

## Balkan provocation escalates British war on United States

by Jeffrey Steinberg

Great Britain's hopes of exploiting the latest Serbian atrocities on behalf of its global campaign to destroy the Clinton Presidency and the United States, have run up against some serious roadblocks. Not only has the Clinton administration responded effectively and flexibly to the Serbian provocations—the assassination of Bosnian Foreign Minister Irfan Ljubiankic on May 28, military assaults against United Nations “peacekeeping” positions, and the taking of over 300 Unprofor hostages. But, as a result of the President's recent Victory in Europe-Day summitry in Moscow, the Russians did not fall into a British trap to drive a wedge between the Yeltsin regime and Washington. Furthermore, since the election of Jacques Chirac as President of France on May 7, France has shown signs of breaking from the previous government's policy of an Anglo-French Entente Cordiale aimed against Germany and the United States.

The Balkan maneuvers by Britain and her Serbian puppets occur at the same time that leading spokesmen for the House of Windsor and its Club of the Isles apparatus have been issuing dire warnings about the imminent breakup of the world financial and monetary system. Their solution: Drive toward totalitarianism and fascist austerity. During the last weeks of May, two of the Club's leading mouthpieces, Lord William Rees-Mogg of the London *Times*, and Sir Peregrine Worsthorne of the *Sunday Telegraph*, have been unabashed in their demands for a new phase in the war to destroy the Clinton Presidency and drive the United States into the hands of the Conservative Revolutionists, who would take London's cue and dismantle the institutions of the U.S. republic.

### London's dilemma

For some time now, it has been clear to the City of London that President Clinton, with the backing of a growing

faction of U.S. political institutions, has made a decisive break with British geopolitics—a break that will be difficult to reverse unless a pliant stooge from the Bush-league can be installed in the Oval Office in the November 1996 elections. After a recent “fact-finding” tour of the United States, Lord Rees-Mogg penned a column in the *Times* pronouncing Presidential candidate Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.) “unelectable.” Shortly after that pronouncement, the *New Republic* published a nasty exposé of the Texas senator's investments in porno films and in a bawdy film satirizing Richard Nixon.

George Bush has signaled his backing of California Gov. Pete Wilson for the GOP Presidential nomination, installing his former chief of staff, Craig Fuller, in charge of the Wilson campaign. But, left to their own devices, none of London's “favorite son” candidates in the GOP Presidential race stand much of a chance of beating the incumbent President—not to mention beating out Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-Kan.) for the GOP nod. Senator Dole, a veteran Washington politician, has shown himself to be willing to forge a bipartisan foreign policy alliance with the White House on the general parameters of U.S. Balkan policy and other vital national security issues, despite bouts of campaign rhetoric to the contrary. Dole is currently co-sponsoring (with Connecticut Democrat Joseph Lieberman) a resolution to lift the arms embargo against Bosnia and pull out the U.N. forces altogether.

Confronted with the prospect of either four more years of Clinton, or a Dole Presidency that would carry forward the anti-British thrust of the Clinton administration, London decided to escalate the Balkan crisis, in the hopes of drawing the United States into the kind of quagmire that might foist one of the Conservative Revolutionists into the White House in 18 months.

The Balkan escalation came shortly after President Clin-

ton's refusal to attend the VE-Day celebrations in London. That diplomatic snub so angered the British royals that Queen Elizabeth II reportedly indicated that she would not return to London from her vacation in Scotland in September to greet President Clinton. This move by the queen could also signal that plans are afoot for a government change. Even Margaret Thatcher has come out in recent weeks giving her blessings to Labour Party chief Tony Blair to succeed Prime Minister John Major.

The fact that the British chose the Balkans as the preferred spot to escalate their war against Washington, was no mere short-term expedient. The British have maintained control over certain Serbian networks since before World War I, when the original "Prince of the Isles," Prince Edward Albert, later King Edward VII, instigated world war in order to block a French, German, Russian, American alliance from building a Eurasian co-prosperity zone that would have eclipsed Britain's world empire.

