Bosnian Professor Charges:

Vance-Owen accepted the Radovan Karadzic plan

Editor's note: *We received the following report and commentary by fax from Mr. M. Borogovac, Ph.D. in mathematical sciences, professor of mathematics at the University of Tuzla, Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, on March 16. The editors believe that the actions of Bosnian leaders Izetbegovic and Siladjzic, which are judged harshly in this piece, must also be seen in the light of the tremendous pressures put upon them recently by the forces of the New World Order. We are nonetheless pleased for the opportunity to publish this view of the United Nations' perfidy toward one of its own member nations, from a Bosnian patriot.*

We reprint Dr. Borogovac's text in full, only slightly edited to standardize spellings and English usages which might otherwise be unclear.

Since the first missions to the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, diplomats Piniero and Cutiliero, followed by François Mitterrand and John Major, with the most recent inclusion of the Vance-Owen team, "the West" has offered Bosnia "charity" in exchange for merciless theft of its statehood, territory, and pride of the Bosnian people toward their homeland in Europe.

In the present phase of the war against the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina (R.B.H., further on in the text, or shortened: Bosnia), an anti-Bosnian lobby came to the conclusion that the time has come to take the masks off, completely, and go openly toward their goal.

The smiling faces of Boutros-Ghali, D. Owen, and C. Vance show that the final success of a large international political and military effort is clearly visible. For the first time in the history of the United Nations, one historical, internationally recognized country is to be broken into pieces (parts?) that have none of these qualities:

1. historical *raison d'être;*
2. territorial integrity and continuity (see the Vance-Owen map);
3. historical and legal rights toward their own individual statehood(s).

Therefore, several questions could be posed:

First question: Why did the above-mentioned gentlemen busy themselves with the task of destruction of the continuity of the statehood and constitution of the 177th member of the U.N.: the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina?

Having in mind the perceptions of "the West," possible answers are the following:

1. The crisis in ex-Yugoslavia is perceived primarily as a Serbo-Croatian problem, and as such can only be solved by satisfying Serbia and Croatia, an act that calls for the sacrifice of Bosnia in order to satisfy them both.

2. Accepting Bosnian statehood became dangerous, since it reintroduced traditional European divisions; a conflict of Central Europe and its peripheral parts could reverse the process of integration that was starting to happen in Europe.

3. The sacrifice of Bosnia has certain advantages: It is a handshake of Europe with a traditional Serbian friend—the Russian empire. At the moment, Russia is "balancing" between "Europeanization" and a return to "traditionalism." In this moment, a satanic sacrifice ceremony of delivering slaughtered Bosnian children and their land to Russia, doesn't seem to be "much of a loss."

4. Having in mind the insufficient knowledge of the meaning and the importance of statehood in the "Islamic world," its reactions cannot be so "harmful." The approval of the Orthodox Christian world is much more important anyway.

5. In the meantime, in the ex-U.S.S.R. and in Russia, Muslims have gotten a clear message and a very bloody lesson: that their aspirations toward independence and statehood are hopeless. The moral of the story is: "When the recognized Bosnians, with one thousand years of statehood, did not make it, you are not going to make it either, so do not even try!"

6. The present policy of "the West" in Bosnia obviously shows that Serbs, everywhere on the territories of ex-Yugoslavia, must be "pacified" by the method of satisfying their aspirations (and war gains, essentially) in such a way as to make them stop the destabilizing activity in the Balkans.

7. The gains of Serbia and Croatia in Bosnia can be useful for solving Serbo-Croatian relations in the Republic of Croatia, where Croatians, according to the Vance plan, have to accept a loss of sovereignty on parts of the territory of the Republic of Croatia for an unspecified amount of time.

Second question: What is the ethical and moral platform on which the cruelty toward Bosnians, especially Bosnian Muslims, is based?

As the apocalypse of Bosnians is irrational, the explana-

In the first tented camp in Europe since World War II, Bosnian refugees are received at a sports center in Rijeka, Croatia in 1992.

tion of the behavior of "the West" is impossible without a transfer to a religious realm. The "missionary" approach to Bosnia, exemplified by the combination of "charity" and cruelty, is the perfect name for the attitude of "the West." It shows the strength of the old stereotypes and emotions in moments of crisis. It shows that the "new world order" is an illusion.

