

obtain his goal by force. But whoever wants full security without any risk to his soldiers, has not understood what is at issue here. I.e., this is the full risk born by Bosnia-Herzegovina, and therewith its end. At the same time, it can have undeniable consequences for world peace. It is war, a horrible war, which is why one sends soldiers, not the Technische Hilfswerk [Germany's equivalent of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers].

Logistical support of all operations in Bosnia-Herzegovina would be considerably easier than in the Gulf war. NATO, with all of its bases, is right at the door. In case of military intervention, the blue helmets will be best protected if they are reinforced. Only weakness is vulnerable. But they are also fully capable of effectively defending themselves now. The testimony of military commanders on the ground confirms this. It is a sure thing, that, given the current mission of U.N. forces, their hands are tied. They do not represent effective protection now. From the beginning of their deployment, they have not been able to fulfill their actual mission. That is why their commander, General [Francis] Briquemont, recently gave up out of disappointment.

It is certain that U.N. troops will have to remain in the country for an extended time in order to control and secure the implementation of just results of the negotiations following the success of a military intervention. But their number can be limited if the balance between Serbs, Croats, and Bosnians is guaranteed. It is not possible to predict how long this will take; but in the cases of Korea and Cyprus, that did not represent an obstacle. The goal at stake completely justifies such a deployment. Prolongation of the war, in any case, would not enable the contingents already there to return, it would only prolong the agony of complete failure.

Not too late to save dignity and lives

The later effective military actions are effected, the higher will be the price for all concerned. For those dead, tortured, made refugees, raped, it is already too late. But for the life and the dignity of many, and also for the salvation of moral and political rationality, it does not yet seem to be too late. Europe will also be destroyed in Bosnia-Herzegovina, by its own complicity.

The pursuit of nationalist political interests by some NATO countries, especially England and France, the pretext of having to contain other political influences (chiefly the Germans), is, in view of the misery we have to stop, absurd and cynical. This implies not only an amoral policy as in the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th century: It is also extremely damaging to the reputation and credibility of the countries in question. The policy pursued by the West, and also by Russia, up to now, has not only been a failure, it has made a new holocaust possible. Stopping this by means of resolute military aid is legitimate, possible, and promises to be successful.

Vatican-Israel accord sparks controversy

by Muriel Mirak-Weissbach

The agreement reached at year's end between the Vatican and the state of Israel, laying the foundation for full diplomatic relations, raised questions, and in some cases, violent criticism, from spokesmen of different faiths. The first question regards religion. Among the non-Catholic churches, the Coptic Church of Egypt was most outspoken in denouncing the step taken by the Holy See. Vatican representative in Jordan Msgr. Raouf Najjar told *EIR*, in an interview published on Feb. 18, that the Copts' reaction was based on a misunderstanding, that the Vatican has reneged on certain theological points which distinguish Christianity from Judaism. It was reported that the Coptic Church had interpreted the agreement to mean that Rome shared the Jews' rejection of Christ as Messiah. Clearly, this was not the case; indeed no theological issues entered into the negotiations. The Israeli-Vatican declaration of principles was drawn up between the Holy See and the state of Israel, not between Christianity and Judaism. Statements issued by Vatican spokesmen, among them Monsignor Najjar, clarified as well that the Holy See was acting in the name of the Catholic Church, and not of other Christian communities.

The non-theological nature of the agreement was underscored in February, when the Holy See rejected the proposal made by the Israeli state, that Rabbi David Rosen be accredited as first Israeli ambassador to Rome. According to the *Catholic World Report*, the decision reflected Rome's preference for career diplomats over clergy. "Apparently, the Vatican feels it does not want to confuse domains," Rosen is quoted as commenting in the Israeli press. "It wants to deal with an Israeli technocrat, not with a spiritual representative of the Jewish people." Archbishop Andrea Cordera Lanza di Montezemolo, the apostolic delegate in Jerusalem and Palestine, denied, however, that the Vatican had rejected Rosen because he is a rabbi. More probably, Rosen received no welcome because he is the director of Interfaith relations for the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), an organization the Holy See apparently does not want to confuse with the state of Israel.

The issue of Jerusalem

More vociferous criticism was voiced in the political realm. At the center of controversy is the status of Jerusalem.

