the order in the Gulf and the Mideast under tight U.S. control. . . . This U.S. type of big power-initiated war maneuver has clearly laid bare the warmongering nature of the ruling circles in Washington. More than a month ago people could be tricked into believing that the United States was helping to liberate Kuwait out of generosity. Now, people have clearly seen through the real motive behind the U.S. decision to initiate this cruel and selfish war.

Malaysian Prime Minister Dr. Mahathir Mohamed, Feb. 19, at a press conference, as reported by *Kuala Lumpur Domestic Service*:

The United States and the allied forces seem content on totally destroying Iraq, Dr. Mahathir said. He questioned the contrast in the reactions of the world and the United States

to the Israeli occupation of southern Lebanon and the West Bank of Jordan to that of Iraq over Kuwait. He said when Iraq attacked Kuwait, the world and the U.N. reacted strongly by sending forces, but such reaction was absent when Israel invaded southern Lebanon and the West Bank of Jordan.

Meera Nanda, in the *Times of India*, Feb. 27:

Ever since the Berlin Wall fell, the U.S. defense establishment has been frantically searching for a new enemy. . . . The forces of nationalism, militant religious ideologies and sophisticated weapons some Third World countries have obtained are now being presented as “clear and present” danger to Western countries' access to natural resources, trade routes and assets. . . . To make the matter for protection appear urgent, Third World dictators unfriendly to the U.S. like Colonel Qaddafi, General Noriega, and now Mr. Saddam Hussein have been demonized beyond recognition. The spread of ballistic missiles and other sophisticated arms to Third World countries has, in the past two years, been made the centerpiece of its planning by the Pentagon.

Seoul Sinmun, a Korean daily, Feb. 18:

The United States has made clear that the nations which were negligent in cooperating with them during the Gulf war may now suffer disadvantages in the field of trade. . . . we can hardly say that our position will be advantageous.

Derivative Assassination: Who Killed Indira Gandhi?

by the Editors of
Executive
Intelligence
Review

Order from:
**Ben Franklin
Booksellers, Inc.**
27 South King St.
Leesburg, VA 22075

\$4.95 plus shipping (\$1.50 for first book, \$.50 for each additional book). Bulk rates available.

