

killing or by the combination of the two.

That is why we have 128,448 persons killed in Bosnia and Hercegovina. That is the effect of an A-bomb. Devastated cities, devastated generations. I was asked the other day how many children died in Bosnia, and I answered, all of them. Those who are really dead are dead—sometimes cruel deaths. But those still living are not children any more, because they experience the rape of their mothers, death of their friends, sisters, and brothers, and they are not children any more. They are just young very old men.

That is why I refuse, when we talk about the possibility of military intervention in Bosnia, to talk any more about any reason beyond this reason. There can be no reason beyond the fact that there is a great crime against humanity being committed in Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Bosnia is one big bleeding place, has been now almost for a year, without almost any meaningful, *any* meaningful reaction from the civilized world. There are some people that really sacrifice their lives there, try to help; but those are individuals from some organizations attempting to do something, but nothing adequate to the colossal crime going on in Bosnia-Hercegovina.

I also think whatever we do now is too late, too late for those dead, for those raped, and for Europe, because it has been defaced, dehumanized. Having rape camps in Europe at the end of the 20th century, having death camps, having people transported in cattle wagons—and not to react to that—is indicative of a state of mind of this civilization. A new neo-isolationism which is, I must say, caused not by political considerations so much as by sheer selfishness and the lack of understanding of how history works.

That is why I say it is my duty to come here to convey the message of what is going on. And it is up to those who can make decisions and who make decisions to do it. If they can live with this, then we can die with this.

Ambassador: 'While we live, it is not too late'

What follows is part of an unofficial transcript of an interview on "CBS This Morning" with Mohammed Sacirby, Bosnia's ambassador to the United Nations, conducted on Dec. 28, 1992 by Paula Zahn.

Zahn: As we approach the end of the year, U.S. troops are securing the relief effort on the ground in Somalia, and patrolling the no-fly zones in the skies over Iraq. And sometime soon, U.S. forces may also be called upon to enforce

the United Nations' no-fly zone over Bosnia. . . . Should the U.S. and other foreign nations enforce the no-fly zone?

Sacirby: Absolutely. It has some practical value for our people, because it prevents helicopters and jets from attacking our town, but it also, I think, sends a symbolic message to stay out of Bosnia's skies.

Zahn: It does not appear that all nations are on board with this idea at the moment. The Russians are sort of going back and forth on this notion.

Sacirby: It does not appear so. I think it's unfortunate because we have so many resolutions passed on Bosnia and by the U.N., and none of them are being enforced. This really sends a very hollow message of what the new world order means.

Zahn: Why do you think the Russians are resisting at this point? And what is your concern about their vacillation?

Sacirby: Well, I think there are quite a few countries that are resisting for reasons that I'm not quite clear on. But, I suspect some of them have to do with concerns that—regarding their troops in Bosnia; and number two, regarding, I think, their being proven wrong in their entire policy of what I would consider appeasement of Serbia.

Zahn: The concern you hear from many Americans is: Okay, so we go in and help enforce the no-fly zone. Then what? Are we going to find ourselves involved in a quagmire like Vietnam and ultimately have to use our ground forces?

Sacirby: Bosnia already has more than sufficient manpower to resist the aggression on its own—

Zahn: You don't think U.S. ground forces then are needed?

Sacirby: Absolutely. We don't think they're needed and we don't, frankly, want them. We think it's a bad idea.

Zahn: What then has to go on from here on out?

Sacirby: I think there are three steps. Number one, enforce the no-fly zone; number two, give the Bosnian troops the right to arm themselves against the superiorly armed enemy; and number three, use American and other western air assets to neutralize the heavy weapons—the tanks, the artillery—that keep bombarding our cities. That three-step solution, I think, could be very effective.

Zahn: How about, in addition to that, surgical air strikes; wiping out power grids; really creating an economic blockade around Belgrade?

Sacirby: Well, at this point in time, we're concerned about the aggression in Bosnia, and nothing is being done to stop the killing of the civilians in Bosnia. If the next necessary step is to do something more regarding Serbia's economic base, so be it.

