

Britain, U.N. threaten Bosnia with starvation

by Katharine Kanter

At the time of writing, all-important talks in Bonn between Croatian President Franjo Tudjman and Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic continue to be sabotaged by the savage bombardment which began on Jan. 8. Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, lies under the heaviest shelling since the Serbian war of aggression began; the airport, thanks to the usual U.N.-Serbian coordination at critical moments for Serbian interests, is yet again closed down.

Meanwhile, on Dec. 16, according to the Bosnian news agency TWRA, Bosnian Foreign Minister Irfan Ljubijankic sent a letter to his British counterpart, Douglas Hurd, informing the latter's government that Bosnia had decided to withdraw its suit for "complicity to commit genocide" against Great Britain, whereas, on Dec. 6, 1993, the suit was to have been presented in the International Court of Justice at The Hague by Prof. Francis Boyle of Illinois University. This decision, which was taken under the most brutal pressures, has unfortunately deprived the Bosnian leadership of their most effective weapon against those who want to see the nation destroyed.

As though on cue, friends and allies of the British in Europe began to sling mud at Bosnian officials known to oppose British policy. On Dec. 27, Faris Nanic, editor of the Bosnian paper *Liljan*, was arrested in Zagreb and held for 24 hours. It was he who, on Dec. 12, at the Schiller Institute conference in Kiedrich, Germany, had issued a joint statement with Croatian journalist Srecko Jurdana, calling for a Croatian-Bosnian alliance against Great Britain and Serbia. At almost precisely the same time, the Danish papers *Politikken* and *Berlingske Tidende* attacked Prof. Lamija Tanovic, a nuclear physicist teaching at the University of Copenhagen, for allegedly inciting trouble among the Bosnian refugees in the Danish camps, in particular, by demanding suitable education for the Bosnian children. But, on Dec. 26, the truth came out: Prof. Eric Siesby, head of the Danish Helsinki

Committee, wrote to *Politikken* to protest that the press campaign against her coincided oddly with the moment Professor Tanovic began to raise funds to pay for Professor Boyle's travel to the court at The Hague.

In a press conference in Washington on Jan. 6, Rep. Frank McCloskey (D-Ind.) said: "I talked to [Bosnian Vice President Dr. Ejup] Ganic and Izetbegovic. . . . But Lord Owen apparently got them into a room and convinced them otherwise. . . . They should polish up those papers and get them back into action. The Bosnian government should not take out the big guns and then withdraw."

Food blackmail

The background was food blackmail, no less. In the words of London *Financial Times* U.N. correspondent Michael Littlejohns on Dec. 21, 1993: "A strong inducement not to proceed with the case was Great Britain's pledge to ensure the delivery of humanitarian aid." Translated from Newspeak, this means, "We have 20,000 heavily armed Un-profor troops in your country. We control your food supply, and you have no weapons. If you want to eat, drop the suit now."

Lord Owen himself said this openly to the press on Jan. 4: "Food aid is being channeled to fighters on all three sides. . . . We are changing the balance of the war and in a way *keeping it going*, but we can *justify keeping it going as long as there is a real chance that the political and military leaders are taking the peace process seriously*" (emphasis added). Translated, again, from Newspeak, this means that the British and French troops, who control, as Vice President Ganic said recently in Königswinter, Germany, "who lives and who dies in Bosnia," are making sure the Serbians and Mate Boban's ethnic Croatian militia (HVO) are resupplied until such time as the Bosnian government collapses and signs the tripartition "agreement" presented to it as an ultimatum at

Geneva in July 1993.

Let us now look at what is happening on the ground. Following the murder of a Danish U.N. driver on Oct. 23, 1993, which the U.N. promptly claimed was a Bosnian action, *U.N. convoys into Bosnia were halted for four weeks*. It now transpires, according to Danish press reports, that the murderers were probably mercenaries in the employ of Boban's HVO. But, no matter, the convoys stopped. In order to eat, the Bosnian population was dependent upon private organizations for the entire month of November. *EIR* has attempted, over the last fortnight, to find out precisely what the situation is now on the ground. As the private organizations understandably fear to go into Bosnia without protection from U.N. troops, they are most reluctant to speak to the press about what the U.N. is really up to in Bosnia, lest they get shot up on their next round.

