

but I have to believe that our leaders, the President in the United States and the prime minister in Canada and perhaps others throughout the world are so hung up on this "new world order" that this decentralization would be potentially in conflict with what they see for the new world order.

EIR: Recently a major Italian magazine, *Famiglia Cristiana*, wrote that the explanation for the abandonment of Croatia to the savagery of the Army was to be found in the role of the international Masonry. A large number of European foreign ministers are members of the Masonry. The magazine stressed that the Masonry does not want the creation of two Catholic countries in the middle of Europe.

Vander Zalm: Masonry!?! Well, that's a theory I've heard a number of times as well, and again I expect that the higher-ups in the Masonry are a tremendous influence on governments throughout the world. They are not only concerned about what you say but also they have been long the promoters of these "world orders."

This concept of world order goes back many years, and as I recall reading or hearing, the Masons have long promoted that sort of approach. Sort of world government, world order, that's the way some politicians would like us to be moving. We had a world order approach back after World War I in 1918 in Versailles. They divided Europe a little differently and the result of that, at least in part in my opinion, was World War II. Then we had a world order after World War II when there was again a division, eastern Europe, Germany, and so forth and we had the Cold War on account of that.

Now we hear the President, the prime minister and other world leaders talking about world order again. And without getting into the pros and cons, obviously it doesn't fit this "order" that the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia should be dividing up into independent republics.

EIR: During his recent visit to Europe, George Bush told the European leaders that they have to decide immediately between an independent defense or the "primacy" of NATO under an Anglo-American leadership. Bush brought up the example of Yugoslavia to show how Europe needed "protection." He said that the war there was a consequence of "nationalism."

Vander Zalm: The war was not the consequence of Croatian nationalism. I saw the suggestion made that it was an ethnic war, I don't agree. I think it's a war for independence, it's a democracy versus a communist system. The people, when they voted for Croatian independence, did so according to the terms of the constitution. They didn't go about this illegally. They did it quite properly. The illegality came from the Yugoslavian Army when they then invaded and started their executions and destructions.

EIR: Do you think there are economic reasons as well? For example, Lawrence Eagleburger, the deputy secretary of

state, had a lot of business with the Yugoslavian government in Belgrade.

Vander Zalm: There are always those who unfortunately benefit from wars. And there are undoubtedly those who have benefited from doing business with Yugoslavia. And they see that threatened. Now what and how much an influence these people have, I can't say but I would expect that it could be considerable.

EIR: You were for many years the premier of British Columbia, and probably you will be again in that position in the future. On the basis of your experience, what do you think about the economic future of Croatia and Slovenia in the context of the Productive Triangle proposal?

Vander Zalm: Economic prospects? I think for Croatia and Slovenia they are very good. They are an industrious people, they are a family people, they are a proud people and that's all of the ingredients for economic success. I also believe that small countries can be extremely successful.

Now I don't know what the impact on Serbia might be. Serbia has too long depended on the resources of other republics for its economy. If they will have to go independent themselves and find their own way, they will become stronger as well. I don't believe a country prospers or anyone prospers by living off the others. And I think you are better off with healthier neighbors than you are with distressed neighbors.

Interview: Zlatko Kramaric

Europe's neglect of Croatia 'criminal'

Professor Kramaric is the mayor of the Croatian city of Osijek. He spoke with correspondents Renate Rumpf and Hartmut Cramer on Nov. 11 in Frankfurt, Germany.

EIR: Mayor Kramaric, can you briefly give us a picture of the situation in your beleaguered city?

Kramaric: To anyone who is not in Croatia and hence does not know our situation, I can say that Osijek finds itself under a semi-blockade; the best way to put what that means at the moment is with Remarque's words, "All quiet in Osijek!"

Our city currently runs the risk of being completely destroyed. There is no "logic of war"; The city is being bom-

barded every day at different times and naturally many die as a result, with most of the victims being civilians. We have just learned that only yesterday four people were killed in our city and one was wounded. They were all civilians.

