

Bosnia expires under the British knife

What motivates a policy to let Bosnians be killed en masse, and to engulf Germany, Austria, and Italy with refugees? Katharine Kanter reports.

A year or two back, Lyndon LaRouche remarked that the difference between a common criminal and a satanist, is that the criminal will steal or kill because he wants money. The satanist will commit a crime because he actually gets pleasure from doing evil. That is exactly how the British ruling classes have dealt toward Bosnia.

When Bosanski Brod fell in early October, the London *Guardian's* diplomatic correspondent Hella Pick spoke with "senior sources" close to Cyrus Vance and Lord Owen, at the so-called peace talks in Geneva. It was understandable, these aides said, that "the Serbs would want to secure a corridor to Krajina before winter sets in. If it *makes the Serbs feel more secure*, possession of Bosanski Brod might act as a spur toward political settlement." Vance and Owen, they said, did not express "any special concern" when the city fell. Owen's qualification for the job, according to the *Daily Telegraph*, is that at 21, he toured "Yugoslavia" in a Land Rover named "The Bugger," an insider's term of contempt for the Bosnians which relates to their Bogomil past.

Now, what actually happened when Bosanski Brod fell? It, like Slavonski Brod across the river Sava, lay under pitiless bombardment from the Serbian Air Force and heavy artillery for several months, although the world's press, and also the Croatian government for some reason, said nothing of this. Ninety percent of the population fled before the rout, into Croatia over the Sava. During the last hours of Bosanski Brod, there was hand-to-hand fighting in the desolate, bombed-out streets. Hundreds of Bosnian and Croatian men and youths fell defending the city within those few hours. As disaster loomed, old people and women emerged in rags from the cellars, half-starved after months of siege, and ran alongside fleeing soldiers over the bridge into Croatia, carrying nothing but a kerchief with a few belongings, a birdcage or a small dog. Then the Serbs blew the bridge up. Thousands more were trapped on the Bosnian side of the Sava. What will happen to them only God knows.

The farcical 'no-fly zone'

When it was proposed in September in the United Nations, by the Muslim nations, that a no-fly zone be imposed to protect Bosnia from Serbian air raids, after much Anglo-French obstruction a resolution was passed to that effect, but

with *no enforcement clause*: England and France claimed that were the resolution enforced, the Serbs would retaliate upon British and French convoys—i.e., although the Republic of Bosnia could be saved by an air blockade, this is not worth the life of one British soldier.

Throughout the "peace" farces at London and Geneva, Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic pleaded in vain for the right to buy weapons, whereas, as Prof. Dr. Ulrich Fastenrath of Cologne University wrote on Aug. 11 in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, to deny Bosnia the *right* to defend herself is a grave breach of international law. When it was proposed in the U.N., again by Muslim states, that the arms embargo against Bosnia be lifted so she could defend herself, the British and their American friends blocked it, to the degree, that the Croatian government has been forced, after the Americans leaked to the press that they had "tipped off Tudjman," to impound aircraft landing in Zagreb with weapons to be transhipped to Bosnia.

But what about the blockade against Serbia? Well, according to a *Guardian* front-page story Oct. 8, an erase button on a Whitehall computer is activated every 28 days to delete all information on those Brits who break the sanctions against Serbia! Customs and Excise officials told the paper: "We don't keep the information on sanctions breaking because our principal client, the Central Statistical Office, intends to *keep Yugoslavia as a single country until next year*. Figures will be available from *next year* when the office will have a new computer system to record *permanently individual republics*." The Labour Party's trade spokesman, Robin Cook, was told by the Department of Trade that British imports from Serbia jumped from £9.7 million in June to £10.89 million in July, fully two months after "sanctions" were imposed. By August, British *exports* to Serbia of what is, in fact, logistics for the war effort, i.e., telecommunications equipment and gasoline, had risen sharply.

On Sept. 12, the *Guardian* reported on its front page that in the last year alone, thousands of Serbian businesses have moved to the "former" British protectorate Cyprus: "Serbian government, business, and private funds have flooded to the offshore banking haven," in the order of several hundred million dollars. "Exploiting the island's financial secrecy, trade from Cyprus to the countries bordering Serbia is now

worth about \$10 million a week.” One European banker told the press that every time his bank tried to stop a transaction they suspected would involve breaking sanctions against Serbia, within 48 hours the Serbian client would demand the relevant amount be sent to a Cypriot bank. In August, Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd said Cyprus should be “watched,” but London has given no recommendations to the Cypriot Central Bank since that speech.