The truth is that "the West" did not permit the helpless hostages even the elementary right to a self-defense from the Evil, whose first name is Hate and whose last name is Death.

The goals of the Vance-Owen policies and their methods

After a year of incredible massacres committed against the Bosnian-Muslim civilians, the policy of "the West" is sublimated in a document known as the "Vance-Owen plan." This plan is being touted, in the western media, and in high diplomacy, as "the only possible road to *peace* and ending of bloodshed."

Diplomacy and the loyal citizens of Bosnia are asked, in this (*a priori*) labeled, exclusivist document, neither more nor less than to accept:

1. Cessation of the continuity of the statehood of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina. (The Vance-Owen plan abolishes the legal constitution of the country and annuls the judicial, legislative, and executive foundations of the government of the 177th member of the U.N. No mention of obligations toward reestablishment of those foundations is even made.)

2. Actually, cessation of the continuity of the statehood is formulated in such a way as to eliminate the hope of reestablishing it ever again, since the Vance-Owen plan calls for an agreement of such gravediggers of Bosnia as Radovan Karadzic, Serbian leader and a certified war criminal, and HDZ leader Mate Boban, a traitor and a backstabber.

In addition to the fact that agreeing to these demands means *the end of the statehood of the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina,* the Vance-Owen plan has the following direct consequences for the state and the people of Bosnia:

1. All the previously voted conventions are annulled. That means, also, that all the obligations of the international community toward the country and the people who are the victims, cease to exist (U.N. Resolution 752). In exchange for the obligations of the U.N., stemming from international laws, in regard to the constitution and the statehood of the recognized country, the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina is offered "guarantees" toward the protection of certain rights. Of course, that is far below the level of sovereignty of any independent country.

2. An additional absurdity: All the guarantees that are offered, are related to the realization of the Vance-Owen plan itself.

For example, the use of U.N. military force is not intended to defend Bosnians from the aggression or for peacemaking, but rather for the "implementation of the Vance-Owen plan."

By paraphrasing itself, the plan "foresees and guarantees":

- That the residents of R.B.H. are going to live in a group of provinces that are going to consist of three national areas.
- On the level of the province, everything shall function as a state, as a *national state,* with the "guarantees" for the protection of the "minorities."
- Legislative, judicial and executive powers of the government of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina do not exist on the level of the republic. That goes for the Army as well.
- The Army of Bosnia, before the final demilitarization, is only legal in the Bosnian-Muslim provinces, and as such, it is being treated the same as the HVO (Croatian HDZ units) and Serbian Chetniks (terrorist cohorts of war criminals).
- Any possibility of investigating war crimes in "Serbian territories" is definitely compromised and made improbable.
- Trials of war criminals require the consensus of the perpetrators of those crimes (Serbian terrorists) themselves. Legally untenable position. A sick farce.
- In all areas not covered by the Vance-Owen plan, a consensus with war criminals is demanded . . . same as the above.
- Pressing for this plan shows plainly how cheap is the life of Bosnian men, women, and children on the international market. This plan starts the most complex, but also, the most illegal, procedure against one recognized state, and against, at least, one large portion of its people:

Destruction of the sovereignty, constitution, statehood, and territorial integrity of a recognized country, in exchange for the status of a *protectorate,* as an in-between stage, prior to the *final dissolution.*

Vance-Owen are right in their claims that their plan brings *peace,* but only under the condition that the above-mentioned premises are accepted. Then the peace shall be closer when the Bosnian Muslims, dispersed along the rivers and roads of Bosnia-Hercegovina, give up their rights to live by the rivers Drina, Neretva, Sava, Una. . . . Also, they must give up their use of highways between major cities. The Bosnians will have the Montenegran border by Trnovo, the Croatian border nearby Sarajevo, and the Serbian border inside Sarajevo, the "ex-capital of Bosnia-Hercegovina."

According to the Vance-Owen plan, Bosnian patriots have to accept the fact that they have reached the end of their history, after one thousand years. *If Bosnian patriots do not accept the Vance-Owen plan, the U.N., once again, guarantees that Bosnians are going to get massacred totally,* since the plan "guarantees" that "one of the three sides" is prevented from receiving weapons and ammunition to defend itself (a 12-month-long, ongoing U.N. "sea-air-land" blockade of the Army of Bosnia-Hercegovina: *the arms embargo*).

