

pilgrimage made by all of China's top leaders to the seaside resort of Beidaihe this year. There were a few newspaper references to his birthday; instead, the activities of President Jiang Zemin were prominent on the front pages that day. In addition, his daughter, Xiao Rong, has just published a much-touted biography of Deng, with accounts of his associations with other Communist Party leaders and international figures, which is being distributed throughout China. Publishing such a biography of a living leader is tantamount to sacrilege in Chinese Communist practice. Xiao Rong, during a reception in Hong Kong for the local publication of her book on Sept. 17, made a point of stating that Deng is "in good health and wishes to visit Hong Kong" after China resumes sovereignty in 1997.

Deng is not the only "disappeared"—nothing has been reported of Chen Yun, 90, his most prominent conservative opponent among the "Gang of Ancients," for many months.

China's unity

Whoever is ruling, or attempting to rule China, national unity is of top priority. British strategists have been publishing books predicting the breakup of China for a century, yet Chinese unity has survived the British Empire. Even during the brutal "warlord" period of the 1920s and early 1930s, every warlord of any power at all asserted that it was his mission to unify China; Chiang Kai-shek was only prevented from doing so by the Japanese invasion and 12-year war against the then-Republic of China. The Chinese are closely watching the situation in Russia and the other former East bloc nations, knowledgeable observers report. Since the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. in 1991, internal Chinese papers have focused on how to prevent disintegration in China.

If it was Deng's mission to maintain Chinese unity, however, he has failed. Convinced that the Soviet Communist Party had been too far divorced from both the Army and business interests, Deng took measures attempting to prevent similar developments in China by allowing CP officials to set up businesses. However, rampant corruption among party officials has been so bad that the attempt has backfired, and forced the party to launch a nationwide drive against corruption in an attempt to hold on to power. CP control over the military, the fundamental basis of communist power both before and after the 1949 revolution, has apparently been maintained, Chinese observers state, although it is difficult to tell what will happen in the future.

In the face of Deng's failure, his critics have another proposal. Wang and Hu, who were reportedly both educated at Yale University, call for China to adopt a U.S.-type federal system that would enable the central government to deal with the provinces, and to create a legal framework for handling conflicts of interest between Beijing and the provinces. The provinces should be allowed voting rights and veto power to participate in central government policy, but Beijing should retain final veto power, they proposed.

NATO in Balkans would be a disaster

by Srecko Jurdana

Srecko Jurdana, journalist and military specialist for the two main Croatian daily newspapers, Vecernij List and Slobodna Dalmacija, made the following remarks to EIR's Paolo Raimondi on Sept. 22. Jurdana is known in Croatia for his precise analyses of the geopolitical moves behind Serbia's war of aggression, and for his criticisms of the political and military decisions taken by the government of President Franjo Tudjman since July 1991. See EIR, Feb. 19, 1993, p. 36, and June 25, 1993, p. 27, for some of Jurdana's previous analyses.

The recent military operations in the field in Croatia have demonstrated the weakness of the Serbian army, an army which is poorly motivated, ill-prepared, and structurally weak. They have good weapons and artillery, but they lack people. As I predicted before, they would not have been able to resist a systematic, simultaneous offensive both in Croatia and in Bosnia. And this is also relevant as a proof, because it is clear that a one- or two-week-long air attack from NATO forces, if they had intervened in that way, would have produced the same result. The recent operations [between Serbia and Croatia] were just a half-offensive, just an artillery exchange on an equal basis, and have already produced a total Serbian defeat in two days. Had we been able to continue the operation, also with the deployment of infantry, we would have won back our territories currently occupied by the Serbs—definitely the Knin and Krajina regions, but maybe not eastern Slavonia, directly on the border with Serbia.

But as it has happened before, the U.N. Security Council promptly prevented the Croatians from continuing. All of Serbia's allies put pressure on Croatia, and allowed the Serbs to maintain the occupied territories under the pretext of the Vance plan, which has produced the presence of the Unprofor [U.N. peacekeeping forces] in Croatia—a ridiculous plan which has only protected the Serbs.

Should Croatia obey the U.N.'s orders and retreat? Note the speed with which the 500 Canadian U.N. troops have been sent into Lika: It took only about 24 hours, proving that they can deploy very rapidly when they want to. The French commander of this contingent immediately allowed the Ser-

bian militia to take control of the area abandoned by the Croats. It was only this amazingly quick deployment of the U.N. that saved the Serbs from total defeat. The U.N. does not want Croatia to have legal authority over these areas, nor do they want to have a Croatian national state in the Balkans, because that would make it impossible for the Serbs to establish Greater Serbia. Thus, defeating the Serbs is militarily possible, but the international community continues to protect the Greater Serbia concept, which is based on genocide.

