

supposed relocation of population, every Serbian worker should pay 1% of his income into a special fund to build 30 factories in Kosovo—for Serbs only!

While the demagogue Milosevic paraded his Kosovo scheme, Serbian media publicized an even more radical chauvinist organization. On Jan. 6, Radio Belgrade reported that a group called the Sava Society had decided to transform itself into a party, Serbian National Renewal. Its program calls for restoration of the Kingdom of Serbia within borders “as they were when the Kingdom of Serbia joined Yugoslavia”—at the close of World War I—“of course, including Montenegro and Macedonia,” two of the six republics of Yugoslavia.

One week later, the Sava Society was banned in five districts, on grounds of its “negation of the existence of the Macedonian state, Montenegrin and Muslim nations, advocacy of a Serbia geographically defined by the ethnic distribution of Serbs, and inciting national hatred,” according to Tanjug. But on January 16, the Belgrade daily *Borba* reprinted another periodical’s interviews with Tudjman, Puksic, and the leader of the Serbian National Renewal, Vuk Draskovic. The paper editorially criticized “the resurrection of these parties, controversies, intrigues, and blood-drenching calls for rallies,” but then allowed Draskovic access to *Borba*’s wide readership, to say: “Everything we had in 1918 . . . will again be ours. In the West, we will capture the territories in which the Serbs were in the majority” before World War II. Draskovic listed regions within Croatia and other republics, which he said should become autonomous, Serb-administrated provinces.

Meanwhile, sporadic fighting in Kosovo flared into major unrest again in late February, and the Army and Air Force moved in. Former Kosovo LC chairman Azem Vlasi, an ethnic Albanian, is still on trial for high treason because he supported a strike. The 200,000-strong Democratic Alliance of Kosovo, the largest, still illegal opposition group in the province, is demanding an immediate end to martial law, release of all political prisoners, resignation of the Serbian-installed Kosovo leadership, and free elections.

Daily demonstrations against the Serbian leadership in Kosovo took place in early February, but were low-key, so as to avoid provoking the Serbs. In January, Serbian special police units had killed at least 17 mostly youthful demonstrators with shots at the back of the head at close range, and more victims were to follow in the coming weeks. When the Croatian paper *Vjesnik* reported this atrocity on the front page on Feb. 4, it created such an uproar that Slovenia publicly announced the withdrawal of all its policemen from Kosovo, while Croatia followed suit, but with no publicity.

Prime Minister Markovic has personally taken leadership of a commission to find a compromise in Kosovo. But the leadership of Serbia is reiterating almost daily, that they will “never give up Kosovo”—culminating in the abovementioned insane call for mass expulsions.

## Iran-Contra gang targets E. Europe

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The National Endowment for Democracy, the quasi-governmental, U.S.-financed organization which played an integral role in the Iran-Contra scam and helped to engineer the coup against Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos, has adopted a new focus for its so-called Project Democracy: Eastern Europe.

In recent months, the NED apparatus has significantly increased its operations in Eastern Europe, and is now laying plans for pouring even more money and manpower into the region. According to spokesman for several key NED branches—the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDIIA), and its Republican counterpart, NRIIA—the NED has reoriented the bulk of its programs from Asia and Ibero-America, to Eastern Europe.

The NED apparatus has a host of projects under way in various Eastern European states, centered on Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and East Germany, but also extending to Romania, Bulgaria, and the Soviet Union.

Czechoslovakia is a chief NED target. The NED’s new organ, the *Journal of Democracy*, has managed to recruit President Vaclav Havel to its international advisory committee. Last month, the NDIIA’s vice-chairman Madeleine Albright—who helped draft the pro-Soviet platforms of former Democratic presidential candidates Walter Mondale and Michael Dukakis—traveled to Prague, where she and other NDIIA experts gave advice to Havel’s government on how to run Czechoslovakia’s upcoming elections. An NDIIA team was to return to Prague at the end of February to finalize what other assistance it will provide.

The NDIIA is also sending a “survey mission” to East Germany shortly, to “explore the prospects” for developing its “democracy-building” programs there. The group’s chairman, Brian Atwood, was in Bonn in January for consultations with the three major party institutes, and planned to fly to East Germany in late February to meet with the heads of the principal parties, including SED party leader Gysi.

The NRIIA has also diverted over half of its resources from Ibero-America and the Caribbean to Eastern Europe over the past few months. According to its director, Keith Scheutte, the NRIIA financed a conference in Vienna two months ago, grandly entitled the First All-European Round Table, which brought together representatives of various Eastern European and Soviet opposition groups and Western conservative parties.

