

The origins of the Balkan war

Croatian journalist and military expert Srecko Jurdana analyzes the war for an audience in Munich, Germany.

The fact that in 1991, at the command of British oligarchical circles who wanted to somehow counteract the collapse of the Berlin Wall, Serbia widened to Bosnia the war it had begun against Croatia, has today become a general tenet of geostrategy. The sad fact that many politicians and many nations tend to lightly pass over this geostrategic fact, does not lessen its historical importance. In the framework of the electoral campaign of the Civil Rights Movement-Solidarity and their Munich chairman, Mrs. Elke Fimmen—whom I personally wholeheartedly politically support and wish an important role for her in German political life—I would like simply to again highlight the fact that the war against Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina is no local war, no product of “centuries-old religious and ethnic quarrels,” as is asserted by many western media and even in serious intellectual circles in Europe and America, and also to briefly comment on Germany’s role in relation to this war.

Lyndon LaRouche, a well-known American intellectual and leader of the Schiller Institute, the international political and cultural organization, predicted at an early date—in 1988—that a war would break out in the Balkans and that this could only be prevented if the policy of the International Monetary Fund, which must be seen as the leading organ of the geostrategic plans of the London oligarchy, were eliminated. Yugoslavia, an unnatural political creation, was created in the Balkan peninsula after World War I in the Versailles Treaty framework. It never had any historical existence before 1918, but was set up as a control mechanism in the Balkans directly controlled from London. In this Yugoslavia, Serbia played a dominant role, launching wars for British and French interests.

Postwar Yugoslavia

The same Yugoslavia disintegrated in 1941 within 24 hours, and in 1945 was set up again from scratch at the zealous instigation of Winston Churchill. Thus, as the war’s victor, London reestablished its Balkan control mechanism on the old Versailles model, with the hegemonic Serbians as the mainstay. Josip Broz Tito was installed as the dictator of the new Yugoslavia. Tito, a hoked-up war legend from the

Bosnian mountains, consistently swept under the rug national injustices, protected the Serbian domination of the country, sentenced Croatians to draconian prison terms, and drove them into massive economic and political emigration. After the breakdown of the Croatian emancipation movement of 1971, the “Croatian Spring,” thousands were sentenced to long prison terms, often only for having expressed an opinion or written a newspaper article, which demanded the implementation of Tito’s slogans about national equality. Tens of thousands of Croats left the country, since they could not find work there. Many of them set up new homes in Germany. Since 1971, the Croatian people have been strewn all over the planet.

Yugoslavia continued its sordid existence until 1991, when it vanished, let us hope forever, in the hell of the war against Croatia. The Croatians were turned into expellees and emigrants, hounded and murdered worldwide by the Yugoslav Secret Police. Certainly these were not the only ones to run afoul of British geostrategy. Lyndon LaRouche experienced this in an especially harsh way. He is today perhaps the first fighter against British imperialism, who because he was able to recognize the neocolonial nature of today’s political process, was imprisoned for five years in an American prison on George Bush’s orders, while fully innocent. A group of LaRouche’s collaborators still remains in prison on no real grounds, some of them facing life sentences.

If we look at events at the end of the last decade, we recognize how the turbulent processes in former Yugoslavia, which finally resulted in the war against Croatia, took place simultaneously with the process of German reunification. When the Berlin Wall fell and it became obvious that the 50-year geostrategic situation in the middle of the European continent was inevitably changing, Serbian Führer Slobodan Milosevic started his so-called “truth meetings” and “anti-bureaucratic revolution.” This led to the destructive, hostile Greater Serbian invasions of Kosova and Vojvodina, and two years later an open war against Croatia. The role of then-American Secretary of State James Baker and former U.S. Ambassador to Belgrade Lawrence Eagleburger in the wid-

ening of the war is known. These two prominent representatives of Kissinger Associates piloted events in Belgrade from behind the scenes. When the Serbs launched the open phase of the war, the Briton Lord Peter Carrington (formerly a director of Kissinger Associates) and ex-U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance were named as international mediators for Yugoslavia. After Carrington and Vance came British Lord David Owen. He joined with British Gen. Michael Rose as the military commanding officer of the U.N. troops in Bosnia.

Great Britain, the puppet-master

It is obvious that from Day One of the struggle Great Britain was pulling all the strings. Its representatives, or people with lifelong ties to the London financial and geopolitical interests, meddled incessantly in the region of the former Yugoslavia. Decisions of peace and war, alliance and enmity, life and death rested in the sovereign hands of Britain. Why? How did Great Britain earn such a power to play God, in deciding issues in which the biological existence of nations is at stake?

