

withdraw its support for the talks, and President Clinton should introduce a resolution in the United Nations to lift the arms embargo, which I sincerely believe is still possible if he engages in the process directly and actively.

I feel very strongly that the United States should not or cannot accept the dismemberment of a U.N. nation—a sovereign U.N. nation in Europe even when that dismemberment is being brought about by force, as it is in this case. The talks that are going on in Geneva now that we refer to as peace talks are in fact partition talks or dismemberment talks, and I find that completely unacceptable that a global democratic power could support such a process. It's completely inconsistent with our values as a nation and what we stand for as a democracy.

Q: And what do you feel about Lord Owen and his position?

Mr. Harris: I think that Lord Owen is overly concerned with getting a political settlement now in Bosnia. I think that his—he's made it too high a priority that we reach a settlement. His overarching concern seems to bring this to a—the conflict and the crisis in Bosnia to a quick conclusion, and I think that's completely inappropriate, and in this case, since it's going to lead to a partitioning of a country, it's completely inappropriate.

Q: Your predecessor at the State Department [George Kenney] also resigned. Does this signal that the State Department is in great turmoil over the policies?

Mr. Harris: Well, I don't know that we're in great turmoil, but it's no secret that there is widespread dissent within the department, dating from the Bush administration; Mr. Kenney's resignation a year or so ago is the most obvious manifestation of that.

I'm not going to speak for my colleagues who remain in the department, but I do know that I'm not alone in feeling that we're not doing the right thing, that we're not doing enough in Bosnia.

... My concern here mainly is that the administration, first of all, has treated Bosnia as a footnote in its domestic policy agenda, rather than as a legitimate foreign policy concern. As I say, the partitioning of a European state should be of vital concern to us here. But the administration has lacked the political will to do more. I think that what they've done so far, I could characterize as half-measures, as would be the air strikes that are being contemplated now.

President Clinton has never directly and actively engaged in Bosnia policy. He has written letters to his counterparts. He has discussed the issue, when asked, with the media. But it seems to me, he needs to be far more forceful and assert himself as a leader of the world's superpower, and he should act accordingly. And it seems to me, maybe they're going about things backwards, that if he were to lead, that would bring the American public along, that would bring along the congressmen who are reluctant to do anything, and it could inspire our European allies to do more.

Israel follows Serbia's lead

by Joseph Brewda

One effect of President Bill Clinton's May 22 capitulation to Anglo-French demands that he do nothing to stop Serbia's conquest of Bosnia, has just been felt: the beginnings of a new Israeli war of conquest. Taking its cue from the U.S. non-response to Serbian genocide, on July 24, the Israeli elite ordered the most intense attack on Lebanon since Israel invaded its neighbor in 1982. The attack was suspended temporarily only after the U.S. brokered a ceasefire on July 31.

Dubbed "Operation Accountability," this attack, and future ones, are intended by Israel to seize all of Lebanon south of the Litani River—a decades-long Zionist demand—after driving out the Arabs through war. At the same time, the British and French governments, and elements of Clinton's administration (whether Clinton knows this or not) intend to use a process of alternating wars and ceasefires, to force through a new division of the Mideast. Israel and Syria have long had a secret deal to carve up Lebanon and the region; the new ceasefire may lead to making that deal public.

As always, the pretext for the Israeli land grab is "terrorism"—in this case, some crude rocket attacks by the Iranian-controlled Hezbollah of southern Lebanon. It was under the pretext of curtailing such attacks, that Israel earlier carved out a "security zone" in southern Lebanon. Flaunting its support for Israel, Britain mildly condemned "both sides" for the assault, while the U.N. Security Council refused even to hold an emergency meeting—although the Israeli Army had attacked a U.N. monitoring facility.

Ethnic cleansing

Although U.S. and European news media carried the Israeli line that the bombardment is intended to end Hezbollah terrorism, Israeli military actions have shown that the Lebanese population generally was the actual target—as Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin has admitted.

The toll of the seven-day artillery and air barrage against southern Lebanon has been extremely high: an estimated 300,000-500,000 refugees (about 10% of Lebanon's population) crowded into Beirut; 10,000 homes destroyed, and another 20,000 damaged. Scores of villages came under direct attack; in many, one-third of all buildings are in ruins. Reconstruction costs are expected to exceed \$1 billion, in a country

already ruined by a 17-year Anglo-American-manipulated civil war.

