

have been practiced *in Europe*. The acceptance of these major criminals on European soil by the western European and NATO nations heretofore means that the fundamental community of values which lies at the foundation of the alliance among these nations has been reduced to an absurdity.

General Scherer told Croatian journalists that the political future of the European Community and the Atlantic Alliance will be essentially determined by their attitude toward the war in former Yugoslavia in the next months. The further obligation of the moral and juridical minimal standards of the West are at stake. It has to do with the question of whether an offensive war with hundreds of thousands of mass murders "pays off." A "Nuremberg II" War Crimes Trial must charge the major culprits of the political and military leadership of Serbia, or rather former Yugoslavia, with the following crimes against humanity:

- planning and carrying out of an offensive war;
- planning and carrying out of genocide, or aiding genocide;
- crimes against humanity, especially mass expulsions;
- instigating or abetting countless "standard" war crimes of the Serbian units, such as killing prisoners and noncombatants, torture, and rape;
- causing material losses, which alone must amount to DM 20 billion (\$13.8 billion).

Along with the major Serbian war criminals, the leaders of international politics and diplomacy who encouraged and supported the Serbian offensive war must be brought to judgment. Leading politicians in the former Soviet Union and Russia, in Great Britain, the United States, France, and other European Community states should be indicted for *abetting* the Serbian offensive war/genocide and *failing to provide help* to the Croatian and Bosnian victims of the Serbian aggression. This must be done, if in Europe the fundamental outlines of international law are to remain in effect. The war in former Yugoslavia no longer involves merely "interests" and "sympathies." It involves the core civilizing substance of the European continent.

Distinguished jurists of international law, such as Professor Fastenrath of Cologne and Prof. Friedrich von der Heydte, have already publicly pointed out that the arms embargo decreed by the U.N. Security Council against Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina represents a blatant violation of international law and of the U.N. Charter. This arms embargo against the victims of aggression means the *de facto participation* of the U.N. Security Council in the implementation of the Serbian offensive war/genocide.

General Scherer repeatedly emphasized the pressing necessity that western European and North American nations must lift the arms embargo against Croatia and Bosnia. This is the absolutely necessary first step toward overcoming the unlawful and "indecent" attitude of the West toward Croatia and Bosnia, and at the same time would constitute an effective contribution toward achieving a just peace.

Conference Report

Searching for a peaceful world order

by Kassim Ahmad

Mr. Ahmad, a Malaysian author, writes from Kuala Lumpur.

This is one of those times in history when human society is plunged into darkness and man cries to Heaven for divine succor. This time around, the darkness is universal and the cries are heard everywhere. Under these conditions, it is fitting that in Kuala Lumpur, the capital of a country that during the Cold War era was anti-communist and that during these days of *Pax Americana* has been critical of President Bush's so-called new world order, a seminar was held (Sept. 28-29) to consider "Post-Marxian Political Thought—Toward a Peaceful World Order," organized by the National Language and Literary Agency and the establishment Secretariat for Islamic Philosophy and Science. The meeting brought together some international and local political scientists and scholars, offered five papers and two fora, fully occupying the two days of the seminar, and was officially opened by the fast-rising Islamic politician, now Malaysia's minister of finance, Anwar Ibrahim.

Several Malay writers and academics insisted that the gap to be filled, the empty space on the world's political stage, however, is not just because of the demise of the Soviet bloc and Marxism. It was argued that democratic liberalism, Francis Fukuyama's supposed final socio-political paradigm of human evolution, in fact is crumbling too, as is becoming increasingly clear from the sad state of western societies and their economic systems.

But the dilemma, as was laid out in discussion, is that the non-aligned and Muslim worlds are just as weak, badly divided, and in disarray, lacking the philosophical basis to replace either Marxism or liberalism. Might the Islamic world view emerge as a significant factor in reshaping the world at this juncture? Only if Muslims once again gravitate toward the perception that real power stems from knowledge, one Muslim author opined.

Varied political persuasions

Hardly had the participants, numbering nearly 300, heard the rather disappointing and conservative keynote address by

the American Muslim scholar of journalism Prof. S. Abdullah Schleifer, and the sad but spirited address by Bosnian Muslim professor of sociology Dr. Ismet Grbo, when some of them fell upon the finance minister's too-sure point about the death of Marxism, arguing that the death was that of the Soviet communist system, but not those positive teachings of Marxism that are still relevant to the modern world and that have become part and parcel of modern scholarship. While there was much in Lenin's contribution to Marxism that deserved to die, "his critique of imperialism is not one of them," argued Ali A. Mazrui, a Kenyan-American author.

