

gious war”; Bosnia’s declaration of independence as “forcible and illegal secession”; Bosnian borders as “internal administrative boundaries of the former Yugoslavia”; the Bosnian government as a “so-called government”; its republic, a “so-called republic,” and so forth.

Mitic’s provocation was succeeded by the truly scandalous presentation of Djordje Lopicic, chargé d’affaires at the Serbian embassy in Holland. His catalogue of falsehoods is best characterized by one glaring slip of the tongue, when he averred that “3,000 *Serbian Muslims* attacked the town of Bradina and burned it to the ground.” Unless he is referring to the oppressed Muslims in the Serbian region of Sandzjak, suddenly falling upon Bosnia, who in heaven’s name *is* he talking about?

Finally, the Serbians rolled out their big gun, Dr. Shabtai Rosenne of Jerusalem, possibly the world’s leading authority in the jurisprudence of The Hague court. As Dr. Rosenne clearly does not want to go down in history as the elderly Jewish scholar who has boldly stood up for genocide, wherever and whenever it takes place, his deal with his Serbian employers appears to be that he will stick to shooting holes in the Bosnian case on pure technicalities. Droll, courtly, witty as always, Dr. Rosenne could charm the pants off just about everyone, so long as they are willing to forget this is mass murder we are dealing with.

After 90 minutes of juridical fireworks, just as he did to great effect on April 8, Dr. Rosenne pulled out the knife on the court, stressing that the court was being invited to take *political decisions*, to substitute itself for the Security Council and the nation-states involved. The court has always refused to substitute its judgment for those of the states before and should continue to do so, he argued, and concluded that according provisional measures would not *facilitate the negotiations*, but rather *harm the delicate measures now in progress of negotiation*.

Stinging rebuttal

Exercising his right of reply, Professor Boyle shook everyone present — one would hope also the court — as he ended the proceedings:

“The Security Council decides not under the rule of law, but according to *Realpolitik*. These are disputes between the great powers. Our rights are up to the highest bidder in the Security Council. We are going to be carved up and eaten for breakfast. So you of the court have to act. What the other contracting parties to the Genocide Convention do is up to them. But if you clarify our rights, the obligation will be undeniable. Dr. Rosenne insists upon the proper procedure. That’s great! Come back in a year! We won’t be here in a year!

“I’m not getting paid here. This is not a publicity stunt. Are people going to get away with partitioning us, dividing us, or exterminating us?”

A judgment is expected in early September.

Human rights lobby and a tale of two massacres

by Valerie Rush

The international human rights lobby and its “indigenous rights” offshoots have raised a hue and cry in recent weeks over a supposed massacre by Brazilian wildcat goldminers of somewhere between 70 and 100 Stone Age Yanomami Indians, which is alleged to have occurred somewhere in the Brazilian Amazon in July. Their charge is that government “indifference” to the Yanomamis’ plight plus covert encouragement of the miners’ aggressions makes the Brazilian state fully complicit in the bloody deed.

No bodies or physical evidence of mass killings were discovered at the massacre site, and a respected anthropologist hired to investigate the incident reports that no more than 16 were killed, and that this occurred on the *Venezuelan side of the border* in a series of separate incidents. But this has not deterred such organizations as Amnesty International, Survival International, Americas Watch, the World Wildlife Fund, Friends of the Earth, the United Nations Human Rights Commission, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Washington Office on Latin America, and others, including the U.S. State Department, from launching a full-scale assault on Brazilian sovereignty over its territory and resources.

The irony is that many of these same self-appointed “watchdogs” over the behavior of sovereign governments were inexplicably silent when another massacre of Indians, this time of Ashaninka tribesmen and women in the forests of Peru, came to light at approximately the same time. The difference was that the Peruvian massacre was carried out by the Shining Path narco-terrorists, in whose defense these international “human rights” organizations, and the State Department, have been highly vocal for years.

Where’s the evidence?

The exaggeration of the Brazilian incident can be laid squarely at the door of Brazil’s National Indian Foundation (FUNAI), a government-appointed agency infested with anthropologists who share the view that Indians should be preserved in their “pristine” and “natural” state of starvation, backwardness, and pagan superstition. FUNAI claimed to base its version of the massacre on the tales of two or three “survivors” who supposedly straggled into FUNAI’s jungle office nearly a month later, bearing gory tales of beheadings.

Despite the fact that the site these “survivors” pointed to revealed only scattered bullet casings and piles of ashes, FUNAI went with the story. Some now say FUNAI created the entire story.

