

## 'Religious' wars in Mideast next on the bankers' agenda

by Joseph Brewda

With just two days remaining in President George Bush's term of office, American, British, and French warplanes staged their third strike on Iraq in less than a week. The actions were so provocative that the Arab League, which had supported the 1991 war against Iraq, was forced to state that it "rejects" the raid, and "regrets" the escalation; even Saudi Arabia distanced itself from the action, calling for implementing U.N. resolutions regarding Israel's deportations of Palestinians and the Serbian slaughter in Bosnia.

The Anglo-American banking elites have opened up a new phase of a long-term plan to set the entire Islamic world aflame through such incidents. Bloody coups and counter-coups, civil and regional wars, and especially religious conflicts are planned. By pitting the North against the Islamic world, the Anglo-Americans intend to ruin any possible cooperation between continental Europe and Japan, and the Third World.

It might be thought, or hoped, that the incoming Clinton administration might break with the imperial policy associated with Bush, as Iraqi Ambassador to the U.N. Nizar Hamdoun, for one, has expressed it. But for Clinton to change policy would require a war with the same establishment that decided last spring to back him and dump Bush. Moreover, the plan to set the Islamic world aflame was first put into practice under the Democratic Carter administration, and continued under Reagan and then Bush. The architect of the policy, Princeton University professor Bernard Lewis, is a mentor of new Secretary of State Warren Christopher.

Freshly examining this policy a few days prior to Clinton's inauguration, former presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche stated, "There's a plan to get a war going with Islamic fundamentalism internationally." LaRouche report-

ed that as part of preparing for that war, the Anglo-American establishment is actually planning to bring the Islamic fundamentalists into power, through "committing atrocities" as in Bosnia or against the Palestinians, "which will cause the Islamic fundamentalists to come to power because of these European-American atrocities. And then once the fundamentalists come to power, in Egypt, for example," the Anglo-American establishment "can declare that the Islamic fundamentalists are fanatics, and they are an enemy of civilization, and we have to do something about them."

The result of this policy will be "general war against Islamic fundamentalism, ranging from the Philippines and Indonesia, all the way, I suppose, to the United States itself, where the Islamic minorities would come under persecution."

In reviewing the attack on Iraq, LaRouche also noted that it has been motivated by the fact that "it is the only oil-exporting Arab nation . . . which did anything consistently for its people." "The Iraqi people," he went on, "have been increased in population and greatly uplifted in their education level, in their economic conditions, and so forth, under Saddam Hussein. That was simply a policy of plowing back national income into education, health care, investment in industry, agriculture works, and so forth. So this image of an Arab nation which has 'gotten above itself,' didn't keep in its place, didn't stay poor and ignorant; this is something these guys wish to destroy."

### A series of provocations

In order to get this process under way, the Anglo-Americans are everywhere confronting the Arab and Islamic world with atrocities, while at the same time justifying these atrocities in the most outrageous way. For example:



*Lyndon LaRouche, who forecast the Balkans war in 1988, today warns that satanic forces are fomenting conflict between Christians and Muslims.*

● **Iraq.** Iraq has now entered the 30th month of a U.N.-imposed embargo which is killing large numbers of children and elderly daily. Well over 150,000 Iraqis were killed in the 1991 Gulf war. Anglo-American mouthpieces have justified this embargo, and the recent raids, as necessary to “uphold U.N. resolutions and international law,” and to “prevent genocide” by the Iraqis against Kurdish and Shiite minorities in Iraq. Additionally, such spokesmen have claimed that the raids are necessary because Iraq has violated a “no-fly” zone that the United States, Great Britain, and France (not the United Nations) imposed over northern and southern Iraq.

No matter what Iraq does or does not do, the sanctions and other punitive actions will continue. The “allies” have made clear that no honorable compromise, or even dishonorable compromise, will be accepted. Even the Egyptian government and Saudi Arabia have had to distance themselves from the U.S.-led action.

● **Bosnia.** Hundreds of thousands of Bosnian Muslims currently face death over this winter through starvation, the lack of fuel and shelter, and the war. Television images broadcast worldwide leave no doubt that the rape camps and related atrocities carried out by the Serbians are equivalent to the Nazi war crimes that Israel and the West continually evoke, *ad nauseam*, to justify Israeli Nazi-like crimes against Arabs.

Yet a “no-fly” zone which the U.N. declared over Bosnia is not enforced. Serbian planes regularly provide Serbian

units with the ammunition and other supplies to kill all the more. Moreover, the U.N. is enforcing an arms embargo against Bosnia, while not so covertly allowing Serbia to regularly receive arms from Greece, Romania, and, according to some evidence, Israel. Demands for action by various Islamic countries and by the Islamic Organization Conference, have been routinely dismissed by Anglo-American and French spokesmen.

● **Israel.** Four hundred and fifteen Palestinians now sit in the freezing cold in the south of Lebanon, expelled by the Israeli government, without trial and in overt violation of the U.N. Charter, the Geneva Convention, and numerous international laws. Even the U.N. Security Council has been forced to (cosmetically) condemn Israel’s action. Israel continues to defy the U.N. and to claim that U.N. resolutions can have no bearing on its policy. “As you know, the government of Israel sticks to its decisions,” in the words of Foreign Minister Shimon Peres.

Simultaneous with such provocations, western media have repeatedly warned of the dangers of the “Islamic bomb,” while saying nothing of the “Christian,” “Jewish,” or “Hindu” bomb. International Monetary Fund conditionalities have savagely cut the standard of living of virtually every country in the region, and deeper cuts are demanded. The frustrated and embittered Arabs are being pushed and pushed. Saudi and Iranian agents, meanwhile, covertly acting according to the Anglo-Americans’ gameplan, are pre-

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 Vatroslav 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-