

dismemberment, annexation, and incorporation, which will constitute the logical culmination and ultimate success of its genocidal plan to establish a "Greater Serbia." . . . If not prevented by this Court, the Respondent plans to annex and incorporate substantial portions of the sovereign territory of Bosnia and to remove therefrom all people who recognize Bosnia citizenship irrespective of their other affiliations—whether Muslim, Christian, Jew, Serb, Croat—by means of genocide and acts of genocide in violation of the Genocide Convention and this Court Order of April 8, 1993. Clearly, the destruction of a sovereign nation-state by means of genocide by another state must fall within the prohibitions of the Genocide Convention to which both states are parties. The Respondent's proposed partition of Bosnia will be the prelude to the final extinction of our State and the ultimate extermination of our People. . . .

Provisional Measures Requested:

1) That Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) must immediately cease and desist from providing directly or indirectly, any type of support to any nations, group, organization . . . in Bosnia and Hercegovina for any reason.

2) That Yugoslavia and all of its public officials—including especially the President of Serbia—must immediately cease and desist from any and all efforts . . . to partition, dismember, annex or incorporate the sovereign territory of Bosnia. . . .

3) That the annexation or incorporation of any territory of Bosnia . . . be deemed illegal, null and void *ab initio*.

4) That the Government of Bosnia must have the means to "prevent" the commission of the acts of genocide. . . .

8) That in order to fulfill the obligations under the Genocide Convention. . . the Government of Bosnia must have the ability to obtain military weapons, equipment and supplies from other [Convention] Contracting Parties.

9) That in order to fulfill their obligations under the Genocide Convention. . . all Contracting Parties must have the ability to provide military weapons . . . and armed forces to the Government of Bosnia.

10) That United Nations Peacekeeping Forces in Bosnia (Unprofor) must do all in their power to ensure the flow of humanitarian relief supplies to the Bosnian People through the Bosnian city of Tuzla.

McCloskey demands removal of Lord Owen

The following are excerpts from a press conference given on Capitol Hill on Aug. 5 by Rep. Frank McCloskey (D-Ind.) and Mr. Marshall Harris, former head of the Bosnia Desk at the State Department, who resigned the day before in protest

against the U.S. policy toward Bosnia.

McCloskey: . . . I call on Secretary Christopher and President Clinton, and they will be formally advised to that effect today, to ask the European Community to replace David Owen as its mediator in the talks. Owen, who is cravenly calling for the dismemberment of the sovereign Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, has egregiously exceeded his mandate as a mediator by pressuring the parties to the talks to agree to the alteration of international borders. In effect, perhaps without his knowing it—I don't know the state of his consciousness—he has become a *de facto* proponent of Serb genocidal interests.

I am pleased to announce today that Marshall Freeman Harris has joined my staff as a foreign policy adviser, in fact, my major foreign policy adviser. Mr. Harris resigned yesterday from his position as Bosnia Desk Officer at the Department of State to protest U.S. pressure on the Bosnian government to accept a partition agreement in Geneva. His expertise in the State Department was in Balkan affairs. He will advise me, however, on the full range of foreign policy issues.

. . . The Clinton administration's decision to launch air strikes against Bosnian Serb targets if the siege of Sarajevo continues is a most welcome development. I have talked to President Clinton himself several times on this in the last two weeks, and I know he is truly sincere in wanting to lift the siege of Sarajevo and, indeed, all of Bosnia, particularly in places where the problems are even worse, such as Gorazde.

I urge the President and the Secretary of State, Christopher, to work vigorously to realize this policy objective. At the same time, I urge them to do more. Air strikes should be only the first step in a U.S.-led military campaign to roll back Bosnian Serb gains and restore Bosnia as a unitary state. The administration should act immediately to lift the arms embargo so that the Bosnian people can defend themselves against the Bosnian Serb forces' campaign of genocidal terror. I also urge President Clinton to withdraw immediately our country's support for the Bosnian partition talks in Geneva. Those are not peace talks, they are genocide—genocide-abetting partition talks, if I might say that.

The following are quotes from an exchange between Mr. Marshall Harris and reporters:

Q: Mr. Harris, are you resigning because you disagree with the policy or do you disagree with the way it's being implemented?

