

Unprofor does not seriously protect the people as much as it very seriously protects the status quo being imposed by force by the aggressor Serbs. The delegation was convinced beyond doubt that Unprofor is not executing its mandate, weak as that mandate is, which is suspicious. Although mandated to provide and protect humanitarian aid, even with the use of force if necessary, Unprofor has constantly acted impotently in the face of the parties blocking humanitarian aid, through endless, futile negotiations that leave caravans at a standstill for months, such as the hundreds of vehicles delayed in Stroganac near Split for the last six months.

4) On this same subject, the delegation noted the ongoing objection of Unprofor to operate the excellent airport of Tuzla, which has been completely liberated by the Bosnians, and which airport, considered to be in better shape than Sarajevo Airport, is capable of receiving over 500 tons of supplies per day.

5) The delegation was worried about the reiterated reports of the withdrawal of some Unprofor units from around Srebrenice, allowing Serbian forces to occupy these positions. Such alarming reports call for investigations, particularly since eastern Bosnia is being subjected to a total blackout by Unprofor.

Mediators violating U.N. covenants

6) The delegation is convinced that the two mediators who control the political decisionmaking of Unprofor are constantly suggesting, and ordering the execution of, proposals which are categorically contradictory to the United Nations covenants, under the pretext of accepting the status quo. This pretext violates categorically the sole founding principle of the United Nations, that no power is allowed to change the borders of a sovereign country by force. The conditions that have been created by the policies of the two mediators are designed specifically to destroy the morals and the resistance of the Bosnians, to force them to sign documents which would eliminate their sovereignty, their culture, and eventually their physical existence. In this respect, the delegation found confirmation of this finding in the draft agreement proposed by the two mediators for the partition of Bosnian and Hercegovina, which most certainly results in withdrawing the sovereignty of the republic and diminishing the status of the Bosnian people to that of a tribe.

7) The delegation was deeply disturbed by the ongoing tightening of restrictions on press activity, unduly frustrating the international media, which are no longer allowed to travel from Zagreb and Split, but only from Ancona, to Sarajevo. The Bosnians are subjected to psychological duress by Unprofor which has begun to restrict the flow of outgoing mail carried by the small number of travellers (including media staff), by limiting the number of letters a person may carry to six! It has been confirmed that certain reporters and photographers had their materials confiscated, their films destroyed, and their equipment returned empty, without any record being made of the materials taken or the action. This raises

grave questions regarding Unprofor's mission: Is it an unbiased, humanitarian mission to protect people and soothe their suffering, or is it a force of occupation with a secret agenda? The secretary general of the United Nations bears the responsibility to investigate, clarify, and correct the situation by making sure that the integrity of the people entrusted with these tremendous powers be above question.

The members of the delegation see it as their duty to bring these findings to the attention of their parliamentary colleagues throughout the world, as well as to influential members of the executive bodies of the governments of the world, and to the peoples of the world, and to inform them beyond any doubt that the delegation bears witness in front of God and humanity that genocide has been and is still being committed against this extremely cultured, European people in Bosnia. Each and every person, whether in a position of public responsibility or a simple citizen in this supposedly civilized world, who receives this information becomes charged with the moral responsibility of acting to stop the genocide, regardless of how modest the action may be; otherwise, we shall all be complicit in the ever mounting atrocities being committed and developing into a trend in world politics, which can lead only to the upsurge of fascism anew and to the horrors of world war.

The delegation calls upon parliamentarians around the world who share love and respect for humanity above all narrow personal or national interests, to join International Parliamentarians Against Genocide in Bosnia and Hercegovina.

Interview: Dominic Puthucheary

Owen, U.N. bureaucrats are not accountable

Dominic Puthucheary, a constitutional lawyer and member of parliament in Malaysia, is one of three co-chairmen of a recently constituted international parliamentary grouping entitled International Parliamentarians Against Genocide in Bosnia and Hercegovina (IPGB). He was interviewed on Oct. 1.

EIR: You are one of the co-chairmen of an international group of parliamentarians calling for a change in policy with respect to the Balkan crisis. What are you trying to do?

Puthucheary: The Balkan crisis reflects certain fundamental questions involving the United Nations—basically, the respect for the sovereignty of a member country and the obligation to protect that country. Secondly, the very important issue of protecting the inhabitants of the member country from genocide being committed against it. And these two

international questions seem to be lost in the general propaganda of the Balkan crisis. As parliamentarians we feel that we have an obligation to each of our parliaments to correct this picture.

