

NATO falls out in chaos over the war in Bosnia

by Katharine Kanter

Just as the whole of continental Europe was preparing to erupt into an explosion of *Schadenfreude* over what has been sensitively described as the “auto-erotic” passing of Stephen Milligan, MP, the British elite which secretes that species of man in garters pulled the trump card from their sleeves: Russia.

Three days after the attack of Feb. 6 upon the Sarajevo market, where 68 people were killed by a single mortar shell, the 16 NATO ambassadors finally agreed in Brussels on Feb. 9 to launch air strikes against the Serbian forces besieging Sarajevo. But read the small print: The Serbians were given ten days to withdraw their weapons ringing the city, and the bombing raids are to start only subject to an explicit order from Boutros Boutros-Ghali, that agent of British influence currently occupying the post of U.N. secretary general. Air strikes were in fact, under French pressure, being contemplated before the latest outrage, but only as a means to force the Bosnians to finally sign Lord David Owen’s tripartition agreement. These late three days of western haggling and indecision, then the grotesque *ten day* period of grace for Serbia—it has already had *three years* of grace—gave the British more than ample time to squeeze their friends in high places in Russia.

Great Britain was preparing for a change in the winds blowing from America well before the events of Feb. 6; David Owen spent most of the previous week in Moscow, as did his Entente Cordiale partner, French Defense Minister François Léotard. Meanwhile, both Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Vasili Churkin and Third Rome ideologue Vladimir Zhirinovskiy were in Serbia.

As Great Britain has nothing to offer Russia from a scientific, technological, or industrial standpoint, its only strength is the complete strategic paralysis of the United States and Germany; it can “offer” Russia what it may not own but can indeed deliver: namely, the guarantee that the United States

will do *nothing* to prevent Russia from retaking all of the former Soviet Union, and, through Greater Serbia, gaining a predominant controlling interest down into Asia Minor. It’s a bluff, but it’s a very clever bluff, and at the moment, it’s working.

By Feb. 10, the Russian deputy prime minister was on stage right on cue, warning that Russia would not tolerate any NATO intervention against Serbia, and that it would be convening an urgent meeting of the U.N. Security Council to that effect. This came shortly after a calculated outburst by presidential adviser Andranik Migranyan, who said on Feb. 7: “A strike against Serbia can prove to be a strike against Russia. If Russian diplomacy doesn’t block inappropriate measures by NATO, the Balkan crisis will lead to a considerable worsening of the domestic political struggle in Russia. It’s a big mistake to believe that Vladimir Zhirinovskiy is alone in his pro-Serbian position.”

Yet another twist to this sorry tale, and one which in the tumult of events received little attention in the western press, were the words of Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev to the effect, that should the West dare move in favor of Bosnia, Russia would look to the “ethnic cleansing” against Russian citizens allegedly taking place in the Baltic states—in other words, he threatened a Russian invasion of the Baltic states.

LaRouche: Smash the Entente Cordiale

Admist all the uproar and confusion, this much is evident: If, to avoid a confrontation with Russia *in the short term*, NATO backs down before Serbia, by April the Serbians will have overrun Kosova and Macedonia and a pan-Balkan war will erupt. This merely puts off the confrontation to the so-called medium term.

In his weekly radio interview “EIR Talks” on Feb. 9, Lyndon LaRouche reiterated that there is one way, and one

way only, to avoid that war, and that is to smash the Entente Cordiale—the British-French alliance to which President Clinton succumbed last May:

“The reason nothing has been done, essentially, is because of a sensitivity on the Russian question. There are a lot of Russian hardliners who are sympathetic to the Serbs, as I explained back in 1988 in a nationwide television broadcast, in discussing the danger of this war. [A change in U.S. policy] would mean an open break with this British faction around Thatcher, around Major. That’s what the problem is. . . .

“You’re not going to succeed in doing anything good, unless you go against the instincts of the Entente Cordiale, or otherwise known as *revanchiste* faction in France, in a subordinate way; and, more primarily, the British faction, which is represented by Lord Owen today, and by Margaret Thatcher and others back in 1989.”

Growing public disgust

The massacre at the Sarajevo market was no “novelty.” Perhaps as many as 500,000 Bosnians have already died since the war began in March 1992, thousands by torture and gang rape. What was “novel” about the events of Feb. 6, is that NATO governments became suddenly aware that public tolerance of their entire policy package has been practically exhausted, and that this may have frightening implications for their supposed economic and social “consensus” as well.

