

## Lord Carrington's Yugoslav peace conference is a fraud

by Konstantin George

A so-called international peace conference on Yugoslavia opened on Sept. 7 under the auspices of the European Community (EC), in the Netherlands' capital of The Hague. The "peace conference" is chaired by Britain's Peter Lord Carrington, a former British foreign secretary and secretary general of NATO. It came into being as the result of an Anglo-French power play, which, instead of bringing an honorable peace, will commence a months-long process whereby the Serbian war against Croatia will continue. During that time, a fraudulent "compromise accord," drafted by Anglo-French interests, with American backing, will sanction a partition of what had been Yugoslavia, with the internal borders redrawn, truncating the republics of Croatia and Bosnia, to the territorial advantage of a "Greater Serbia."

The "peace conference" is an ugly turning point, reflecting the failure of the EC, because of Anglo-French sabotage, to take decisive steps to end the war on the territory of Croatia. These steps ought to have been: 1) immediate recognition of the independence and territorial integrity of Slovenia and Croatia, based on the inter-republic borders; 2) immediate resumption of trade and economic aid to Slovenia and Croatia, while enforcing a strict embargo against Serbia, until Serbian forces depart from Croatian territory; 3) extension of the EC embargo to any country that aids Serbia; 4) defensive military assistance to Slovenia and Croatia (Germany was moving in this direction, and in fact was on the verge of recognizing the independence of Slovenia and Croatia). Furthermore, as the Schiller Institute emphasized in a statement on Aug. 28, a program of economic assistance to Croatia and Serbia should be undertaken, integrating them into the rest of continental Europe, in the context of Lyndon LaRouche's "Productive Triangle" proposal for high-tech-

nology infrastructure and industry.

Trapped by the absurd rules of first forging an "consensus" on Yugoslavia—which means adapting to the policies of Britain—the EC policy to date, even before the "peace conference" was embarked upon, has been a series of disasters, the sort which inevitably flow from the false axioms of "consensus" politics.

The first and legally decisive false axiom is the fraudulent term "Yugoslav civil war," which maintains the fiction of a nonexistent Yugoslavia, or, otherwise, the "war between Serbia and Croatia," placing both parties on an equal footing. There is no "equal footing." The EC has adopted a de facto embargo in all trade and economic relations with "Yugoslavia." In real terms, this is, whatever the intentions, an embargo against Slovenia and Croatia, the two republics with which EC nations have always conducted the overwhelming portion of their business. Thus, a policy labeled as "fair play" has exclusively benefited the aggressor, the Serbian communist regime of Slobodan Milosevic (see box, page 43).

Serbia has already effectively annexed about 25% of the territory of Croatia. The offensive has had two overall aims: the gaining of territory and the mass expulsion of Croats from the zones conquered. The main aim of the daily shelling of Croatian cities, towns, and villages is not to kill on a mass scale, though about 1,000 Croats have been killed in two months of fighting. The main Serbian aim is to create an uninhabitable zone of war devastation which the Croatian population is forced to vacate. This is a pogrom war in which for every Croat killed, at least 100 are forced to become refugees. By Sept. 10, well over 100,000 displaced Croats had been forced to flee their homes.

## Is European Community becoming superfluous?

*This statement was issued by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, president of the Schiller Institute in Germany, on Sept. 9.*

As expected, the extraordinary conference of the EC on the crisis in the former Yugoslavia, has produced less than nothing. While Croatian villagers too old and weak to run away continue to be bestially murdered by the Serbs, the EC has again proved itself completely useless vis-à-vis this war being played out in the middle of Europe. The very idea that this conference, in the face of the catastrophe in Croatia, might be dragged out over half a year, is the absolute height of absurdity.

When in the face of a fundamental crisis—and this war is precisely that—institutions prove themselves completely incapable of responding in an adequate way, but instead stage trivial discussions, then these institutions will not long survive. When Lord Carrington, no less, thinks that he can play the role of “honest broker,” when we should be putting a stop to bestial genocide occurring right in front of our eyes, then we have to ask ourselves,

what is really behind all this?

