

In Bosnia, the time is for total war

by Katharine Kanter

The blood-stained curtain of current events covers the essence of the conflict in Bosnia. This is not a civil war, unless you wish to assert that the French Resistance was a civil war. . . . It is an honor for us to fight for those principles, which means, to fight for Europe. I am sure of final victory.

These words were spoken in Brussels in April 1994 by Irfan Ljubijankic, then foreign minister of Bosnia. He was assassinated on May 28, 1995, when his helicopter was shot down over occupied Croatia. The Kordun Corps of Serbian militiamen claimed responsibility for the murder.

Although the events of early June may seem bewildering to the citizen trying to puzzle out the hundreds of pages of newsprint on the conflict in Bosnia, all that has happened on the military and diplomatic front is coherent with the existence of a NATO plan, in fact an American plan, leaked to the press under the name "Determined Effort," or Plan 40 104. Bosnian and other news agencies have had access to "leaks" concerning the plan; they refer to an operation in five stages: 1) moving troops to Croatia and southeast Italy; 2) deploying additional units onto the territory of Bosnia and Croatia; 3) pulling out Unprofor (U.N. Protection Forces) after regrouping; 4) transporting them to centers outside ex-Yugoslavia; and 5) sending them back.

This will be the largest naval deployment in the Adriatic since World War II, and the largest military action, with between 40,000 and 60,000 men deployed, ever carried out by NATO in its history. "Determined Effort" is to unfold over a three-to-four-month period, and lead to a complete withdrawal of U.N. forces. And Bosnians are not going to

throw themselves under U.N. tank treads to keep them there. In the words of President Alija Izetbegovic: "Let them go! We shall not stop them!"

1995—a good year to stop genocide

The complication in this otherwise pellucid picture, is that the British do not want to leave, and therefore, within NATO there are two policies: that of England and her allies, and that of the United States. The United States has paid lip service to the arms embargo imposed upon Bosnia, while covertly delivering weapons to it, while England has, through its control over the U.N., Unprofor, and over Russia, given Serbia aid and succor in every form. When it became clear at the end of May to Whitehall and the Foreign Office, that the new French President Jacques Chirac wants out, there was, first, consternation, and then a flurry of wild activity in London: 5,000 fresh troops would be sent to Bosnia, they would be under British command, they would "stiffen French resolve," and so forth. But Chirac wants out. And then the United States came forward with Plan 40 104, which has already begun to move. What is not known, is what the United States will do then. Will Clinton continue the offensive? Will the arms embargo against Bosnia be lifted? Will the United States reject completely the sadistic London Contact Group policy for the division of Bosnia into "ethnic" parts?

And, in the event that President Clinton really delivers the goods, are the British going to be happy campers about losing? Are they going to tuck their little tails in and slink away? A front-page headline in the *Daily Telegraph* on June 2, "Allies Suspect U.S. Hawks of Increasing Risk of War"—

not to speak of another couple of assassination scares aimed at the White House—would lead one to think not. Accompanied by a bold-face piece by defense correspondent Robert Fox, leaking privy information on American arms shipments to Bosnia, the which were tittle-tattled on to London by British and other Unprofor officials in the area, the lead by political editor George Jones ever so frankly states:

“Relations between Washington and Europe on Bosnia have been . . . undermined further by indications that factions within the White House and U.S. State Department are now openly backing the predominantly Muslim-Bosnian government in Sarajevo. Some [British] ministers fear that elements in the U.S. administration are threatening any hopes of compromise in Bosnia by covertly promoting Muslim interests—without informing their European allies—to force the Bosnian Serbs to give up territory they have seized.”

The same week, David Lord Owen, upon resigning as head of the Geneva Conference on “former Yugoslavia,” told the Paris daily *Le Figaro* that in his view, there is no reason whatsoever to change the Unprofor mandate, no reason to withdraw the troops, no cause to do anything with the Serbians but negotiate. The present U.S. administration, which, he claims, talks of the Serbians as “the enemy,” thereby “feeding their paranoia” (sic), is the object of his most unguarded, most undisguised hatred: “I have no lessons to learn from the Americans after what they did in Somalia,” he concludes.