The head of Serbia’s biggest offshore operation in Cyprus, Beogradska Banka, is Borka Vucic, 66, described by a prominent London banker as a “dear little soul.” A fervid Communist, she is said to be thick as thieves with Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic. Before moving to Cyprus in 1988 to take over Beogradska, she was head of the bank’s London office, and then became chairman of the London-based Anglo-Yugoslav bank. In 1988, Beogradska’s balance sheet showed a mere \$126 million in assets. It now shows \$634 million.

In May of this year, the Croatians and Bosnians signed a defense pact. Forthwith, England and France made it known to the Croatians, that unless Croatia withdrew her regular troops and tanks from Bosnia, sanctions would be slapped down on her. The Croatians pulled out. By July, Carrington was openly saying that peace would not come to Bosnia unless the republic were “de facto partitioned . . . there must be a stalemate, such as if the Serbs thought they had seized enough land, or exhaustion when one side, probably the Muslims, can no longer fight. We are not at the stage of exhaustion yet” (Carrington to the *Telegraph*, July 24, 1992). By September, northern Bosnia was lost.

‘If you want a Bosnian, go to Yugoslavia’

Those few in England who oppose the policy have been shut up. The best-known is Lady Miloska Nott, wife of the former defense minister. A Slovenian by birth, she, in August, had given the leading dailies a series of interviews attacking British policy; it was then intimated to her that funds would “become unavailable” for her Balkans charity unless she stop the polemic. This news service learned from prominent British-born Croatians, that the editors of the leading papers will no longer print their letters protesting British policy; the Balkans war has become a “page 9 story.” Foreign Office sources quoted in the *Guardian* gave as the reason for the blackout, that the Serbians had “reacted very angrily” to British press reports from Bosnian eyewitnesses of what was done to them in the Serbian camps. Dixit the *Guardian*: “This led the Foreign Office to conclude that it would be unwise to publish details of further atrocities.”

This past August, a well-known woman journalist, Lynne Reid Banks, called the Foreign Office and the Home Office and asked whether she could put Bosnian refugees up in her country home. “We are not encouraging refugees to come here,” said one high official. “If you want a Bosnian, you’ll have to go to Yugoslavia [sic], and get one yourself.”

Fact is, that in the last 12 months, Germany has taken 400,000, perhaps 500,000, refugees from Bosnia and Croatia; the two tiny nations Austria and Switzerland have taken between 70,000 and 100,000 each. Official figures for “Yugoslavians” in Great Britain are 1,300, but British journalists who investigated believe even that figure is a fraud: About half are probably Serbians in the United Kingdom for business or tourism. The British government, the only one not to sign the Open Borders clause of the 1993 European customs agreement, has been invoking the Dublin Agreement on Immigration to send back Bosnian and Croatian refugees to Germany and Austria. Under that pact, a European state can lawfully return refugees to the first country they arrived at and demand they seek asylum there. The clause was plainly written for and by the British, as theirs is the only major European country on an island.

The British are proceeding according to plan, and part of the plan is for Germany, Austria, and Italy to collapse under the burden of “ethnically purged” Bosnians, Albanians, and Croatians. It is estimated that at least 5 million people will have fled into western Europe by early next spring, if the war proceeds into Kosovo and Macedonia as Fitzroy Maclean would have it.

Is there any chance, at least, that we may judge the Serbian leadership for war crimes? The Bosnian Ministry of Defense, from its embattled HQ in Sarajevo, has set up an Institute to Investigate War Crimes, led by Gen. Mahir Zisko and is demanding trials on the Nuremberg model against Serbia. When this was raised Oct. 6 in the U.N. Security Council, England, and France quashed it, on the grounds that “communication has to be kept up with the Bosnian Serb leadership.” The British government has just refused to make public its official report to the U.N. on Serbian war crimes as the Foreign Office feels “this would only precipitate further atrocities” by irritating Serbia.

Although the French government has shown itself keen to polish the British boot, the chief instigator of this war designed to engulf all of Central Europe is England. In recent months, the *Daily Telegraph* has taken to publishing commentaries on the Balkans by one Antony Roberts, the biographer of Lord Halifax. “Britain owes nothing to Yugoslavia,” he writes. “No matter how hideous the massacres, neither Croatia nor Serbia are worth the healthy bones of a single British Grenadier. . . . It is hard to see after the self-destruction of the Yugoslavian tourist industry what possible interest, other than academic, Britons could have in what goes on there.”

Or, as the *Telegraph’s* editorialist begged the question on Aug. 4, 1991: “A civil war in Yugoslavia may be bad for part of Europe, but would it be bad for our part?”

The writing is on the wall for continental Europe. If we still refuse, in the name of “consensus politics,” to recognize the specific quality of evil in the British elite, and crush it, we will go the way of Bosnia and be destroyed.