

# Paris and London undercut Clinton's policy on Bosnia

by Edward Spannaus

The Anglo-American "special relationship" that has dominated United States postwar strategic policy is on increasingly shaky ground, as the Clinton administration considers moving toward asserting an independent policy toward Bosnia. Yet the U.S. President is encountering enormous resistance and outright sabotage of his proposals from Britain and France, which are determined to prevent any U.S. intervention that could tip the balance in the former Yugoslavia against the Serbs.

President Clinton clearly favors a strategy which is based on providing arms and light weapons to the Bosnian Army, while using air strikes to hold off the Serbs while the Bosnians are brought up to a more equal fighting strength. Notably, the administration's preferred policy would not involve U.S. ground troops.

However, the Europeans, with much of the U.S. news media in tow, are determined to force Clinton to back down from this policy commitment, and are loudly proclaiming that he has already done so. As well, many of the media pundits are advising Clinton to focus on domestic policy, and not to get bogged down in a "quagmire" in Bosnia.

For Clinton to follow such advice would be fatal for his presidency. The Bosnia issue is the predominant test for the President at this time, one on which he has staked out a position which commits the United States to a course of action which is morally correct against the treachery and venality of the British-French alliance. He has strong bipartisan support for taking forceful action in Bosnia, with leading Republican spokesmen such as Senators Robert Dole (Kan.) and Richard Lugar (Ind.) fully supporting him.

The people of both Europe and America are looking for bold leadership from the President. Despite all the backbiting and sabotage from London, the British would have no choice but to grudgingly follow along if Clinton embarked on a

course of decisive action. The danger of an open break, in which the United States carries out a course of action independent of the British, is something that London will not risk.

## Owen lectures the 'colonies'

When Secretary of State Warren Christopher returned from his six days of meetings with the European allies and the Russians, he briefed President Clinton on the European resistance to lifting the U.N.-imposed arms embargo against Bosnia, and told the President that the Europeans, and especially the Russians, wanted to wait until after the May 15-16 referendum of the Bosnian Serbs before agreeing to any action. At this point, the administration apparently decided to put any final decisionmaking on hold for a week. This was decided *before* the May 10 European Community (EC) foreign ministers meeting.

Meanwhile, EC "peace negotiator" Lord David Owen continued his haughty lectures to the American colonies, demanding that the United States give up its "silly" ideas of air strikes and lifting the arms embargo, and instead put troops on the ground in Bosnia in support of U.N. "peacekeeping" and the Vance-Owen plan.

Appearing on NBC's "Meet the Press" on May 9, Owen advised Washington that "to go rushing into military action tomorrow or the next day would be, in my view, extremely foolish. . . . I don't think this is a time to lose our nerve or give up." Owen continued, "We've got to be very careful against having Europeans thinking of the Americans as cowboys and Americans thinking of the Europeans as wimps."

Owen's transparent strategy is to increase the number of ground troops in Bosnia, as insurance to protect his friends the Serbs against western air strikes, and as a policy alternative to allowing the Bosnians to obtain arms to defend themselves. The Vance-Owen plan is premised on the elimination

of Bosnia as a multi-ethnic sovereign nation, by breaking it up into ethnic enclaves. Since the fall of the town of Srebrenica, the plans to destroy Bosnia have gone even further, with the U.N. Security Council declaring five towns plus the city of Sarajevo to be "safe havens" for the Muslim population. The "safe haven" scheme, as pushed by the British and the French, would simply create bantustan-type "homelands" in Bosnia policed by U.N. forces.

It is from this standpoint that Owen demands that the U.S. send ground troops. "If you want to up your profile on Bosnia," Owen said on NBC, "the best thing the Americans could do would [be to] put 2,000 or so U.N. troops into these safe areas. . . . The absence of your ground forces is a real problem."

### **Bosnians tell the U.N. to get out**

While Owen was declaring that the absence of U.S. ground forces as U.N. peacekeepers is a "real problem," the Bosnian government was declaring the opposite: that the *presence* of the U.N. peacekeeping forces is the major obstacle to taking the necessary next steps.

