LETTER DATED 14 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 13 September 1992, from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, H.E. Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Annex

Letter dated 13 September 1992 from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council

We have to inform you with regrets that the Serbian-Montenegrin aggressors are intensifying their attacks against residential areas in the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina, including a more frequent and more ruthless use of military air force which is controlled by the so-called Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Yesterday, they bombarded the towns of Jajce, Gradačac, Brčko, Bihać and others. In these towns tens of civilians were killed, while whole residential areas were destroyed. All of the jet fighters took off from the military airfields in Batajnica and Niš (Serbia), Bodgorisa (Montenegro) and Banja Luka (occupied territory in Bosnia-Herzegovina).

In accordance with the aforesaid, we kindly ask you to intercede in the United Nations Security Council for a ban of all military flights of the aggressor's forces in the airspace of Bosnia-Herzegovina. We do not see any other possibility to protect the civilian population against the crimes committed by the enemy air force, since we do not dispose of any means for prevention of air attacks.

We would appreciate this letter to be distributed as a Security Council document.

With the expectations of your understanding and of a positive decision by the Security Council, I remain

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIĆ
The Security Council this evening approved an enlargement of the mandate and strength of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in order to provide protection for convoys transporting humanitarian aid and released detainees.

It took that action through its adoption of resolution 776 (1992), by a vote of 12 in favour to none against, with 3 abstentions (China, India and Zimbabwe).

By today's action, the Council approved the Secretary-General's report, which proposed an expansion of the Force by a factor of four or five, in order to enable the delivery of some 5,000 tonnes a week of humanitarian relief, under the supervision of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The expansion is to be carried out at no cost to the United Nations, as a result of offers of support from a number of States.

The report states that UNPROFOR troops concerned would follow normal peace-keeping rules of engagement, which authorize them to use force in self-defence, including situations in which armed persons attempt by force to prevent them from carrying out their mandate.

Also by today's text, the Council urged Member States to provide the Secretary-General with such financial or other assistance he deems appropriate in the performance of UNPROFOR's expanded functions. It also decided to consider what further steps might be necessary to ensure the Force's security and to enable it to fulfil its mandate.

Statements in explanation of vote were made by the representatives of Zimbabwe, India, China, France, Austria, Hungary, the United States and Belgium.

The representatives of China, India and Zimbabwe said they fully supported the recommendations of the Secretary-General. However, they could not support operative paragraph 2 of the text, which linked the expansion of the mandate to the implementation of resolution 770 (1992), which authorized the use of all necessary means to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

(A MORE DETAILED ACCOUNT OF THE MEETING APPEARS IN TAKES 1-6 OF THIS RELEASE)
Letter dated 14 September 1992 from the President of the Security Council to the President of the General Assembly

I refer to your letter dated 2 September 1992 (A/46/967-S/24517), in which you conveyed your views to the Security Council on the prevailing view in the General Assembly regarding the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As you know, the Council has been deeply concerned about the serious deterioration of the situation in the former Yugoslavia, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Council has also been greatly disturbed by the death and suffering of innocent human beings as a result of their being denied satisfaction of their basic needs and also as a result of the widespread violation of international humanitarian law.

Over the past 12 months, the Council has been dealing with these problems virtually on a continuous basis.

The Council has also supported the cooperation between the Presidency of the European Community and the Secretary-General in convening the International Conference on the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia with the aim of achieving a political settlement of the crisis in all its aspects through continuous and uninterrupted effort. The Council has called upon the parties and others concerned, who entered into specific commitments in London, to cooperate fully in achieving a comprehensive settlement.

The Council will continue to do its utmost to bring about an end to the problems of the former Yugoslavia.

(Signed) José AYALA LASSO
President of the Security Council
OUTGOING CRYPTO FAX

TO: GOULDING, UNATIONS, NEW YORK

FROM: VANCE, BELGRADE

DATE: 13 SEPTEMBER 1992

NUMBER: UNPROFOR - B - 308

SUBJECT: B-H "AIR EXCLUSION ZONE"

HAVING DISCUSSED THE MATTER WITH NAMBIAR, AHTISAARI, OKUN,
AND THORNBERRY, I AM AT THE PRESENT TIME DISINCLINED TO SUPPORT
THE IDEA NOW BEING PUT FORWARD OF AN "AIR EXCLUSION ZONE". FIRST
AND FOREMOST, THERE HAS BEEN NO SUGGESTION THAT HUMANITARIAN
FLIGHTS HAVE BEEN INTERFERED WITH FROM THE AIR: THE PROBLEM,
INSTEAD, LIES ON THE GROUND WHERE HAND-HELD MISSILES BORNE BY
IRREGULARS IN FORESTED MOUNTAINS PROVIDE THE BASIC THREAT, TO
WHICH AIR COVER DOES NOT PRESENT AN ANSWER. THE DANGER,
MOREOVER, IS THAT THE PRESENCE OF FOREIGN WARPLANES ON
RECONNAISSANCE OR ESCORT FLIGHTS WILL ATTRACT MORE TROUBLE THAN
THEY CAN PREVENT. THUS THE POSSIBILITY OF ESCALATION OF THE
CONFLICT HAS TO BE CONSIDERED. OUR RELIABLE INFORMATION IS THAT
THERE HAS BEEN NO MILITARY CROSS-BORDER FLYING FROM SERBIA AND
MONTENEGRO FOR SEVERAL MONTHS, THOUGH SOME HAS TAKEN PLACE
RECENTLY FROM BANJA LUKA. IF THE SITUATION SHOULD CHANGE I WOULD
BE PREPARED TO REVISIT THIS CONCLUSION. GENERAL NAMBIAR SHARES
THIS GENERAL VIEW AND WILL BE Sending YOU HIS COMMENT SEPARATELY.
REGARDS.

ENDALL.

OK'd By CRV
11 September 1992

Excellency, Mr. Colombo,

I have the honour to thank you for your letter of 28 August, informing me of offers made by members of the Western European Union to contribute troops and other resources to a United Nations operation for the protection of humanitarian convoys in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

I should like to express my gratitude to you and, through you, to the Council of Ministers of the Western European Union for your efforts in this regard. As you know, I have today submitted to the Security Council a proposal to expand the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) for this purpose. It is my intention shortly to approach several of the members of the Western European Union, as well as other States, to participate in this operation.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

With my warmest personal regards,

Boutros Boutros-Ghali

His Excellency
Mr. Emilio Colombo
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Italy
Rome
LETTER DATED 11 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In reference to the letters to the Security Council from my President, dated 3 July 1992 and 14 July 1992, and my letters dated 13 July 1992 and 28 July 1992, regarding the urgent need to initiate relief flights to the airport in Tuzla;

I have the honour to present to you an attached abridged report, "The New Enemy: Serbs at bay, Bosnian town fights hunger", by an independent source, Mr. Roy Gutman, published in the New York Newsday on 20 August 1992, regarding the gravity of the humanitarian situation in Tuzla, and regarding the capacity of the Tuzla airport to accommodate unhindered the relief flights.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the report as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative
Annex

"The New Enemy: Serbs at bay, Bosnian town fights hunger"
by Roy Gutman - European correspondent

Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzegovina - The woman was 45 and well-dressed, but she had gone so long without food when she appeared outside the modest office of the Red Crescent charity earlier this month that she could not even sit up. She asked only for a glass of water with sugar.

The staff noted signs of shock and called an ambulance, but the doctor was unable to assist her because the hospital had run out of intravenous fluid. "I gave her my own breakfast, a slice of bread and a tomato," said Nejira Nalic, a Red Crescent employee. "Then we let her go. We could do nothing for her."

The woman, whose fate is unknown, is just one of thousands of victims of a severe shortage of food and medical supplies in Northeast Bosnia, where 750,000 people now live, including 150,000 mostly Muslim refugees from "ethnically cleansed" towns and villages. And the Red Crescent's inability to help her shows, in a microcosm, how ineffectual international aid has been in reducing the suffering here.

"Every day, people are going hungry. They come asking for a liter of cooking oil or a kilo of flour. People are desperate," said Sead Avdic, president of the local governing council.

But Tuzla, Bosnia's leading industrial center, is not just another city under siege. It is, in fact, the last fully functioning free region of any size in the internationally recognized country of Bosnia. It was here that local leaders, through wit, organization and a modest supply of arms, managed in May to hold off the Serb military juggernaut that captured two-thirds of Bosnia's territory. By conquering Bosnian territory the Serbs hope to expand the territory of Serbia to include ethnic Serbs wherever they live.

Now, with the Serbs at bay, the enemy is hunger. But Tuzla's pleas for international help have fallen on deaf ears. The shelves in the city's supermarkets are bare. There has been no gasoline since April. According to mayor Selim Beslagic, Tuzla normally consumes 7,300 tons of food a month, but is receiving only 400 tons a month by humanitarian convoys it has organized with its own resources and foreign donations.

As of late last week, Tuzla's Gradina Hospital had run out of antibiotics except for penicillin, of intravenous fluid and X-ray film, and was down to a three-day supply of medicine needed for kidney dialysis and only a week's worth of basic vaccines.
"Every day is dramatic. We're used to it," said Hilmija Hadzefendic, who is in charge of the city's health crisis staff. "The most dramatic moment was when we ran out of bandages. On July 26, we issued the last meter of bandage." Then they started using ripped bedsheets, and when the supply ran out, they tried cellulose. That did not work, so they turned to "cellstoff," a material used in hygienic wipes.

Tuzla and the surrounding region, historically a concentration of Bosnia-Herzegovina's mainly Muslim population, are evidence that some of the republic is still alive and functioning despite the Serb onslaught, and that Bosnians can defend themselves. But Tuzla also provides evidence of a pattern of neglect by the international community, which has ignored the Bosnian hinterlands and, driven by the presence of the world news media, focused almost exclusively on Sarajevo.

Although more than half of Bosnia's endangered Muslim population is living here, no international organization has a representative in Tuzla. City officials said this reporter was the first westerner to visit since May.

"All of the world's activity is focused on Sarajevo, as if it were the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina," said Beslagic. "We accept that Sarajevo is unquestionably Bosnia-Herzegovina. But Bosnia-Herzegovina is also Visegrad, Gorazde, Mostar, Trebinje, and Tuzla, and we cannot accept that our destiny will be solved through only Sarajevo."

Tuzla also illustrates the enormous challenge facing every Bosnian town as fall and winter approach, compounded by its size, the influx of refugees, and its near total isolation.

The city's normal population of 80,000 has been swollen by 55,000 registered refugees. The region's usual population of 600,000 has increased by 155,000 refugees. New refugees arrive at the rate of 500 to 1,000 a day, city officials said, mostly with only the shirts on their backs and a grocery bag of belongings.

The United Nations has sent in only two relief convoys since April, leaving the city to organize resupply on its own. The only route is a primitive dirt road hacked out of the mountainside that will become impassable after the first rains of autumn.

In the last month, Beslagic sent a series of SOS messages to President George Bush, Secretary of State James Baker, UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the International Red Cross and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. "Please, do everything you could do" to open an air bridge to ease the growing crisis, he pleaded in the memo, a copy of which was made available to New York Newsday. He told them Tuzla's airport is bigger than Sarajevo's, is ready for operations, is out of line of the Serb cannon, and can easily be protected with a force of 100 UN troops. But no one replied.

