

Reviewer Noel Malcolm, writing in the *Sunday Telegraph* on Nov. 12, 1995, points out, however: "What Lord Owen does not tell us is that a second, more thorough [Unprofor] investigation found that the first had made mistakes in its calculations, and concluded that the shell could equally have come from the Serb side. It is surely inconceivable that Owen is unaware of this second report; yet he chooses not to mention it."

Lie #2: The war is basically an ethnic conflict

Related to the previous lie, is Owen's fraudulent claim that the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina is an ethnic dispute among "the Muslims" and "the Serbs" and "the Croatsians." He always refers to the Bosnian government forces as "the Muslims," and dismisses Bosnia-Herzegovina's multi-ethnic Presidency as a sham.

In fact, it is long-standing British policy to manipulate and provoke conflicts among the various ethnic groups of Yugoslavia, to keep the war going, in service of the doctrine of "divide and rule."

As Lyndon H. LaRouche wrote in *EIR*'s Oct. 13, 1995

Special Report on terrorism in South Asia: "London's strategic use of 'ethnicity' . . . is key to all British long-term strategy in the Americas, Eurasia, and Africa, during the past 20 years. It is the basis for the British monarchy's genocide campaign against Rwanda and Burundi, and London's current efforts to bring about the total destruction of Nigeria and Sudan. It is also an integral component of London's strategic orientation toward the intended dissolution of Canada, of the United States, and of every presently existing nation of Central and South America. *Ethnicity*, whether in the foreign-directed insurgency within Mexico's federal state of Chiapas, Africa, and Eurasia, or the ongoing destruction of Australia, is the theme of the new, massive wave of international terrorism which London offices are directing today."

See *Documentation*, p. 32, for excerpts from an article in the Croatian publication *Danas*, reprinted in *EIR* on Aug. 27, 1993, which shows exactly how this manipulation was carried out in the case of the war between Croatsians and Bosnians.

We can refute Owen's lie about the ethnic nature of the war, by quoting the participants in the conflict themselves. The following chronology gives a very different picture (the dates refer to the issue of *EIR* in which the item appears):

Jan. 15, 1993: Prof. Dr. Kasim Trnka, "Ethnic Constitution Is Unacceptable." Dr. Trnka is an adviser to Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic and a member of the delegation

Locke Society promotes balkanization, secession

Thomas Hobbes's partner in crime, in developing the concept of the "social contract" by which man allegedly overcomes the bestial "state of nature," was John Locke (1632-1704)—another philosophical mentor of Lord David Owen. Charles K. Rowley, general director of The Locke Institute in Fairfax, Virginia, spells out his vision of Lockean classical liberalism, and a call for the demolition of the nation-state, in a treatise titled Property Rights and the Limits of Democracy (1993), quoted below. Rowley, an Englishman, came to the United States in 1984, where he is active in promoting "limited government and the free enterprise system." For more on Locke's political philosophy, see Philip Valenti, "The Anti-Newtonian Roots of the American Revolution," EIR, Dec. 1, 1995.

Locke himself had no notion in mind that democracy might enfranchise the property-less classes who would place no high valuation on protecting property, and who might welcome democracy only as an instrument of plunder. Yet, in modern times, attempts to limit the franchise would invoke

alienation and disaffection on a scale that would surely threaten the basis of civil society.

Given such constraints, those who value liberty highly and who seek to obtain for themselves the right to life, liberty and property, might do well to argue in favour of the dismantling of mega-states, at least for all purposes other than defence, and to favour the balkanization of civil societies into a set of smaller clubs that allow individuals real choices with respect to civil government. If certain clubs, such as the District of Columbia, should evidence strong preferences for welfare state socialism, gradually inward and outward migration would consolidate that tendency. If other clubs, such as Indiana, should evidence strong preferences for a Lockean society, true believers in liberty might cluster there, just like the Pilgrims in New England. . . .

Unlike the Pilgrims, there is no obvious wilderness to which classical liberals may relocate in a dramatically narrowing world. Only by making the case for secession and balkanization of states can they reasonably expect to achieve a society of like-minded individuals who recognize the importance of minimal government as the only safeguard for liberty available in a world increasingly characterized by individuals rather than to themselves for the solutions to their perceived problems.