On May 11, the government of Bosnia-Herzegovina formally asked the U.N. Security Council to withdraw all U.N. personnel from Bosnian territory, as a first step toward lifting the international arms embargo. "We find that the U.N. presence on the ground has become an impediment to critical decisions by the international community," Foreign Minister Haris Silajdzic said in a letter to the Security Council. He said that the lifting of the arms embargo would give the "democratic, multi-ethnic republic . . . the means to defend itself."

Silajdzic singled out President Clinton as one who understands the Bosnians' "commitment and desperate plight" by his seeking support for lifting of the arms embargo. "We beseech the Security Council to cease an arms embargo that has, in practice, constituted an international intervention against our legitimate rights as a member of the United Nations."

### **Biden blasts 'bigotry'**

While Bosnia was delivering its demand to the U.N., Sen. Joseph Biden (D-Del.) blasted the Europeans for their "timidity" and "hypocrisy" over Bosnia, in a speech which sent shock waves across the Atlantic. Addressing Secretary of State Christopher during Senate hearings, Biden expressed sympathy for Christopher's having encountered "a discouraging mosaic of indifference, timidity, self-delusion, and hypocrisy" among the European allies.

"Frankly, I've been hopeful that the allies would recognize several realities," Biden continued. "First, that the Vance-Owen map-drawing approach to this question is profoundly flawed and has been from the outset. By starting with the premise that Bosnia will be carved up into ethnic enclaves, this so-called peace plan, in my view, has only incited violence rather than discouraging it. And secondly, I would hope that they would understand that we face not a religious civil war, but a blatant act of Serbian expansionism and aggression which in turn has unleashed Croatian appe-

tites as well. This is no more a civil war than Germany and Austria and Czechoslovakia had civil wars in the 1930s. This, as then, in my view, is fascist thuggery on the march, where religion is not a cause of violence but, I believe, the excuse for violence.

"And the third thing I'd hope that they'd realize is that the world community, by maintaining an arms embargo against a multi-ethnic Bosnian democracy, has committed an act of moral rape. . . .

"I can't even begin to express my anger for a European policy that's now asking us to participate in what amounts to the codification of a Serbian victory. Let's not mince words. European policy is based on cultural and religious indifference, if not bigotry. And I think it's fair to say that this would be an entirely different situation if the Muslims were doing what the Serbs have done, if this was Muslim aggression instead of Serbian aggression. The truth is not lost on the Islamic world, which is filled with a rising anger that we have not yet begun to understand, and I predict we will pay a large price for it, as will the Europeans."

Biden's remarks received front-page coverage in Britain over the next days, with Britain's Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd fuming that "it doesn't serve any purpose to start exchanging accusations across the Atlantic." The London *Daily Telegraph* in an editorial accused Biden of hypocrisy and cynicism, and complained that "accusations of inaction against [British Prime Minister] Mr. Major come especially ill from a nation that has done nothing to date except indulge in a near-farcical crowd-pleasing exercise, to parachute relief supplies from the air over Bosnia."

The day after his Senate remarks, Biden was asked in a CNN interview what he thinks the Europeans should do. "What they should do is what the Bosnian government wants them to do," Biden replied. "The Bosnian government officially asked the United Nations to leave so they could have the embargo lifted. If they believe—and there's a legitimate reason for it—that their troops delivering food are in jeopardy if the arms embargo is lifted, then do what the Bosnian government suggests and what I suggest—*leave*."

---

## **Documentation**

---

*Speaking to this news service on May 11, Gen. Paul Albert Scherer, former head of German military intelligence (MAD), said:*

On March 10, 1993, I spoke at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. Then I urged the United States government to intervene militarily against Serbian aggression in Bosnia in view of Europe's incapacity to act. I urged the Clinton administration to proceed with the lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Croatia and with American air

assaults against Serbian artillery positions and supply lines. I strongly disapproved against any deployment of American ground forces in Bosnia.

