

that there should be a great number of Muslims in the Army or other institutions. But the Army is *not* fighting for 'Muslim interests' alone. They are fighting for our State, in which all religions will freely share."

Interview with **Jovan Diviak**, a general of the Army of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and a Serbian Orthodox. He points out that there are many Serbs in the Army (4%) and the units of the Interior Ministry (14%), and that many Serbs have been decorated for valor. "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 Serbs were forced to bring in many people from other parts, especially, for example, from Montenegro. Because it was not easy to make the Serbs born in Bosnia fight against their country."

Sept. 29, 1995: Interview with **Mirko Pejanovic**, president of the Serb Civil Council of Bosnia and a member of Bosnia's collective Presidency: "The Karadzic regime is one thing and the Serbian people a different one. The majority of the Serbs living in areas controlled by Karadzic do not support him. . . . Karadzic's propaganda was already proven wrong by the Serb Civic Council. We proclaimed to the world community that *we are Serbs who are not with the aggressors*, and that the total number of the Serbs against

the Karadzic regime is *bigger* than the number under his control. The total number of loyal Serbs is 650,000; under Karadzic's regime there are 500,000. And if we put aside for a moment the Pale regime itself, I only want to say that the people under that regime *do not identify with it*. Those people who live in the area under Karadzic's control are *not supporting him*. . . . [President Izetbegovic] is a Bosnian Muslim, but he is the President of a Presidency in which there are two Serbs, two Croats, and he never discusses topics about Bosnia with anyone, *without the presence of a multi-national, multi-ethnic delegation*. They are always putting him forward as a Muslim. Some governments call our army the 'Muslim Army,' even though there are Serbs fighting in it, and we are resisting that."

Lie #3: There is no military solution

Lord Owen's argument that there is no military solution to the Bosnian war, is intended primarily to con the Clinton administration into the British game of Hobbesian diplomacy and cabinet warfare. The reality is, that from day one of the war, the British were out to prevent or sabotage any decisive military operations against Serbia. The following chronology

The man who would 'plug his wife into the mains'

In a cover story on Feb. 12, 1993, "Nazi Psychiatrists Behind Serbia's Reign of Terror," EIR documented the fact that many of the top leaders of the Serbian Chetnik forces are psychiatrists, trained at London's Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, the University of Frankfurt's Institute of Social Research ("Frankfurt School"), or affiliated institutions. Tavistock was, during World War II, the psychological warfare arm of British intelligence. After the war, it became a laboratory for the development of hard-core brainwashing techniques. That's where Dr. David Owen comes in.

Owen, in his 1991 autobiography, Time to Declare, describes his training with Dr. William Sargant, a Tavistock researcher in the 1950s and '60s. Sargant was a controversial proponent of using both leucotomy—a method of cutting out parts of the brain, which has been made illegal in Europe—and electro-convulsive shock therapy. The following excerpts from Owen's book describe events in 1964:

I returned to London, quite happy to switch right out of politics and to concentrate on medicine. . . . At the hospital I was now combining what I had always wanted to do, psychiatry, with neurology, and working for Dr. William Sargant. He was a giant both physically . . . and clinically, a dominating personality with the therapeutic courage of a lion, author of a best-selling book on brainwashing called *Battle for the Mind*. That generation of psychiatrists who worked at the Maudsley Hospital transformed British psychiatry. They pioneered the unlocking of all doors and the treating of psychiatric patients in all respects like patients in medical wards of general hospitals. Before the war psychotherapy and psychoanalytical treatments had done nothing to cut the size of the large remote Victorian psychiatric hospitals. People were protected in hospital wards rather than treated. The most many psychiatrists could hope to do was to shield them against the three Ss: starvation, sleeplessness and suicide. Even after the war patients were still virtually imprisoned with wards locked and, in all too many cases, patients neglected. The transformation of their life during the 1950s was a social revolution. Psychiatric patients began to be treated with physical methods like electro-convulsive therapy (ECT) and the special anti-depressant drugs began to appear. . . .