The NRIIA is working with groups in Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria on “democracy-building projects,” leading up to the spring round of elections in these countries. Scheutte said that his organization “will play a role” in East Germany.

### **Meddling with the constitution**

One area into which the NED apparatus dearly wants to insinuate itself is the constitution-drafting process now under way in several Eastern European nations. That is hardly surprising, given that a country’s constitution forms its fundamental philosophical and juridical outlook.

According to an NDIIA spokesman, his organization is conducting discussions with the Havel government on the prospect of assisting its constitution-writing effort.

Any NED advice on shaping a constitution is bound to be bad. Even worse, though, is the fact that one of the most notorious opponents of the U.S. Constitution—perhaps the most perfect of all national constitutions to be crafted in history—is involved in this particularly odious project. We refer to Lloyd Cutler, former counsel to President Jimmy Carter, and founder of the Committee on the Constitutional System, who claims that the U.S. Constitution should be thrown out, because it is too constituency-oriented to allow for the imposition of austerity measures during times of economic crisis.

Cutler, along with American University law professor Herman Schwartz, visited Czechoslovakia in early February for talks with Havel’s advisers on what the new Czech constitution should look like. Before leaving the U.S., Schwartz told *USA Today*, “We have the oldest but not necessarily the most useful constitution in the world.”

The two men head a committee on Czech affairs, sponsored by the Salzburg seminar, which has already submitted a list of recommendations to the Havel government for use by the Constitutional Commission, which is expected to be set up in March. The Cutler-Schwartz group will then meet with members of the Czech commission at the Salzburg seminar in April for further discussions. According to one participant in the process, it is “very possible” that the Cutler-Schwartz team will propose that some kind of “environmental protection” provision be written into the new constitution.

### **The fundamental issue: growth vs. austerity**

That points directly to the fundamental issue at stake: economic growth, conducive to true human dignity, versus austerity and despair. The NED’s move into Eastern Europe stems from the Bush administration’s conviction that the revolutions sweeping the region represent a threat to the “stability” of the present global monetary and strategic arrangements, and therefore must be carefully controlled and directed.

The Bush team, along with its British co-thinkers, harbor a profound fear that developments in Eastern Europe will

catalyze a more generalized revolt against the monetarist, anti-productive economic policies which characterize the Anglo-American Establishment’s outlook—a revolt which will destroy Establishment power.

Thus, despite its claims, the NED’s real mission in Eastern Europe is to spread the immoral “free market” ideology of Adam Smith, in hopes of subverting the adoption of a high-technology vectored economic strategy embodied in Lyndon LaRouche’s “development triangle” proposal. If the NED succeeds in foisting its Bukharinite policies on Eastern Europe’s intelligentsia, the economic consequences will be so devastating that Soviet-backed counterrevolutions, or equally destructive forms of strife, will become all but inevitable.

The hypocrisy of the NED comes across quite clearly in an article by former Polish dissident Leszek Kolakowski, published in the premier issue of *Journal of Democracy*. Kolakowski, who divides his time between Oxford’s All Souls College and the University of Chicago, starts from the false premise that there are limits to growth, and argues that this will require democratic governments to adopt undemocratic measures to impose the requisite levels of austerity.

“The rapid pace of economic growth during the postwar decades has produced—both in the rich and in the poor countries—a mentality of endless expectations,” Kolakowski writes. “Somehow we have gotten used to the hope that each of us is going to have more and more of everything in the indefinite future and to the firm belief that this is what each of us deserves. But these hopes are bound to end up in bitter disappointment, at least for the overwhelming majority of the world’s people.

“Overpopulation, shrinking resources of agricultural land and of water, and ecological catastrophes will certainly compel mankind in the near future to devote more and more effort and money to repairing the damages already inflicted on our environment and to warding off further calamities,” he continues. “This will not only lead to growing restrictions imposed on our freedom of movement and property rights. It will result, above all, in a dampening of our hopes for ‘more and more’ and, indeed, in the demand that we recognize that we have enough, or even that we must manage with less, limit our wants, and accept a more modest life. The amount of frustration, irrational rage, and aggressiveness that these imperatives are going to cause will be enormous, and will affect the poor and the rich alike. . . . It is hard to predict what ideological expression or other channels this frustration might find, *but in order to tame it and to prevent society from plunging into chaos or falling prey to a lawless tyranny, it is likely that many undemocratic restrictions will be needed*” [emphasis added].

If this sounds strikingly similar to the “ungovernability of democracy” thesis which Samuel Huntington penned for the Trilateral Commission back in 1975, it should—Huntington just happens to be on the *Journal of Democracy*’s editorial board.