...
"We get lots of requests," said Ron Redmond, spokesman for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees in Zagreb, Croatia, noting that his agency is trying to set up a warehouse in Bosnia where towns could obtain supplies and, using their own trucks, deliver the material to their citizens. But such a plan would not help Tuzla, given the political conflict that threatens to block relief convoys and the imminent closing of the road link.

UN officials in New York also appeared to be unaware of the appeal from Tuzla.

UN officials could not recall the references to Tuzla but later found in their files copies of several letters from Bosnian officials about the city's plight.
LETTER DATED 10 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 4 September 1992, from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, H.E. Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative
Letter dated 4 September 1992 from the President of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council

In the aftermath of the London Conference, I would like to comment on developments in my country and to personally inform you of the position of the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with respect to the recommendations upon which we have agreed.

You will recall the specific decisions from this Conference:

- Early lifting of the sieges of towns and cities;
- International supervision of heavy weapons;
- Ban on military flights;
- Posting of observers on our borders;
- Effective delivery of humanitarian aid;
- Progressive return of refugees to their homes;
- Unconditional and unilateral release under international supervision of all civilians detained;
- Bringing to account those responsible for ordering grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, and the creation of an international criminal court;
- Assure vigorous application of sanctions, including those on the Danube.

These actions must be taken immediately if there is to be peace in the region. We would like to express our appreciation for your support in reaching the Agreement.

Regrettably, however, those branded by the international community as aggressors think nothing of breaching the London Agreement despite calls for immediate implementation. While we were completing our work on the London Conference document, my people were subjected to ferocious bombardment in several places. The artillery attacks have continued unabated since the conclusion of the Conference. The new attacks include vicious attacks on civilians and numerous historic buildings including the National Library and Archives in Sarajevo as well as continued attacks throughout the countryside.
In view of these developments, and the approaching winter, the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has determined that it cannot continue to participate in the negotiations if the Serbian army continues to reject the letter and the spirit of the London Agreement.

To facilitate full exploitation of the diplomatic option, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina demands that the provision for the "no-fly zone" be implemented immediately and that a date be set now for an assessment of the implementation of the remaining provisions of the London Conference accord by a UN/EC task force established explicitly for this purpose. We recommend that the date for this assessment be as soon as possible, but in any case prior to the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

Remaining committed to a full implementation of the London Agreement, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina will demand that the international community implement all provisions of United Nations Security Council resolutions relevant to applying all means necessary, including military force, to aid our country. If hostilities continue, the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina will choose to exercise its right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and will ask the General Assembly to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Our Government has demonstrated its good faith in the London diplomatic effort and during previous EC-sponsored negotiations. I fear, however, that we are approaching the point where diplomatic means can no longer offer the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina any hope for survival.

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIC
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

INTRODUCTION

1. Following the adoption of resolution 770 (1992) on 13 August 1992, a number of the co-sponsors of that resolution communicated to me views about how the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina could be facilitated through the provision of protective support by the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR). In essence, their view was that this function could be added to UNPROFOR's mandate and carried out by military personnel, under the command of the Force Commander of UNPROFOR, operating in accordance with the established principles and practices of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Some of the Member States concerned indicated that they were ready to provide the necessary military personnel, equipment and logistic support at no cost to the United Nations.

2. I welcomed this approach, especially as regards its financial aspects, and instructed my staff to discuss it in greater detail with the Member States concerned, with a view to formulating proposals which I could present to the Security Council. The present report contains such proposals.

I. CONCEPT OF OPERATION

3. These proposals, which have been discussed with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and enjoy her support, recognize UNHCR's role as the lead agency for humanitarian activities in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. UNPROFOR's task, under its enlarged mandate, would be to support UNHCR's efforts to deliver humanitarian relief throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in particular to provide protection, at UNHCR's request, where and when UNHCR considered such protection necessary.
4. It would remain UNHCR's responsibility, as at present, to determine the priorities and schedules for the delivery of such relief, to organize the relief convoys, to negotiate safe passage along the intended routes, with UNPROFOR's assistance as required, and to coordinate requests from non-governmental organizations and other agencies wishing to join UNPROFOR-protected convoys. UNHCR, after consulting UNPROFOR, would decide which convoys needed protection, and protection would be provided only at UNHCR's request. Other humanitarian agencies seeking UNPROFOR's protection for their deliveries of relief supplies would have to address their requests to UNHCR.

5. UNHCR would establish regional storage and distribution centres at 11 locations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as follows:

   (a) With access from Croatia: Banja Luka, Bihac, Mostar, Sarajevo, Vitez;
   (b) With access from Serbia/Montenegro: Bilece, Foca, Gorazde, Vlasenica;
   (c) With access from both: Doboj, Tuzla.

6. UNPROFOR would, when so requested by UNHCR, provide protection of convoys to UNHCR's regional centres and from them to local distribution points. UNPROFOR would also assume responsibility for the protection of United Nations facilities, including UNHCR storage centres, if so requested by UNHCR.

7. The military elements added to UNPROFOR would include a transport battalion which would be at the disposal of UNHCR for the delivery of relief supplies along routes determined by UNHCR, after consultation with UNPROFOR, to be particularly difficult. In other cases, UNHCR trucks with civilian drivers would constitute the convoy but would be escorted by UNPROFOR military vehicles and personnel.

8. Operational decisions relating to a protected convoy, including action to be taken in the event that the convoy encountered obstacles, would be the responsibility of the commander of the UNPROFOR escort, who would, where possible, consult the senior UNHCR representative in the convoy before taking such decisions. The relationship between UNPROFOR and UNHCR would be comparable to that developed for the Sarajevo airport operation.

9. In providing protective support to UNHCR-organized convoys, the UNPROFOR troops concerned would follow normal peace-keeping rules of engagement. They would thus be authorized to use force in self-defence. It is to be noted that, in this context, self-defence is deemed to include situations in which armed persons attempt by force to prevent United Nations troops from carrying out their mandate. These considerations are particularly relevant in the current tense situation in the proposed area of operations. The Security Council's approval of the recommendations contained in this report would mean that the number of troops and other UNPROFOR personnel deployed in Bosnia and
Herzegovina would be increased by a factor of four or five. It is therefore essential that all parties uphold the undertakings they have made and cease forthwith their attacks on United Nations personnel and property. Should this not occur, the Security Council would have to consider what further steps might be necessary to ensure UNPROFOR's security and enable it to fulfil its mandate.

10. It is envisaged that UNHCR's expanded programme of humanitarian relief deliveries, with UNPROFOR's protection as required, would deliver some 5,000 tonnes a week to those in need in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

11. Following the agreement at the London International Conference on the unconditional and unilateral release, under international supervision, of all civilians detained in detention camps, the question has arisen of the security of those who would be released. The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has expressed concern at the risks to which those detainees who wished to leave Bosnia and Herzegovina might be exposed while being taken from the camps and detention centres to places of refuge in neighbouring countries. UNPROFOR does not at present have the resources in Bosnia and Herzegovina to undertake the protection of such persons except on a very limited basis. However, should the Security Council decide to expand the mandate and strength of UNPROFOR as recommended in this report, the additional resources provided to it could also be used to protect convoys of released detainees if the ICRC so requested and if the Force Commander agreed that the request was practicable. In taking action on this report, the Council may wish to authorize UNPROFOR to undertake this function.

II. STRUCTURE OF THE OPERATION

12. Overall command and control of the operation would be exercised by the Force Commander of UNPROFOR. A new Bosnia and Herzegovina Command would be established within UNPROFOR at the two-star level, with its headquarters at Sarajevo. This Command would assume responsibility for all peace-keeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, i.e. the current operation at Sarajevo airport, the protective support of humanitarian convoys and of released detainees, the work of United Nations military observers deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the original UNPROFOR mandate (currently only at Bihac) and the supervision of the parties' heavy weapons, should the Security Council assign this further task to UNPROFOR.

13. UNPROFOR's Bosnia and Herzegovina Command would consist of:

(a) Sector Sarajevo, commanded as at present at the one-star level, to continue performing the tasks arising from the 5 June agreement and authorized by resolutions 758 (1992) and 761 (1992);

(b) Four or five new zones, the precise locations of which would be determined after further consultation with UNHCR. Possible centres for them include Banja Luka, Bihac, Doboj, Gorazde, Mostar, Tuzla and Vitez. In each
zone there would be an infantry battalion group, whose headquarters would also need to include civilian staff to undertake political and information functions and liaison with UNHCR. It is envisaged that approximately 20 international Professional staff, 18 General Service and 10 local staff would be required for these functions, with an additional 20 international civil administration personnel and 12 local staff for administrative support tasks. (The possibility of a small reduction in these numbers will also be studied by the advance party proposed in paragraph 16 below.)

14. The UNPROFOR units in the new zones would need to have a high degree of self-sufficiency, possessing their own front-line and second-line logistic capacity, subject to decisions by the planning party on what logistic support they could obtain from UNPROFOR's existing logistic structures. In addition, UNPROFOR's Bosnia and Herzegovina Command would need an engineer bridging company, medical evacuation capability and an integral communications unit. A total of 80 additional United Nations military observers would also be required for patrolling, liaison, negotiation and ad hoc humanitarian tasks.

15. To summarize the above requirements, UNPROFOR would need to be augmented by the following, in addition to its present strength in Sarajevo:

(a) Four or five infantry battalion groups, each including a headquarters and a headquarters company, two armoured reconnaissance companies, two armoured infantry companies, an engineer sub-unit for route and mine clearance and ordnance disposal and logistic capability as described above;

(b) A transport battalion of some 500 all ranks with 100 trucks and an adequate maintenance capacity;

(c) A medical evacuation capability;

(d) An engineer bridging company;

(e) A signals unit for communications within and between the zones and headquarters;

(f) Eighty United Nations military observers;

(g) Approximately 80 civilian staff members.

16. As soon as the Security Council has taken action on this report, I shall ask the Member States contributing additional elements to UNPROFOR to form a joint planning team. This team will proceed to Zagreb and finalize, in consultation with the Force Commander and his staff and with representatives of UNHCR, plans for implementing the concept described in this report, especially as regards the deployment of the additional elements and their logistic support.
III. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

17. In consultations with Member States who have expressed an interest in contributing military personnel, equipment and logistic support to UNPROFOR for this operation, I have made it clear that my recommendation to the Security Council for UNPROFOR's mandate to be enlarged in this way would be based on the assumption that all such resources would be provided at no cost to the United Nations and that the contributing countries, or other Member States on a voluntary basis, would cover the additional administrative expenses which would be incurred by the United Nations. It would be necessary to confirm that sufficient funds were available from these sources before the additional troops could be put in place.

IV. OBSERVATIONS

18. The concept described in this report seems to me to provide the best possibility for ensuring increased deliveries of humanitarian relief to the suffering people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It would assure the Security Council's control of the operation, while at the same time avoiding the imposition of additional financial burdens on the Organization. I therefore recommend that the Security Council approve the expansion of UNPROFOR's mandate and strength, on the basis of the plan described above, to provide protective support for UNHCR-organized humanitarian convoys throughout the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
Note to the Secretary-General

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA: PROTECTION OF HUMANITARIAN CONVOYS

Attached, for your urgent approval, is the draft of your report to the Security Council. The new matter, none of it controversial, relates to:

(a) a strengthening of the language about the security of UNPROFOR personnel (paragraph 9);
(b) the protection of convoys of released detainees (paragraph 11);
(c) the proposal to ask the contributing countries to establish a joint planning team which would finalize the plan with General Nambiar in Zagreb (paragraph 16).