William Sargant was a human dynamo. Controversial,

of *EIR*'s coverage proves the point (see also *Documentation*, p. 34 and p. 38, articles by Croatian journalist Srecko Jurdana and Germany's Gen. Count Hanno von Kielmansegg):

Dec. 17, 1993: At a meeting in Königswinter, Germany Dec. 1-2 of the Conference of International Parliamentarians Against Genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Germany's **Gen. Count Hanno von Kielmansegg**, former NATO commander for the Northern Region, and until recently head of the Unprofor headquarters in Bosnia, said: "Moral appeals to England are useless. All we can do is to try to make it clear to the English that their behavior is not, in the real sense, in their own interest. Our strength is in our own populations, where there is still some moral spark, no matter how feeble. In any event, the only way we can save Bosnia is by military intervention against Serbia. We must. I agree with Representative Wilson that the British and French troops are deliberately kept there as hostages. It would be better to pull them out now. The lifting of the embargo against Bosnia would be far more effective to save her, than keeping such troops there."

April 1, 1994, "British Military: 'We Have Quietly Taken over Bosnia,' " by Katharine Kanter. The London daily *Independent* recently wrote: "Great Britain has quietly taken control of much of the U.N.'s Bosnia operation." As soon as **Gen. Sir Michael Rose** arrived in February, as the new commander of Unprofor, he created two new military sectors, and reorganized the U.N. command. According to the London *Daily*

Telegraph, "at least 50 British special forces troops are engaged in covert operations in Bosnia" under the direct command of General Rose. This is the first time that British special units have been officially deployed as part of a U.N. force. They are designated as "U.N. military observers," and are deployed throughout Bosnia, according to the *Telegraph*, "wherever Serbian gunners have long-established firing positions." On March 19, the *Telegraph* reported on "impromptu" seminars given by British **Brig. John Reith** and General Rose, to the Muslim and Croatian militia leaders. Reith: "We told them they lacked the mobility, firepower, and logistics for maneuver warfare . . . that they were locked in a war of attrition." Reith and Rose "convinced" the Croats and Muslims that they had "no military options left," and this, according to the *Telegraph*, was what led to the Washington agreement of March 19 being signed. *EIR* points out that this pact between Bosnians and Croats was brokered by the United States, not Britain, but the British were just trying to insinuate themselves into the process.

April 22, 1994: On April 10-11, American bombers carried out extremely limited bombing of Serbian matériel used in the siege of Gorazde. According to British Labour Party sources, **Gen. Sir Michael Rose**, commander of the U.N. troops in Bosnia, was not informed in advance. He told BBC radio: "It was the Pentagon which launched the attack, not the U.N. Security Council." The London *Times* reported on April

committed, he was the sort of person of whom legends are made. . . .

To work for Sargant was a delight because he was so enthusiastic. He was, as his critics claimed, often infuriating and he did at times stretch the evidence and exaggerate the effects of his preferred treatment. . . . Sargant claimed that he was entitled to take some risks with the treatment of a depressed patient in the same way that a surgeon takes risks with his patients. When side-effects were discovered for such successful drugs as chlorpromazine hydrochloride, commonly called Largactil, used in the treatment of schizophrenia, or the then newly discovered monoamine oxidase inhibitors used for anxiety depression. Sargant would not only refuse to stop dispensing them but he would defend the side-effects by reference to the number of patients who were expected to die just by virtue of having an anaesthetic. . . . To his critics all this was dangerous bravado. To his supporters it was robust common sense. . . .

In the psychiatric department a great deal of careful thought was given as to whether to refer schizophrenic patients to the neuro-surgeons for a modified leucotomy operation. The operation Sargant favoured cut the lower medial quadrants of the frontal lobe of the brain and specifically avoided the upper quadrant. Sargant found in a

careful follow-up that when all other treatments had failed many of these carefully selected patients did well. Leucotomy also helped some very bad obsessional cases, people with rituals such as having to wash their hands non-stop, provided that they had a good previous, albeit obsessive, personality. For some psychiatrists the fact that Sargant was even prepared to contemplate recommending a leucotomy was a sign of derangement and his conduct aroused bitter controversy.

The widespread use of electro-convulsive therapy in St. Thomas's also shocked people. Yet I saw too many patients respond dramatically to ECT to harbour many doubts about its efficacy in carefully selected patients suffering psychotic rather than neurotic symptoms. . . . I was reminded how controversial all this treatment was when some years later I was having lunch in Soho with Anthony Howard, then editor of the *New Statesman*, and a doctor friend of his. Talking as one might among doctors I used the shorthand description for ECT and said that if my wife ever got depressed after childbirth "I wouldn't hesitate to plug her into the mains" [electrical outlets]. A few months later he used that quote in a profile and, ever since, it keeps recurring without any linkage to post-puerperal depression. So I simply became the man who would not hesitate to plug his wife into the mains!