In the run-up to World War I, Prince Edward Albert forged what came to be known as the Triple Entente—an unholy alliance among London, Paris, and Moscow, against Germany, and, by implication, against the United States.

Today, the British are out to accomplish the same objective. The only difference is that this time, the venom against the United States is much more explicit. On the other hand, this time around, the U.S. political institutions that have rallied behind the Clinton Presidency are far more conscious of the British perfidy, and are therefore less prone to walk into obvious traps.

President Clinton demonstrated this political insight during his recent summit meetings in Moscow. While disagreeing with Russian President Boris Yeltsin on several specific policy fronts, Clinton made clear that the United States is committed to a long-term political partnership with Russia and is sensitive to some of the problems that Russia faces. The tense negotiations over Russia's planned nuclear power plant sales to Iran were resolved amicably, as were broad parameters for Russian membership in the Partnership for Peace.

The United States also made its dissatisfaction with former French Prime Minister Edouard Balladur and his virulently anti-American interior minister, Charles Pasqua, well known in the period prior to the French Presidential elections in May. Balladur's surprise defeat on the first ballot spelled the end of Pasqua's political career, at least for the foreseeable future; and President Chirac and Prime Minister Alain Juppé have already indicated that they will tilt France's policies back toward the kind of European integration and European-American cooperation that will further weaken the Anglo-French Entente Cordiale.

In early April, the San Francisco *Chronicle* reported that a Moroccan opposition figure had been granted political asylum in the United States through an unprecedented State Department intervention, because the man, a son of a former Moroccan interior minister, had produced evidence of Pas-

qua's personal involvement in protecting a heroin-smuggling ring active in southern France and Morocco.

All of these developments contributed to the ploy by the Bosnian Serbs in May to escalate the Balkan crisis.

## **Backfire potential**

When Serb military units attacked French-manned United Nations "peacekeeping" positions inside Sarajevo in mid-May, the U.N. responded by authorizing NATO air strikes against Serbian artillery positions and even against the Bosnian Serb command post. The Serbs replied by taking several hundred Unprofor troops hostage, and killing several French troops.

British asset and Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic's provocation was aimed at calling NATO's bluff and forcing either a withdrawal of Unprofor or a dramatic escalation of NATO presence—including a large United States contingent. From London's vantage point, it was hoped that such a Hobbesian choice would subject President Clinton to political attack from the Congress and from NATO allies, anxious either to pin the crisis on Clinton or draw the United States—at long last—into a quagmire in the Balkans.

Instead, the British found themselves facing a serious set of problems. First, President Clinton—with bipartisan support reflective of a degree of consistency of U.S. policy support for the sovereignty of Croatia and Bosnia that predated the Clinton election—steered a cautious but effective military-diplomatic course, avoiding the traps set by London. He reiterated that any escalation of U.S. involvement in the Balkan crisis would be as part of a NATO—not Unprofor—initiative, and that there were moral issues involved in the Serbian genocide that could not go unanswered. While details of the NATO response are still being worked out as we go to press, President Clinton has reiterated that he does not plan to allow large contingents of U.S. ground troops to get involved. Rather, sources near the administration suggest that the United States is looking at contingency plans based on the kind of intensive air warfare and sophisticated reconnaissance of Serbian positions that was used in the Gulf War.

Second, the British found themselves confronted with a revolt by European citizenry furious at the Serb taking of French and other western hostages. Whereas in the past, the British had exploited European xenophobia concerning a Muslim state on European soil to manipulate and prolong the Serbian aggression against Bosnia, now, Europeans are reacting viscerally against the Serb hostage-taking. Furthermore, the City of London-based financial apparatus, beset with major problems such as the imminent collapse of the S.J. Warburg and the near-bankrupt status of Lloyd's of London, suddenly found that Balkan instability might trigger a flight of capital out of Europe and into U.S. markets. Such a move could trigger an acceleration of the global financial disintegration, at a time and under circumstances to the decided disadvantage of the Club of the Isles.