Marrack Goulding
10 September 1992

cc: Mr. Aimé
Mr. de Soto
LETTER DATED 9 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 8 September 1992, from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, H.E. Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative
Annex

Letter dated 8 September 1992 from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council

The right to personal dignity, work, housing, freedom of expression and freedom of religion are basic entitlements of every citizen. The right to life is fundamental.

The inviolability of frontiers is meaningless if murder runs riot within. The aspirations, declarations and undertakings made in London are valueless without the means to hold to account those who deliberately break their solemn word. It is essential to produce evidence which will convince not just the Governments and international institutions, but the citizens of the world, of the need for concerted and sustained action against such transgressors.

The means are at hand.

Remote satellite sensing, fixed wing and rotary aircraft, can all, with suitable equipment, provide incontrovertible evidence in meticulous detail of the topography of the whole of Bosnia and Herzegovina and adjacent territories. It is a sine qua non of military planning to engage in the maximum possible reconnaissances prior to any activity. It seems reasonable to suggest that the combined forces of NATO have not overlooked this principle.

The specific points detailed under the headings Cessation of Violence, Confidence Building Measures, Humanitarian Issues, Refugees and Detention Camps, Safe Areas, Sanctions and Violations of International Humanitarian Law, all require the ability to those endeavouring to implement these objectives to have the means at hand to produce all pertinent detail in such a manner as to preclude denial, equivocation and procrastination over legitimate demands for physical inspection.

Aerial surveys are a non-confrontational means of assisting all parties in this essential and urgent work. The methods available are all-weather and 24 hours in capacity. They can be conducted by civilian personnel in suitably identified aircraft. Any party to the London Conference declarations, which seeks to oppose the introduction of such technology must have much to hide from scrutiny of the world.

The Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina formally requests that the joint United Nations-European Community working group immediately take all appropriate measures designed to implement this proposal without delay.

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIC
Following consultations with the members of the Security Council, the President of the Council made the following statement, on behalf of the Council, at its 3113th meeting, on 9 September 1992, in connection with the Council's consideration of the item entitled "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina":

"The Security Council has noted with deep concern the attack which cost the lives of two French soldiers of UNPROFOR near Sarajevo, during which five other soldiers were wounded. It conveys its deep-felt sympathy and condolences to the Government of France and to the bereaved families. It strongly condemns this deliberate attack against UNPROFOR personnel.

"The Council invites the Secretary-General to inform it as soon as possible on the findings of the inquiry into the circumstances of this attack as well as other similar incidents involving the United Nations activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in particular the incident which cost the lives of four Italian airmen in charge of the transportation of humanitarian relief to Sarajevo Airport. It invites him also to pass on to it any information which he could gather on the responsibility for these incidents.

"These serious incidents underline the urgent need for reinforcing the security and protection of UNPROFOR personnel as well as of all personnel involved in the United Nations activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Security Council expresses its readiness to adopt without delay measures to this end."
Security Council

Distr. GENERAL
S/24537
9 September 1992
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 5 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Acting under paragraph 5 of the resolution 771 (13 August 1992) where the Security Council "calls upon States ... to collate substantiated information in their possession or submitted to them relating to the violations of humanitarian law, including grave breaches of the Geneva conventions, being committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia and to make this information available to the Council"; and further,

Acting under the President's statement of 4 August (S/PV.3103) where the Security Council "... calls upon all parties, States, ... to make immediately available to the Council any further information they might possess regarding these camps and access to them";

I have the honour to present to you the attached report "Camps: No Rules for Deaths," published by the Vreme News Digest Agency on 17 August 1992. Vreme is a highly regarded Belgrade, Serbia, weekly.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the report as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative

92-42981 3682b (E) 090992 090992
An n ex
No Rules for Deaths

The camp at Manjaca has already become known, while fresh data pertain to Bosanski Novi where civilians, all of them, women included, have had their hairs shaven. Serbian regulars and irregulars are torturing the civilians they round up from villages near Bosanski Novi. They take the "prisoners" in buses, torturing them on the way. Recently, only 5 out of 50 villagers from around Bosanski Novi had reached the camp, for others were killed and massacred along the way.

Moslem and Croat population in Banja Luka is maltreated. In Kozarac near Prijedor, all houses, with people, were burned down, and charred bodies lie along the street. Moslem and Croats flee Prijedor illegally unless they have paid 10,000 DEM to some of the local Serbs. The Serbs caught in helping Croats and Moslems are punished by the "true" Serbs in the same way. They are arrested in the same camps. In Banja Luka, Moslem-owned shops have almost invariably been blown up. Those that have not, stay closed, because their owners are threatened constantly.

Moslems and Croats have been removed from all major offices in the army of the "Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina". For having uttered a wrong word, people are taken away or killed. A curfew closes at 9 a.m., electric power is cut off throughout most of the day, a state-of-war-threat is proclaimed, and all Serbs aged up to 65 years are mobilized.

The mobilized men from the area of Banja Luka municipality are engaged in war around Doboj and Odzak, where they mop up the field, which presumes the extermination of Moslems and other non-Serbs in the localities nearby.

Travelling from Banja Luka to Belgrade, one passes a multitude of predominately para-military checkpoints. The most essential is the name and surname as stated in personal identity papers, while the usual question is: "Any Turks here?". If a Moslem happens to be here, this is the end for his journey: he is dragged out from the vehicle and liquidated on the spot.

Certain predominantly Moslem-populated places in the vicinity of Banja Luka, towards Prijedor, Derventa and Doboj, exist now only as names on maps.

The military communication line Banjaluka-Belgrade is very busy. Every weekend, trucks driven by Banjaluka reservists arrive carrying arms from barracks in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The entire operation is organized through the command of Banjaluka garrison, which receives also arms also with the assistance of Serbian forces from Pale (near Sarajevo).

One of the latest shipments of munitions to Banjaluka weighed one thousand tonnes of ammunition.
LETTER DATED 4 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Acting under paragraph 5 of resolution 771 (13 August 1992) where the Security Council "calls upon States ... to collate substantiated information in their possession or submitted to them relating to the violations of humanitarian law, including grave breaches of the Geneva conventions, being committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia and to make this information available to the Council;".

I have the honour to present to you the attached report "Rape by Order: Bosnian Women Terrorized by Serbs", written by Mr. Roy Gutman and published by the New York Newsday on 23 August 1992. Mr. Gutman's reports have been widely distributed and used as a source for subsequent reports by the international humanitarian organizations.

Mr. Gutman has expressed strong willingness to present his findings related to this report and to many other widely read reports to the Security Council and the Secretary-General, collectively or individually.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the report as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
TUZLA, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serb forces in northern Bosnia systematically raped 40 young Muslim women of a town they captured early this summer, telling some of their victims they were under orders to do so, the young women say.

Statements by victims of the assault, describing their ordeal in chilling detail, bear out reports that the Serb conquerors of Bosnia have raped Muslim women, not as a byproduct of the war but as a principal tactic of the war.

"We have orders to rape the girls", Mirsada, 23, one of 20 young victims interviewed by New York Newsday, said the young man who abducted her told her. He said he was "ashamed to be a Serb" and added that "everything that is going on is a war crime", she said.

Hafiza, also 23, said she sought to dissuade the soldier who raped her. "I tried crying and begging" she said. "I said, 'You have a mother and a sister, a female in the family.' He said nothing. He didn't talk. Then he said 'I must. I must.' I said, 'You must not, if you don't want to.'" But she was unable to stop him.

The incident involved 40 young women from Brezovo Polje, a small town on the Sava River, where conquering forces marched in, seized all the civilians, and dispatched them according to age and gender to their assigned fate.

The rape victims were interviewed in a refugee center, their only refuge after the destruction of their homes, their families and the basis of their economic survival. They agreed to be quoted and photographed, provided they were identified only by first name and age.

"We want the world to know about our truth. All mothers. All women", said Senada, 17, who wrote a statement by hand and gave it to the chief gynecologist at Tuzla Hospital with the request she pass it on to New York Newsday. "I wouldn't want anyone else to have the same experience. It is worse than any other punishment in the world."

The Brezovo Polje episode is only one of a number of indications of a pattern of systematized rape during the Serb conquest of Bosnia.

In separate interviews in Tuzla, four young women from the village of Liplje, near Zvornik, said their Serb captors had detained them in a makeshift bordello where three or more men raped them every night for 10 nights. A leading Bosnian women's group charged that upward of 10,000 Bosnian women are currently being held in Serb detention camps where their captors rape them repeatedly, though that has not been independently confirmed. Another pattern is the rape of pregnant women and some middle-aged women.
Dr. Melika Kreitmayer, leader of the gynecological team that examined 25 of the 40 victims from Brezovo Polje, said she and her colleagues are convinced that the object of the rapes was "to humiliate Muslim women, to insult them, to destroy their persons and cause shock."

"These women were not raped because it was the male instinct. They were raped because it was the goal of the war", she said. "My impression is that someone had an order to rape the girls."

She cited as proof that some young women said they had been taken to a house and not raped, but were instructed to tell others that they had been raped.

Kreitmayer, who is of Muslim origin and whose team includes a Serb and Slovene doctor, made those assertions without any sign of objection from colleagues. "We are shocked by what we have heard," commented her Serb colleague, Dr. Nenad Trifkovic.

According to the young women, the rapists discussed the assaults with their victims as a mission they had to accomplish. Many of the men fortified their resolve by taking white pills, the women said. The men's claim they were operating under orders was reinforced when a new group of irregular forces arrived that owed its allegiance to one of the most savage of the warlords, Vojislav Seselj, a militant nationalist from Sarajevo. The leaders of the original group tried to protect the women of Brezovo Polje from the Seselj followers, the women indicated.

"'Don't worry. The girls have been raped once,'" Zlata, 23, recalled one of the officers as telling the Seselj followers.

According to the victims, preparations for the mass rape began early on the morning of June 17, when Serb soldiers in army uniforms and masks piled out their minivans and rounded up the Muslims of Brezovo Polje for "ethnic cleansing".

They loaded the able-bodied men from 18 to 60 onto buses and sent them "for interrogation" to Luka, a notorious, Serb-run detention camp in nearby Brcko, where nine in 10 prisoners were slaughtered, according to a survivor interviewed by New York Newsday.

Then they packed about 1,000 women, children, and old people into eight buses, drove them around the countryside for two days and held them under armed guard for four terrifying nights without food or water in a parking lot in the nearby town of Ban Brdo, the victims said. Serb soldiers returning from the front invaded the buses every night and led off women and girls to an unknown location at knifepoint, recalled Senada, 17. "They threw them out in the morning, and their clothes were torn, and they were covered with blood", she said.
Finally the group arrived in Caparde, where about 50 Serb irregulars, bearded followers of a warlord named Zeljko Arkan, robbed the mothers and forcibly separated them from their daughters. The mothers were taken by bus and deposited in a war zone. Meanwhile, in the Osnovo furniture warehouse in Capaerde, where the daughters were held, the men, mostly with long beards in the style of the World War II Serbian royalist force known as the Chetniks, selected what one of the rapists said were the 40 prettiest young women and raped them in groups of 10.

