

siege and blackmail tactics. While the U.N. is demanding significant military concessions and withdrawal of troops by the Bosnians, such as from around Mount Igman near Sarajevo, at the same time, Serbian forces, undisturbed, are daily breaking the truce and stepping up artillery attacks against Bihac, Velika Kladusa, Bosanska Krupa, and Otoka. The artillery shelling against Bihac is being carried out, even after the cease-fire had allegedly been agreed on, from the U.N. Protected Areas (UNPA) in occupied Croatia.

The first January 1995 issue of the Bosnia weekly *Ljiljan* revealed several examples of the cooperation of high-level Unprofor officials with Karadzic's group. For example, the adjutant of General Rose, the Unprofor commander in Bos-

nia-Hercegovina, is Michael Stanly. Stanly's real name is Mihajlo Stevanovic, a British-Serb liaison officer who provided Karadzic's Maj. Milenko Indjic with information on Bosnian Army movements. Two Unprofor officers, Ronald Hagen and Charles Megres, rejected an order issued by a commander of the U.N. Sarajevo sector, Gen. André Subirou, to alter the reports of the U.N. military observers to the effect that the cease-fire agreements were violated by the "Bosnian side." Those officers were transferred as punishment. Subirou also transferred the officers of the North Battalion, after their troops responded with heavy fire from their Leopard tanks to an ambush by Karadzic's soldiers near Lopare, northeast of Tuzla.

How Europe could face down Serbia

The following article appeared in the French press and appears here in translation by permission of the authors.

Europe would do well to remember that, between 1912 and 1918, three wars pitted Serbia against Turkey, Bulgaria, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Five countries could now be drawn into the Balkans tinderbox: ● Albania, allied to Kosova, Montenegro, and Macedonia; ● Greece, historically opposed to Turkey and Macedonia; ● Bulgaria, interested in annexing part of Macedonia; ● Hungary and Romania, concerned to protect their communities which have settled in Vojvodina.

The U.N., NATO, the EEC [European Union], the U.S.A., and France have been outdoing one another in explanations, excuses, or pretexts to justify doing nothing, faced with Serbian ethnic cleansing. The fact is, that western political leaders want public opinion to believe that a humiliating Munich is somehow necessary, the pretext being that they lack the means to impose international decisions. The official thesis is that a military intervention would imply sending a major expeditionary corps, which would be bogged down in a new Vietnam War.

The argument does not hold water. Europe could easily face down a Serbian Army, equipped with a great quantity of matériel which is, however, outdated. Better still, the operation could be conducted without our suffering losses. In order for an effective campaign to be waged, the new weapons systems proven during the [Persian] Gulf war have only to be deployed. These known and tested, sophisticated systems are: observation satellites and drones, cruise missiles, multiple rocket launchers,

tanks equipped for night combat. As for mastery of the air, this can be considered as certain. Neutralizing the Serbian Navy would call for only limited means.

A 60,000-man army corps, made up of two armored Franco-German divisions, backed by two infantry divisions from other EEC countries, would suffice to force the Serbians to withdraw, whether willingly, or by force. This army corps would apply 10 MRL (multiple rocket launcher) batteries (90 pieces) and a few hundred cruise missiles. Half the troops would be deployed east of Zagreb to hasten the liberation of the Krajina and then Bihac, and half north of Mostar to break the siege of Sarajevo. Parallels to Vietnam or the German invasion in 1941 are merely specious, as, on the contrary, the issue is to push back an invader here. The European units would not have to intervene directly: The terrain is or should be held by the Croatian or Bosnia infantry alone, eager to free their native soil.

What missions are to be assigned to an expeditionary corps which does not directly intervene? These are of three types: ● to secure the rear bases of the army corps and the MRL batteries; ● to destroy strategic objectives with Cruise missiles (airports, radars, etc.); ● to nail to the ground any attacks and pulverize any resistance to evacuating unjustly conquered territory, using MRL firepower.

There is every reason to believe that, faced with the threat of being annihilated, as was done to Iraq, the Serbians will withdraw to the areas assigned to them.

Contrary to what is now being said, the Yugoslavian question is not military, but political: Is there, or is there not, the will to impose international law?

If Europe continues to flaunt her impotence, she will not reap peace, as public opinion might imagine, but on the contrary, will foster national irredentism and the danger of an all-out explosion. This is not the voice of Cassandra, but the memory of two world wars.

—Lt. Gen. de Zélicourt (ret.) and H. de Beaufort.