Mr. Harris: I disagree with the policy, and the policy is that we are prepared to use air strikes now in Bosnia, not merely to punish the Bosnian Serbs, who are guilty of genocide and brutal aggression in that country, but to use those strikes as a means of compelling a political settlement in Geneva, a political settlement that will inevitably lead to the partitioning of Bosnia. . . . The administration, I think, should—as the congressman has said today—immediately

withdraw its support for the talks, and President Clinton should introduce a resolution in the United Nations to lift the arms embargo, which I sincerely believe is still possible if he engages in the process directly and actively.

I feel very strongly that the United States should not or cannot accept the dismemberment of a U.N. nation—a sovereign U.N. nation in Europe even when that dismemberment is being brought about by force, as it is in this case. The talks that are going on in Geneva now that we refer to as peace talks are in fact partition talks or dismemberment talks, and I find that completely unacceptable that a global democratic power could support such a process. It's completely inconsistent with our values as a nation and what we stand for as a democracy.

Q: And what do you feel about Lord Owen and his position?

Mr. Harris: I think that Lord Owen is overly concerned with getting a political settlement now in Bosnia. I think that his—he's made it too high a priority that we reach a settlement. His overarching concern seems to bring this to a—the conflict and the crisis in Bosnia to a quick conclusion, and I think that's completely inappropriate, and in this case, since it's going to lead to a partitioning of a country, it's completely inappropriate.

Q: Your predecessor at the State Department [George Kenney] also resigned. Does this signal that the State Department is in great turmoil over the policies?

Mr. Harris: Well, I don't know that we're in great turmoil, but it's no secret that there is widespread dissent within the department, dating from the Bush administration; Mr. Kenney's resignation a year or so ago is the most obvious manifestation of that.

I'm not going to speak for my colleagues who remain in the department, but I do know that I'm not alone in feeling that we're not doing the right thing, that we're not doing enough in Bosnia.

... My concern here mainly is that the administration, first of all, has treated Bosnia as a footnote in its domestic policy agenda, rather than as a legitimate foreign policy concern. As I say, the partitioning of a European state should be of vital concern to us here. But the administration has lacked the political will to do more. I think that what they've done so far, I could characterize as half-measures, as would be the air strikes that are being contemplated now.

President Clinton has never directly and actively engaged in Bosnia policy. He has written letters to his counterparts. He has discussed the issue, when asked, with the media. But it seems to me, he needs to be far more forceful and assert himself as a leader of the world's superpower, and he should act accordingly. And it seems to me, maybe they're going about things backwards, that if he were to lead, that would bring the American public along, that would bring along the congressmen who are reluctant to do anything, and it could inspire our European allies to do more.

Israel follows Serbia's lead

by Joseph Brewda

One effect of President Bill Clinton's May 22 capitulation to Anglo-French demands that he do nothing to stop Serbia's conquest of Bosnia, has just been felt: the beginnings of a new Israeli war of conquest. Taking its cue from the U.S. non-response to Serbian genocide, on July 24, the Israeli elite ordered the most intense attack on Lebanon since Israel invaded its neighbor in 1982. The attack was suspended temporarily only after the U.S. brokered a ceasefire on July 31.

Dubbed "Operation Accountability," this attack, and future ones, are intended by Israel to seize all of Lebanon south of the Litani River—a decades-long Zionist demand—after driving out the Arabs through war. At the same time, the British and French governments, and elements of Clinton's administration (whether Clinton knows this or not) intend to use a process of alternating wars and ceasefires, to force through a new division of the Mideast. Israel and Syria have long had a secret deal to carve up Lebanon and the region; the new ceasefire may lead to making that deal public.

As always, the pretext for the Israeli land grab is "terrorism"—in this case, some crude rocket attacks by the Iranian-controlled Hezbollah of southern Lebanon. It was under the pretext of curtailing such attacks, that Israel earlier carved out a "security zone" in southern Lebanon. Flaunting its support for Israel, Britain mildly condemned "both sides" for the assault, while the U.N. Security Council refused even to hold an emergency meeting—although the Israeli Army had attacked a U.N. monitoring facility.

Ethnic cleansing

Although U.S. and European news media carried the Israeli line that the bombardment is intended to end Hezbollah terrorism, Israeli military actions have shown that the Lebanese population generally was the actual target—as Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin has admitted.

The toll of the seven-day artillery and air barrage against southern Lebanon has been extremely high: an estimated 300,000-500,000 refugees (about 10% of Lebanon's population) crowded into Beirut; 10,000 homes destroyed, and another 20,000 damaged. Scores of villages came under direct attack; in many, one-third of all buildings are in ruins. Reconstruction costs are expected to exceed \$1 billion, in a country