Hajrira, 21, said she asked Dragan, the man who raped her, why they were doing it. "He said we are the cleanest convoy that passed Caparde, the prettiest and most attractive, and that they wouldn't let us pass because we are so beautiful."

The victims are aged 15 to 30, with careful dress and gentle manners.

"They would come by and tap us on the shoulder," recalled Herija, 21, another victim. "They told everyone else that we had gone to 'fetch water'. Some of the girls came back two hours later. Some the next morning. And each of them sat down and cried" she said.

The mothers arrived in Tuzla on June 23, distraught about their missing daughters and traumatized by the journey, which began with another bus ride and ended with a forced 12-mile walk through a war zone on a road littered with human corpses.

Their daughters arrived four days later, after a forced walk across a mined road with number of elderly people of whom died en route, they said.

The young women were exhausted and in a state of shock, doctors said. Most, according to the gynecological team later examined them, had vaginal infections of staphylococcus and other bacteria that originate in dirt or fecal matter.

Almost every one of 20 women interviewed by New York Newsday reported that the men who raped them were filthy and smelly, and, in some cases, bloody.

The health and psychological stresses upon the young women of Prezovo Polje are only part of their tragedy, for each of Brezovo Polje are only part of their tragedy, for each is missing a father or a brother. Few of the women have anywhere to go, and the rapes have shaken their confidence. Almost everyone broke into tears as she talked over several days to this reporter.

Their trauma is not over, for Kreitmayer noted, many of them may be pregnant. The hospital will provide hormonal drugs to induce abortion, she added.

The deepest hurt seems to be moral shame. These women from the countryside, where premarital sex is prohibited, and Kreitmayer confirmed that all but one had been virgins. Most of them think they have been ruined. "We
all feel that we lost everything," said Heira, 25, "... Every woman, if she is raped, has to feel the same."

Satka, 20, said she despised the man who raped her because "he had no feeling for me. I wasn't his girlfriend. It was savagery." She said she felt shame because "I was an honest girl. I was a virgin. I gave it to someone who didn't deserve it. Someone whom I love deserves it. But not a savage."

Several pregnant women who were raped were so shattered that they asked to have their babies aborted.

Kreitmayer said one nurse from Brezovo Polje had lost her mother, father, husband, and 4-year-old child "in front of her eyes". The woman told doctors the Serb conquerors decided not to kill her but brought her to their military hospital. "She worked everyday for them but every night she was raped. She was sick. She was desperate. She told them she was between two and three months pregnant. But it meant nothing for them", Kreitmayer said.

For young women of Brezovo Polje, shame alternates with anger. Each time this reporter returned to the school where they are living, a large group of victims joined in the discussion. Rape has been so rare over the years in Bosnia that there are few professional counselors, and Kreitmayer said this was the first appearance of mass rape and aggression toward women.

The victims say that right now they would like to be anywhere but in Bosnia. Most say that once they leave, they do not plan to return ever again.
LETTER DATED 8 SEPTEMBER 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 4 September 1992, from my President, Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Annex

Letter dated 4 September 1992 from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council

I am writing to inform you that the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina continues, with intensified attacks in many areas. The latest massive offensive of the aggressor's forces against the town of Jajce and its surroundings is the most striking example.

Yugoslav army is destroying the town using its usual methods: indiscriminate bombing by heavy artillery and air strikes. Using inflammable projectiles, the aggressor brings about terrible suffering to the civilian population and destruction of property.

At the same time, a member of the Parliament of Serbia, and a leader of the ultra-nationalist paramilitary group the "Chetniks", Vojislav Seselj, has brought new military reinforcements from Serbia and Montenegro, to the region of Ilijas (near Sarajevo), occupied by the irregular Serb forces.

Obviously, the aggressor does not intend to respect any commitments it undertook in the presence of the representatives of the world community at the London Conference.

On behalf of the people and the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, we urge you to use your influence in order to put an end to the suffering of innocent civilians and to make the aggressor comply with the adopted decisions.

Under the existing circumstances, Excellency, we cannot take part in any negotiations, for we do not accept to be deceived anymore by the aggressor.

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIC
REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA
MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: H.E. Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General United Nations 963-2155

FROM: H.E. Mr. Muhamed Sacirbey
Ambassador and Permanent Representative

DATE: 9/8/92

PAGES: including the cover page.

COMMENTS:
H.E. Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General
United Nations
New York

Your Excellency:

I have the honor to present to you the attached letter, dated September 4, 1992, from my President, Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Muhamed Sacirbey
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
4 September 1992

H.E. Dr. Jose Ayala Lasso
President of the Security Council
United Nations, New York

Your Excellency:

I am writing to inform you that the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina continues, with intensified attacks in many areas. The latest massive offensive of the aggressor's forces against the town of Jajce and its surroundings is the most striking example.

Yugoslav army is destroying the town using its usual methods: indiscriminate bombing by heavy artillery and air strikes. Using inflammable projectiles, the aggressor brings about terrible suffering to the civilian population and destruction of property.

At the same time, a member of the Parliament of Serbia, and a leader of the ultra-nationalist paramilitary group the "Chetniks," Vojislav Seselj, has brought new military reinforcements from Serbia and Montenegro, to the region of Ilijas (near Sarajevo), occupied by the irregular Serb forces.

Obviously, the aggressor does not intend to respect any commitments it undertook in the presence of the representatives of the world community at the London Conference.

On behalf of the people and the Presidency of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, we urge you to use your influence in order to put an end to the suffering of innocent civilians and to make the aggressor comply with the adopted decisions.

Under the existing circumstances, Excellency, we can not take part in any negotiations, for we do not accept to be deceived anymore by the aggressor.

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Alija Izetbegovic

cc: H.E. Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Co-Chairman, The London Conference

H.E. Mr. John Major
Co-Chairman, The London Conference

The Honorable Cyrus Vance
Co-Chairman, The Steering Committee

Lord David Owen
Co-Chairman, The Steering Committee

Phone (38-71) 610-340, 664-941, 664-897. Fax (38.71) 664-942.
Letter dated 2 September 1992 from the President of the General Assembly to the President of the Security Council

Last week, the General Assembly held a two-day debate on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which a large number of Member States from all the regional groups participated, resulting in the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/242 on 25 August 1992 by an overwhelming majority.

In this regard, I consider it my duty to put on record and convey to Your Excellency, and to the distinguished members of the Security Council, my impressions of the prevailing view in the General Assembly, as reflected in its resolution 46/242 and in the statements of a majority of Member States (which I am sure you are also aware of as members of the General Assembly), and of the discussions I had with many Ambassadors, which I wish to summarize as follows:

1. While commending the role being played by the Secretary-General, the Security Council, the United Nations Protection Force, and other United Nations agencies, it was generally felt that much more ought to be done and can be done by the United Nations as a whole to find an urgent solution to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, to safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and national unity, to put an end to the fighting and to the grave violations of international humanitarian law there.

The above is particularly reflected in preambular paragraphs 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19, as well as in paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 46/242.
2. Paragraph 4 of General Assembly resolution 46/242 reaffirms the right of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to self-defence. And it was generally felt by a great number of the members as expressed in their statements in the Assembly and in their direct discussions with me that the arms embargo precluded Bosnia and Herzegovina’s inherent right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, and that action should be taken to rectify this.

The above is particularly reflected in preambular paragraph 17 and paragraph 4 of the General Assembly resolution.

3. It was generally felt that the time factor is vital, it is working against the victims, and to the advantage of the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the support of the Yugoslav People’s Army.

The above is particularly reflected in preambular paragraph 11 and paragraph 5 of the resolution.

In view of the above, I hope you and the distinguished members of the Security Council will find it appropriate, in the full spirit of the Charter, to take urgent action on General Assembly resolution 46/242, which represents the collective will of an overwhelming majority of the membership of the United Nations.

(Signed) Samir S. SHIHABI
President
I have the honour to refer to a letter dated 26 August 1992, addressed to you by the Permanent Representative of Turkey (with an annex) and circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 45 and 150, and of the Security Council (A/46/964-S/24490) in response to my statement in the General Assembly on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, on 24 August 1992.

The relevant part of that statement is as follows:

"The unfortunate and indeed tragic fact is that the odious and abhorrent policy of "ethnic cleansing" is not a new phenomenon, nor did it originate in Bosnia. We in Cyprus have had bitter experience in this regard. We have witnessed equally grave violations of international humanitarian law, as attested to by the European Commission of Human Rights, not only during the 1974 invasion but also in 1975 with the enclaved 20,000 Greek Cypriots in the Karpass, of whom now less than 500 remain.

"To quote from a major editorial from the respected Financial Times newspaper, on 16 July 1992, under the heading 'They must be stopped':

'A State recognized by most other States and admitted to numerous international bodies is being dismembered. Frontiers are being redrawn by war. Large numbers of people are being forcibly driven from their homes, with widespread killing. Such actions
would be intolerable at any time or place, but in many times and places have been tolerated. A particularly clear precedent was set in Cyprus in 1974. There, too, a neighbouring State, Turkey, intervened to protect a minority and used military force to secure an area for that minority's exclusive use, expelling from it all members of the majority community. There, too, the international community failed to take any effective action or reverse the process. But "stopping the fighting" is not enough if it turns out to mean, as in Cyprus, consolidating a cease-fire only after the aggressor has secured his objectives and then being content to urge the virtue of negotiations and concessions equally on both sides.'

"I shall refrain from going any further at this point, as the issues involved are fully documented in the records of past debates in the United Nations and I do not want to deflect attention from the item we are now considering.

"My Government's policy has been and continues to be to cooperate fully and with good will with the Secretary-General in sincerely seeking a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus. President Vassiliou has amply demonstrated this policy in the past and very recently, and the same sincere effort will continue when the talks resume later this year. But it is essential for Turkey and all concerned to recognize that, if these talks are to bear fruit, the present inequitable division of territory cannot continue and the right of the displaced persons to return to their homes and property cannot be negated.

"This is a valid proposition in Bosnia and Herzegovina and it is an equally valid proposition in Cyprus. In the case of Bosnia, even Mr. Karadjic is reported to have declared over the weekend that 'all the refugees must be allowed to return home' and that 'all property handed over under duress will have to be returned'. Whether one accepts these declarations at face value or not, can there be any reasonable person who can disagree with these principles, and is it too much to hope that the same principles are also applicable to Cyprus?

"It is to be hoped that Turkey, which has taken a leading role in protecting those who suffer in Bosnia, will at long last play a constructive role also in the search for a just and lasting solution to the tragic problem my own country has been confronted with and suffered from for too long, a solution within the letter and spirit of the numerous applicable United Nations resolutions which so far have remained unimplemented. There should be no double standard."

This statement, and the quotation from the main editorial of 16 July 1992 of the authoritative British newspaper the Financial Times, are clear and require no elaboration. Far from revealing "deep-seated hostility to the Turkish Cypriots", as is falsely alleged, it is a factual and sad reminder of our experience of "ethnic cleansing" applied as a deliberate policy by Turkey
in the occupied part of Cyprus following the 1974 invasion and its parallel to the tragic situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina today.

