

Germans weigh military action against Serbia

by Michael Liebig in Wiesbaden

The war in former Yugoslavia is forcing Germany to take a good look at its fundamental principles, and to make decisions that will affect its very existence. There are many signs that by sometime this spring, a military intervention will be launched against Serbia by the United States and western European nations. Paradoxically, the military action is being planned by the very same governments which for 18 months have been permitting Serbia to wage its war offensive against Croatia and Bosnia. While the West has been practicing "appeasement," the fascist-communist leadership of Serbia has been committing war crimes of such monstrous magnitude, that citizens' revulsion can no longer be ignored by their governments. The western political elites, thanks to their provocative passivity, are seeing their credibility sink below the minimum threshold.

Serbia today is Europe's "Frankenstein's monster," in the tradition of Hitler and Stalin. There is no question about the legitimacy, according to international law, of initiating military action against Serbia. International law requires that assistance be given to the victims of aggression, and it calls for military action against aggressor states. However, the "Serbian question" cannot be separated from the question of the "geopolitical accessories to the crime"—Britain's Lord Carrington, former U.S. Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger, U.N. envoy Cyrus Vance, certain people in Moscow, and many others. The outbreak and subsequent course of the Balkan war has shown that the Anglo-American establishment and French diplomacy, in conjunction with influential forces in Moscow, were and are pursuing a policy of "geopolitical balance of power." The Serbian leadership's racist expansionism was encouraged in order to create a counterbalance in southern Europe to reunited Germany.

The chances that the situation might open up, such that the United States would dump the geopolitical axioms of its European-Eurasian policy, are not that bad, since the consequences of this policy are now beginning to turn against the United States itself. Washington fears that without a military intervention into Serbia, NATO's entire southern flank would crumble, as Turkey and Greece take opposite sides in

the conflict. In the Islamic world, most regimes, led by Saudi Arabia, fear that the war in Bosnia will become a catalyst for "Islamic fundamentalism." This in turn would affect U.S. long-term interests in the region. France is seeing its own political viability, and that of western Europe as a whole, dramatically undermined as a result of the the geopolitically oriented policy it has pursued up to now. But on the other hand, France can not simply "leave it up to the Americans" to intervene in Serbia, since that would reestablish the United States as the dominant power in Europe.

This ambivalence in geopolitical doctrine, whose results we have witnessed in the Balkans since 1991, is especially evident with regard to Russia. According to the premises of geopolitics, a western military intervention against Serbia could lead to a new East-West confrontation in Europe. Under those circumstances, Germany—regardless of whether it participated in the intervention or not—would be the strategic loser. On the other hand, only an intervention which is *not* based on geopolitical premises can prevent a drawn-out Balkan war from leading to the creation of a "Slavic-Orthodox power bloc" under Great Russian leadership, which would pose a strategic threat to the United States.

Concerning an intervention against Serbia, it can and must be made convincingly clear to the Russian leadership and the Russian people, that their interests are not served by supporting the Serbian aggressor and terror regime, but rather lie in an economic reconstruction program "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

What the objectives must be

If military steps are taken against Serbia, then such a war must be brought to a conclusion as rapidly as possible, with the greatest political and military resolve. From the very outset, military planning must exclude the contingency of a long, drawn-out, Vietnam-style campaign involving the big powers. The war and peace objectives of a military intervention must be:

- Depose Serbia's fascist-communist leaders and bring them before a war crimes tribunal.
- Reestablish the legitimate borders of the states of former Yugoslavia.
- Economic reconstruction in the framework of an European-wide reconstruction program.

These goals can be attained through the arming of Bosnia and Croatia, which will bear the brunt of the battle; through cutting off Serbian supply routes into Bosnia and Croatia; and through shutting out Serbia's Air Force.

The options for Germany

German participation in an intervention, so defined militarily and politically, is legitimate according to both international law and Germany's own constitution. Germany's Basic Law does not limit the deployment of German Armed Forces to NATO's territory. Article 26 of the Basic Law

forbids all offensive wars, regardless of their form, location, or under what pretext they are conducted. German Bundeswehr participation in combat units in the framework of collective security systems, is permitted only when it is a question of "bringing about and ensuring a peaceful and lasting order in Europe and between the peoples of the world" (Article 24). At the same time, Article 87a of the Basic Law allows the German Armed Forces, without any geographic restrictions, to be deployed for defensive purposes. Germany's constitutional bodies have the express duty to use military means to protect the German people from harm, regardless of where the assault on Germany's fundamental security interests emanates from.

