

European Parliament calls for removal of Lord 'Dr. Death' Owen

by Mark Burdman

During the last summer, the Schiller Institute, the organization founded by Helga Zepp-LaRouche, launched an intensive international mobilization to remove Britain's Lord David Owen as European Union "mediator" in the Bosnia crisis, charging that Owen was carrying out British geopolitical policy to back Serbian aggression and to eliminate the nation and people of Bosnia-Herzegovina. While Owen, whose well-deserved nickname is "Dr. Death," has held onto the post through January 1994, continuing to diplomatically "manage" the genocide being carried out against the Bosnian people, his brief career has been seriously undermined by the first decision from an important European institution that has taken up the Schiller Institute call. On Jan. 19, the European Parliament in Strasbourg, by a vote of 106-95 with 29 abstentions, voted for the replacement of Owen by a "new EU negotiator with a proper mandate and a new strategy for exercising it." The vote is technically non-binding, since only the European Council of Ministers can remove him, but Owen's authority and credibility have been irretrievably damaged.

The European Parliament vote was remarkable in two ways: First, it was motivated and backed by an unusual coalition of forces normally on opposite sides of the political fence, ranging from members of the European Parliament (MEPs) of the "right-wing" European People's Party to the Greens; the only exception to this anti-Owen trend was the Socialist bloc, which refused to join in the resolution against him. Second, the pro-Owen vote came overwhelmingly from the 77 British MEPs. Party divisions were overcome among these British MEPs, as they banded together to defend the Union Jack. The anti-Owen vote came primarily from the Germans, Dutch, Italians, and French. The vote, then, was a rallying of European continental political forces against Great Britain, something which is truly exceptional in European politics.

The element of the continent-versus-Britain in the vote was only made more interesting by the fact that Owen immediately received the backing of British Prime Minister John Major and other British officials. On Jan. 20, Major declared, "David Owen has not spared himself in the search for a peaceful settlement on Bosnia. . . . He enjoys the full support of the British government." British dailies reported that

Major was "angered" by the attack on Owen.

By so certifying the genocidalist Owen, Major has only further underscored the rottenness of his own government, which has become notorious for its hypocrisy and craven immorality. Its endorsement of Owen only adds to the list of reasons why that government should be retired at the earliest possible date. Already, Major has the lowest approval rating of any British prime minister in several decades.

Other support for Owen came from curious quarters, outside the European Union. On Jan. 24, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaly Churkin said that it would be best if Owen were to stay in his post, since the appointment of a new mediator would only encourage "the warring parties" in the belief that there was a new agenda for Bosnia. This was seconded by the speaker of the Bosnian Serb rump parliament Krajisnic. Owen, of course, has very special relations with the Bosnian Serb *nomenklatura*; Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic, like Owen, is a psychiatrist, and, like Owen, trained in the mind-destroying techniques of the Tavistock Institute (see "Nazi Psychiatrists Behind Serbia's Reign of Terror," *EIR*, Feb. 12, 1993). In his autobiography *Time To Declare*, Owen boasts about his own support for use of electro-convulsive shock therapy and leucotomy against psychiatric patients, during his years as a neuro-psychiatrist at St. Thomas' Hospital in London.

Regrettably, the European Union has also reaffirmed its support for Owen, distancing itself from the parliament's decision.

'Bosnia would disappear soon'

In an interview with *EIR* on Jan. 20, Dutch MEP Arie Oostlander, a member of the European People's Party who was instrumental in bringing the motion against Owen, declared that a central motivation for the action was that he and his colleagues were "disturbed a lot" by Owen's "close relations" with British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, who "informally gave a mandate for Dr. Owen" in the Bosnia negotiations. In practice, then, Owen had not been really working on behalf of the European Union, but rather on behalf of the British Foreign Office.

Oostlander reported that he had been told by knowledgeable Croatian politicians, that Croatian President Franjo



A Schiller Institute-sponsored demonstration against the European Union's "negotiator" Lord David "Dr. Death" Owen, outside the British Consulate in Chicago in August 1993.

Tudjman claims to have seen a letter from Hurd to Owen, saying that "the division of Bosnia-Herzegovina between Serbia and Croatia would be okay." Because of such views, "I don't trust what Owen is doing," said Oostlander. "We would prefer to have closer relations between the Croats and Bosnians." He further charged that Owen himself had recently given an interview to the Dutch magazine *Elsevier*, in which "he said that, if there would be a military alliance between Serbia and Croatia, the crisis would be settled quickly, because Bosnia would disappear soon."

It is such kind of thinking, he said, that motivated many MEPs to vote against Owen. Oostlander stressed that "Owen will be weakened by this vote, and we hope it will contribute to his disappearance as European mediator."

In comments made to BBC radio the same day, Oostlander charged that Owen's crimes included continually "aligning himself to the strongest party," and using the word "Muslims" to refer to the "anti-apartheid government of Bosnia-Herzegovina." Oostlander reported that anti-Owen MEPs wanted the current round of negotiations in Geneva to be stopped, the arms embargo against Bosnia to be lifted, and the declaration of NATO about bombing Serbian positions to "become a reality." He said that "the legality of the government of Bosnia-Herzegovina against racist forces must be strengthened."

