

glo-American neo-conservatives use the word “democracy,” they mean something else than the benevolent concept that the average citizen would understand. British “parliamentary democracy,” after all, is in essence a facade, a living theater, in which various formal parliamentary and electoral procedures provide the illusion of British subjects’ participation in the decision-making system, but in which the actual options are decided by a tiny oligarchical clique, and in which the monarchy itself plays an all-pervasive political and liturgical-symbolic role.

A key aspect of the theater, is the mythology spread by British ideologues that one of the seminal “democratic” theorists was the 17th-century Thomas Hobbes of Britain. This myth is repeatedly purveyed, for example, in the recently published book of former U.S. State Department Policy Planning deputy director Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man*, one of the most widely discussed works in this year’s European intellectuals’ cocktail circuits, which was singled out for praise in a March London *Times* editorial. The central claim in Fukuyama’s book is that “liberal democracy” of the Anglo-Saxon variety has irreversibly triumphed, philosophically and historically, over all competing systems of government.

Without offering one shred of evidence, Fukuyama asserts that Hobbes was one of the chief philosophical inspirations behind the American Constitution and in the thinking of the American Founding Fathers. Yet it is known to Fukuyama, and to all those who think like him, that Hobbes was one of modern history’s most persistent theorists and defenders of absolute monarchy.

Hobbes’s “original state of nature” and “war of each against all” is not abstract theorizing: it is the operational plan of the leading oligarchical factions today, who seek to drive most of the human race into a desperate fight for bare survival, so that they can impose a new “Leviathan,” a Roman Empire-modeled world government, likely run out of the United Nations. From this standpoint, it is not surprising that the leading theoreticians of “Project Democracy” in the United States are all passionate Hobbesians.

Thus we find the National Endowment for Democracy, the “public-private” agency that funds Project Democracy’s projects, concretely backing the monarchy-restoration project in the Balkans. As noted by the April 28 *Le Monde*, and as confirmed independently by Bulgarian sources in discussions with *EIR*, a chief supporter of bringing Simeon of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha to the throne is the head of the Podkrepa “independent” trade union movement, one Trenchev. According to the 1990 Annual Report of the National Endowment for Democracy, the NED gave two financial grants to Podkrepa, via an entity called the Free Trade Union Institute. One grant, for \$276,190, was to “provide material and technical support to Bulgaria’s independent trade union movement Podkrepa,” and the other, for \$51,024, was to “help Podkrepa organize a voter referendum campaign for the local elections.”

## Bosnia faces being wiped off the map

by Konstantin George

For the first time since World War II, a nation on the European continent, officially recognized by the European Community, is being subjected to partition and thereby to outright liquidation. This is the mixed ethnic former Yugoslav republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (44% Bosnian Muslim, 32% Serb, 18% Croatian).

The Serbian war of aggression in April and the first half of May, has already achieved, on the ground, a de facto partition of Bosnia. By May 13, when a cynical “unilateral five-day cease-fire” was proclaimed by the “Parliament of Serbian Bosnia” from its “capital,” the west Bosnian city of Banja Luka, the Serbian Armed Forces had conquered most of the 60% of Bosnia-Herzegovina that Serbia had intended to annex as the “Serbian Bosnian Republic.” The Army had seized all of predominantly Muslim Eastern Bosnia, most of Northern Bosnia, with its mixed population of all three groups, all of Western Bosnia, which is predominantly Serbian inhabited, and parts of Herzegovina in the south. The Bosnian capital, Sarajevo, has become a war-ravaged divided city, a Balkan “Beirut.” A further 20% of Bosnia-Herzegovina is controlled by ethnic Croatian self-defense units, leaving the Bosnian Muslims with the remaining 20%, a rump “state” in the geographical center of what had been Bosnia-Herzegovina.

At the local political level, the partition of Bosnia is occurring through an arrangement between Serbia and Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, the former communist and Partisan general, whereby Serbia will annex the regions it has conquered, and Croatia will receive the main Croatian-inhabited areas, meaning western Herzegovina, and areas in northern Bosnia adjacent to Croatian Slavonia.

A broad agreement along these lines was reached May 6 at secret talks held by the leaders of the Serbian and Croatian Bosnians, Radovan Karadzic and Franjo Boras, respectively, in the Austrian city of Graz. The deal was announced May 7 by the “Yugoslav” news agency, Tanjug. No one in either Zagreb or Belgrade denied it. Since then, both Serbian and Croatian media have been filled with “leaks” on the partition formula, ranging from a Serbian-Croatian-Bosnian Muslim division of 60-20-20, to 60-30-10. Again, no denials anywhere.