I would say: only because those were called upon to resist, preferred to passively accept the prevailing trends and conformism, rather than assume a firm moral stand and take up resistance. It was clear from the outset that in the Balkans, a fascist, genocidal war of aggression was being conducted, which was concocted in the Anglo-Saxon geostrategic laboratories.

This war could have been stopped at once. Instead of complaining to the originators of the war and demanding that they stop propping up the Serbs, all the various international actors have engaged in pseudo-peace-making activities which London was promoting, the practical and political purpose of which was to further expand the war. But under Carrington, Vance, and Owen's leadership the world has not stopped the Serbs. Instead it has punished Croats and forbidden them to carry out the offensive that would have freed them. The United Nations forces brought into Croatia—the so-called Unprofor—guaranteed the Serbian-occupied areas, consolidated the country's partition, and allow the Serbian Army to open up the front in Bosnia.

Instead of supporting the Muslims in Bosnia, against whom the Serbians carried out a frightful genocide in the first phase of the war, the world strangled the victims with an arms embargo, which still remains in place. The world's pseudo-negotiations, this hypocritical "peace preparation" which qualitatively equates victim and killer in order to reward the killer in the final arrangement, will become a weighty memorial to the moral attitude of western civilization at the end of the 20th century.

When the Serbian shells fell on Sarajevo, and massacred ten people a day, French President Francois Mitterrand stated publicly that unfortunately nothing could be done, since the "balance of power does not permit it." What kind of "balance

of power" is it that stands above all moral principles? Doubtless it is the balance of power which former Prime Minister Mrs. Margaret Thatcher described in her memoirs: the balance of power in continental Europe, set up after the Second World War. The Pax Britannica-Americana-Sovietica imposed in 1945, along with the shattering of Germany, also broke up Central Europe as a whole, which traditionally was a single cultural area dominated by German economic influence. The part of Central Europe which stayed outside the Soviet bloc was assured economic prosperity on the principles of modern liberal capitalism. This part, the nation-states, was supposed thereby to remain in the enduring condition of a political dwarf, which can assume minimal influence over its regional situation.

The year 1945 brought on not only the division of Germany—the country which up to then had assured the development of continental Europe—but also a specific division of the traditional German sphere of influence among Central European countries. Some were forced into the Soviet bloc, such as Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, while others, like Slovenia and Croatia, were violently incorporated into Yugoslavia, a geostrategic pawn concocted by London and Paris after World War I.

The European postwar peace hence not only included the separation of Germany but also the dissolution of her entire sphere of interests, in which Croatia with Bosnia perhaps took first place from the geostrategic standpoint. Croatia controlled the Adriatic, linking continental Europe to the Mediterranean area, whereas Bosnia was a cultural bridge to Turkey and the Near East. This entire region, in which Croatia had the status of an independent state in the 1941-45 era, was to be divided after World War II and set up under Serbian administration in the form of Yugoslavia—because this was the ideal way for destroying the entire German geostrategic centrifuge in Europe.

Thatcher vs. Germany

Margaret Thatcher mentions in her memoirs the danger that reunified Germany "would peacefully be able to achieve the continental domination which she had not achieved by war." As we see, for Great Britain *any* form of German economic-political presence outside its boundaries sets off alarm bells of the highest strategic danger, because it is likely to threaten the position of the British Empire, for which she had fought the Balkan wars and two successive world wars (which Britain itself provoked). When the ineluctable reunification of Germany became obvious—since the Gorbachov crowd then ruling Russia could do nothing to oppose it—Mrs. Thatcher featured as her fundamental political task, the "renewal of the anti-fascist coalition of the Second World War," the revived alliance of the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France, which with its unified forces was supposed to stop German reunification and keep continental Europe under the London oligarchy's super-

vision.

Mrs. Thatcher's exertion proved to be pointless and, indeed, unfulfillable. Despite having Bush and Mitterrand as her excellent collaborators, she beat her head against the wall of the changed world situation, where the political models of 1945 no longer fit. It became clear that the reunification of Germany was inevitable.

Even if the direct blow against what London saw as its central danger was not possible, perhaps it could be delivered in the "rimlands of danger." And thus the goal of paralyzing the spread of German influence could be achieved by round-about means. In this context the old London client state of Serbia was activated, with the job of placing the distinctly German partners in the Balkans, Croatia and Bosnia, under its own possession, thus perpetuating British, or Anglo-Russian, supremacy in southeastern Europe and the Adriatic.