One day before the massacre, the largest demonstration ever held in Germany in favor of Bosnia took place in Stuttgart, where 8-10,000 people, according to police, assembled in the main square, carrying banners demanding arms for Bosnia, and accusing Lord Owen and Boutros-Ghali of genocide. As no other German political figures agreed to address the demonstration, the Bosnian organizers invited two representatives of the Schiller Institute to address the multitude.

In Paris, on Feb. 7, a spontaneous gathering of 300 people outside the French Foreign Ministry, shouting “Arms for Bosnia! Down with Western Hypocrisy!” moved from the ministry, across the Alexander III Bridge, and proceeded up toward the Champs Elysées. Within minutes, the group had become a crowd of over 2,000, as men and women off the street joined in, raising their voice with the same battle cry.

The British government too has been made keenly aware, that its absolute, overriding priority, namely, the special relationship to the United States, has reached the snapping point (see p. 60). This is what pushed British Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd to call off his projected trip to South Africa, and state that “the balance of *risk* and *rewards* has shifted,” or, as military sources told the *Daily Telegraph*, “There may now be overriding *diplomatic* reasons to threaten air strikes.”

Bosnian resistance gets stronger

There is something else which has got the British and French worried: the will to resist of the Bosnian people. The

Paris daily *Le Monde* commented that the thrust of Franco-American talks on Bosnia involved the French agreeing to go along with NATO air strikes, in exchange for the Americans forcing the Bosnians to sign the Owen tripartition plan. Quite openly, the François Mitterrand government has gone so far as to try to talk the U.S. administration into imposing sanctions on *Bosnia!* What is actually behind this foolish little double game, is that the French want to preserve the Entente with their British and Russian friends, by ensuring tripartition and a Serbian victory in Bosnia, without going the whole hog and having to test Russian reaction to a pan-Balkan war. A clinical case of Marie-Antoinette wanting to have her cake and eat it!

This news service was told by a high-level French source, whose current occupation is touring Bosnian Army camps in the guise of a pro-Bosnian activist, that the reorganization of the Bosnian Army has been extraordinarily effective and that there is a real “risk” that the Bosnians could reconquer the Serbian-occupied territories; therefore, said he, the Bosnians should be “allowed” to get only so strong, as to be confident to sign the tripartition without feeling they would lose everything in so doing.

The Bosnian people, however, seem to have other things on their mind which do not involve toeing the British line; they were greatly heartened also, by the visit of Turkish Prime Minister Tansu Ciller and Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto to Sarajevo the first week in February. Bosnia, a nation of scarcely 4 million people, overrun by a country three times its size with one of the best-trained and equipped armies in the world; Bosnia, a nation which has 15,000 hostile “U.N.” troops on its territory; Bosnia, whose enemies include three of the world’s most powerful nations, namely Russia, England, and France, has held out against all odds for almost two years. Although its people are starving, it has refused to sign the tripartition “agreement,” it has entirely reorganized its armies, it is fighting, and it is refusing to surrender although three-quarters of its territory lies in enemy hands. Few people in the West realize that the Bosnian resistance is one of the only things standing between them, and what will otherwise surely become a general European war.

A shift in Croatia

There can be little doubt that it is the Bosnian resistance, informed by LaRouche’s attack on the Entente Cordiale powers, which has drawn the Croatian nation back from the brink of the abyss. Only a fortnight after the Croatian cultural review *Hrvatski Rukopis* hit the newsstands with a cover feature on Lyndon LaRouche and the Entente Cordiale, Mate Boban, leader of the self-styled “Croatian Republic of Herceg-Bosna,” resigned amidst a chorus of attacks. Even *Le Monde* felt obliged to report that “very unhappy with Mr. Boban’s policy of splitting and partitioning Bosnia, and attaching ‘Herceg-Bosna’ to the so-called ‘Mother Croatia,’

many Croatians had gone over into open rebellion." On Feb. 7, an Assembly of Croatians of Bosnia was formed at Sarajevo to oppose tripartition; on Feb. 9, the head of the Liberal Party of Croatia called for the dissolution of the so-called Republic of Herceg-Bosna.