I'm very glad that the Clinton administration has apparently in principle adopted a policy of lifting the arms embargo and air attacks against Serbia. I am outraged at the arrogant obstructionism by Great Britain and France against that U. S. policy. I strongly urge President Clinton to proceed with his correct policy no matter what diplomatic trickery may be put forward by this renovated Entente Cordiale. Obviously this new Entente Cordiale is determined to block any breakout of the United States out of the geopolitical "Procrustean Bed" of Versailles/Trianon/Yalta.

Never was the strategic factor of time so important as now. Action or non-action in the next two weeks can have the most dramatic consequences. I think within the next two weeks the United States must proceed with a military intervention against Serbia. Were there no U.S. intervention, which I sincerely hope will not happen, the military situation for the Bosnia forces would likely be such that there is no chance of ever rolling back Serbian conquests in Bosnia.

Equally important is that we must assume that already in the month of June the political and economic crisis in Russia is going to dramatically escalate again. Under these circumstances a U.S. military intervention in Bosnia would become increasingly difficult, if not impossible. In addition, with the Russian crisis worsening further, world public opinion is likely to turn away from Bosnia.

It must be understood that if there is no U.S. military intervention against Serbia in the time frame indicated, a "Pandora's Box" of armed conflicts all over the globe will open up in the near-term. Inaction of the West will signify internationally that war of aggression and seizing of territory by force is again an acceptable instrument of international relations. In many parts of the world, there are latent conflicts which so far have been constrained by the perception that the West, and in particular the United States, will not tolerate wars of aggression. Inaction against Serbia would signify that the West's proclaimed principles of international law are not to be taken seriously any more. The West, and in particular the United States, would appear to be a "paper tiger."

I'm especially concerned about the long-range effect of western inaction in Bosnia in the Islamic world. Were the West to tolerate the destruction of the Bosnian state and the mass slaughter and rape of its citizenry, this is likely to become the trigger of a new wave of Islamic anti-western feeling that goes well beyond anything we have seen so far. It would not be a cheap piece of anti-western propaganda, but it would address the truth of western complicity in the slaughter of an Islamic people on the European continent.

All of these factors necessitate that the United States act now. And as a European, I say that the United States should act unilaterally and ignore European obstructionism, cowardice, and diplomatic trickery.

## Suall a target of California spy probe

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Irwin Suall, the director of the Fact-Finding Division of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL), is a prime target of the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, whose investigators are probing a nationwide spy ring that stole classified government data and passed it to the governments of South Africa and Israel.

A source close to the six-month-old investigation of the ADL, which has turned up evidence of ADL illegal surveillance and data gathering on over 950 political groups and at least 20,000 American citizens, told the San Francisco *Examiner* on May 11: "Look at the top, at the organizational setup, at the fact finders." The source named Suall as a leading target of the probe, which is expected to be concluded with indictments by mid-June.

In fact, on April 30, Suall hired Bay Area lawyer Charles Breyer to represent him. The move came immediately after police released an inventory of documents seized in their April 8, 1993 raids on the San Francisco and Los Angeles ADL offices. Among those seized records were numerous memos to and from Suall and the ADL's local San Francisco spy, Roy Bullock, as well as extensive financial records dealing with ADL "fact-finding" expenses.

The San Francisco spy scandal is not the first time that Suall has been caught up in illegal intrigues. In March 1986, Suall led an ADL effort to blame American political figure Lyndon LaRouche for the Feb. 28, 1986 assassination of Sweden's Prime Minister Olof Palme. Working with NBC producer Patricia Lynch, Suall stirred up media smears against LaRouche and tried to fuel a Swedish police probe of a nonexistent "LaRouche angle" on the Palme killing.

Years later, a former top official of the East German secret police agency, the Stasi, revealed that the "LaRouche killed Palme" story had been hatched in East Berlin and been foisted on gullible police and media by East German agents of influence in the West. Although Suall was never named by the former East German spy, it was the ADL Fact-Finding Division that joined wholeheartedly with the Stasi and with top Soviet KGB officials in perpetrating the fraud and cover-up of the Palme assassination, which to this day remains unsolved.

### Gerard returns to face indictment

On May 6, in a surprise development, former San Francisco police officer Tom Gerard, a central player in the early