The decision to participate in a military intervention against Serbia is perhaps the most difficult one which Germany has had to make since the end of World War II. If it comes to a military intervention against Serbia, this would have a dramatic impact on Germany's domestic political situation. Germany would become a de facto "frontline nation," along with Hungary, Austria, and Italy. Western Europe, and especially Germany, would cease being a peaceful area behind the front, where life could go on more or less without disruption. The prevailing lifestyle in western Europe, with its emphasis on physical possessions, hedonism, entertainment culture, and alienation from Christianity, would be challenged. But it should also be considered that certain waning political forces might unscrupulously use the objective "state of emergency" in order to keep themselves in power.

Moreover, Germany would be threatened on its own soil by Serbian terrorist low-intensity warfare actions. Military experts reckon that Serbia is already engaged in intensive efforts to acquire ballistic missiles. Missiles with a range of 1,000 kilometers could strike targets in southeastern Germany.

There is much talk about how, for historical reasons, Germany cannot participate in any military action against Serbia. On April 6, 1941, beginning with a merciless air bombardment of Belgrade, Nazi Germany assaulted Yugoslavia, which capitulated on April 17, 1941. Particularly in 1943-44, partisan forces were locked in brutal battle against the German occupation forces. These historical events, however, do not alter the fact that today it is Serbia which is guilty of waging an offensive war and of committing genocide and monstrous war crimes. Past crimes are no reason for us to tolerate crimes being committed in the present.

In Europe, the time for avoiding and ending war solely by political and economic means, is now behind us. Under the present historical circumstances, Germany and France have no choice but to systematically expand their military cooperation with the aim of mounting an intervention against Serbia. This military alliance must be constructed on the basis of the Franco-German Treaty of Jan. 22, 1962 between French President Charles de Gaulle and German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

'Friends of Schiller' meet in Croatian capital

On Jan. 23, the Schiller Institute held a meeting at the University of Philosophy in Zagreb, Croatia, to explore the possibility of setting up a Cultural Association of the Friends of the Schiller Institute. More than 25 people attended, including journalists who had previously published material from the institute and from *EIR*, engineers, government employees, and *EIR* readers.

The Schiller Institute was founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche in 1984, and has chapters around the world.

The Zagreb seminar was opened by Paolo Raimondi of Germany, who outlined the geopolitical goals of the Anglo-Americans and their role today in this new Balkan war. He compared the geopolitical notions of Halford Mackinder, Lord Kitchener, and Karl Haushofer at the turn of the century, with the views of Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, et al., aimed to prevent the development and integration of the Eurasian continent. He explained that the programs of the Schiller Institute derive from the fundamental idea of man as *imago viva Dei*—in the living image of God.

This concept was developed further by Elke Fimmen, also of Germany, who explained why the Schiller Institute was named after the German poet Friedrich Schiller (1759-1805), the poet of freedom and republicanism who fought to make culture the highest point of the political fight to free men and nations from the oligarchical systems. Fimmen also outlined Lyndon LaRouche's program for a Paris-Berlin-Vienna Productive Triangle of economic development, to spark the revival of Europe as a whole.

Sheila Jones, from the United States, spoke about the political persecution of LaRouche in America, and his effort to create a movement based on reason, to defeat the corruption of the ruling elite which is leading to a third world war. She spoke about the fight of the U.S. civil rights movement, and the recent merging of the best parts of that movement with the LaRouche movement internationally.

EIR Editor for Russia and Eastern Europe Konstantin George exposed the economic disaster that followed the implementation of the International Monetary Fund's austerity programs in the East European countries. Croatia was recently accepted into the IMF, and the media have created a false expectation of aid and development as a result of this.

Many participants signed a letter to President Clinton, demanding freedom for LaRouche. It was agreed that the first step of the Friends of the Schiller Institute should be the publication of literature in the Croatian language. Later, steps will be taken toward the formation of an official association. The main Croatian daily *Vjesnik* published a report on the conference, focusing on the Schiller Institute's attack on the IMF.