Despite the lack of evidence, Brazilian Attorney General Aristides Junqueira, a friend and supporter of Amnesty International, did not hesitate to issue the charge of “genocide,” which was all his friends in the international human rights movement needed to go into action.

Calls for creating a separate Yanomami nation are now being circulated; the *New York Times* declared that this was “the largest massacre of Brazilian Indians in this century” and blamed the Armed Forces; a spokesman for the Environmental Defense Fund used the pages of the *Times* to demand that the World Bank punish Brazil financially until it shows “a minimal concern about human rights”; and foreign diplomats and journalists have tried to visit the alleged massacre site without government permission.

Nobel Peace Prize winner and “indigenous rights” mouthpiece Rigoberta Menchú condemned the Brazilian “massacre” and urged immediate U.N. intervention to protect the indigenous population. According to the daily *O Estado de São Paulo*, diplomatic sources have revealed that the United Nations is, in fact, seriously considering “a concrete initiative in the Amazon,” which could possibly include sending a mission of “human rights” observers into Yanomami territory.

Brazilian fears of foreign interference in the Amazon, about which the Armed Forces in particular have been warning, are more than justified. And yet, such non-government organizations as the Europe-based Survival International are charging that “Brazil’s military, politicians, and businessmen are warning against the ‘internationalization’ of the Amazon to avoid having to recognize Yanomami territory.” Yanomami “territory” consists of an area the size of Portugal, and was granted (under intense international pressure) to the country’s 9,000 Yanomami Indians by the former Collor de Mello government on the eve of last year’s Eco-92 greenie bash in Rio de Janeiro. The fact that the mineral-rich reserve is located along the Brazilian-Venezuelan border makes it a high-priority national security concern for the Brazilian Armed Forces.

Narco-terrorist massacre

The details of the Peruvian massacre are that a large number of Indians who had been “force recruited” by the Shining Path to cultivate drugs and undergo terrorist training on pain of death, managed to escape their captors. In retaliation, Shining Path assassins invaded 10 Ashaninka villages on Aug. 16, using machetes to take revenge on especially women and children. The death toll was initially placed at 70, and is still rising. Another 40 persons were seriously wounded.

The terrible brutality of the assaults, which included tor-

ture and mutilation, stunned even the United Nations and Organization of American States, which issued statements of concern, while Pope John Paul II sent his own expression of pain and horror “at this abominable massacre.”

And yet Americas Watch waited nearly a week before criticizing Shining Path for violating the rules of war by attacking non-military targets, a formulation justifying its terrorist activity generally as acts of war. Embarrassed by the failure of its home office in London to issue a statement after more than a week, Amnesty International in Peru offered the press the explanation that London needed to determine the “veracity” of the story so as not to adversely affect “the credibility of this organization.” On Aug. 26, Amnesty finally issued a statement which refused to condemn or censure Shining Path and instead “exhorted” the narco-terrorists “to repudiate these acts.”

The newspaper *Expreso* editorially trounced Amnesty for describing Shining Path as belligerents “on a par with the [Peruvian] Armed Forces.” Roger Cáceres, head of the Peruvian Congress’ human rights commission, denounced the “excessively cautious” nature of the Amnesty statement. Echoing Cáceres, former U.N. Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, a Peruvian, called on the likes of Amnesty, Americas Watch, and the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) to “urgently alert world public opinion on the truth of these terrorist movements.”

The explanation for such hypocrisy on the part of these self-appointed defenders of human rights worldwide perhaps lies in the fact that putting the limelight on Shining Path’s atrocities would seriously undermine the Anglo-American establishment’s ongoing campaign to halt Peruvian President Alberto Fujimori’s exemplary anti-terrorist offensive. A case in point is the *New York Times*, which on Aug. 18 editorially endorsed an open letter by U.S. Rep. David Obey (D-Wisc.) and Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) calling on Secretary of State Warren Christopher to withhold all aid from Peru until it dismantled the most important elements of its anti-terrorist campaign—in the name of “human rights,” of course.

Lying that Peru has “the worst human rights record on the continent,” the *Times* demands that the Clinton administration “champion” Peru’s human rights victims, such as the Shining Path terrorists who are finally being tried, convicted, and imprisoned for their barbarous acts after nearly a decade of virtual impunity. The daily *Expreso* responded to the “incredible” editorial: “We should ask the relatives of the 59 children, women, and men assassinated by Shining Path a few days ago . . . if they also believe the United States is their strongest defender. . . . Who defended the eight Peruvians who no longer die every day? The United States? It was Peru, the barely reconstructed Peruvian state, with a determined anti-subversion strategy and the backing of the population. Never has the state of human rights been better in Peru.”