On May 5, as Karadzic and Boras were departing for Graz, Tudjman issued a declaration that Bosnia can “only remain a state” under conditions of a “complete cantonization,” i.e., a thinly disguised partition. On May 8, Tudjman

hailed the Graz deal as an "important step forward." Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic chose the same day to announce his support for "efforts by the European Community" to promote the "building of independent cantons" by "Croats and Serbs" in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

This is not the first time that Tudjman has skewered Croatia's national interests to make a deal with the Milosevic regime in Belgrade at the expense of another former Yugoslav republic. Last July, he let the Yugoslav Army transit Croatian territory unmolested, to supply and reinforce Army units engaged in trying to suppress Slovenian independence. Over the past year, Tudjman has several times, prior to the Graz meeting, gone on public record as favoring a partition of Bosnia between Serbia and Croatia.

### International amorality

The partition of Bosnia has been tacitly accepted by the leading western powers and Russia, just as they had previously accepted the occupation of one-third of Croatia. Up to mid-May, "actions" by the European Community to stop the Serbian aggression have been pathetic empty gestures.

On May 12, with great fanfare, the ambassadors to Belgrade from the EC nations and the United States were recalled for "consultations," and Serbian aggression was verbally condemned in the strongest terms. At the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Serbia was duly expelled from any deliberations concerning Bosnia, a cruel joke, since on the ground, Bosnia's fate was being determined, not by the CSCE, but by the Serbian Army. No sanctions against Serbia of any sort had been decided on. While the EC was fulminating verbally, the EC observers were withdrawn from the Bosnian capital of Sarajevo, and left Bosnia that same day.

Britain's Lord Carrington, chairman of the EC's "peace process" for former Yugoslavia, was quoted by the London *Times* of May 13 on his solution for Bosnia: "If people want to fight, there are only two options. Either let them, or separate them forcefully." The latter "option," he added was "unlikely"; ergo, "let them fight."

At a Geneva press conference, May 12, José Maria Mendiluce, from the U.N. High Commission for Refugees, reported on what has happened to Bosnia in a mere six weeks: "What we are seeing is something like World War II, with population centers being destroyed, and towns and villages attacked not as military objects, but with the sole purpose of driving the people away." As in Croatia, Serbia's goal has not been simply to conquer territory, but to render the land purely Serbian through mass expulsion of all non-Serbian inhabitants.

While Croatia has been "amputated," but is still very much alive, Bosnia is on the verge of ceasing to exist. In Croatia, the capital Zagreb and other major cities lying outside the areas under direct ground or artillery attack by the Serbian forces remain relatively unscathed. There are almost

no such havens in Bosnia. From the capital Sarajevo on down, nearly every city and large town has suffered heavily, from air, artillery, and ground attack.

The Bosnian government reported May 11 that in six weeks of war, 1,300 people had been confirmed killed, but another 1,900 were missing and presumed dead. A third category of deaths cannot be estimated, from combat areas where reportage is scarce or non-existent. By conservative estimate, the actual death toll could be 4-5,000. There are 650,000 refugees, the great bulk of them Bosnian Muslims, more than the number of refugees produced in war-torn Croatia. By mid-May, one out of four Bosnian Muslims had become a refugee.

Infrastructure deficits make the prospects even grimmer. Two-thirds of Bosnia has no electricity or running water. The half of Sarajevo not occupied by Serbian forces, and remaining urban communities in Bosnian hands, are facing terrible food shortages. The mass dislocation of people and the fighting have disrupted spring planting. A net food importer even in peacetime, Bosnia risks starvation this year without international food aid.

## Croatian parliament ousts banker in anti-IMF move

The Croatian Parliament has dismissed National Bank governor Ante Cicin-Sain in a protest move against International Monetary Fund shock therapy. The decision "has raised doubts of a market-economy orientation of the republic," reported the Swiss newspaper *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of May 13. Cicin-Sain has earned the reputation of a staunch follower of the IMF. His ouster had been demanded by the "council of experts," which is chaired by former Defense Minister Djordan. The council accused Sain of having turned the National Bank into a "fourth estate" within the state, bowing to the "holy cow" of fiscal stability and demands for an economic development program. The move is threatening the IMF package for Croatia and its integration into western Europe, claims the paper, which normally speaks for the financial "gnomes of Zurich": "The new bank governor, Prof. Pero Jukovic, is a qualified national economist. He has not conveyed the impression that he will resist political pressure as consistently as his predecessor has done." A high-ranking IMF delegation will visit Croatia at the end of May to discuss the conditions of a standby credit and prepare a "structural adjustment program," which is the euphemism for economic austerity shock therapy.