If the EC as an institution, and the governments that support it, again let themselves be made into fools, the laughing-stock of their own peoples, then they put their own existence into question. Why should our taxes support a huge bureaucracy which does nothing? And why should we elect governments that, in the face of the aggression of inhuman tyrannies, do nothing?

The EC were well advised to remember, that it was the total incapacity of the League of Nations to react to the crisis of Ethiopia which brought about its discrediting, and the widespread opinion that its representatives were no more than a heap of fools. Clearly the EC, faced with a crisis of incomparably greater import, runs the same danger.

Close at hand lies the suspicion that this is precisely the aim of those sabotaging decisive action by the EC. The intent of the Anglo-American opponents of the idea of European unity is very clearly to make the EC into a laughing-stock, precisely because they fear the positive potential for all of Europe implicit in the current historic situation. It is high time that we draw the consequences from this. The immediate recognition and adequate defense of Croatia and Slovenia, is the first step long overdue. Ridding the EC of elements hostile to Europe, the second.

### A New Congress of Berlin?

The EC's establishment of a “peace conference” process, chaired by Lord Carrington, and thus under British hegemony, has undercut any positive efforts by nations of continental Europe to render effective assistance to embattled Croatia. Specifically, as was bitterly noted in a Sept. 11 press conference by Croatian Foreign Minister Zvonimir Separovic, the “peace conference” prevented an otherwise inevitable recognition of Slovenia and Croatia as independent states by Germany, which was moving rapidly in this direction. The German move would have opened the door to recognition by Austria and Hungary, which border on Slovenia and Croatia, thus creating first a central European corridor of assistance, with other EC members expected to follow.

The “peace conference” process contains many haunting parallels to the 1878 Congress of Berlin, convened at British initiative to impose a European “Concert of Powers” territorial settlement on the Balkans, in the wake of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, which militarily had driven the Ottoman Empire off the European continent. The Congress of Berlin was chaired by Britain, and its deliberations dragged on for months, as the present case will be under the Carrington script. It devoted itself solely to redrawing the map of the Balkans. It neither solved nor attempted to solve any of the

problems that were leading to war in that region, beginning with the miserable economic and social status bequeathed by four centuries of Ottoman rule. The republics of former Yugoslavia have also been bequeathed a staggering economic crisis, with its roots in 45 years of communist rule, and accelerated to beyond the breaking point by the last several years of stringent International Monetary Fund conditionalities, an exorbitant debt repayment burden, and the enforcement, through Harvard's Jeffrey Sachs, of the mass shut-down of industrial enterprises.

The 1878 Congress of Berlin imposed a deceptive pseudo-stability on the Balkans, while in reality its decisions created the preconditions for World War I. In much the same way that a historically dead “Yugoslav Federation” is being artificially propped up today as the pseudo-legal cover for Milosevic's expansionism, the Congress of Berlin artificially kept alive the European part of the Ottoman Empire, by restoring the Turkish hold over much of the southern Balkans. This policy created the basis for the subsequent manipulation by Britain and other powers of the Balkan states, drawing them into the wars of 1912 and 1913 over the division of the remaining Ottoman territories.

The failure to solve or even address vital economic questions provided the basis for the bankrupt countries of the

Balkans to distract their people from internal crises by raising the banner of war to “protect” and “liberate” their ethnic kinsmen who formed minorities in adjacent countries. This was the basis for the Second Balkan War of 1913, and the 1914 Serbian drive to “liberate” Austrian-held Bosnia, which created the matrix for the Sarajevo assassination of the Archduke Ferdinand, which triggered World War I.

The parallels to today, where the bankruptcy of Serbia acts as a driving force in its war of conquest, are striking. Serbia is striving to conquer and annex economically lucrative areas. Slavonia, for example, has the only oil and gas deposits in Yugoslavia. Another objective is the southern half of Croatia’s Dalmatian coastal region, Yugoslavia’s major source of foreign exchange earned from tourism. Not accidentally, the Serbian attacks of Sept. 10-12 were aimed at cutting off southern Dalmatia. This was preliminarily achieved on Sept. 11, when the vital bridge at Maslenica, on the coast, southern Dalmatia’s only link to the rest of Croatia, was attacked and forced to close. On the third front, the Banija region, southeast of Zagreb, economic considerations also play a major role. A primary Serbian objective there is the vital rail and road junction of Sisak, which also houses one of the two largest oil refineries of Croatia.