How the anti-Bosnian lobby destroyed Bosnia

The Vance-Owen team clearly stated their terms to the Bosnian leaders: "Either accept the plan, or bear the guilt for the continuation of war!" At the same time, the Vance-Owen team is misleading "the world public" that the same condition is put to the Serbians.

The Vance-Owen plan is different from the Serbian plan only in the "dynamics" of the planned disappearance of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina and its Bosnian Muslim population (Croatian also, later on, when they are done with Bosnian Muslims); it supports, stimulates, and provides a "legal cover" for the Serbian aggression. It also covers for the causes and consequences of the aggression.

In order to make those strategies "invisible," Vance-Owen have constantly repeated "small lies" in order to achieve "great effects." For example:

"In Bosnia-Hercegovina there are no 'citizens,' there are only Serbs, Croats, and Muslims." That is when the U.N. did not need the terms "citizens" and "civilians." However, when the aggression was "explained," they used the term "civil war," not "the Serbian aggression." Such a manipulation of facts and semantics is actually *de jure* a complete amnesty for Serbian crimes against civilians, since civil wars are not necessarily subject to sanctions according to the applicable international laws, but rather an internal business of each country. Such an attitude actually means that nobody is safe in the entire world, since any one ethnic/national group in any one country can decide to slaughter any other ethnic/national group in the same country and call it a civil war and thus suspend international law and legal defense mechanisms. Another example:

"The Bosnian Army is a 'Muslim army,' the government is 'Muslim,' President Mr. Alija Izetbegovic is a 'Muslim President' . . . etc., etc." Those are outright lies, since only the Bosnian government represents the secular, multi-ethnic, civic, democratic entity in the entire country. Both other concepts, Serbian, and to a certain extent, Croatian, are exclusivist, chauvinist. Serb national chauvinists exclude everybody, Croatians exclude the Serbs, while only the Bosnian Muslims insist on including both loyal Croatians and Serbs in all Bosnian institutions.

Those and similar activities, on the "lighter side," with many other "darker sides," make the Vance-Owen team partners in Serbian crimes against the innocent civilian population, and other crimes against humanity.

"Negotiations of the three warring parties are the only alternative to the war." This statement was used to remove the legal case of the aggression against Bosnia from the supervision of the Security Council of the U.N., to the "out-of-bounds-out-of-legal-sphere" negotiations. In doing so, the Vance-Owen team discarded the international legal system and enabled themselves to change the definitions of the victim and the aggressor. The *trial,* i.e., the legal procedure in the Security Council of the U.N., was replaced with the "negotiations," a dubious category, that proved to be fatal for the victim of the aggression. In this context, an international court for the crimes against humanity should consider the role and the participation of C. Vance and D. Owen, as well as Boutros-Ghali, in the war against one member of the U.N. and the open abuse of the Charter of the U.N.

Responsibility of diplomacy and the President of Bosnia-Hercegovina

In the diplomatic activity of the leaders of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, there are many important moments that have been, if not the causes, then certainly contributing factors in the tragedy of Bosnia-Hercegovina. If we accept the legal codex that "ignorance or lack of information are not to be cited as an excuse should they become a cause for damage . . ." then the major objections to the diplomacy of Bosnia could be:

1. Agreeing to negotiations without the clear identification of the partners in those talks.

(Even before being classified as a war criminal, Radovan Karadzic, a Serbian terrorist leader, could not have been a partner in negotiations anywhere else but in the Parliament, especially not after some important factors in the international community in some way recognized the war against Bosnia as a war of Yugoslavia against Bosnia and not as a civil war in the country itself. The right to talk to the President of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina could have been granted only to Slobodan Milosevic and Dobric Cosic—Presidents of Serbia and the new Yugoslavia—as the chiefs of the aggressor countries. That privilege should not have been granted to the "leader of the Bosnian Serbs," Radovan Karadzic and his gang.)

2. Agreeing to negotiations with "to be announced" type of topics and schedules.

(The last time that Bosnia had an undefeatable political position, before the Geneva talks, the terrible error was made

to allow the negotiations to be held with war criminals, and also under a completely changed position of negotiating on the basis of "ethnic divisions" and abandoning the already established position of the "civic state" principle.)

