

## U.S. credibility at stake in Bosnia, says LaRouche

by Edward Spannaus

As officials from the United States and allied nations, including Russia, headed into the July 21 emergency meetings on Bosnia in London, U.S. statesmen Lyndon LaRouche warned that the credibility of the United States would be finished unless the United States and NATO carried out massive air strikes against the Serbs.

"What has to be done," LaRouche said, is that in this immediate period, NATO "is going to have to take out all the relevant targets of opportunity, logistical heavy weapons, through largely air-strike methods . . . to bring about the defeat of a bunch of war criminals who won't stop committing war crimes and crimes against humanity, as in the case of Srebrenica.

"If that does not happen," he continued, "then the credibility of the United States, the United States government in particular, but the United States as a whole, is *gone*."

"If we do not act," LaRouche warned, "the United States government, which would mean the Clinton administration in this particular case but the whole government, the U.S. military, and the entire United States, *has lost strategic credibility*, and our attempts to project *any* policy, any foreign policy whatsoever, will be generally treated with disgust and contempt by nations around the world. And therefore the time has come in which we have to act."

### A turning point

After months and years of being deterred from such action by the United Nations and by the British, the United States, acting through the Clinton administration, headed into the London meetings with an aggressive proposal for what were being called "massive and disproportionate" air strikes against the Serbs.

Of particular importance was the reported French agreement with the U.S. proposal, which followed a telephone

conversation between Presidents William Clinton and Jacques Chirac on July 20. It was also notable that the British, apparently fearing the loss of their ability to control and manipulate the Balkans situation, were said to be giving grudging support to Clinton's plan, in order to salvage the U.N. presence in Bosnia.

The stated, official position of the Clinton administration going into the London meeting was that the U.N. mission in Bosnia must be strengthened and reinvigorated. This appeared to stand in sharp contrast to the declaration of representatives of Bosnia and Hercegovina that the U.N. mission in their country is finished and should be terminated.

Likewise, the Clinton administration loudly declared its opposition to a unilateral lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia, as is being advocated by Sen. Robert Dole (R-Kan.) and an apparent majority in the United States Senate, not to mention the Bosnians themselves.

However, on both questions—the future of the U.N. mission, and the lifting of the arms embargo—the difference between the Clinton administration's official view, and the contrary course it appears to be opposing, is not as great as it appears on the surface. And indeed, no matter what the outcome of the London meeting, events are moving toward a long-overdue and rapid termination of the U.N.'s criminal operation in Bosnia, combined with a lifting of the arms embargo which has denied to the Bosnians their inherent right to self-defense.

One indication of this was the willingness of Senate leaders to accede to President Clinton's request that they delay the vote on S. 21, the bill to lift the arms embargo, until after the London conference. Another was the repeated declarations by administration spokesmen of their determination that the U.N. mission would be ended if, after one last chance, it could not be revitalized, and their insistence that the United

States and NATO would no longer tolerate the “insane” dual-key arrangement whereby U.N. officials have a veto over NATO air strikes.

In the likely event that the Unprofor forces in Bosnia are to be evacuated, this will require the same sort of massive use of air power which the United States is proposing at London. Senate leaders such as Dole are insisting that if U.S. troops are used to assist a U.N. evacuation from Bosnia, that this should only be done under NATO command, with the U.N. kept out of it, and with the United States having the right of massive retaliation against the Serbs, including taking out SAM missile sites and other strategic targets. Administration spokesmen have indicated their agreement with the need for such rules of engagement.