Far from treating Serbia as the enemy, the U.S. government has left a door open for it to get out of the war altogether, by hanging its warlords in occupied Bosnia and Croatia, Radovan Karadzic and General Martić respectively, out to dry. U.S. Special Envoy Fraser traveled to Belgrade several times since the beginning of May, offering to have the trade sanctions against Serbia lifted were it to agree to this. However, it is the British who are advising Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic—the Frankenstein to Karadzic’s Monster, in Foreign Minister Muhamad Sacirbey’s words—and they have told him to play tough. Talks broke down again the week of June 4. It is also, beyond a doubt, the British who have orchestrated the entire hostage crisis.

Hostages can thank Cambridge’s John Zametica

That is why John Zametica, an Englishman who was sent out from Cambridge to Pale at the onset of the war to control Karadzic, has suddenly reappeared at the height of the hostage crisis, acting as Karadzic’s spokesman—although, in 1994, it was the British themselves who put about the rumor that Zametica had been purged. The hostage hoax was mounted, in order for the British to put through Plan A: Occupy Bosnia with a massive invasion force, prevent the French from leaving, and thus, keep the war going

as long as possible. Plan B is to accept defeat and get out, while wrecking whatever is left of the place on the way out, and inflicting the greatest possible political damage on the United States, Germany, and anybody else in the way. The British are off-balance and have not yet plumped for one or the other plan: Both plans are flying, which is what makes things confusing.

What makes England really squirm, however, is not that it is about to lose the war in Bosnia: It is the fact that it is about to lose Russia, the big stick with which it could beat the rest of the world over the head. The Russians, seeing that Mr. Clinton is finally taking decisive warlike action to save Bosnia, have got the message that not too far down the pipeline, this may lead to an equally decisive American break with the International Monetary Fund and shock therapy. As they care far more for serious trade relations with the United States and Germany, than for the two basket cases, England and Serbia, or for the barren, mountainous terrain of Bosnia, neither the Russian government nor the Army has said or done anything of note since the United States made it plain they would force the British out of Bosnia.

A signal piece to this effect appeared May 30 in the Russian magazine *Sevodnya*, signed by defense correspondent Pavel Felgenauer. With quick stabs of the pen, Felgenauer defines Serbia as but an albatross around Russia’s neck; she has always lied to Russia and dragged her into disastrous adventures, World War I being the worst.

Then, on Sunday night, June 4, a meeting took place in Vienna between the U.S. commander of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. John Shalikashvili, and his Russian counterpart, General Kolesnikov. No communiqué was issued. But had there been a violent U.S.-Russian disagreement over the policy toward Serbia, the world would know by now.

In all this diplomatic to-ing and fro-ing, one might do well to remember that the people we are supposed to be rescuing, are running out of time. The Bosnian capital has had no light, water, or gas for five weeks; the supply was cut by the Serbians. No food aid has been airlifted into the city since the Serbians closed the airport in early April, while the route over Mt. Igman is virtually impassable due to Serbian snipers. As for the eastern enclaves, no convoys have reached them for several weeks, due to Serbian attacks.

Meanwhile, back to Unreality: At the recent Cannes Film Festival, the jury awarded its Golden Palm to Emir Kusturica, a self-avowed “punk-rock” apologist in the “Yugoslavian” cause, for *Underground*, a film so bad it made the pouting starlets out on the boardwalk look brainy. But, like his jury, Kusturica’s true concerns are not cinematographic. He told the press corps at Cannes, that the reason for the present war, was the fall of the Berlin Wall, and “those little countries who are Nazi satellites, like Slovenia, Croatia, Hungary, and Bosnia”!