For want of valid arguments, in response to the substantive issue raised, the Turkish representative resorts to false accusations by proxy. I would not follow his example and resort to polemics.

But it should be pointed out that this is yet another instance of the abuse of the process of circulation of United Nations official documents by the Turkish Mission in the name of an entity recognized by no member of the international community, other than Turkey itself, and which was rightly described in Security Council resolutions 541 (1983) of 18 November 1983 and 550 (1984) of 11 May 1984 as "legally invalid" and a "secessionist entity", resolutions unanimously and significantly reaffirmed by the Security Council in resolution 774 (1992) as recently as 26 August 1992. It was by the same resolution 541 (1983) that the Security Council called upon all States "not to recognize any Cypriot State other than the Republic of Cyprus". Yet Turkey persists in abusing the right to request the circulation of Security Council documents using the name of that unrecognized entity which the Security Council itself described and continues to regard as "legally invalid" and "secessionist".

As I stressed in my above-cited statement, my Government's policy has been and continues to be to cooperate fully and with good will with the Secretary-General in sincerely seeking a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus. It is our hope that when the talks resume later this year Turkey will at long last play a constructive role in this regard. We have long held the conviction that a just and lasting solution to the tragic problem my country has been confronted with for too long would be to the benefit of all concerned, including Turkey, to the interest of all the people of Cyprus and for peace in our volatile region.

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 45 and 150, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Andreas J. JACOVIDES
Ambassador
Permanent Representative
Sarajevo, August 31, 1992

His Excellency Dr. Boutros Ghali
Secretary General of the United Nations
New York
Fax: (09-1-212) 963-4879

Dear Secretary General,

The voices of the innocent peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina turn to you and the United Nations for help. We are desperate. The light of humanity seems to dim for us in each day. Savage warfare is reducing our country to rubble. Our homes, hospitals and schools are destroyed. Our people slaughtered. We are struggling to ensure the most basic civil services. Starvation is now a reality for hundreds of thousands. We appeal to you for immediate humanitarian relief and assistance.

Your Excellency, we respectfully request that a noted humanitarian committed to international relief, development assistance and refugee programs be immediately appointed by you with sufficient authority to assist us in creating additional, non-governmental sources of relief. We recommend that the Reverend Canon Samir J. Habiby of Greenwich, Connecticut, be appointed to create and
coordinate under the United Nations auspices humanitarian relief programs from non-governmental, private, non-profit, voluntary sources. A Christian born in Palestine, Dr. Habiby has decades of experience in Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Americas.

Dr. Habiby's background as well as his expertise in relief and refugee work based on the private voluntary agencies associated with the United Nations make him the impartial coordinator best suited to assist us at this time.

Dr. Habiby has the full confidence of our Government.

Our government and people are fully committed to peace and a just resolution of the complex issues facing us. You can be assured that as a newly sovereign member of the international community we will provide our full support for the timely administration of the urgently needed relief program. Each day is an eternity. Help us, please, to save our people.

I remain respectfully yours,

Mr. Alija Delimustafic
Minister
Ministry of Supply and Enterprises
31 August 1992

Excellency,

I have the honour to refer to a letter dated 26 August 1992 addressed to your Excellency by the Permanent Representative of Turkey (with an annex) circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 45 and 150, and of the Security Council, in response to my statement in the General Assembly on "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina", on 24 August 1992.

The relevant part of this statement is as follows:

"The unfortunate and indeed tragic fact is that the odious and abhorrent policy of "ethnic cleansing" is not a new phenomenon nor did it originate in Bosnia. We in Cyprus have had a bitter experience in this regard. We have witnessed equally grave violations of international humanitarian law, as attested to by the European Commission of Human Rights, not only during the 1974 invasion but also in 1975, with the enslaved 20,000 Greek Cypriots in the Karpass, of whom now less than 500 remain.

To quote from a main editorial of the respected newspaper Financial Times (16 July 1992), under the heading "They must be stopped" and I quote:

"A state, recognized by most other states and admitted to numerous international bodies, is being dismembered. Frontiers are being redrawn by war. Large numbers of people are being forcibly driver from their homes with widespread killing.

Such action would be intolerable at any time or place, but in many times and places have been tolerated. A particularly clear precedent was set in Cyprus in 1974. There too a neighbouring state (Turkey) intervened to protect a minority and used military force to secure an
area for that minority's exclusive use, expelling from it all members of the majority community. There too the international community .... failed to take any effective action or reverse the process.

But 'stopping the fighting' is not enough if it turns out to mean, as in Cyprus, consolidating a cease-fire only after the aggressor has secured his objectives, and then being content to urge the virtue of negotiations and concessions equally on both sides". Unquote.

I will refrain from going any further at this point as the issues involved are fully documented in the records of past debates in the United Nations and I do not wish to deflect attention from the item we are now considering. My Government's policy has been and continues to be to cooperate fully and with good will with the Secretary-General in sincerely seeking a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus. President Vassiliou has amply demonstrated this policy in the past and very recently, and the same sincere effort will continue when the talks resume later this year. But it is essential for Turkey and all concerned to recognize that, if these talks are to bear fruit, the present inequitable division of territory cannot continue and the right of the displaced persons to return to their homes and property cannot be negated.

This is a valid proposition in Bosnia-Herzegovina and it is an equally valid proposition in Cyprus. In the case of Bosnia even Mr. Karadžić is reported to have declared over the week-end that "all the refugees must be allowed to return home" and that "all property handed over under duress will have to be returned" Whether one accepts these declarations on face value or not, can there be any reasonable person who can disagree with these principles and is it too much to hope that the same principles are applicable also to Cyprus? It is to be hoped that Turkey, which has taken a leading role in protecting those who suffer in Bosnia, will at long last play a constructive role also in the search for a just and lasting solution to the tragic problem my own country has been confronted with, and suffered from, for too long, a solution within the letter and spirit of the numerous applicable United Nations resolutions which so far have remained unimplemented. There should be no double standards."
This statement, and the quotation from the main editorial of 16 July 1992 of the authoritative British newspaper The Financial Times, are clear and require no elaboration. Far from revealing "deep-seated hostility to the Turkish Cypriots", as is falsely alleged, it is a factual and sad reminder of our experience of "ethnic cleansing" applied as a deliberate policy by Turkey in the occupied part of Cyprus following the 1974 invasion and its parallel to to-day's tragic situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

For want of valid arguments, in response to the substantive issue raised, the Turkish Representative resorts to false accusations by proxy. I would not follow his example and resort to polemics.

But it should be pointed out that this is yet another instance of the abuse of the process of circulation of United Nations official documents by the Turkish Mission in the name of an entity recognized by no member of the international community, other than Turkey itself, and which was rightly described in Security Council Resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984) as "legally invalid" and "secessionist entity", Resolutions unanimously and significantly reaffirmed by the Security Council in Resolution 774 (1992) as recently as 26 August 1992. It was in the same Resolution, 541 (1983), that the Security Council called upon all states "not to recognize any Cypriot state other than the Republic of Cyprus". Yet Turkey persists in abusing the right to request the circulation of Security Council documents using the name of that unrecognized entity which the Security Council itself described and continues to regard as "legally invalid" and "secessionist".

As I stressed in my above-cited statement, my Government's policy has been and continues to be to cooperate fully and with good will with the Secretary-General in sincerely seeking a just and lasting solution to the problem of Cyprus. It is our hope that when the talks resume later this year Turkey will at long last play a constructive role in this regard. We have long held the conviction that a just and lasting solution to the tragic problem my country has been confronted with for too long would be to the benefit of all concerned, including Turkey, to the interest of all the people of Cyprus and for peace in our volatile region.
I should be grateful if the text of the present letter would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 45 and 150, and of the Security Council.

Andreas J. Jacovides
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

H.E. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General of the
United Nations
New York.

/cd.
LETTER DATED 28 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 26 August 1992, from the Acting President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dr. Ejup Ganic, and the Prime Minister of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Mr. Jure Pelivan.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Joint letter dated 26 August 1992 from the Acting President of the Presidency and the Prime Minister of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the Security Council

While the world is making diplomatic efforts to find a key to a just and peaceful solution to the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Conference in London being such an effort, the aggression against our country is continuing with even greater intensity.

In the last 24 hours 3,000 artillery shells have been fired from the hills at civilian targets in Sarajevo, including apartment buildings and hospitals. The famous National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been set on fire and is still burning. Sarajevo is without water or electricity, as a result of constant bombardments. Last night and today dozens of civilians were killed in Sarajevo, hundreds were wounded, and aggressor's artillery and aviation is still active throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We ask and expect you to use your great influence and have the United Nations and the United Nations Security Council decisions respected, so that the aggression on Bosnia and Herzegovina could be stopped in a most effective way.

(Signed) Jure PELIVAN
Prime Minister

(Signed) Ejup GANIC
Acting President of the Presidency
LETTER DATED 27 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated
21 August 1992, from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
His Excellency Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Despite the fact that the Security Council has passed two new resolutions concerned with the humanitarian aspect of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the aggression against this country is continuing, and its target remains the innocent civilian population.

The situation is particularly serious in the besieged towns of Gorazde, Jajce and Bosanski Brod, which the warplanes of the Yugoslav Army have intensively bombarded during recent days.

These warplanes have been using internationally-banned cluster bombs and napalm bombs. A rocket attack on Gorazde has destroyed some of the humanitarian aid which arrived only the previous day.

The capital city of Sarajevo continues to be the target of daily artillery attacks. The method of attack has changed, however the bombardments are less frequent, but are made with more destructive and deadly weapons (155 mm and 180 mm multiple rocket launchers). The results remain the same. In Sarajevo alone, some 10 civilians die and 40-80 are injured every day.

We demand that the Security Council of the United Nations, in accordance with the resolutions already passed, use means which will stop once and for all the military activities of the Yugoslav Army in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and at the same time bring to an end all forms of persecution and killing of innocent civilians.

We ask that this letter be distributed as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIC
President
LETTER DATED 26 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter, dated 20 August 1992, from the President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, His Excellency Mr. Alija Izetbegovic.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Annex

Letter dated 20 August 1992 from the President of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the President of the Security Council

Regarding the ongoing absolute blockade of Sarajevo and special UNPROFOR mission determined by resolution 758 (1992) to reopen the Sarajevo airport for humanitarian purposes as a first step towards the implementation of Security Council resolution 757 (1992), paragraph 17, you are kindly requested to give guidelines to the relevant authorities so that which is shortly defined, should comprise the following:

(A) Humanitarian and resupply missions comprise also the evacuation of sick, wounded and all other persons indisposed by war activities to destinations abroad upon officially expressed readiness of responsible authorities from foreign countries.

(B) Resupply missions at the request of the legal authorities of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina intended for revitalization of local facilities producing medicine and medical equipment, food, construction material and fuel for the forthcoming winter which are of humanitarian nature.