He stressed that the tactical aim of the resolution was to

pressure the European Council of Ministers to change policy. That body is "not under the control of European citizens," and "the European Parliament attitude toward Owen reflects its attitude toward both the council and Owen."

Anti-Owen sentiment in Britain

Support from within Britain for the removal of Owen came from Prof. Adrians Hasting, on behalf of the London-based Alliance to Defend Bosnia-Herzegovina, in a Jan. 22 letter to the London *Guardian*. Hastings affirmed that there "were five excellent reasons" for Lord Owen's "immediate replacement" as the EU peace envoy in the Balkans. He then proceeded to draw up a bill of indictment of his genocidal lordship:

"The first [reason] is that in 18 months he has achieved nothing. It is time that somebody else was given a chance.

"The second is that he has never exercised an independent role as a neutral mediator. His policy has followed that of the British government. No wonder our ministers praise him.

"The third is that he has no less consistently favored the side of the Serbs. He has accepted their most outrageous claims and fantasies as reasonable. He has covered up their deceptions. On the other side, he has frequently bullied the Bosnian President. At the last Geneva meeting, he managed to imply that it was the Bosnians, refusing to accept terms wholly destructive of their country, who were guilty of prolonging

the war.

"The fourth is that the one thing he still claims as his own, the Owen-Vance plan, was disastrous in its consequences, being the proximate cause of the breakdown of the Muslim-Croat Alliance which until then had been Bosnia's greatest source of strength. He has never admitted this colossal mistake.

"The fifth is that all his policies have been based on an acceptance by the international community of successful aggression and ethnic cleansing. When challenged, he has defended himself on the ground that this was inevitable, given the world's refusal to intervene militarily or raise the arms embargo on the Bosnian government, yet whenever there has been a possibility of the world moving into action in this way, he has thrown his weight against it with the fatuous phrase, 'Give peace a chance.' In practice, this has meant futile conferences in Geneva while in Bosnia, Serb aggression continued, based on a huge superiority in armaments. He has, in collusion with the British government, gerrymandered the circumstances in which a sellout to aggression could be justified as inevitable."

In our Aug. 27, 1993 issue, Hastings contributed an article calling for Owen's removal entitled, "Lord Owen Was Appointed to Do Great Britain's Dirty Work."

Documentation

Resolution to remove Owen

The European Parliament,

A. having regard to the desperate condition of the people in Bosnia-Herzegovina and their belief that they have been betrayed by the failure to ensure respect for the minimum standards of international law,

B. having regard to the fact that a large proportion of the population of Bosnia-Herzegovina is still maintaining a multi-ethnic society,

C. having regard to the continuing attacks against the civilian population and the frequent interruptions of the supply of humanitarian aid,

D. having regard to the isolation by blockade and siege of towns and large areas,

E. having regard to the dissatisfaction of the Unprofor [U.N. Protection Forces] troops and their commanders, as expressed by General Briquemont and General Cot, with the weakness of their mandate and the lack of resources needed to implement U.N. decisions,

F. having regard to the requests for U.S. military participation in stopping the violence,

G. having regard to the reluctance of EU member states to provide extra troops in spite of solemn promises to that effect,

H. having regard to the mandate, the strategy and the lack of results achieved by the U.N. and EU negotiators, who consistently attempt to divide Bosnia-Herzegovina along ethnic lines, even though it is a member of the United Nations,

I. having regard to the statements of the North Atlantic Council and the U.N. Security Council,

1. Demands:

(a) that the over-riding aims of EU policy in Bosnia be to achieve a negotiated settlement and to prevent the spread of war in the Balkans;

(b) the recognition and protection of the legal government of Bosnia-Herzegovina to a viable state;

(c) the determination to turn Unprofor into "peace-making" troops since the failure to establish peace dooms "peace-keeping" to failure;

(d) troops to ensure, by their active intervention, the safety of all "safe areas" as promised by the Council and the Member States;

(e) the opening of supply routes and the airport to Tuzla, which is the biggest area where the Bosnians still maintain a multi-ethnic civilian government;

(f) an end to the "strangulation" of Sarajevo;

(g) an end to the blocking of the rotation of Unprofor contingents;

(h) the dismantling of artillery positions from which cease-fires are broken and the elimination of sniper activities pursuant to the NATO decision of 11 January 1994;

(i) that every effort be made to keep civilian and Unprofor casualties to a minimum;

(j) active diplomacy and pressure on Croatia in order to end Croatian attacks on Bosnia-Herzegovina and to restore good relations between the two countries;

(k) sanctions against the Belgrade regime to be rigorously maintained until all Serb aggression against Bosnia-Herzegovina is ended;

(l) active assistance to all those throughout the former Yugoslavia who support human rights, democracy, and dialogue against chauvinism and ethnic cleansing;

(m) that political, operational, and financial support for the International Tribunal for War Crimes in former Yugoslavia be part of the common action program of the European Union;

(n) the nomination of a new EU negotiator with a proper mandate and a new strategy for exercising it;

II. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission, the Council, the Secretaries General of the U.N., NATO, and the WEU [Western European Union] and the governments of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia.