

The Bosnian resistance— 'unexpected, unexplainable'

by Katharine Kanter

"We have shown resistance which, for many of you, was unexpected and unexplainable. From only about a hundred small groups made up of 20 to 150 people armed with only light guns . . . we have made an army of 150,000 soldiers which has neutralized tens of thousands of aggressors and has destroyed a thousand of their armored vehicles.

"On the wars of liberation, there is some undefinable dimension, which resists all analysis. As a consequence of this factor, military and political analysts issue wrong prognoses. Our people are fighting for their freedom, and for their survival. Such a battle is difficult to wage, but it is also difficult to lose. No war of liberation has been lost in the last 50 years. I do not know why ours would be lost. No one can force our 150,000 soldiers to hand over their weapons. I would suggest everyone take account of this fact, as much for us, as for themselves."

So spoke Alija Izetbegovic, President of Bosnia-Herzegovina, to the summit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), in Budapest on Dec. 5, 1994. Look no further for a suitable Christmas gift for the person most beloved to you, but obtain for that man or woman a full version of the speech we have quoted from above. Neither tearful, nor embittered, the Bosnian President's words are both a clear statement of the strategic truth, and a marshaling of forces in the world which he himself may not yet see or reckon with. By resisting as it has done, against all odds and for nearly three years, Bosnia has won precious time for the enemies of its enemies to regroup themselves in battle order.

Since the massive Serbian offensive on Bihac in western Bosnia began in mid-November, the British and the French have dropped all pretense of "fair play" toward Bosnia—and toward the Clinton administration. The main thrust of the offensive was carried out from the Unprofor zone in Serbian-

occupied Croatia, known as the Krajina. The French Unprofor battalion in Bihac was withdrawn shortly before the Serbian offensive, and replaced by 1,200 Bangladeshis with no munitions, one rifle for every five men, no food, and no fuel. All foreign journalists were forbidden by Unprofor to enter the Bihac area, and at this time of writing (Dec. 7), there is *no* source of confirmation on conditions in the enclave save short-wave radio operators inside the besieged city. There is virtually no food, because Unprofor claims that forcing aid convoys through only "provokes" the Serbians.

The last ten days have seen intense diplomatic activity, in a general configuration which can only be described as degenerative. For example, NATO spokesmen in Brussels said on Dec. 5 that over the preceding week alone, there were nine separate incidents of Serbian surface-to-air missiles being fired at NATO aircraft over Bosnia, and 15 incidents of radar attached to the Serbian missile networks locking onto aircraft.

Unprofor sources now say that there are about 100 high-altitude SAM-2 and medium-altitude SAM-6 missile batteries deployed throughout Serbian-occupied Bosnia; Unprofor's director of air operations, British Wing Commander Timothy Hewlett, told the press, "We have known of their existence for a long time." How long? According to Bosnian Vice President Ejup Ganic, these systems were not on line in ex-Yugoslavia; they have, he said, been brought in from Russia *recently*.

The first week of December, Unprofor says it "asked" NATO to stop air patrols over Bosnia because the entire radar apparatus pertaining to the SAMs was switched on; Unprofor claimed NATO should "cool off" after the Nov. 23 anti-missile pinprick raids. Chaos broke out at NATO headquarters in Brussels over the weekend, as Hewlett claimed that "NATO has stood down, at [Unprofor's] request." Only min-

utes later, a spokesman for NATO's Southern Command said: "We have not stopped enforcing the no-fly zone." Apparently, what happened in fact is that only the AWACS (radar surveillance aircraft) were actually patrolling Bosnia—somehow or other, the French and British in NATO headquarters had managed to ram through orders that all other aircraft should be pulled off. By Dec. 5, Washington had woken up, and the planes were sent back in.

But the implications are mind-boggling. England and France, purporting to be members of the same NATO military alliance as the United States, rushing into NATO headquarters, pushing the U.S. President aside, and slamming their fingers down on every button, knob, and lever simultaneously to prove, as Al Haig said the day they tried to kill Reagan, "I'm in charge here."

EGGING ON RUSSIA AGAINST THE U.S.