The aim would be a unity of parliaments to reflect concern that a very well-established principle of international law—basically, the U.N. Charter and the convention on genocide—has been overlooked in this particular case. It is frightening to realize that this can be done in this day and age. The problem is that this establishes a very serious precedent and, in an age where there are going to be increasing ethnic conflicts which are created deliberately or for historical reasons remain unresolved, it can make the United Nations totally impotent and cause a lot of suffering to millions of innocent people.

The purpose of the international parliamentarians conference that will be held in the Malaysian capital of Kuala Lumpur on Nov. 16-17 (this will follow the fact-finding trip to Sarajevo) is to focus international opinion on these problems, and influence the U.N.

One of the problems that arises from the lack of implementation of the accepted principles of international law is that the bureaucracy of the international organizations, that is, the U.N. or the European Community, has simply taken over not only the responsibility, but the responsibility without accountability. As members of parliament, we are imbued with the responsibility of accountability. There seems to be a serious gap in international law, the international order, when nations entrust the Security Council to take some decisions on their behalf. These decisions then are transmitted to bureaucrats as a mandate. The bureaucrats must then be accountable to the Security Council and the Security Council to the General Assembly. *But that's not what's happening.* There is a serious gap.

What this really means is that the final accountability of the bureaucrat is to his nation-state, to his government, and not to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, as it has proved in this case. The two mediators, David Owen and Thorvald Stoltenberg, one from the European Community and the other from the United Nations, are doing things entirely on their own. Who can question them? Who can bring them into line with the policies of the United Nations, the theoretical policies of the U.N.? . . .

I'm a Malaysian. Malaysia is a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society. There are no geographical boundaries separating the communities. We live in a very mixed society, in a political and geographical sense. We have always prided ourselves on being an exemplary society as far as multi-racialism is concerned. Therefore, what is happening to Bosnia is the antithesis of what we have been trying to achieve in Malaysia.

The problem is that if it can happen to Bosnia, it can happen to any country. What the U.N. has not understood, or the mediators have not understood, is that their policy in respect to Bosnia is to encourage irredentist movements *all over the world*. Wherever countries share borders, for example, you have an overflow of people of one ethnic group into

the other. For centuries those who live in these kind of border areas have accepted that they belong to the country that they reside in. It is an accepted policy of all nations in Asia and in ASEAN [the Association of Southeast Asian Nations] in particular that we shall not seek to change the border of our territories irrespective of whether or not there are people of common ethnicity in the neighborhood.

If the United Nations policy is to tolerate a change of borders to follow ethnic grouping and not geopolitical reality, that's a very dangerous step in international politics. If you redraw these boundaries, you are going to uproot millions and millions of people. It destroys nations. . . .

EIR: In Egypt, they have been having huge demonstrations around the Balkan crisis. Many Islamic countries see this as an Islamic issue.

Puthucheary: The Islamic countries who respond to it as an Islamic issue are making a mistake. It is not an Islamic issue. It is only an Islamic issue as a consequence of the policy of genocide against the Muslims; and insofar as that is concerned, yes, it is a concern of the Islamic groups. How do you respond to it? It is understandable when Islamic countries respond as Muslims when they see persecution and genocide against those who share their belief. But as leaders of the world community, or leaders of the nation, you must see it differently, and seek a solution.

You must rise above the emotions that are unleashed in this kind of conflict, and the suffering that has been brought onto the Muslims in Bosnia, and see it in the larger political sense. For a mediator or a national leader to say and think that it is an ethnic problem, a problem of religious conflict, is to bring the leader down to the level of the masses, and this is not leadership.

EIR: If this is allowed to stand, what will it do to North-South relations?

Puthucheary: It is going to leave a very deep mark in the minds of the people in Asia and Africa, particularly within the Muslim nations. . . . The result of this will proliferate extremist movements; it will give ideological sustenance to the clash of civilizations—Samuel Huntington's words. It will give the [radical] Islamic groups the ideological advantage over the more liberal Islamic groups. The impact and the consequences seem to have been so frivolously handled by western leaders.

EIR: Bosnian leaders have identified Britain, Russia, and France as being the major bloc in the international community on this policy. Do you agree?

Puthucheary: I have no concrete evidence to say who in fact is responsible, except that if you start from the premises of the policy as proposed by David Owen, and you work yourself from that point upwards, then inevitably he must be reflecting British Establishment opinion because he is the appointee of the British Establishment.