### The Sacirbey declaration

Of singular importance was the statement made by Bosnian Foreign Minister Muhamed Sacirbey in Washington on July 17, in which Sacirbey announced that the U.N. mission in Bosnia and Hercegovina “is at an end,” and that “the U.N. framework is no longer an acceptable basis for the presence of international troops within Bosnia and Hercegovina.” Bosnia will henceforth deal with friendly countries on a bilateral basis or some framework other than the United Nations. Sacirbey also strongly indicated that his nation was finished with the so-called Contact Group, saying that “the current dance with Mr. [Serbian President Slobodan] Milosevic undertaken by Mr. [Swedish U.N. mediator Carl] Bildt and in the past through Mr. Frasure and the Contact Group has shown itself to be at an end,” and has become a means for continued aggression rather than peace.

Sacirbey castigated the attitude of some countries which want the Bosnians to fight alongside their troops, but still deny the Bosnian Army the weapons needed to carry on the fight—in what appeared to be a criticism of the French proposals to inject additional ground forces while maintaining the arms embargo. “I find this position incomprehensible and morally flawed,” the ambassador stated. Sacirbey singled out British Prime Minister John Major for using the London meeting as a delaying tactic “which is intended to allow [the U.N. safe haven] Zepa to die.” While covered as a front-page story in some daily newspapers, Sacirbey’s declaration was completely blacked out by the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. (Substantial portions of Ambassador Sacirbey’s statement will be found on p. 42 in this issue.)

### British perfidy

While other statesmen were beating around the bush and speaking in diplomatic terms, the most accurate and blunt assessment of the British role in the Balkans was as usual provided by LaRouche in his radio interview with “*EIR Talks*” on July 19, from which the quotes at the opening of this article are taken.

LaRouche said that, contrary to what often appears to be the case, it is not that the Serbs are being protected by the

British, but that actually, the Serbs are the *agents* of the British. “Despite what Margaret Thatcher is saying at present,” LaRouche noted, “it was under her government, and with the connivance of President George Bush, that this operation by the Milosevic Serbs against Croatia, briefly against Slovenia too, and against Bosnia was launched. This was done for British geopolitical reasons, initiated, launched, by the government of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.”

LaRouche said that this operation has been run for some time, with the U.N. “policing the warfare *to make sure that the Bosnians and Croats should never actually defeat the Serbs and should be forced to submit to Serb victories.*”

As a result, LaRouche declared, “high officials of the British government, high U.N. officials, including Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the secretary general of the United Nations, have been guilty of complicity in war crimes.”

LaRouche noted that the United States has been opposed to this and has, under President Clinton, desired to have this matter resolved. But, he added: “We have been deterred from acting by the United Nations, and by British influence, and, formerly, British and French influence, under a revived Entente Cordiale, and [by] a British determination to use the Balkans as a lever to try to create a revival of the Triple Entente, nominally against Germany, but actually also against the United States.”

Analyzing the military situation on the ground in Bosnia, LaRouche noted that the Croatian and Bosnian infantry is a far superior fighting force to the Serb Chetnik forces under Radovan Karadzic, but that the margin of advantage of the Chetniks is the heavy weapons capability which they have obtained from Serbia. This advantage can be eliminated very rapidly through the use of U.S. aerospace capabilities, operating under NATO with French-American sponsorship. And this would mean that President Clinton would have to give the U.S. military the latitude to get the job done, without limitations.

We have now come to the point, LaRouche emphasized, that we have to push ahead very quickly, to get agreement among France, the United States, and other forces “to implement what Dole is calling for, lifting of the embargo, and go in there and act expeditiously using full military capabilities, both to assist in the protection of the Unprofor troops who are there, but also to take out this Serb atrocity, *which must be removed* if there’s going to be peace, and a solution to the issues of war crimes in Bosnia.”

“If the United States acts expeditiously—shall we say ‘with pungency and force and expedition’—this whole mess will be under control within a matter of days,” LaRouche concluded. “We may have a problem with the U.N., we may have a problem with our so-called British ally, but *it’s time to have it out*. We cannot mull around with so-called sensitivity or therapy group types of negotiations, in which the cost of continuing the therapy group chats with the mentally ill from London, is that tens of thousands of people in Bosnia are butchered. That’s not acceptable.”