Israel conquered and occupied the eastern Arab quarter in 1967 and demands recognition of Jerusalem as its national capital. Thus, some read into the Vatican's agreement with Israel a capitulation to this claim based on military occupation. Spokesmen for the Holy See clarified that this was not the case. Monsignor Najjar said, "There could be no question of attempting to negotiate the political status of Jerusalem in this agreement." The Vatican's position, he said, "remains unchanged. Entering into an agreement with Israel does not imply admitting its claims to Jerusalem, or occupied territories and security zones."

Jerusalem, according to the agreement signed in September 1993 between Israel and the PLO, put the question of Jerusalem on the back burner, to be dealt with in the course of future negotiations. Concerned about the possible implications of the Holy See's new relations to Israel, the PLO sent a delegation to Rome. On Jan. 17, the PLO delegation met with the secretary of state of the Vatican, Cardinal Angelo Sodano. Following that meeting, Mohammad Zuhdi Nashashibi issued a statement, approved by the minister: "I can confirm that the attitude of the Vatican toward Jerusalem did not change and remains as it has been declared on several occasions. Also the minister of foreign affairs of the Vatican reiterated during our meeting the full support of the Vatican to the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people including their right to self-determination and their right to return to their homeland." In his interview with *EIR*, Monsignor Najjar further specified that, by establishing diplomatic relations with Israel, the Holy See would be in a position to participate actively in the peace negotiations, and to lend further support to the Palestinian position.

Sovereignty over Jerusalem remains the most heated point of debate. Until 1988, Jordan had exerted sovereignty over East Jerusalem, but in that year, it relinquished political responsibility for the West Bank, acknowledging the PLO's jurisdiction. In a speech a few months ago, His Majesty King Hussein issued a statement which departed from earlier assumptions contesting Israeli sovereignty. He spoke of God as being the "only sovereign" over the city. Since then, proposals have been floated for a form of joint sovereignty, which would allow Israel and the future Palestinian state—or a Palestinian-Jordanian confederation—to hold parts of the city as their capitals, within an undivided city. The primary concern of the Vatican, which has been reiterated in the context of the deal with Israel, is that international guarantees be established to protect the holy places, ensuring freedom of access and respect for the rights of the many religious communities there. Currently, the city's religious communities are ruled according to time-honored agreements among the different confessions. In the Christian quarter, this includes the Latin Patriarchate, the Orthodox, the Copts, and the Armenians; in the Muslim quarter, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan has exercised authority over religious matters through a religious council.

Documentation

The "fundamental agreement between the Holy See and the state of Israel" acknowledges the "unique nature of the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people, and of the historic process of reconciliation and growth in mutual understanding and friendship between Catholics and Jews." It continues:

The Holy See and the state of Israel are committed to appropriate cooperation in combatting all forms of anti-Semitism and all kinds of racism and of religious intolerance, and in promoting mutual understanding among nations, tolerance among communities and respect for human life and dignity.

The Holy See takes this occasion to reiterate its condemnation of hatred, persecution, and all other manifestations of anti-Semitism directed against the Jewish people and individual Jews anywhere, anytime, and by anyone. In particular, the Holy See deplors attacks on Jews and desecration of Jewish synagogues and cemeteries, acts which offend the memory of the victims of the holocaust, especially when they occur in the same places which witnessed it.

The state of Israel agrees with the Holy See on the obligation of continuing respect for and protection of the character proper to Catholic sacred places, such as churches, monasteries, convents, cemeteries, and their like.

The Holy See and the state of Israel recognize that both have an interest in favoring Christian pilgrimages to the Holy Land.

The Holy See and the state of Israel will negotiate in good faith a comprehensive agreement, containing solutions acceptable to both parties, on unclear, unsettled, and disputed issues, concerning property, economic, and fiscal matters relating to the Catholic Church generally, or to specific Catholic communities or institutions.

Following the entry into force and immediately upon the beginning of the implementation of the present fundamental agreement, the Holy See and the state of Israel will establish full diplomatic relations at the level of apostolic nunciature, on the part of the Holy See and embassy, on the part of the state of Israel. . . .

As to whether or not this agreement will clear the way for a visit by the pope to Israel and Jerusalem, one can only answer that it is bound to improve chances for such a trip. The Holy Father has repeatedly expressed his desire to come as a pilgrim of peace to the Middle East. A papal visit to Lebanon during the celebration of the Synod of the Catholic Church in Lebanon is already planned for 1994. But to date, there are no specific plans or possible dates for a visit by the pope to the Holy Land.