Encouraging as that may be, a Croatian-Bosnian agreement will not suffice to stop the war, because both nations are pawns in the geopolitical Great Game. Precisely as LaRouche has warned countless times since the outbreak of the Balkans conflict in 1991, it is U.S. alignment on British policy which has led us down the path toward a confrontation with Russia implying the greatest perils. Now again, the British have succeeded in maneuvering the U.S. administration into a Catch-22: If Clinton, seeking to avoid in the short term a confrontation with Russia, takes no action to save Bosnia, a pan-Balkan war will erupt. If Clinton does take military action, he may find himself in a Cuban missile crisis-style situation. In the midst of that crisis, Kennedy had the wisdom to consult General MacArthur. Before things go that far wrong, one hopes someone around the U.S. administration will have the wisdom to consult Lyndon LaRouche.

Croatia trapped by compromise

by Elke Fimmen

The author recently toured Croatia, and addressed two public forums there on Lyndon LaRouche's policies over the weekend of Jan. 29-30.

The pedestrian walking around in downtown Zagreb these days, as I observed on a recent visit there, will frequently pass by newsstands displaying front pages sporting a picture of the American opposition politician Lyndon LaRouche. Indeed, in no other country in Europe is there such open and intensive discussion of LaRouche's strategic analyses of the Anglo-American role in destabilizing Europe through the Balkan war, as well as of LaRouche's economic programs and philosophical ideas. During the past three weeks alone, the Croatian magazine *Hrvatski Rukopis* printed a multi-paged interview with LaRouche, followed up by two extensive reports on LaRouche's political ideas in the Sunday issues of the big daily paper *Vecernji List*, dealing among other things with the issue of whether national sovereignty should be defended.

Sovereignty has become a burning issue for people in Croatia, following their bitter experience with Serbian aggression, the West's support for Serbia, the United Nations

occupation policy, and the recent "normalization agreement" which the Croatian government made with Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic. That agreement provides not only for the establishment of mutual diplomatic contacts, but also for the reopening of the superhighway to Belgrade and Croatian shipments of oil to Serbia. Many Croatians fear that they will once again entirely lose their hard-fought independence, and that if the rapprochement continues any further, the one-third of Croatian territory currently occupied by Serbs will permanently remain under Serb control. This fear has prompted the bitter comment that "maybe Milosevic will get a medal soon for having liberated Croatia."

Nobody believes that "peace" with Serbia is possible, or that Milosevic is seriously willing to make concessions to Croatia, such as pulling out of the occupied areas. On the contrary, following the relative lull which Milosevic has created in Bosnia and in the internal Serbian situation, the Serbs are expected to launch new military actions within Croatia. "There have been countless agreements, and what has come of them?" we were told. All of the refugees who cannot return to their homes in Croatia, and people living in the war zones themselves, are most realistic in their pessimism.

Nose-to-nose with the Serbs

One can get a peek at this reality by visiting the Croatian-controlled area on the northern bank of the Sava River in Slavonia. This is an extremely fertile agricultural area with villages dotting the river's shoreline. For more than two years, people have been living there nose-to-nose against the Serbian Chetniks, who control the entire Croatian area from the Sava southward to the Bosnian border. A young priest showed us the two shut-down churches he is in charge of. In one of them—a beautiful old church—the steeple is missing, the sanctuary is burned out and blackened with soot; only the words "*gloria in excelsis Deo*" have been painstakingly restored above the choir. Elderly ladies showed us the shot-out windows and other damage to their homes, which are situated directly opposite the Serbs. Ongoing individual incidents are frequent.

In another area, a Croatian bridgehead on the Sava's southern bank, the situation is even more tense. This was the scene of recent Serbian attacks in which many people were killed. Serbian troop reinforcements have also been observed there. Here, the Serbian Chetniks are only 20 meters away on the other side of the railroad tracks. The destruction of the houses located directly on the front line is indescribable, spooky. It must look a lot like this in Vukovar.

The mood in Croatia these days is gloomy, and is marked by feelings of helplessness over the "realpolitik" driving the rapprochement with Serbia, a process which came about mostly because of pressure from the West and the intensification of the warfare in Bosnia. Nevertheless, in some parts of Bosnia—around Tuzla, for example—Croats and Muslims continue to fight side-by-side against the Serbian aggressors;