The people in Osijek are living in the cellars. Winter has already begun, and there is a danger of epidemics. If the semi-blockade were to expand into a total blockade, then there would again be the threat of famine. I believe that these bits of information give you a picture of how things stand in Osijek.

EIR: What is your view of the attitude of the West, in particular the European Community?

Kramaric: From the standpoint of the victims we judge Europe's attitude as criminal. That's a harsh word, but it's true. And we would still have to debate the political aspect. This proves once again that humanitarianism is not an element of politics.

Europe should have gotten more directly involved in this war. The behavior of the Europeans in this case is more cosmetic, so they did not behave like surgeons, whose job is to isolate the cancer.

EIR: What do you expect from the German government?

Kramaric: I already said at my press conference that Germany is politically and economically strong enough to act effectively independently from the rest of Europe. Germany is so strong, that it should not be afraid of any resulting sanctions against it. By effective action in this war Germany could free itself from the mortgage that has been hanging over it since World War II. So today we are living in a totally different context, and a clear attitude by Germany in this conflict would have nothing to do with the actions of 50 years ago.

As you know, Chancellor Kohl invited our President, Dr. Tudjman, and Mr. Kucan, our prime minister, to Bonn and I must admit that I have high hopes from these talks.

EIR: What do you concretely need from Germany?

Kramaric: Besides official recognition, we can make good use of any other aid. So, medicines, food, clothing, etc. And above all we should work for the future. When the war is finally over, there should be close economic ties between Germany and Croatia. On the basis of its extraordinary economic strength, Germany can and must play the decisive role in rebuilding central and eastern Europe.

EIR: Since the German government unfortunately has not given enough aid, what can we German citizens do to really help Croatia and her cities?

Kramaric: In western democracies the possibility exists to build up and exert extraparlimentary pressure; i.e., the population can constantly make the government aware of what is going on in Croatia and urge it to help.

Balkan-style wars in Transcaucasus

by Konstantin George

A fatal juncture has been crossed in post-coup events in the former Soviet Union with the successful seizure of power in the Russian Federation's Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic by renegade Soviet Air Force General Dzhokhar Dudayev, an ethnic Chechen. Dudayev's coup, setting up a fanatical Muslim regime, has opened wide two major flanks against Eurasian stability. Chechen-Ingush A.S.S.R. is but one of 16 such autonomous republics, several of which are also Muslim, within the Russian Federation. The Dudayev putsch will encourage kindred western-manipulated radical Muslim nationalists to emulate the Chechen precedent.

Even should the Russian leadership contain the damage on this front, Dudayev's coup, staged in the context of an already highly explosive situation in the Caucasus, has opened an era of protracted, multi-front wars and conflicts embracing the North Caucasus region of Russia, the Transcaucasian republics of Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaidzhan, and eventually spilling over into Turkey and Iran.

Dudayev, a member of the Muslim North Caucasus Chechen tribe, backed by tens of thousands of armed Chechens, seized power Oct. 27, proclaiming himself "President" of a "Chechen Republic" which declared its independence from Russia. His move followed a month of negotiations with a Russian leadership team led by Russia's Vice President Aleksander Rutskoi, and Parliament President Ruslan Khasbulatov, himself an ethnic Chechen. Dudayev was offered everything short of full independence, all to no avail. His Oct. 27 "independence" declaration was then declared null and void by the Russian leadership and parliament. Dudayev's response was to warn that he would launch armed Chechen "terrorist actions," including to "blow up Russian nuclear power plants" unless Russia recognized his coup d'état. That threat, not an idle one as we shall see, was the immediate backdrop to Russian President Yeltsin's imposing, on Nov. 8, a state of emergency over the Chechen republic.

Past the point of no return

The state of emergency, because of its extremely hasty planning and execution, led to a debacle for Yeltsin and the Russian leadership. This was the prime reason why the same Russian Parliament which had demanded that Yeltsin take