

Military action nears after Serbs reject 'peace' plan

by Konstantin George

The rejection of the Vance-Owen "peace" plan for Bosnia by the so-called Parliament of the Bosnian Serbs late in the night of May 5-6, is a blessing in disguise. The rejection has cleared the deck for a U.S.-led military intervention to end the Serbian war of aggression on a moral, principled basis, and steps will likely commence between May 8 and 15. It has also buried once and for all the corpse of the hideous Vance-Owen plan, which had been crafted in London and Paris, and which would have divided Bosnia into nine "ethnically pure" entities, with a floating "internationalized" city of Sarajevo as the capital of a non-existent nation. It was nothing more than a formula for codifying "ethnic cleansing" and genocide, and a partition of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The disgusting charade of Vance-Owen, a replay as farce of the appeasement of Hitler in Munich, reached its nadir in the so-called Athens Peace Conference, hosted by Greek Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis, and attended by Lord Owen, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, and his Bosnian Serb asset Radovan Karadzic, in which Karadzic signed the Vance-Owen plan.

Vance-Owen cover for butchery

During the Athens conference, Serbian forces were engaged in their heaviest offensives of the war, seeking to grab as much territory in eastern and northern Bosnia as possible. Emboldened by the aura of appeasement that emanated from the Athens proceedings, the Serbs on May 4 launched an all-out attack on the Bosnian Muslim enclave around the town of Zepa in eastern Bosnia. The Serbs broke through the outer Bosnian lines and, by the end of the day, after merciless bombardment, Zepa, housing some 40,000 Bosnian Muslim refugees, was left burning. Bosnian Foreign Minister Haris Silajdzic called Zepa "the best proof of what the signature

from Athens means."

Silajdzic, in an address to the American Enterprise Institute in Washington on May 3, reiterated the moral imperative for immediate military intervention, and denounced the use of the term "civil war" to describe the Serbian war of aggression: "You have no right to call it a civil war. Bosnia is a slaughterhouse. It's called a conflict. Well, if we get arms, then it's a conflict, otherwise it's a slaughter. If this is a civil war, what are tanks from Serbia and Montenegro doing in Bosnia? What are the regular troops now attacking Zepa doing in Bosnia, if this is a civil war?" He made an impassioned plea for America to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia to give Bosnians the means "to liberate our country."

The Anglo-French backing of the Vance-Owen plan has been directly responsible for the deaths of many thousands of Bosnian Muslim civilians. Under the cover of "trying" to get Serbia to accept the plan, invaluable time was consciously bought for Serbian aggression. In February, large parts of eastern Bosnia were still under Bosnian Muslim control, in five enclaves. Three of them have since fallen: Cerska, Konjevic Polje, and, de facto, Srebrenica. The remaining two, Zepa and Gorazde, are under continuous Serbian pounding, with Zepa on the brink of falling.

Moscow gives green light

The news of the rejection by the Bosnian Serbs came hours after talks held on May 5 in Moscow between U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Russian President Boris Yeltsin and Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev. Notably, Russian Defense Minister Gen. Pavel Grachev attended part of those talks. The statements issued from the talks gave the clearest indication that a U.S. military operation was imminent, and that, minimally, Russia would do nothing to oppose it.

The meetings produced a terse joint declaration which more than implied the inevitability of military action if the Bosnian Serbs rejected Vance-Owen: "If it [Vance-Owen] is not accepted and implemented, Russia and the United States will immediately hold talks for new, tougher measures. No measure is excluded from consideration." Christopher elaborated, saying that there exists, in the event of rejection, "broad agreement on the necessity of resolute measures, including taking military steps." Interestingly, he did not cite Moscow as the reason why these measures might have to be changed or weakened when he stated that "several adaptations" might become necessary in the consultations with America's "allies," i.e., Britain and France.