But, we do not want to have Serbian citizens being at-

tacked. We want to have their military taken out of our country.

Zahn: Senator D'Amato suggested this morning though: Unless you do something about strangling Belgrade, then a lot of the things you're talking about wanting to happen, simply won't.

Sacirby: I think that's at least partially true. I think the problem in Bosnia and in Serbia is not necessarily Milosevic, it's the entire military structure that I think has been way overbuilt and that's, by a factor of ten, too large. Their military structure needs to be significantly shrunk, and I suspect that something along the lines of what happened in Iraq may be necessary.

Zahn: Give us an idea of the scale of the type of operation you're talking about that it would require to wipe out the Serbian military strength in terms of tanks and planes.

Sacirby: When we're talking about what's present in Bosnia—and only in Bosnia—we're talking about anywhere from 500 to 600 tanks. We're talking about a couple of thousand at least artillery pieces. I think a lot of that, obviously, could be dealt with strategical air strikes, and could be done within a relatively short period of time. But, remember, the idea is not to destroy everything. The idea is to get it, to be either withdrawn, or to be handed over to the national control.

Zahn: Why is protecting the Bosnians in the national interest of Americans?

Sacirby: I think the strategic interest kind of has been lost in discussions regarding oil or other economic interests. But, it is the most important strategic interest the United States could have, and that is preserving international law and order.

If we do not preserve it in Bosnia, then we will not manage to preserve it again in a place like Kuwait, or in a place next to our borders. If we talk about strategic interests in terms of economic interests, then what it comes down to is the United States is applying international law and order on a selective basis. And international law and order applied on a selective basis really doesn't constitute law and order anymore; in fact, it constitutes imperialism, so that—

Zahn: Does it anger you? Because, you are—in fact, you're talking about U.S. troops going over to help the Somalians. You now see that the no-fly zone being enforced over Iraq.

Sacirby: No, it doesn't anger me. I'm very happy to see what's happening in Somalia. I think those people deserved it. I think they had a justified humanitarian need.

But, Bosnia deserves it just as much. We not only have a humanitarian need, we also have, I think, a political—and most importantly—a legal need here. A country has been invaded. Its citizens are being slaughtered. Genocide is going

on. We find no help coming; worst of all, we find ourselves facing an arms embargo that prevents us from even coming up close to being able to confront our enemy.

Zahn: We had a number of senators push for involvement more than a year ago. Have we missed our window of opportunity?

Sacirby: For our people, the window of opportunity exists as long as we're alive. And, frankly, from the western perspective, the longer that we wait to confront the Serbian aggression—the Serbian military—whether it's maybe in Bosnia or down the road in Kosovo or Macedonia, I think the worse it will be.

So, yes, to some extent, I think we've missed many golden opportunities, but we shouldn't assume that time is passing by. Certainly, Bosnians are not thinking time has passed them by. We continue to struggle.

Women's group documents mass sexual atrocities

The Women's Group Tresnjevka, located in Zagreb, Croatia, released the reports excerpted here on Sept. 28, 1992:

... The stream of survivor testimonies which we came across, together with the work of other organizations throughout Croatia and information gathered in refugee camps throughout Europe, prompted our investigation into the systematic sexual atrocities being committed against women in the context of the Serbian and Montenegrin occupations of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. We are in the second month of our research, which is bringing staggering and appalling results.

At the time when the world was shocked by the media pictures of Nazi-style concentration camps on the occupied areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina, we were finding out about the existence of rape/death camps for women and children, mostly of reproductive ages, in occupied territories of both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia. Very little is known about the fate of these women, and unfortunately the topic of sexual abuse is still treated as a secondary concern within the world organizations and the media which are investigating the war crimes that are occurring on these territories.

Rape/death camps

The existence of rape/death camps must be understood as a strategy or tactic of genocide, of a "final solution." Unlike rape camps which were set up during the wars in, for example, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Korea, the camps in