Simply put, as Lyndon LaRouche did in a recent *EIR* interview, the British are in a hurry to get a continental war going, before the United States breaks with British policy in Europe; for the British, Albert Gore's visit to Moscow to denounce the International Monetary Fund (IMF) is the writing on the wall. If the British can only keep their troops in Bosnia till March or April, where they operate as the Yugoslavian Army's elite units, the Serbians will have mopped up Bosnia, and can then move on to Kosova and Macedonia. At that point, a pan-Balkan war leading into a continental war, becomes unstoppable.

Hence, the British invasion of Bosnia.

British deployments in Bosnia-Hercegovina

What we are really dealing with in Bosnia is an invasion and encirclement of that unhappy nation by the Entente Cordiale powers, while the United States stands by and whistles, or, in the words of U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. John Shalikashvili in early January, "There is no military solution for Bosnia." Perhaps a throwaway line buried in the midst of a spread on NATO in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* that same week may shed a little light on the American high command's "ho-hum" attitude to genocide in Bosnia. According to the paper, the real base for NATO's U.S. contingent is not the official NATO HQ in Brussels, but "an undistinguished brick house in Grosvenor Square, London, out of which is now run the U.S. Command Center. . . . As a U.S. officer told us: 'London is fundamental for all our operations.' "

Forget all that twaddle in the London *Daily Telegraph* about mujaheddin streaming in the thousands over the borders to succor their Muslim brothers. You cannot get into, or out of, Bosnia without running the gauntlet of British or allied troops. There are now approaching 30,000 Unprofor troops on the territory of former Yugoslavia, two-thirds of them, i.e., over 20,000 men, in Bosnia, nearly all the rest defending Serbian conquests in Croatia. Whereas there are no U.N. battalions sealing off Serbia's long border with Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria, over which Serbia receives,

unceasingly, fresh supplies.

Northern Ireland model

On the territory of Bosnia, the most important grouping is the ancient British regiment known as the Coldstream Guards. These are no choirboys. The regiment is perhaps the most qualified elite unit in Europe, and is personal guard to the British monarch; it issues from Monck's Regiment of Foot, i.e., Cromwell's New Model Army, and has had unbroken combat experience, most recently in such pleasure spots as Northern Island, the Malvinas, Cyprus, and Iraq. Lt. Gen. Sir Michael Rose, also of the Coldstream Guards, has just been appointed to replace Lt. Gen. Francis Briquetment as head of the Unprofor in Bosnia; he is described by the Italian daily *Corriere della Sera* as "an expert in guerrilla warfare." His biography includes SAS commander 1979-82, and service in Aden, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland.

In the latter province, the role of the SAS in inciting Catholic-Protestant hatred by "taking out" selected targets on both sides, until such time as the conflict became satisfactorily self-moving, has been the subject of much discussion in continental Europe; the presence of SAS and elite British military units at the *outset* of the Ulster troubles, and their presence at the *outset* of Croatian-Muslim strife in central Bosnia gives food for thought.

Why a British expert in guerrilla warfare? The Serbian mode of operation in Bosnia is definitely not guerrilla warfare; in fact, for the first time, a U.N. commander based in Belgrade, the Norwegian Jantora Strandas, stated baldly on Jan. 7 that regular Yugoslavian Army units are routinely deployed in Bosnia. "Just stand in Zvornik and watch the Yugoslav Army cross over," he said. It is the Bosnians, isolated, cut off, and dispersed into scattered militia detachments all over the terrain of their own country, whose mode of warfare is increasingly that of a resistance, of partisan, guerrilla warfare. That is why General Rose is now being sent out there: The *Bosnians* are considered the enemy.

Do not underestimate the British soldiery in Bosnia because they are few (2,500) in number. The British military has, over the last 200 years, developed extraordinary skills in controlling vast areas with a few dozen or hundred crack troops, as the example of the SAS in World War II shows. The British control the only access route to central Bosnia and to Sarajevo, in which immediate area they get a little help from those great humanists, the French Foreign Legion, and 6,000 or so other French choirboys.

The only passable roads now into central Bosnia, notably the so-called Diamond Road, were cut last year by the British Army's engineers; they know these roads like the back of their hand, and they have their troops all over them. According to private aid agencies consulted, the British battalion will let only 25 trucks a day down the road from Gornji Vakuf through Vitez, another major base for the British forces, whereas at least 55 trucks a day could probably pass. That route is critical to resupply Tuzla, center of Bosnian

industrial production and capital of the largest province remaining in Bosnian hands, not only with food for over a million people, but with raw materials for its factories.