Although artillery fire over the week was extraordinarily intense—at least 30,000 howitzer shells and 1,000 jet-fired rockets were fired—casualties have been relatively small. So far, 128 people are dead, 120 of them civilians. As Israeli state radio has proclaimed, Israel's assault was intended to force the "mass flight" of the civilian population. Driving out some 725,000 Arabs this way allowed Israel to dramatically expand its borders in 1947-48. The purpose of the recent assault is similar.

That this is policy has been proclaimed all over the Israeli media. From the outset, the Israeli government has made clear to its own people that the target is the Lebanese population generally, to be driven out by making southern Lebanon unlivable. It is reported that 93% of Israelis polled support this policy.

"We want to make it unequivocally clear that if there is no quiet here, there will be no quiet for the residents of south Lebanon north of the 'security zone,'" Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin bellowed on Israeli television. "If there is no quiet here [in Israel], there will be such 'unquiet' there that they [the Lebanese] won't be able to live there." Israel Army Chief of Staff Ehud Barak told the press smugly to the press that "people are leaving the villages, and I assume the outflow will be heavier." "Tens of thousands of villagers yesterday understood the unequivocal message Israel sent to them and began fleeing north," the daily *Al Hamishmar* wrote front-page on July 26. "The others, who remain in their homes, may be harmed."

And a new Syrian Deal

Having forced virtually the entire population of the region into flight, Israel agreed to a U.S.-brokered "ceasefire." Although some refugees are now returning, Rabin's continuing threats of future actions, and the massive destruction of homes and infrastructure, will ensure that the Arab population in southern Lebanon remains low.

At the same time, the context has now been created for a dramatic "separate peace" with Syria. U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher arrived in the region on Aug. 2 to meet with Rabin, Syrian President Hafez Assad, and Lebanese Prime Minister Rafik Hariri. The ceasefire had been negotiated through his telephone contact with all three leaders. Suddenly, strangely, Assad is a hero.

"There is no doubt the way in which Assad played his cards in the latest incident strengthened the feeling that there is someone to talk to and something to talk about," gushed Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres on Israeli Army radio on Aug. 2. "Syria has definitely changed in that it's a partner to such an arrangement as this," said Uri Lubrani, the diplomat in charge of the Israel's secret deals with Syria. Even Israeli Chief of Staff General Barak praised Assad as "a very serious and highly responsible leader."

India's government survives challenge

by Ramtanu Maitra

On July 28, the ruling Congress (I) party of India managed to vote down the no-confidence motion brought by the opposition against the government by a slender margin. But the tension and crisis that gripped the ruling party, even on the day of the parliamentary vote, is a testimony to how much India's political institutions have weakened. The victory on the parliamentary floor may turn out to be a short respite for the government, and it remains to be seen whether the episode has jolted it out of the deep slumber it seems to be in.

The core of the no-confidence motion presented before the Lok Sabha, the lower house of parliament, by a strange alliance of communists, Hindu chauvinists, socialists, and others, was focused on the scandals implicating high government officials, including the allegation of a payoff to the prime minister by a stockbroker, and increasing communalism in the Indian polity. While these issues, mostly allegations, are no doubt much discussed in homes and on the streets of India, the government's real problems lie elsewhere. Although corruption and communalism have proven populist appeal, the greater worry that plagues an average Indian is that the nation is now being led by a government which is indecisive, evasive, and utterly vulnerable. All these weaknesses together have made India, a nation of over 850 million people, increasingly insignificant and vulnerable to external pressures in the present unipolar world order.

The promise

The government of Prime Minister Narasimha Rao, which has met with two major calamities in the form of the demolition of the Babri Masjid and a \$1.7 billion securities scam which has tainted officials high and low, was keen to present itself from the very outset of its birth in June 1991 as a government which would change India's economic condition over a period of years through the dismantling of various regulatory measures and by managing money judiciously. Finance Minister Manmohan Singh, who has repeatedly expressed his discontent over India's reliance on aid funds from donor countries during the 1970s and 1980s, was given the difficult task of bringing life back into the Indian economy.

However, two years later, a period which the Finance Ministry claims is too short, the Indian economy looks as vulnerable as ever. India's "begging" from donor countries