Among the buttons these people are pushing is the Russia button, a messy, slippery button. At the NATO foreign ministers' meeting on Dec. 2, Juppé made a plea to throw Hungary, Poland, etc. to the dogs, chapter and verse being supplied as to why enlarging NATO to the former East bloc nations should be put off till some hazy future date. Then he pulled the Russian rabbit out of his hat: Aleksei Kozyrev, who made statements seeming to have come from the previous week's British Foreign Office policy guidelines printout. NATO, he said, was too "transatlantic"; the thing now is military cooperation between Russia and the Western European Union.

Leaving aside what Kozyrev proposed as the details of such cooperation, most of which Russia will never deliver on because it involves the transfer of military secrets, the outline of the proposal is a revival of the World War I Triple Entente. England is putting up the bugabear of Russian "intransigence" over Serbia, to try and bully the United States into submitting to British designs on Central Europe. On Dec. 4, the French and British foreign ministers flew to Belgrade to meet with Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic. All this travel may be bad for their health, but Messrs. Juppé and Hurd are in a hurry. A French diplomat told *Le Figaro*: "We're in a race against time. We have only one to two months at the outset. Clinton has a little leeway before Congress resumes in January. Then, it's curtains! So we have to move now . . . or by March, the U.S.A. may really lift the arms embargo."

According to *Le Figaro*, the same diplomatic sources moot reducing Bosnia to a "Grand Duchy of Sarajevo" and handing over Tuzla and eastern Bosnia to the Pale ("Bosnian Serb") regime. What is certain is that Hurd and Juppé offered Milosevic a confederation between Serbia-Montenegro and the Serb-occupied areas of Bosnia, which confederation, however, neither England nor France are in a position to deliver, because they *own neither* Bosnia, nor the United States.

Although Hurd and Juppé had, as they winged off to beauteous Belgrade, left instructions to blacken the U.S. ad-

ministration by playing up Defense Secretary William Perry's statement on the Serbian "victory" as the final word on U.S. policy, a bright spot emerged on the horizon with Sen. Robert Dole's (R-Kan.) trip to Europe prior to the formal NATO meetings. The London *Times* commented that the senator had "exasperated and infuriated" the British government in "polarized and fractious" talks. Losing not a single opportunity to sally forth, he said, on leaving Downing Street, "British policy on Bosnia is wrong." He described the U.N. record in Bosnia as "abysmal," and decried the "dual key" approach over Bosnia which requires that NATO seek U.N. approval for any action. Dole's comments were echoed on Dec. 4 by incoming House Speaker Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.).

Throughout the Bihac offensive by Serbia, Dole was in direct contact with the Bosnian President and Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic, by satellite telephone.

Perry's statements gave rise to a massive campaign by the news media claiming a major "policy shift" in the United States. However, President Clinton and the White House repeatedly denied that any such shift had occurred. Bosnian Vice President Ganic told *Le Figaro* that the Pentagon had immediately sent the Bosnian government a letter denying any shift, and Ganic added that "the Bosnians have no evidence that the Americans had abandoned their moral support for a multi-ethnic Bosnia." Silajdzic read a letter sent by Clinton to Izetbegovic on Dec. 4, which said that the United States "remains committed to the preservation of Bosnia-Herzegovina as a single state within its existing borders," and that "we do not favor a Bosnian Serb confederation with Serbia."

The fact is, as Lyndon LaRouche underlined in a radio interview, that the "French and British governments have cooperated to organize the Serbian slaughter of the Croats, the Bosnians, and so forth in the Balkans, solely as a part of an operation against the United States and Germany." Secondly, "the British are attempting to organize a strategic conflict between two nuclear powers, Russia and the United States," he stressed. This is the background to conflicts inside the U.S. Congress and administration over Bosnia policy.

The United States can be helped to distinguish its policy interests from those of Britain. A thousand people demonstrated in Copenhagen, another thousand in Stuttgart, outside the British Consulate, carrying banners against the Entente Cordiale and the Triple Entente, as the London *Times* reported laconically on its front page that a demonstration against British policy in Bosnia had also taken place outside the British Embassy in Washington. Meanwhile, casting all "Allied niceties" overboard, Germany's Gen. Count Johann Adolf von Kielmansegg, until 1993 Chief of Staff for NATO's Northern Group, told the Croatian press that he had been assigned, in 1992, to transfer that group to Bosnia to function as the military headquarters of Unprofor. England and France, he said, sabotaged this plan, as they did *not* want a NATO headquarters in Bosnia. Today, he said, Unprofor in Bosnia is in no way neutral, but supports the Serbian war of aggression.