How bad the supply situation in British-occupied Bosnia has become, is shown by a few lines which quietly appeared in the London *Times* in early January. The United States will be *doubling* air drops to the so-called "Muslim enclaves" immediately, because, said the *Times*, the "U.N.-brokered agreements for free passage of relief" have failed. Again translated from Newspeak, this means that Unprofor are sticking their rifles in the snow and smiling as the Boban militiamen and the Serbians plunder the convoys.

Here are some of the facts concerning Sarajevo, supplied to *Scotland on Sunday* by their correspondent in Bosnia, Paul Harris: a bundle of firewood costs \$31, one candle \$12.50, whereas a doctor earns \$1.25 a month. The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees has just cut the food ration in Sarajevo by *two-thirds*, from 600 grams to 200 grams of food a day—with 20,000 heavily armed U.N. troops controlling every supply road into Bosnia, and NATO patrolling every millimeter of Bosnian airspace! Incidentally, military sources confirmed to *EIR* on Jan. 7 that *Serbian* personnel have been invited by the U.N. to vet every relief package airlifted into Bosnia from the military airport at Frankfurt am Main, under the U.N. program "Provide Promise."

The Croatian debacle

It is quite extraordinary how the British have managed to deflect the world's rage against themselves onto Croatia, unprincipled as be the government of Tudjman. As Owen rumbled on the BBC on Jan. 5, calling for sanctions against Croatia as tough as those against Serbia, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine Albright flew into Zagreb to denounce, not the British, but the Croatians for war crimes in Bosnia. It cannot be excluded that economic sanctions, or even "allied" military actions, will soon be carried out against Croatia.

Should that occur, many of the 800,000 refugees now in Croatia would attempt, in order to avoid starvation, to flee into western Europe, provoking absolute chaos in neighboring states, while hideous disorders and degenerate social movements will erupt within Croatia itself. Such is, doubtless, British policy.

Diplomatic sources have recently remarked to *EIR* how much they admire, if that is the word, the ferocious energy, the resolve, the bitter determination of British officers and diplomats in their race to get their continental war off the ground. These same sources felt that were the Clinton administration to deploy one-tenth of that energy to break with Great Britain and conduct a principled foreign policy, the war in Bosnia could be stopped within 48 hours.

A flawed approach

The Schiller Institute, founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, points out a number of serious flaws in the final communiqué of the "Conference of International Parliamentarians and other Citizens against Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina," which met in Königswinter near Bonn, Germany on Dec. 1-2 (see *EIR*, Dec. 17, 1993).

1) The communiqué calls for international trade sanctions against Croatia. This is not the policy of the Schiller Institute, whose spokesmen at Königswinter called for trade sanctions against Great Britain, and for breaking off diplomatic relations with Great Britain until such time as it ceases and desists from its support for Serbia. Were sanctions imposed upon Croatia, its territory in Krajina and Slavonia now occupied by Serbia would be lost forever. Economic sanctions only intend to starve the already suffering population of Croatia and provoke rage against Europe, a rage which could then be manipulated for destabilizing efforts.

2) The communiqué calls for air strikes only to ensure that relief convoys get through. The Schiller Institute has

called and does call for air strikes now, against Serbian supply lines, military depots, and airbases, in order to stop Serbia from further prosecuting the war.

3) The communiqué appears to accept the permanent existence of U.N. "safe areas" and "protectorates" inside Bosnia. The Schiller Institute rejects this notion of "Indian reservations" for Bosnia. The only lawful borders for Bosnia are those as of the day it declared independence in 1992.

4) The communiqué does not, despite demands by the Schiller Institute, refer in any way to the special criminal responsibility of Great Britain, nor to the suit which the government of Bosnia was bringing against that nation in The Hague for complicity in genocide.

5) The communiqué calls for replacing Lord David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg with "impartial" mediators at Geneva. The Schiller Institute does not support the Geneva talks, the sole aim of which is to force the Bosnians to sign a tripartition agreement.

The Schiller Institute holds the view that the only way to stop the war in Bosnia, is a) to bring about a strategic rupture between the United States and Europe, on one side, and Great Britain on the other, and b) for Croatia and Bosnia to ally against their common enemies.