Regarding the present massacre of the people of Bosnia and what Dr. Grbo bravely termed a war of liberation, castigating "the American betrayal of Bosnian Muslims," there was an atmosphere of gloom and helplessness in the seminar hall. One participant reminded his audience that the Bosnian tragedy was a continuation of the tragedy that has befallen the Muslim world since the Palestinians were robbed of their homeland by the western-imposed colonial settler state of Israel in 1948. It was sad, the participant remarked, that the Muslim and Third World nations, constituting a majority in the United Nations and a majority among the world's populations, could do nothing to prevent the continued perpetration of this monstrous crime plotted by the Anglo-American neo-imperialists to destabilize continental Europe and establish their One World empire.

After getting, on the first day, a heavy dose of apologetics for a "single U.S. superpower supremacy" for an indefinite period, it was refreshing to hear of the declining state of the U.S. and western imperialist-fascist power structure, and various acknowledgments of an emerging new world structure. This was clearly stated in two of the papers and implied in the third.

Dr. Mazrui stated, "As a result of the Islamic triad [the 1979 Iranian revolution, the 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and the 1990-91 Gulf war], the nature of the 21st century has been remarkably altered." He noted, however, that the big question hinges on the outcome of the Gulf war as one of a triad of most momentous Muslim crises.

Malaysian social scientist Khoo Khay Jin cautioned against "the unseemly rush" on the part of too many states in the South to adopt the socio-economic recipes promoted by the North and the international agencies under their influence. "The irony is that at the moment of its alleged triumph, contemporary capitalism is once more in the throes of recession and crisis." He concluded, "The states of the South will have to do the best they can in the present and foreseeable circumstances; one can only hope that they will see beyond developmentalism [either of the classical Adam Smith-Malthus-Ricardo type, or the neo-classical Keynes-Rostow type] and find a way to come together to push for a different world and social order. People . . . must seek to keep alive alternative conceptions and, instead of dividing over labels, should

come together in a spirit of tolerance to seek to clarify the content of the human values . . . and the form of their realization in a world that . . . can no longer simply hope to return to a simpler time nor can it carry on much longer with developmentalism."

The end of history?

The ideologue and apologist for liberal capitalism Francis Fukuyama came in for a hard beating at the seminar. Finance Minister Datuk Seri Anwar Ibrahim, who opened the meeting, recently described Fukuyama's position as "idolization of liberal democracy." Khoo Khay Jin denounced Fukuyama's Hegelian and Nietzschean "sleight of hand and his poor history," and surmised that his book, *The End of History and the Last Man*, would soon be forgotten, as had the more brilliant Daniel Bell's *The End of Ideology*. Fukuyama's position—that for at least the near future, history has come to an end, with the momentous changes in eastern Europe and former Soviet Union—has not gone unchallenged by the Third World and in particular the Islamic world.

Without a doubt, Marxism and liberalism as reigning social philosophies are now spent forces, and a new paradigm shift is taking place in the world. This makes it a historic period in world history. But what the form and content of this new philosophical paradigm are, none of the paper writers and forum discussants would say. In fact, the Malaysian history lecturer Mohamad Abu Bakar, a Muslim fundamentalist ideologically, if ever there was one, dismissed the present Muslim resurgence as too divisive and incoherent to provide the alternative.

The role of Islam

Although the Muslim participants in the seminar were less insistent and sure this time than they were 10 years ago about the role of Islam as the third system (an alternative to the two failed ones of Marxism and liberalism), the belief persists. When a participant pointed out that the current Muslim resurgence lacks a coherent universal philosophy to deal with the problems of the modern world, as it had during the first Arab-Muslim Renaissance from the 7th through the 13th centuries, however, another participant leapt up to assert that Islam was superior to any philosophy and was more than enough for Muslims. Although this is an important lead, no other participant took up this theme, and it was allowed to die in the midst of a searching, groping, diffident, and inconclusive two-day debate.

The theme of the seminar was, perhaps, too vast, the paper writers somewhat limited in their Islamic outlook, and, as very often happens at such seminars, the time very limited for dealing with the subject adequately and coming up with concrete proposals. Nevertheless, it is hoped that enough interest has been aroused for it to be followed by similar discussions, which should be better focused and better intellectually represented internationally and nationally.