

there are hotheads, there are clashes now and then, but on the whole, it is good.

EIR: What happened at the eastern enclaves?

Diviak: All those governments which took part in the London Conference in July, bear the guilt for the fall of Srebrenica and Zepa. Those governments acted in a partisan way. They were partial to the Serbian side. They delivered up those cities to the forces of Gen. [Ratko] Mladic.

EIR: Do you think that most Serbians in Serbia are pleased with the war?

Diviak: Three hundred thousand men of science, learned men, have left Serbia in the last two years alone. There are a great many deserters from the Army. A great many Serbs know that they can perfectly well live alongside the Muslims.

There are also many who protest in the Serbian-occupied parts of Bosnia against Radovan Karadzic's regime. They protest. But they are under pressure and they are not able to say what they think.

To wage this war, the Serbians were forced to bring in many people from other parts, especially, for example, from Montenegro. Because it was not easy to make the Serbians born in Bosnia to fight against their country.

Interview: Francis Boyle

Supply arms to Bosnia in the fastest way

Francis Boyle is Professor of International Law at the University of Illinois at Champaign.

EIR: Senator Dole has just put off the vote on the arms embargo again.

Boyle: If people really want to get those arms into Bosnia, the easiest, the fastest way, is to tack on an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Bill. It cannot be vetoed, or the entire defense budget goes. I think we just missed the boat on that one.

Or, the bill to fund the entire government is coming up. Half a billion dollars to buy weapons for Bosnia-Herzegovina could be tacked on.

This would require *leadership* from Mr. Dole and Mr. [Jesse] Helms [R-N.C., chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee], but it can be done.

First Lady takes Beijing by storm

by William Jones

Mrs. Hillary Clinton accomplished a diplomatic tour de force in her first visit to the Chinese capital on the occasion of the U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women that opened in Beijing on Sept. 5. Her address to the Beijing international women's conference denounced the attempts to impose a United Nations Organization-agencies dictatorship to intervene in the internal affairs of families within nations. "What we are learning around the world, is that, if women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. . . . And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish," Mrs. Clinton said.

Her attack on human rights violations against women was also a clear swipe at practices supported by anti-population non-governmental organizations, although the news media chose to interpret it as simply against China. "It is a violation of human rights when women are denied the right to plan their own families, and that includes being forced to have abortions or being sterilized against their will," Mrs. Clinton said.

She also attacked it as a violation of human rights "when women are raped in their own communities and when thousands of women are subjected to rape as a tactic or prize of war," the hardly veiled target of which was the Bosnian Serb leadership.

The speech garnered significant approval from such a strong right-to-life Republican as Rep. Chris Smith (R-N.J.), who characterized it as "eloquent."

A pleasant surprise

A few weeks prior to the Beijing conference, things looked pretty dim for any possibility of having her attend the conference, in spite of intense lobbying by the Chinese to get her there. By August, relations with the Chinese government had fallen to their lowest point in years after an explosive and rather disproportionate Chinese reaction to the private visit of Taiwan's President Lee Teng-hui to the United States last June.

The Clinton administration had given President Lee permission to come to the United States strictly on a private basis to attend a class reunion at his alma mater, Cornell University. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman

Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) had been a key promoter of the Lee visit, hoping to turn it into a major political demonstration against the Chinese government. But the Clinton administration was having none of that, asserting the “private” nature of President Lee’s visit as well as U.S. adherence to a “one China” policy.

The Chinese government had withdrawn its ambassador to the United States in protest to the visit and had canceled a series of scheduled diplomatic exchanges at various levels. Then, on June 19, Chinese authorities arrested Chinese-American activist Harry Wu, then on a visit to China. Wu is an outspoken “human rights” activist, who has been strongly supported by Senator Helms and his colleagues. Wu had earlier angered the Chinese by his exposure of the Chinese use of prison labor in making products for export. The arrest of the controversial activist by the Chinese was grist for the mill of Helms and other Republicans who wanted to throw a monkey-wrench into attempts by the Clinton administration to improve relations with China.

A meeting was held between Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, and a visit to China of Undersecretary of State Peter Tarnoff was arranged for the end of August. At the same time, the United States was asking that the Chinese release Harry Wu for humanitarian reasons. It was while Tarnoff was in China that the Chinese announced that they were expelling Harry Wu from the country, after having convicted him in record time for illicit activities a few days before.

The release of Wu opened the door to a visit by the First Lady to the Beijing Women’s Conference.

Statesman-like performance

The visit itself immediately became the target of right-wing Republican sniping, with some Republicans warning that a visit by the First Lady would be equivalent to “acquiescing” in China’s violation of human rights. In her first speech to the conference, Mrs. Clinton took the wind out of the sails of her critics, giving a very direct and hard-hitting speech on the rights of women, or as the First Lady defined it, the right of every woman “to realize her God-given potential.”

The intervention of the First Lady also served to significantly shift the conference away from the bombastic posturing of radical feminists such as Bella Abzug, orienting it, instead, toward issues of economic and social development. Already on Aug. 24, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Madeleine Albright, the official head of the U.S. delegation, had indicated that the purpose of the Beijing conference, in the eyes of the United States, was to focus on the importance of the family, indicating that the U.S. delegation would be lining up more with the forces of the Vatican, also present at the conference, rather than with the radical feminists, who were present at the conference en masse.



First Lady Hillary Clinton told the U.N. conference on women in Beijing: “If women are healthy and educated, their families will flourish. . . . And when families flourish, communities and nations will flourish.”

However, no individual nation was singled out by name, although the nature of the abuses to be condemned were delineated in no uncertain terms. Mrs. Clinton also asserted the rights of people “to assemble, organize, and debate openly.”

Although such sentiments may also have rankled some Chinese leaders, and the Chinese government did not allow the Clinton speech to be published in the *Beijing Forum* newsletter and attempted to keep the conference within very strict limits, they took no public umbrage at her comments. The very presence of the First Lady at the conference was undoubtedly for them a clear indication that the Clinton administration was willing to work with the Chinese government.

That willingness was clearly conveyed by the First Lady, who stated that the President intended to remain “engaged” with China in a broad and comprehensive relationship, emphasizing that the United States was seeking to establish “an honest relationship” with the Chinese leaders.