## Interview: Ivo Komsic

## Diplomacy is not working for peace

EIR correspondents Elke Fimmen and Sheila Jones interviewed Prof. Ivo Komsic, member of the State Presidium of Bosnia-Hercegovina, in Munich, Germany on Oct. 9.

**EIR:** Despite the Serbian offensive in Bosnia it is claimed that the Bosnian Serbs are not getting any more support from the Serbians. Can you tell us something about the actual situation?

Komsic: To expect that 150 international observers can check the borders between Serbia and Bosnia so that [Bosnian Serb boss Radovan] Karadzic won't get any more aid, is an illusion. The border is 1,600 kilometers long, and such a task is ridiculous. This is a trick of French and British diplomacy in order to lift the sanctions against [Serbian President Slobodan] Milosevic. We have reliable information that pontoon bridges have already been thrown up over the Drina to keep the aid coming. But even without these bridges, supplies to the Bosnian Serbs are getting through successfully.

EIR: What can you say about the so-called Contact Group? Komsic: The Contact Group did not have the aim of ending the war in Bosnia. As is becoming increasingly clear, its purpose was to settle the so-called Serbian question in Bosnia and lift the sanctions against Serbia. To force Karadzic to settle, the Contact Group could have achieved this more simply by pressuring Milosevic. The pressure on Karadzic was purely and simply to achieve what happened, the partial lifting of sanctions against Serbia. The only lucky part is that Karadzic did not realize that the plan [to partition Bosnia] in reality is in his favor. He is obsessed with the idea of a Greater Serbia.

EIR: There are now more and more signs that the United Nations and the Serbs are working very closely together. How to do you view American policy in this connection? **Komsic:** Despite our dissatisfaction we must maintain some comprehension for American policy. The main partner for America is solely and uniquely Russia. The American engagement in Bosnia-Hercegovina is determined from the Russian standpoint. The Russian engagement in Bosnia-Hercegovina is overshadowed on their side by internal





British Foreign Minister Douglas Hurd, French Foreign Minister Alain Juppé: French and British strategy "has a clear goal: namely, Greater Serbia."

Russian developments, by the Russian extremists, who could bring about tensions with NATO. That limits the American posture in Bosnia-Hercegovina and makes them cautious.

**EIR:** How do you see the British role? It appears as if Great Britain were doing everything to sabotage a potentially different policy of America and Russia toward Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Komsic: Great Britain is using the internal difficulties of both America and Russia and is attempting to push through its own policy. The policy of Great Britain is unfavorable to us, because it supports the continuity of the first and second Yugoslavia (1918, 1946). We experience this most clearly in the attitude of the British Unprofor troops. They do not represent the U.N., but their own government. The negative role of General Rose is well known. Most recently he has been preventing sorties by NATO aircraft. Together with the Karadzic clique in Pale, they declared NATO as their intrinsic enemy.

**EIR:** Can you say anything about the reasons why President Alija Izetbegovic was moved to accept a postponement of the lifting of the arms embargo?

**Komsic:** We analyzed this question for a long time in the Presidium in Sarajevo. After much discussion we came to the view that the arms embargo should be lifted now, but arms deliveries should be set up somewhat later. The motive

for this is that the Russians, British, and French have threatened that if the arms embargo is lifted, they would immediately withdraw their Unprofor troops from Bosnia. That would have meant that practically all the enclaves which are under Unprofor protection would be delivered to Karadzic. In order to prevent this, we reached this decision.

**EIR:** What is the relationship in Bosnia between Croatians and Muslims? Would it not be possible to build a military alliance?

Komsic: It is clear that a military alliance between Croats and Muslims in Bosnia would be necessary, likewise between the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina. The same enemy has attacked us, and an effective defense is linked up to that.

EIR: We think, and that is also the analysis of the American politician Lyndon LaRouche, that the possibility now exists to forge a different policy in Europe, since Clinton has called for tighter collaboration with Germany and cut off the special relationship with England. This Balkan war was begun for geopolitical reasons. Thatcher and Baker egged on the Serbs to begin the aggression in order to destabilize Europe after the fall of communism. What do you think about this?

Komsic: The Serbians would certainly not have been able, without support, to act in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina. Even the numerous U.N. resolutions against [Serbia] were not in fact implemented. The Americans after the Cold War have simply lost the political strategy toward the Balkans. They appear on the political stage of this region only with short-term measures, without any clear goal. On the other hand, the British and French strategy has a clear goal, namely a Greater Serbia over which they could impose their political goals on the Balkans. It appears that the Americans have only grasped that very recently, and now they are pushing a more decisive policy. In this sense Clinton's visit to Germany is significant. If you analyze his statements, he essentially delivered Bosnia-Hercegovina and the Balkans into Germany's sphere of influence. So it is very important that Germany take on this duty with full awareness and act accordingly. It is certain that Germany has more influence over Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina than anyone else. Germany must use this influence and be guided by its own interests.

EIR: You know that Germany has been attacked by the British press since the fall of the Berlin Wall as a "Fourth Reich," because it allegedly wants to broaden its sphere of influence

Komsic: In no way whatsoever, even vis-à-vis Britain and France, must Germany give up its interests in the Balkans. It is very important that the Americans and the Germans should continue to act as the joint creators of the Washington agreement.

## Greenpeace suffers legal setbacks

by Emmanuel Grenier

The environmentalist organization Greenpeace, the darling of the news media during the 1980s, has now undergone a series of major defeats at the international level, which also shed light on the true nature of its activities. The list of court cases lost in Europe by Greenpeace keeps getting longer, and the trend doesn't seem to be ending. On the contrary, judges, police officers, and journalists seem to be less and less inclined to accept the violent methods of those who call for "environmental justice" and put themselves above the law: Be it trespassing, damaging of property, or aggravated theft, Greenpeace activists believe that (almost) anything goes for the sake of what they deem vital to the planet.

In the past, industry officials and administrators "looked the other way" when Greenpeace carried out illegal activities, but now, they have decided to systematically oppose them. It is the Belgium multinational group Solvay, which sounded the alarm of the revolt. This chemical giant, the world's number one chlorine producer, reacted when Greenpeace plunged into an insane campaign aimed at "zero chlorine." Besides the hundreds of millions of tons of chlorine found in the ocean and the hydrochloric acid found in gastric juices of mammals, nature itself produces numerous type of organic chloride molecules (molecules occurring in living processes, and consisting of chlorine and carbon atoms). In an approach typical of their "ecological fundamentalism," Greenpeace asserted that chlorine is harmful in itself, that "the breakdown of salt is a mortal sin of humanity" (that is, carrying out the electrolysis of salt, or sodium chloride, to obtain chlorine and sodium), and that "a world without chlorine" must be reached quickly.

Solvay, seeing its vital interests threatened, is responding tit for tat to the Greenpeace attacks. Any occupation of the factory or violation of property is immediately attacked and referred to the courts. Damages are demanded—with interest. Above all, Solvay is answering the Greenpeace attacks point by point and going directly to the public to reestablish the truth when it is distorted. This method has produced numerous court victories since 1991 and has culminated recently in a severe defeat for Greenpeace in Belgium, where the movement has been silenced by losing its spokesman, Martin Besieux.

54 International EIR November 4, 1994