(C) Official missions comprise missions of the legal authorities: Presidency of the Republic, Government and the Ministries aiming to facilitate economic and political life of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as an independent and sovereign State.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Alija IZETBEGOVIC
President
RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[without reference to a Main Committee (A/46/L.76 and Add.1)]

46/242. The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The General Assembly,

Having considered the item entitled "The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina",

Reaffirming the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and guided by the need to implement them,

Aware of its responsibility to promote and encourage respect for international legitimacy,

Considering that the United Nations, pursuant to the provisions of its Charter, has a major role to play in, and responsibility for, the maintenance of international peace and security,

Recalling the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the Commission on Human Rights, as well as Economic and Social Council decision 1992/305 of 18 August 1992,

Noting that a large number of States have reserved their position regarding the succession of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro),

Deploring the grave situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the serious deterioration of the living conditions of the people there, especially the Muslim and Croat populations, arising from the aggression against the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security,
Alarmed by the prospect of further escalation of the fighting in the region,

Expressing grave alarm at continuing reports of widespread violations of international humanitarian law occurring within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including reports of mass forcible expulsion and deportation of civilians, imprisonment and abuse of civilians in detention centres and deliberate attacks on non-combatants, hospitals and ambulances, impeding the delivery of food and medical supplies to the civilian population, as well as wanton devastation and destruction of property,

Strongly condemning the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing", which constitutes a grave and serious violation of international humanitarian law,

Recalling the report of the Secretary-General of 12 May 1992, in which he states that "all international observers agree that what is happening is a concerted effort by the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the acquiescence of, and at least some support from, the Yugoslav People's Army, to create 'ethnically pure' regions in the context of negotiations on the 'cantonization' of the Republic in the Conference of the European Community on Bosnia and Herzegovina", 1/

Expressing grave concern that, despite the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, no effective measure has been implemented to stop the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing", or to reverse and discourage the policies and proposals that might encourage it,

Appalled by the continuing reports of widespread, massive and grave violations of human rights perpetrated within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including reports of summary and arbitrary executions, forced disappearances, torture, rape and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, as well as arbitrary arrest and detention,

Expressing grave concern that, despite repeated demands by the Security Council, the cease-fire agreed upon by all parties has not been respected,


Reaffirming the necessity of respecting the sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and national unity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and rejecting any attempt to change the boundaries of that Republic,

Reaffirming also the inherent right of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to individual or collective self-defence in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter,

1/ See S/23900, para. 5.
Underlining the imperative need for an urgent peaceful solution to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in conformity with the Charter and the principles of international law, in particular the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-recognition of the fruits of aggression and non-recognition of the acquisition of territory by force, and welcoming in this context the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, scheduled to be convened in London on 26 August 1992,

Commending the efforts of the Secretary-General, the Security Council, United Nations agencies, including the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other international and relief organizations, including the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the European Community, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the International Committee of the Red Cross,

Commending also the United Nations Protection Force for its continuing action in support of the relief operation in Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Deeply concerned about the safety of the personnel of the United Nations Protection Force and expressing sympathy for the losses suffered by them,

1. **Demands** that all parties to the conflict immediately stop fighting and find a peaceful solution in line with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, and in particular the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-recognition of the fruits of aggression and non-recognition of the acquisition of territory by force;

2. **Demands also** that all forms of interference from outside the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina cease immediately;

3. **Demands further** that those units of the Yugoslav People's Army and elements of the Croatian Army now in Bosnia and Herzegovina must either be withdrawn, or be subject to the authority of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, or be disbanded and disarmed with their weapons placed under effective international monitoring, and requests the Secretary-General to consider without delay what kind of international assistance could be provided in this connection;

4. **Reaffirms** its support for the Government and people of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in their just struggle to safeguard their sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity;

5. **Urge** the Security Council to consider, on an urgent basis, taking further appropriate measures, as provided in Chapter VII of the Charter, to put an end to the fighting and to restore the unity and the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

6. **Condemns** the violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as the massive violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, in particular the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing", and demands that this practice be brought to an end immediately and that further steps be taken, on an urgent basis, to stop the massive and forcible displacement of population from and within the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as all other forms of violation of human rights in the former Yugoslavia;
7. **Affirms** that States are to be held accountable for violations of human rights which their agents commit upon the territory of another State;

8. **Calls upon** all States and international organizations not to recognize the consequences of the acquisition of territory by force and of the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing";

9. **Demands** that the International Committee of the Red Cross be granted immediate, unimpeded and continued access to all camps, prisons and other places of detention within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and that all parties ensure complete safety and freedom of movement for the International Committee and otherwise facilitate such access;

10. **Demands also** the safe, unconditional and honourable repatriation of the refugees and deportees to their homes in Bosnia and Herzegovina and recognizes their right to receive reparation for their losses;

11. **Calls upon** organs of the United Nations and all international relief agencies to facilitate the return of the displaced people to their homes in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as their rehabilitation;

12. **Commends** the untiring efforts and the bravery of the United Nations Protection Force in securing the relief operation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the efforts of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and other relief agencies;

13. **Urges** all parties and others concerned to take the necessary measures to secure the safety of the United Nations Protection Force and all other United Nations personnel;

14. **Urges** all States to support the ongoing efforts to be taken in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to all parts of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

15. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session on the implementation of the present resolution;

16. **Decides** to remain seized of the matter and to continue its consideration of this item at its forty-seventh session.

*91st plenary meeting*  
25 August 1992
Your Excellency,

While the world is making diplomatic efforts to find a key to a just and peaceful solution to the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Conference in London being such an effort, the aggression against our country is continuing with even greater intensity.

In the last 24 hours 3000 artillery shells have been fired from the hills at civilian targets in Sarajevo, including apartment buildings and hospitals. The famous National Library of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been set on fire and is still burning. Sarajevo is without water or electricity, as a result of constant bombardments. Last night and today dozens civilians were killed in Sarajevo, hundreds were wounded, and aggressor’s artillery and aviation is still active throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We ask and expect you to use your great influence and have the UN and the UN Security Council decisions respected, so that the aggression on Bosnia and Herzegovina could be stopped in a most effective way.

Respectfully,

JURE BELIVAN
Prime Minister

ELJUP CANIĆ
Acting President of the Presidency

H.E. Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali
UN Secretary General
Letter dated 26 August 1992 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter dated 25 August 1992 addressed to you by His Excellency Osman Ertuğ, representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter and its annex would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 45 and 150, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mustafa AKŞIN
Ambassador
Permanent Representative
I have the honour to refer to the remarks made by the Greek Cypriot representative in the course of his intervention at the resumed session of the General Assembly held yesterday afternoon on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Greek Cypriot side, which misses no opportunity to lash out at the Turkish Cypriots, has also exploited this occasion for its own political ends, by attempting to establish a parallel between the item on the agenda and Cyprus.

Those of us who are familiar with the events of the recent past in Cyprus know perfectly well that the Greek Cypriots are the last people to talk about "ethnic cleansing". In the genocidal attacks they launched against the Turkish Cypriots in 1963, not only did the Greek Cypriots drive us out of our homes and properties but also tried to exterminate us. The savagery of these attacks, which continued intermittently until 1974 prompted a former American Under-Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball, to state in his memoirs entitled "The Past Has Another Pattern" that Makarios was trying "to turn this beautiful island into (his) private abattoir" (p. 347).

It was our resistance and, ultimately, Turkey's rescue operation in 1974 in its capacity as Guarantor under the 1960 Agreements that saved Cyprus from the vicious Greek Cypriot campaign of "ethnic cleansing".

The Greek Cypriot side cannot cover up its shameful record by trying to shift the blame for their crimes on others. The mass population movements after 1963, which affected exclusively the Turkish Cypriots, were the direct result of the Greek Cypriot campaign to "Hellenize" Cyprus. This was a typical case of "ethnic cleansing". As a consequence, fully a quarter of the Turkish Cypriot population became refugees and the Turkish Cypriots found themselves squeezed into enclaves covering 3 per cent of the country. The Greek Cypriot representative conveniently ignored this dark episode of the history of Cyprus and alluded to what happened after 1974. The regrouping of populations in 1975 was the result of an agreement between the two sides reached in Vienna on 2 August of that year, which was implemented on a totally voluntary basis under United Nations supervision in September 1975 (see S/11789/Add.2 dated 13 September 1975).

The Greek Cypriot representative remarked that there were only 500 Greek Cypriots living in the north. It is regrettable that he did not have the courage to also refer to the even fewer Turkish Cypriots who live in the south.
The Greek Cypriot representative used the occasion of a debate on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina to slander us by drawing false analogies between Bosnia and Herzegovina and Cyprus. As I have indicated, the correct analogy is between the Bosnians and the Turkish Cypriots who have both been victims of brutal "ethnic cleansing".

Before concluding, I should like to point out that the implacable hostility of the Greek Cypriots vis-à-vis their Turkish Cypriot neighbours became manifest once again on the occasion of the General Assembly debate on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Once again, the Greek Cypriots were unable to resist the temptation to reveal their deep-seated hostility to the Turkish Cypriots. They have revealed once again how utterly unprepared they are to form a federation of equals with us. We and the rest of the world will not fail to draw the obvious conclusions on the eve of the convening of the next round of intercommunal talks in New York designed to forge the two Cypriot States into one Federal Republic of Cyprus.

I shall appreciate it if this letter is circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 45 and 150, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Osman ERTÜG
Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
LETTER DATED 24 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I.
OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF CROATIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to enclose herewith a facsimile letter dated
19 August 1992 from Mr. Vladimir Šeks, Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic
of Croatia and President of the Government's Commission for the United Nations
Protection Force.

We kindly request that this letter be circulated as a document of the
Security Council.

(Signed) Mario NOBILO
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Letter dated 19 August 1992 from the Deputy Prime Minister of Croatia addressed to the President of the Security Council

Acting according to paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 771 (1992) of 13 August 1992, by which the Security Council calls upon States to collate substantiated information in their possession relating to the violations of humanitarian law, and to make this information available to the Council;

Referring to Security Council resolution 770 (1992) of 13 August 1992, by which it demands from all States to facilitate undisturbed delivery of humanitarian assistance wherever needed in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Acting on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Croatia;

I wish to inform you personally, Your Excellency, and the United Nations Security Council about the violations of international humanitarian law as well as about some crucial moments in the implementation of the United Nations peace plan and of activities of the international community whose fulfilment the Republic of Croatia expects. In our view, the conditions have ripened for some urgent actions of the international community which, without requiring new means and special efforts, can contribute exceptionally to the establishment of peace in the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The special reason for this letter is the fact that specific forms of war against the Republic of Croatia have occurred and, by not halting them, it makes the international community jointly responsible for suffering of the civilian population in the territory of the two Republics.

A wider area of the town of Slavonski Brod, territory of the Republic of Croatia outside the zone of the responsibility of the United Nations, under full control of the Croatian authorities has been endangered by special, rarely seen forms of activities by the Serbian aggressor, which are prohibited by international law.

Slavonski Brod is a municipality with approximately 120,000 people and at the present moment with more than 20,000 displaced persons and refugees from the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This area is situated between the United Nations Protected Area Sectors East and West and separated from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the river Sava as a border. Slavonski Brod and the bridge across the river Sava are the only link with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in that part and also the place of largest pogrom of Muslim and Croatian populace from that Republic. It has been five months now that the town and its surroundings are daily under general alert and air-raid alerts. From the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina the city constantly comes under artillery attacks using all kinds of weapons, overflights and bombardment by aircraft of former
Yugoslav National Army (JNA). From 23 March up to now the aggressor aircraft flew over the city area 130 times and were active 30 times. Many sorts of forbidden weapons were used; cluster bombs, HVAR 59 mm rockets and surface-to-surface missiles (FROG-7). From well fortified and hidden facilities of the former JNA the Serbs from the occupied territories of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina are attacking the territory of the Republic of Croatia with unlimited quantity of weapons of the former JNA.

The Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Serbs from the United Nations Protected Area territories in the Republic of Croatia are using the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the attacks on another sovereign State.

The only aim of such an aggression is the destruction of civilian population and destruction of civilian facilities. Sufferings of children, innocent population and refugees are enormous. In the town's hospital, under the conditions of daily bombardment, some 3,500 people underwent the most complex medical treatments. Over 180 civilians, including 43 children, died from the consequences of the attacks. Only in the last 10 days 28 civilians were killed and 98 were wounded. On the day preceding this report more than 200 artillery and tank projectiles fell on the town and 7 civilians were killed.

Civilian population and civilian facilities are the aims of the destruction and demolition. The attacks of the aggressor are carried out indiscriminately through acts of violence and repression, deliberate infliction of injuries and sufferings. Such acts are contrary to the provisions of articles 51 and 52 of the Protocol additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and relating to the protection of victims of international armed conflicts (Protocol I).

Unprovoked, indiscriminate and savage attacks may result in an economic and ecological catastrophe which could happen if oil facilities on both sides of the river are destroyed. The consequence of that would be a new and terrible suffering of the civilian population and displaced persons. The aggressor condemned to sanctions and oil embargo is capable of doing that. In addition to these atrocities committed in respect of the population of the Republic of Croatia, we would like to point out the sufferings of the civilian population in northern Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Apart from the wider area of Gorazde, the area of northern Bosnia and Herzegovina is the area with the biggest suffering of the civilian population including the Muslim displaced persons who had been surrounded by the enemy for many weeks. The situation concerning the fully destroyed places along the road from Bosanski Brod to Sarajevo is completely uncertain.

Therefore, in order to stop unknown sufferings of the civilian population and their homes, because of the violation of all recognized rules of international humanitarian law and the principle of humanity and in order to remove the danger of possible catastrophes we urge that on the basis of...
Security Council resolutions 770 (1992) and 771 (1992), in cooperation with the United Nations forces and the forces of regional, European defence organizations, the securing of the corridor for humanitarian aid for the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the Slavonski Brod (Bosanski Brod)-Sarajevo route be carried out with military support.

The securing of the above-mentioned corridor, in addition to the possible Split-Sarajevo corridor from the south, would be the cessation of the Serbian aggression from the possible territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina towards that part of the Republic of Croatia and the securing of the section Slavonski Brod-Sarajevo (approximately the same length as the direction Split-Sarajevo) would result in the cessation of the aggression and would ensure that the badly needed humanitarian aid reaches the northern and central part of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The suggested solution, I am convinced, would contribute to the cessation of the aggression on the Republics of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Republic of Croatia will provide full and comprehensive assistance for all activities of the international community in achieving the mentioned goals.

(Signed) Vladimir Šeks
Vice-President of the Government of the Republic of Croatia
President of the Government's Commission for UNPROFOR

Notes

LETTER DATED 24 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to the Presidential Statement of 4 August 1992 requesting more information regarding gross human rights violations on the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I am enclosing the translation of resolution No. 01-800-85/92 of 23 July 1992, issued by the War Presidency of the Municipality of Celinac (region of Banja Luka temporarily occupied by the Belgrade regime and its surrogates in Bosnia and Herzegovina) regarding the status of the non-Serbian population.

I should be grateful if the text of this resolution could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
On the meeting held on 23 July 1992, the War Presidency of the Municipality of Celinac has passed the following Resolution about the status of non-Serbian citizens in the Municipality of Celinac:

**Article 1**

With reference to combat activities on the territory of the Municipality of Celinac as well as out of its municipal borders, there are well-founded reasons to determine a special status for the non-Serbian population which clearly defines its rights, obligations and responsibilities.

**Article 2**

1. Memecic (Edhem) Halil
2. Memic (Edhem) (Osman)
3. Hodzic (Pasa) Refik
4. Hodzic (Pasa) Dzevd
5. Hodzic (Pasa) Dzemal
6. Hodzic (Pasa) Kemal
7. Hodzic (Edib) Munib
8. Bekaric (Mustafa) Esad
9. Tenic (Refik) Zinaid
10. Nezirevic (Istif) Ekrem
11. Mecacvica (Adem) Mirsad
12. Nezirevic (Esad) Suad
13. Sejdic (Hasan) Hasenad
14. Nezirovic (Esad) Ibrahim
15. Masic (Ibro) Hasim
16. Masic (Ibro) Tasim
17. Malkic (Fahrudin) Armin
18. Nezirovic (Kasim) Salih
19. Nezirovic (Saban) Nazif
20. Hodzic (Abaz) Munib
21. Sprahic Remzija
22. Mandal (Adem) Serif
23. Sabanovic (Bakir) Saban
24. Sabanovic (Bakir) Naim
25. Beharic (Hamdija) Mirsad
26. Smajic (Mahmud) Bejir
27. Culum (Salih) Hamdija
28. Toplic (Muhamed) Nijaz
29. Zahirolvic (Muhamed) Mustafa
30. Malkic (Dzemal) Fahrudin
31. Baharic (Muhamed) Ismet
32. Basic (Ibrahim) Nijaz
33. Nazirovic (Idriz) Hilmija
34. Lukic (Anto) Josip

It is judged that these individuals have acted and expressed themselves negatively in other ways, affecting the Serbian people. Because of that a special treatment is determined for these individuals.

/...
Article 3

The citizens from article 2 have the right to live undisturbed within the limits of their households, to work and produce, thus satisfying their vital needs, while the municipal authority will ensure personal and proprietary safety.

Article 4

The citizens mentioned in article 2 are allowed to leave the territory of the Municipality of Celinac provided that relocation is done in an organized manner and provided that the entire family household is relocated. The authorities in charge will provide necessary documents and safe passage.

Article 5

The citizens from article 2 are forbidden to:

- Move through town of Celinac from 1600 until 0600 hours;
- Stop in the streets, restaurants, cafés and other public places;
- Swim in the rivers Vrbanja and Josavica, go fishing and hunting;
- Travel from Celinac to other towns without permission given by the relevant municipal authority;
- Possess any kind of firearms, irrespective of the possession of valid licence;
- Drive or in other ways use a car;
- Get together in groups larger than three men;
- Contact with family members who do not reside on the territory of the Municipality of Celinac, without special permission. The citizens have to report the presence of such persons in their homes;
- Use any other means of communication except postal telephone;
- Keep, put on and wear any kind of uniform (military, police, forester);
- Sell real estate and exchange the apartments without special permission from the relevant municipal authority.
Article 6

- The citizens mentioned in article 2 of this resolution are obliged to report dutifully for the working obligation, act in an obedient way and not to affect the struggle of the Serbian people for freedom;
- The citizens are obliged to show full solidarity towards poor individuals from their national group;
- The citizens are obliged to take cover from possible aerial actions in cellars and shelters and to protect children, women and disabled persons;
- The citizens are obliged to pay regularly their legal obligations;
- All citizens are obliged to report the presence of armed groups or individuals, members of Ustachi army or Green Berets;
- In case of natural disaster (fire, flood, earthquake) the citizens are obliged to undertake all necessary measures in order to save the people and the property;
- The citizens are obliged to take a certain number of cattle to feed and tend, if military authorities so require.

Article 7

The citizens from article 2 of this resolution, besides the above-mentioned obligations, are forbidden to have any kind of contact with the individuals from the neighbourhood and to move from 0000 to 2400 hours, except if called for working obligation.

Article 8

The obligations quoted in this resolution are not applicable to a certain number of households and individuals for which the War Presidency issues a special certificate.

Article 9

This resolution comes into force from the date of issuance and will be applied starting with 2 August 1992.
Article 10

Non-compliance with this resolution will result in responsibilities in accordance with the existing law.

Article 11

The Police Headquarters of the Municipality of Celinac as well as other relevant municipal bodies are in charge of enforcement of this resolution.

War Presidency
(Stamp and signature)

Sent to:
- Police Headquarters in Celinac
- Headquarters of Light Infantry Brigade in Celinac
- All households
- Archive
GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONTINUES DEBATE ON SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Yugoslav Foreign Minister, Representatives
Of Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. 18 Other States Express Views

The Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, this afternoon, called for the urgent enforcement of recent Security Council resolutions concerning the use of "all necessary measures" to deliver humanitarian aid and calling for the withdrawal of military forces and heavy weaponry from Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina was addressing the General Assembly as it continued its debate on the situation in his country. He also said that it was not reasonable to expect those who had specifically targeted civilians with violence and "ethnic cleansing" would now allow them to be adequately fed, adding that if more urgent steps were not promptly undertaken, hundreds of thousands would perish from starvation and exposure.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia said his Government had no territorial claim on Bosnia and Herzegovina and would support any arrangement agreed upon by "all three constituent peoples" of that country. Yugoslavia rejected the practice of "ethnic cleansing" and would bring to justice any Yugoslav citizen that engaged in any act of "ethnic cleansing". Yugoslavia would also cooperate with United Nations observation of all prison camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the provision of humanitarian aid, he added.

The draft resolution before the Assembly, he continued, called for the withdrawal of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Yet, the Force Commander of the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) had confirmed that since 20 May, "not a single soldier of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia remained in that territory".

Statements, this afternoon, were also made by the representatives of Sweden, the United States, Qatar, Norway, Hungary, Morocco, Bahrain, the Sudan, Indonesia, the Ukraine, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Antigua and Barbuda, Czechoslovakia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Yemen, Cyprus, Oman and Kuwait.

The Assembly will meet again at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, 25 August, to continue its debate of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and take action on a draft resolution on the issue.

For information media—not an official record
The General Assembly met this afternoon to continue its debate on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. (For background, see Press Release GA/8325, issued today.)

The Assembly has before it a draft resolution on the subject (document A/46/L.76), by which, it would urge the Security Council to consider, on an urgent basis, taking appropriate further measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to end the fighting and restore unity and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Assembly would demand that units of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and elements of the Croatian Army now in Bosnia and Herzegovina either be withdrawn, placed under Bosnian authority, or be disarmed with their weapons placed under international supervision. The Assembly would further condemn violations of the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as massive violations of human rights and international law -- particularly the "abhorrent practice of ethnic cleansing". It would demand an end to that practice, and demand that urgent steps be taken to stop the "massive and forcible displacement" of that country's population.

The Assembly would reaffirm its support for the Government and people of Bosnia and Herzegovina in their "just struggle to safeguard their sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity. It would affirm that States are to be held accountable for violations of human rights which their agents commit upon the territory of another State".

By another provision of the draft resolution, the Assembly would demand that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) be granted immediate, unimpeded and continued access to all places of detention within the territory of the former Yugoslavia, and would further demand unconditional repatriation of refugees and deportees. It would call upon all States and international organizations to not recognize the consequences of the abhorrent practice of "ethnic cleansing" and the acquisition of territory by force. Parties to the conflict would be urged to secure the safety of the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) and all other United Nations personnel and to support ongoing efforts to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Assembly would also decide to remain seized of the matter and to continue its consideration of the issue at its next session.