The Carrington “peace conference” process has sabotaged any early European recognition of Slovenia and Croatia, and any near future chance for effective measures against the Milosevic regime. It has officially opened the door for redrawing the internal borders. The “peace conference” began on an ominous note, by accepting the negotiating guidelines set by a “Yugoslav Presidential Commission” which, acting as a front for Serbia, called for the “fate of Yugoslavia” to be decided by “the freely expressed will of the six nations,” and specified the admissibility of border changes through negotiations, corresponding to the “will” of a “nation.” In Yugoslav parlance, “nations” is limited to the dominant ethnic group of each republic, referring, for example, not to Serbia or Croatia, but to Serbs and Croats. Otherwise, the “nations” are the Slovenes, the Montenegrins, the Macedonians, and the Bosnians. The definition explicitly omits Albanians and Hungarians, who are listed as “national minorities,” and therefore rules out any changes within Serbia, concerning the regions of Kosovo and Vojvodina.

This little-noticed declaration, which opens the door for redrawing the map in the republics of Bosnia and Croatia, where the Serbian “nation” is numerically strong, was warmly endorsed by Serbia’s Milosevic, and rejected by Croatia.

While the “peace conference” deliberates, and in Carrington’s words, attempts to “find a joint basis” for a solution, 25-30% of Croatia will remain occupied by Serbian forces. The “peace conference” opened with an EC declaration, signed by the foreign ministers of the six Yugoslav republics, agreeing that there should be “no border changes without negotiations.” Thus, border changes through negotiations—the Serbian position—have now been legitimized.

---

Interview: Michael Montillo, Antun Irek

---

## ‘Anti-Semitic slander supports genocide!’

*Michael Montillo is deputy foreign minister of Croatia. A Sephardic Jew, a partisan during World War II, and awarded the Knighthood of the Italian Republic in 1982, Montillo strongly rejects the slander that Croatians are anti-Semitic and “Ustashi” (Nazi collaborators). “It is a campaign conducted to justify the genocide against our people. It is totally false and people should learn history not rumors.”*

*Montillo talked to EIR from Zagreb’s Dubrovnik Hotel, where he was expressing support to a Jewish-American citizen of Croatian extraction, Antun Irek, who has been on hunger strike since Aug. 29. Mr. Irek, a piano teacher with 200 very young pupils in Los Angeles, is not the only example of international solidarity for the Croatian cause. Several foreign citizens who were vacationing in Croatia joined the defense of the republic when they saw the horrors the Federal Army is perpetrating without any serious reaction from the outside world. Both Montillo and Irek talked to Umberto Pascali on Sept. 11.*

**EIR:** Mr. Irek, why this hunger strike in Zagreb?

**Irek:** Because I think that my country, the United States of America, must recognize Croatia and Slovenia immediately. When I was in Los Angeles the news of this war was not circulating. When I arrived here and I saw what was happening I was very disappointed to discover that people in the U.S. do not know anything. I want to get the attention of the U.S. people and the administration.

**EIR:** Why do you think the U.S. refuses to recognize the two countries?

**Irek:** Somebody in the U.S. has been blocking the news. I think the Serbian lobby has succeeded in lying about Croatia and convinced people that being Croatians is the equivalent of being Nazis and genocidalists so that people don’t care about Croatia. They think that maybe if they are eliminated from the face of the earth nobody will really care. As long as this war was going on in Slovenia, it was everyday front-page in the Los Angeles media, with big color pictures. But as soon as it came to Croatia it stopped completely.

**EIR:** What would you say to people who believe in these slanders?

**Irek:** This is a 100% lie. First of all, besides isolated events, the Croatian people have not been anti-Semitic. There is a