

Gloves come off on U.N. complicity with Serb aggression

by Paolo Raimondi

Croatian and Bosnian political leaders are finally taking the gloves off in their fight against United Nations complicity with the "Greater Serbia" designs of Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic and Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic and their crimes against the people and nations victimized by their aggression. On Dec. 20, Prof. Zvonimir Separovic, the former foreign minister of Croatia and currently the leader of Libertas, the opposition movement to Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, speaking as chairman of the Society of Victimology of Zagreb, announced an *actio popularis* initiative against U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali for his complicity and negligence in dealing with the crimes of the Serbian aggressors.

Actio popularis is a form of popular denunciation in old Roman Law, a demonstration of popular, informal, non-institutionalized denunciation of someone or something operating against the people.

Professor Separovic, speaking in the name of millions of victims in Croatia and Bosnia, accused Boutros-Ghali of being morally and politically guilty of the crime of omission vis-à-vis the crimes perpetrated by the Serbian aggressors. Among other accusations, Separovic charged Boutros-Ghali with sabotaging the measures adopted by the U.N. to stop the aggressors' genocidal actions, thus contradicting the principles of right and international law; preventing NATO air strikes and military intervention against the aggressors; maintaining the weapons embargo against Croatia and Bosnia, thus preventing effective self-defense by the victims; making impossible the carrying forward of the investigations by the commission of experts against the war criminals in former Yugoslavia, starting with Milosevic, Karadzic, and General Martić; demanding that European Union mediator Lord David Owen reduce the number of Serbian actions classified as crimes; and attempting to equate the responsibility of the aggressors with that of the victims. Separovic charged that Boutros-Ghali committed these crimes with full knowledge of the consequences.

Some of the results of Boutros-Ghali's crimes of omission, Separovic said, have been the failure of the mandate of the U.N. Protection Forces (Unprofor) in Croatia and Bosnia, the failure to disarm the aggressors, and the go-ahead given to the Serbs to launch attacks against Bihac (a U.N. protected

zone) from Unprofor-controlled zones in Croatia.

The denunciation against Boutros-Ghali was just the first of similar *actio popularis* petitions expected to be forthcoming against Lord Owen, former U.S. and U.N. mediators Cyrus Vance and Thorvald Stoltenberg, Gen. Sir Michael Rose, General MacKenzie, and others who allowed the crimes to be perpetrated.

As reported in the Croatian daily *Slobodna Dalmacija*, the initiative was also signed by the Mothers of Vukovar; the Association of Displaced Croats of the areas of Sisak, Ilok, Skabrnje, and Nadina; the Association of Displaced Persons from Bosnia-Herzegovina; and the mayor of Bihac, Hamdija Kabiljagic, on behalf of 70,000 people who are still trapped in that Bosnian city.

Part of the 'new world order'

Presenting his initiative to the public, Professor Separovic, in an interview in *Slobodna Dalmacija* on Dec. 22, said that the activities of the United Nations in the Balkans have to be seen in the context of "a scenario of a new geopolitics at work, of a Trilateral, Kissinger new world order, and in the context of freemasonic interests in the Balkans [working] against the existence of nation-states." He also exposed the agreement of the Triple Entente among London, Paris, and Moscow to create a new Yugoslavia, or Greater Serbia.

The most recent U.N.-proposed initiatives and agreements also fit the same pattern of complicity with the aggressors as in the past. Croatian President Tudjman and Serbian President Milosevic have worked out, under U.N. sponsorship, a "peace" plan whose implementation can only lead to the re-creation of a U.N.-British-controlled new Yugoslavia. With big propaganda fanfare at the end of December, the highway from Zagreb to Belgrade was reopened after more than three years of interruption, following the Serbian aggression and occupation of the eastern part of Croatian territory. In fact, a section of the highway goes through Serbian-occupied Slavonia. Leaders of the Croatian opposition have denounced this deal as a sellout of the Croatian national interest and as a signal that the perspective of regaining national territorial integrity is being abandoned.

Political analyst Srećko Jurđana, writing in *Slobodna Dalmacija* on Jan. 6, put it bluntly: Instead of using the unsecured corridor of Bosanska-Posavina to resupply the Serbian-occupied territories in Croatia with weapons and men, the Serbs now can use a four-lane, high-speed highway from Belgrade to Okučani (in Slavonia), and Banja Luka to Knin. It is clear that the acceptance of such a deal implies the implementation of the Lord Owen plan of carving up Bosnia-Herzegovina and dismantling it as a state.

On the Bosnia front, the U.N. (with the unhappy help of former U.S. President Jimmy Carter) orchestrated a four-month cease-fire between the Bosnian forces and the Chetniks of Karadzic, but this has proven to be a farce, designed just to help the Serbians troops reorganize and continue their

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.