Spreading the conflict into Europe

The second thing I want to speak about, is the replacement of Unprofor with NATO troops. Within the past few days, the Croatian President has urged NATO to take over the Unprofor's tasks, i.e., to allow the refugees to go back to their homes and to create a Croatian juridical system in these territories. But I do not see why NATO should do that, after the U.N. has refused to do it. NATO is a military alliance; this means that the conflict will be brought into NATO states, since in an indirect way the conflict involves a Franco-British entente against Germany. This in turn could mean the direct occupation of Croatia by French and British troops. The U.K. forces are already calling for the outright occupation of the port of Ploce, under the pretext of securing a corridor to supply Bosnian Muslims.

The British military, you must understand, is heavily involved in Bosnia. They are constantly killing Croatian soldiers—about 19 in the past months, the last two in the non-conflict area of Duvno. This is the Owen plan: a NATO occupation of Bosnia to secure a Greater Serbian state; events are going in this direction.

At the present time, it appears that the division of Bosnia is almost inevitable. This is the Owen scenario: first the partition, and second, 50,000 NATO troops to secure the partition—i.e., to secure Greater Serbia; at the same time, a partition of Croatia and a deployment here of 20,000-30,000 NATO troops, which will fix the division of Croatia—i.e., once again, securing Greater Serbia. In other words, about 10 NATO divisions are to be sent into the Balkans to secure the existence and the survival of the Greater Serbian state, which will be the gendarme of the British, the French, and the Russians in the Balkans and in Europe. If NATO enters into this situation, both for Croatia and Bosnia the partition will become irreversible.

The Croatian army is in a position to retake the occupied territories, because Unprofor will not be able to prevent it; but with the NATO troops it will be totally different. The U.N. sees the danger that the Serbs cannot exist by themselves and hold onto the territories given to them by Britain's Lord Peter Carrington; this is why there is a direct military threat against Croatia. Because for political reasons it is not possible to become directly involved on the side of the Serbs, there is tremendous pressure on Croatia, and no one opposes this process on the strategic level.

The vice president of China visited Zagreb recently. This is an indication that the Chinese may see the danger of direct Russian influence in this area, and they may be looking for some counter-action. But so far, Croatia has received only warnings from its allies, saying, "You must accept a peaceful solution." This was also the message brought by China and Germany.

What is the meaning of this "peaceful solution," if it means the partition of Croatia and Bosnia? This is only the rewarding of genocide and the elimination of two independent, sovereign, and internationally recognized states. Time is not on Croatia and Bosnia's side: If the territories are not reconquered in the next few months, then it will be a victory for Greater Serbia.

Unprofor's mandate expires at the end of September. There might perhaps be an agreement to withdraw the U.N. and replace it with NATO; then we will have the Owen plan. The point is: What would the political and military mission be of the NATO troops sent into Croatia: to protect Greater Serbia, or to return the territories occupied to Croatian juridical control? I would be the first to welcome NATO if they are deployed for the survival of Croatia, and not for Greater Serbia. But right now I see NATO as the extension of the Unprofor mission.

British play geopolitics again

Concerning the recent negotiations on the British aircraft carrier *Invincible*, it is humiliating for the Croats to hold discussions on the British ship, and it is repugnant that the Croatian leadership had to accept the measures imposed. You must know that the British consider Croatia and Bosnia to be part of the British sphere of influence. They know what they want, and the story of the aircraft carrier proves it.

Concerning the role of Russia and its relation with Belgrade, they are mainly exerting pressure internationally to lift the sanctions against Serbia. Serbia has come into difficulties, and life under the U.N. sanctions is impossible. It is curious that a quick solution in Bosnia is the precondition for lifting the sanctions, and that it is demanded that Croatia be involved in the game of accepting the division of Bosnia. If Croatia accepts a quick agreement in Bosnia, then Serbia will be freed from the sanctions.

Croatia is being offered a ridiculously small portion of territory in Bosnia: Two-thirds of the Croatian population live outside of the territories offered in the partition deal. Croatia is also being asked to give Adriatic Sea access to the Bosnia Muslims and to the Serbs. At the same time, Croatia is being prevented from liberating its own territories. This is a ridiculous position. The only sensible objective for Croatia would be to *delay* the partition of Bosnia and to completely withdraw from the negotiations, as I already suggested several months ago. Unfortunately, the Croatian government was not clever enough to follow this recommendation, and we are now in a mess.