Contrary to a common Cold War assumption, the main opponent of a U.S. military intervention against Serbian aggression is not Moscow, but London and Paris. Propelled by the insane geopolitical obsession of forging a so-called European "balance of power" to "contain" united Germany and post-Bolshevik Russia, Britain and France have reverted to their infamous pre-World War I Entente Cordiale and its disastrous geopolitical axioms which ultimately led to that war.

Will America oppose the Entente Cordiale?

Will an American military intervention lead to the smashing of the Entente Cordiale? This, and the crucial questions concerning the immediate U.S. policy decisions proceeding from it, were posed on May 5 by American political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche (see p. 65): "The question is, will President Clinton lose his nerve and back down piecemeal under the pressure from Paris and London, under the pressure of the same Entente Cordiale policies which caused World War I and implicitly World War II, or will the United States take effective action in this situation? The United States is going to do something. The question is, is it going to be an effective action?"

LaRouche spelled out that effective action must be "to implement a policy which will get the Serbs' military forces and all of the so-called Bosnian-Croatian Serbs—who are nothing but instruments of Belgrade policy—back to the borders which existed prior to the start of this war." To do this, America must "lift the arms embargo against arming the Bosnians and the Croats against this Serbian fascist plot," and combine this "with air support." In terms of ground troops, LaRouche said, only enough personnel should be put in there "to coordinate the relationship between the defendants, the Bosnians and the Croats, against the war criminal aggressors, the Serbs, under the direction of Milosevic and such creatures or assets of his, as Karadzic."

Sabotaging an intervention

The Anglo-French gameplan has been to either prevent or delay as long as possible American military action. As military intervention nears, Anglo-French tactics have changed toward "joining" an intervention, to thereby sabo-

tage its effectiveness from the "inside" by co-determining its policies and goals, shifting it in the direction of a "no-win" quagmire-like endeavor.

This sabotage went into high gear right after the conclusion of the Athens conference. On May 3, Christopher began his European tour in London, and met total British opposition to U.S. plans to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia. He got the same answer on his next stop in Paris. The French press of May 4 quoted senior Foreign Ministry officials saying, "For us, the question of the arms embargo is an unconditional 'No.' If there were a vote in the [U.N.] Security Council tomorrow, we would veto it."

In the midst of the Christopher tour, French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur arrived in London on May 4 for talks with British Prime Minister John Major and Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd. The visit occasioned a front-page article in the French daily *Libération*, which celebrated the creation of a "new Entente Cordiale between Britain and France." The article quoted an unnamed "diplomat for Her Majesty" who exuded, "One could not slip a sliver of cigarette paper between the positions of our two countries." *Libération* commented: "The two countries share the same colonial past, the same determination to have a global policy and to lend to this policy the necessary military means."

The existence of this nefarious new Entente Cordiale has been confirmed repeatedly by the coordinated actions of Britain and France to allow Serbian aggression to run rampant. British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd was quoted in the May 4 French daily *Le Figaro* saying that the present collaboration between Britain and France "is without precedent since the First World War," and will now be expanded through their mutual role as "pillars" in implementing the Vance-Owen plan for Bosnia.

The Entente Cordiale also correlates with an Anglo-French policy of using Serbia as a tool to create an adversary relationship between Germany and Russia. Then as now, the mutual weakening of these two powers was a primary goal of Anglo-French policy. The Entente Cordiale was formally constituted in 1904. It was not coincidentally preceded by a British-orchestrated coup in Belgrade in 1903 that toppled the Serbian Obrenovic Dynasty, which was forging a policy of reconciliation and cooperation with Germany and Austria, and replaced it with the Karageorgevic dynasty, an asset of the British Foreign Office. Backed by the Entente Cordiale, the new regime embarked on a "Greater Serbia" confrontationalist policy against Austria, launching a campaign to take Bosnia which culminated in the June 28, 1914 assassination in Sarajevo of Archduke Ferdinand, triggering World War I.

The parallels to the present situation are haunting. If President Clinton does not bow to the Entente Cordiale and embarks instead on an effective military intervention, he will have spared the Balkans, Europe, and the world from having to repeat the decade of tragedy that culminated in the First World War.