This is the primary reason for the war against Croatia and Bosnia, which began openly in 1991 and is still going on. Therein also lies the reason for the British intervention into this war. This is seen in the shameless pressures from such mediators as Vance, Carrington, Owen, and Stoltenberg, and Rose, Akashi and others, who for four years have been working to make sure that the Serbians do not suffer a military defeat. Recently one of Croatian President Franjo Tudjman's chief advisers, Hrvoje Sarinic, said in a leading Croatian daily that Serbia must derive some use from all that has occurred. That is, instead of a "Greater Serbia" to be carved out of the larger part of Croatia and Bosnia, as originally planned, according to Mr. Sarinic a "small Greater Serbia" would be created from somewhat smaller areas of Croatia and Bosnia. It goes without saying that this "minimalism" is being mooted by the closest British confidant in Croatia, and this shows the plan of the present "Contact Group."

The heroic resistance of the Croatian and Muslim people against Serbian aggression has shown Serbia's protectors in East and West that Serbia cannot be the military victor who dictates the peace conditions, as London originally wanted. At this very moment, in which Serbia faces a possible total military defeat, the "Contact Group" is pushing for a general "peace process" and trying to keep something of the original plan: the drastic shrinking in territory of the Bosnian state, the amputation of a part of Croatia, and, on top of all that, the maintenance of the Milosevic regime in Belgrade.

For the designers of the present war it is extraordinarily important that the Serbian regime not be impugned as criminal and fascist and led before an international tribunal, but that it keep the basis of legitimacy. Only in this way can the Serbians be kept on as agents of British interests in the Balkans. That is why there is an alleged conflict between Milosevic and Radovan Karadzic at the level of the "Contact Group." The guilt for all Serbian crimes will be shoved off on Karadzic and his commanding officer, and the Belgrade dictator Milosevic, one of the greatest war criminals of our times, will be given the chance to wash his hands in inno-

cence and build up his image as a "peace maker."

Germany's weak Balkans policy

I promised to speak about the role of German policy in the context which has been described. Unfortunately I must state that present German foreign policy is not adequate to the historical situation nor, if you will, to its moral challenge. It seems to me that Germany is being pushed into the immoral doctrine of "balance of power," about which the old Nazi collaborator Mitterrand speaks, as the criterion of its political posture vis-à-vis the war against Croatia and Bosnia.

It is clear that Great Britain and some other countries today, on purely selfish grounds, want to resurrect and maintain the postwar atmosphere. That means: Germany as an economic giant, but a political dwarf, which may not swerve too much from the Anglo-Saxon orientation. This artificial climate of "victor" and "loser" in World War II—as if the war had ended yesterday and not 50 years ago—is reflected in the Croatian example, where German politicians regularly line up on key questions of policy with the Anglo-Saxon mediators.

One of the major backers of the so-called Vance Plan for bringing Unprofor troops into Croatia, was also, sad to say, Hans-Dietrich Genscher. The former German foreign minister, who earned merit around the recognition of the Croatian state, did not sufficiently draw the right conclusions to oppose the Anglo-Saxon conditions on recognition, according to which Croatia would be split into a Croatian and a Serbian part. In that regard, the statements of the present German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel do not differ in any essential respect from the postures of Great Britain, France, or Russia, countries which see the criminal Serbia as the main custodian of their interests in the Balkans.

Foreign Minister Kinkel was briefly in the Croatian capital, Zagreb, where he gave the Croats a lecture that they should at all costs not get into a new war to free their country. But he neglected to mention by what peaceful means Croatia can be freed. All the "peaceful ways" that the United Nations have imposed on Croatia and Bosnia, have proved to be euphemisms for the political protection of Serbian conquest and the rescue of the Milosevic regime, which may today be the only official national socialist regime in the world.

This sanctimonious "peace" in Croatia and Bosnia is being demanded by actors, who are unable to agree on their own interests and hence at least want to fix in writing the status quo, even at the price of elementary human ethics and Christian morals. This "peace" is only the first phase of a new, even bloodier war with more serious results in the foreseeable future, which will not remain confined to the Balkans. Those who long to feed the Serbian Moloch with territories of Croatia and Bosnia, so that western philistines can sleep peacefully, must, if they even have a scintilla of political responsibility in the face of history, reckon on the consequences of such a "peace."