Documentation

Dr. Ljubijankic: Our fight is for universal values

Bosnian Foreign Minister Irfan Ljubijankic gave this speech on April 28, 1994, at a meeting in Brussels of the International Parliamentarians against Genocide in Bosnia. Dr. Ljubijankic was killed on May 28 of this year, when his helicopter was shot down over Serbian-occupied Croatia. The Kordun Corps of Serbian militiamen has claimed responsibility for the murder.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will be brief. I will not describe the situation in Bosnia; it is well known. Very often the bloody curtain of current events covers the essence of the conflict.

First of all, is it a civil war or not? We used to live together for centuries. Bosnia has never existed as an exclusive national territory. What has happened, is that those peaceful people started to fight each other. There is an answer: the dream of a Greater Serbia. The Serbian national program is more than 100 years old. It was created by academicians; it has a methodology. The methodology that is implemented in Bosnia is the methodology of creating quisling power states within sovereign states. We saw such a methodology in the Second World War, when Hitler created such states. What is the aim of such states, those creations? Nothing more than a first tactical step in annexation of territories. If the French Resistance was a civil war, then we can say that the Bosnian war is a civil war. Fortunately, it is not true; it is a clear aggression.

The leader of the so-called Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, saw Bosnia for the first time when he came to study at a Bosnian university. Now the international community calls him the leader of the Bosnian Serbs. He is Montenegrin; he is not Bosnian. He has never been Bosnian. If he knew Bosnia, he would never do such things.

So what is the issue of creating a quisling power state within a sovereign state? It is a fascistic act, like the concentration camps were. The motto "All Serbs in one country," is nothing more than "*Ein Reich, ein Führer, ein Volk.*" We have fascism on the scene in Bosnia, and the international community is obliged to recognize it. What concerns us, is the approach of Europe.

Europe is based on two principles: respect for human rights and inviolability of borders. These two principles have been violated in Bosnia in the most horrible ways in the last two years. There is no justification for neutrality in Bosnia. Let us recall that [Neville] Chamberlain said, on the eve of the Second World War, that there was "a quarrel among faraway nations of which we know nothing." Today we know

that that neutrality was paid for by millions of human lives.

Let me emphasize that whenever Europe violates its own principles, catastrophe follows. The international community has acted shamefully, with a hesitating and reluctant approach in Bosnia. Sarajevo is the largest concentration camp in the world. I have to say, "Europe, wake up," recognize fascism in the very heart of Europe. We are not only defending our country; we are defending two main principles on which Europe is based: inviolability of borders and human rights.

Let me conclude and say that peace will have to come, and we are for peace, but not for peace by any means. Negotiations under the present conditions of military imbalance are nothing more than diktat. Auschwitz was not liberated by negotiations, but by force. Force recognizes force, and for us it is an honor to fight for those principles, for universal values, and we will continue. We will need help. Bosnia is a universal problem. I am sure of the final victory; it takes time, it takes blood, but we will win finally. Stay by our side, and you will have cause to be proud of us.

Interview: Prof. Francis Boyle

Arms embargo backers are accomplices to genocide

Professor Boyle teaches public international law at the University of Illinois, and is noted for his defense of the presently much-contested sovereignty of Third World and "small" nations. He acted as legal adviser to the Bosnian government during the so-called "Peace Conference on Former Yugoslavia," held under U.N.-European Community aegis in Geneva in 1993. The interview was conducted by Katharine Kantner on May 30.

EIR: Bosnian Foreign Minister Irfan Ljubijankic was murdered on Sunday night, May 28. His aircraft was shot down over Croatian territory by Serbian militiamen who had invaded Croatia. What should be the response of the western powers?

Boyle: This is a reprehensible act. Mr. Ljubijankic was not a normal citizen, but an internationally protected person, under international law. There is a special treaty, the New York Convention, protecting heads of states, foreign ministers, ambassadors, and so forth, from harm to their physical person. It is another treaty set at naught.

I knew the minister personally. He was a good man and a good minister. It will be very hard to replace him.

EIR: In terms of the Serbian actions over the weekend of May 27-28, could you explain the position in international law?