3. Agreeing to an inferior position in negotiation.

Before going out to negotiate, Bosnian diplomacy could have made a number of completely legitimate requests and could have gained a number of "life-saving" little advantages, that would provide for stronger negotiating positions in diplomacy and on the battlefield. The informational, traffic, and political deblockade of Sarajevo, government of Bosnia, and Tuzla airport could have been preconditions for the negotiations. Subservience did not help at all.

After all, the delegation of Bosnia, during the negotiations, went further and further away from the mandate received from the "Expanded Presidency" in the capital, Sarajevo, and thus committed an unauthorized acceptance of the "basic principles" and later of "the military agreement," also. Therefore:

The delegation of Bosnia committed the "*sellout*" of the continuity of the statehood and the constitution of the Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina. In return, they received "*guarantees*" of the human rights and religious rights that are usually included in the higher categories (statehood and constitution) which they have lost and/or abandoned.

The delegation of Bosnia (President Mr. Alija Izetbegovic and Foreign Minister Mr. Haris Silajdzic as well as other members) traded away the principle of the sovereignty of Bosnia and the principle of the firmness of the borders, for the humiliating *protectorate over Bosnia,* which is the only method for a "legal" destruction of the sovereignty of a member of the United Nations.

Having done that, the delegation of Bosnia has caused a severe loss of morale in the Bosnian population, with a total collapse in certain areas. Army commanders, very discouraged by such treason, were also criticized for "politicking," meaning that the delegation does not care for the opinion of the Army of Bosnia-Hercegovina, which fights valiantly for the freedom of the entire country and not the slavery and slaughter that the Vance-Owen plan basically imposes. Further more, the "negotiating skills" of Mr. Alija Izetbegovic have given a morale boost for a renewed Serbian offensive in eastern Bosnia, stemming from the Serbian (correct) perception that the Vance-Owen plan gives them a total *carte blanche* to kill, even 12 months after the commencement of the slaughter of the innocent Bosnian civilians.

Finally, nobody has the right to negotiate, let alone accept, the destruction of the continuity of the statehood and the constitution of Bosnia, especially not the leaders who were sworn to defend those sacred principles.

How will "the West" solve the Bosnian-Muslim refugee problem? It accepts the refugees. The exit from Sarajevo is cynically granted "to the signers of the Vance-Owen documents."

Is India losing its grip on Kashmir?

by Ramtanu Maitra

As the winter snow melts and makes accessible the rugged terrain of Kashmir, the Indian Army is facing a new wave of well-trained and well-armed intruders from the Pakistan side of the border. On the ground in the Kashmir Valley, it is evident that India's 38-month effort to eradicate violence and militancy has failed, and it is to be seen whether the Indian Army, battling an elusive army backed by the locals, can contain the situation through the coming summer.

Such a question is no longer rhetorical, as is evident from the growing urgency expressed by New Delhi. Newly appointed Minister of State for Home Affairs Rajesh Pilot, who is in charge of internal security, has made a quick foray to Kashmir and is now busy pushing for a political solution. The 33-month tenure of the Jammu and Kashmir governor and former chief of Indian intelligence, Girish Chandra Saxena, has been abruptly ended. Gen. Krishna Rao (ret.), who had already had a short stint as governor in 1989 before the valley erupted with violence and militancy, has been asked to take over. Such old hands as the former chief minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Dr. Farooq Abdullah, and the scion of the Kashmir royal house, Dr. Karan Singh, have already indicated that Delhi should hold talks with both Pakistan and the Kashmiri militants of all hues to resolve the problem. Dr. Abdullah, in fact, has gone further, to indicate that India should discuss the autonomy of the Kashmir Valley with the militants and define the autonomy quantitatively so that the "boys" do not feel that they have not gained anything.

Threat of war

The increasing evidence that Pakistan is directly involved through its military intelligence wing, Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), in training and arming Kashmiri militants, including the jihad-seeking Afghan mujahideen and even, reportedly, Sudanese fundamentalists, as documented by India, has endangered peace in the subcontinent. In the coming summer, if the Indian Army fails to prevent a reported 4,000 trained guerrillas from entering the valley and loses a number of personnel in the process, a war-like situation is bound to emerge. Moreover, Indian intelligence is alluding to an ISI hand in the recent bombings that rocked Bombay's