The draft resolution is sponsored by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Comoros, Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and Turkey.

**Statements Made**

**PETER OSVALD (Sweden)**, condemning the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, said he deplored the policies of "ethnic cleansing" directed against the Muslim population and other ethnic groups. The continuing reports of widespread violations of international humanitarian law in detention camps
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ON SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Turkey Introduces Draft Calling for Urgent Measures
To End Fighting, Withdraw Foreign Troops, Restore Seized Territory

The General Assembly would urge the Security Council to consider taking further measures as a matter of urgency, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to end the fighting and restore the territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina, under the terms of a draft resolution introduced this morning by Turkey.

Also by that text, the Assembly would demand that units of the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and elements of the Croatian Army in Bosnia and Herzegovina either be withdrawn, placed under Bosnian authority, or have their weapons placed under international supervision.

The Assembly would further condemn violations of the sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as massive violations of human rights and international law -- particularly the "abhorrent practice of ethnic cleansing". It would also demand an end to that practice, and that urgent steps be taken to stop the "massive and forcible displacement" of that republic's population.

As the Assembly, in a resumed session requested by Turkey, began discussion of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the representatives of Iran and Pakistan called for a lifting of the United Nations arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter which concerns States' right to self-defence. The representative of the United Kingdom, speaking on behalf of the European Community, reminded Member States of their obligations under the Security Council resolution imposing an arms embargo on the former Yugoslavia. The Community was considering further measures to guarantee its enforcement, he added.
Recalling the statement issued by the Security Council summit of 31 January, which reaffirmed the Council's commitment to dealing with threats to peace and acts of aggression, the representative of Malaysia said that commitment stood for nothing considering that the Council "could not even agree to a formal debate to address the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina".

"We have to formalize the complete isolation of Serbia", the representative of Croatia stated. He called on the Security Council to adopt a resolution expelling the former Yugoslavia from the Organization.

Statements were also made by the representatives of Egypt, Senegal, Austria, the Russian Federation, New Zealand, Australia, Canada and Mexico. Benon Sevan, Assistant Secretary-General in the Department of Political Affairs, read out a message from Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

The Assembly will meet again at 3 p.m. today to continue its debate on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
Subject: Resumed session of the General Assembly on "the Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina"

1. In today's plenary meetings, the Assembly heard statements of thirty-seven member States on the newly adopted item on "The Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina". The member States were: Turkey, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Egypt, Senegal, Pakistan, Austria, U.K. (E.C.), Croatia, Russian Federation, Malaysia, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, Mexico, Sweden, U.S.A., Qatar, Norway, Hungary, Morocco, Bahrain, Sudan, Indonesia, Ukraine, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Saudi Arabia, Yugoslavia (FM), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia, Antigua and Barbuda, Czechoslovakia, Bangladesh, Brazil, Yemen, Cyprus, Oman and Kuwait. Some seventeen speakers are scheduled for Tuesday morning.

2. Delegations expressed their "shock", "anguish" or "extreme concern" over the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. They stated that the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity of a member State should be respected and the flagrant violations of human rights and international humanitarian law there should be stopped. Many of them expressed abhorrence towards the practice of "ethnic cleansing" which had resulted in large numbers of refugees. Many advocated that those responsible for grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions should be brought to justice. Many stated that if solutions were not found soon, the problem might spread to other areas of former Yugoslavia, such as Kosovo, Vojvodina and Sandjak. Finally, countries such as Australia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the U.S.A. voiced opposition to accepting Serbia and Montenegro as successor State to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

3. Many delegations expressed support for Security Council resolutions 770 and 771. However, some States, such as Iran, Malaysia and Senegal, felt that the Security Council had only addressed the symptoms, and not the causes of the problem. Some of them such as Bangladesh, Iran and Pakistan believed that the application of Article 42 of the Charter, even if strictly enforced, might not be sufficient and urged Security Council to take all necessary measures, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to put an end to the fighting and to restore the unity and the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. (Operative Paragraph 5 of the draft resolution - A/46/L.76). Some speakers, such as Bangladesh, Iran, Malaysia, Pakistan and Slovenia, felt that the situation had changed in Bosnia and Herzegovina and that the continued embargo against the entire former Yugoslavia would only benefit Serbia. Bosnia and Herzegovina was entitled under article 51 of the Charter, to have the capacity of self-defence against a militarily superior enemy.

4. All speakers stated that there was no other way than through negotiations that the problems could be resolved. The General Assembly should send a strong message to those responsible for this state of affairs that the continuation of this situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina would not be tolerated. Many supported the recent appointment of the Special Rapporteur on Human Rights. Many expressed the hope that the coming London Conference, and the greater involvement of the United Nations, would help bring a peaceful solution to the problems of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
5. There were some suggestions, not included in the draft resolution, that were proposed:

- Safety zones under protection of international forces should be established in Bosnia and Herzegovina in which the threatened population, especially the Moslems, will find safe haven and to which the refugees could return (Slovenia);

- The readiness of the CSCE to contribute to the United Nations peace-keeping activities, including the establishing and the operation of a control mechanism for monitoring heavy weapons in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the willingness of the CSCE to coordinate individual or collective contribution of States (Czechoslovakia);

- The camps should not just be inspected, they should be disbanded and the prisoners freed (Bosnia and Herzegovina).
LETTER DATED 20 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to present to you the attached letter and two enclosures, dated 16 August 1992 from my Prime Minister, Mr. Jure Pelivan.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Annex

Letter dated 16 August 1992 from the Prime Minister of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina addressed to the Secretary-General

In view of the still continuing aggression and terrorism against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, we request you to urge the Security Council to station United Nations observers along the borders of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the neighbouring States of Serbia, Montenegro and Croatia. These observers would be joined by representatives of the legal Government with a view to performing those functions proper to border crossings between States.

Military equipment and new reinforcements are continually arriving on our territory from Serbia and Montenegro, the States responsible for the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. This can be seen from the enclosed information (enclosure I). Also, from the Republic of Croatia units of the former Yugoslav Army and paramilitary formations are constantly arriving to whom the former Yugoslav Army has given arms and which are now withdrawing from those parts of Croatia where United Nations control has been established.

Furthermore, the aggressors are looting and removing to Serbia and Montenegro natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products from Bosnia and Herzegovina. This form of theft is extremely widespread, and we are unable to prevent it without international help. Information concerning this is enclosed (enclosure II).

In view of the above, we are convinced that proper protection of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the implementation of the Security Council resolutions and the demands of the international community, are not possible without supervision of our frontiers, along with other measures.

We trust that this request will be met with your understanding and support.

(Signed) Jure PELIVAN
Prime Minister
Enclosure I

Information on continuing support in manpower and equipment arriving from Serbia and Montenegro to the aggressors' units on the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Relying upon the arms potentials of the ex-Yugoslav People's Army (JNA), the Serbian Democratic Party (SDS) leadership first armed a narrow circle of its members and continued by arming entire communities, villages and parts of towns with mixed population. Most of the arms, ammunition and military equipment is derived from Army arsenals, while the training of armed civilians was held on Army premises, with ex-JNA officers as instructors. A part of the formations, armed and trained in this manner, took part in the war operations in the Republic of Croatia. While withdrawing from Croatia, the Yugo-Army stationed complete combat units on the territory of our Republic. Thus the tank unit from Jasterbarsko was relocated to Dubrave, near Tuzla, a smaller part being stationed in the region of Prijedor, while the Knin Corps units were sent to the localities of Bosanski Petrovac, Dryvar, Bosansko Grahovo and Kupres. The unit from "Zeljave" airport, near Bihać, with about 50 combat planes, was relocated to Mahovljani near Banja Luka.

After the establishment of "pink zones" in the Republic of Croatia, which are supposed to be under United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) control, a new massive regrouping of the ex-JNA forces from the territory of Croatia to that of Bosnia and Herzegovina was carried out, from the so-called SAO Kraina and Slavonia in particular. Fifty-six tanks have been relocated from Lička Ploča to "Zeljave" airport, while the imagined border line between Croatia and "the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina" has been reinforced by the units that have crossed the border region at Petrinja, Dvorna Uni and Glina. The effect of the Knin and Karlovac Corps activities can be seen all over "the autonomous Banja Luka region", while in the region of Podrinje and Herzegovina, the Valjevo, Užice and Titograd Corps units are operating.

At the beginning of June 1992 Radovan Karadžić and General Ratko Mladić sent a group of Chetnik commanders, among them Božo Vučurević, Duško Kornjača, Ratko Adžić and Radomir Nešković, to Mirko Jović, Vojislav Šešelj and Captain Dragan's headquarters to provide for an urgent supply of "fresh forces". The task of Karadžić's voivodas was to speed up the dispatch of manpower and equipment to reinforce the units preparing for the general attack to be launched at Goražde. One part of the enemies' forces has arrived to the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, while a convoy of 60 tanks was ready for Goražde via Cajnice. Karadžić promised his commanders that he would block out the United Nations and UNPROFOR observers, i.e. engage them with the problems in the Sarajevo area, during the offensive operations in Goražde and in the direction of the Neretva, in other words, keep them busy with Sarajevo until Goražde had been wiped out, and the business in Herzegovina completed.
At the beginning of July the Chetniks transferred from Butmir airport to Lukavica 27 trucks of goods of all kinds, mainly spare parts for airport installations, previously brought from "Pleso" airport, Zagreb, and Zemunik, near Zadar. Along with other equipment, seven tanks, six armoured transporters and four anti-aircraft machine-guns were dislocated whereas the armoured vehicles were relocated from the airport premises to Lukavica barracks. According to the agreement reached with the Jugo-Army from Serbia, the SDS extremists posted around Sarajevo expected a new shipment of ammunition by the beginning of July (one shipment containing about 1,500 12-millimetre bullets and 1,000 12.5-millimetre bullets).

However, ever new troops of "volunteers" have been arriving at Pale from Belgrade, Valjevo and Cacak. At the same time new shipments of ammunition are arriving from Serbia, whereas goods or all sorts of equipment are being taken out of the Republic.

The bridges at Ilidža are controlled by irregulars from Valjevo, Aleksandrovac and Aleksinac.

A larger convoy with arms has been stationed in Rogatica, while numerous army vehicles and buses with irregulars from Serbia have been reported in the region of Poća. Besides the new troops of "Šešelj's men" and "Arkan's Gang" have arrived from Serbia in the region of Mostar and Neum, disguised in civilian clothes and with forged identification papers.

During the preparations for the offensive against Gorazde, large groups of "volunteers" from Serbia and Montenegro have concentrated in the surrounding of Priboj so that now there are several thousand men along with heavy artillery and infantry armament. The units are to be committed on the fronts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Captain Dragan in charge of the operation. The main centres for distribution of manpower and equipment from Serbia and Montenegro are in Priboj (Serbia), Nikšić and Pljevlja (Montenegro). The "volunteers" are behaving very violently towards the Muslim population in Priboj and its surroundings, with numerous cases of rape and mining of Muslim property, which has led to a massive evacuation of the Muslim population which has been forced to find refuge in West European countries.

After completing their military training in Bijeljina barracks, the irregulars were committed to the front lines in Brčko, and in the direction of Tuzla and Majevica region. The ex-JNA still continues providing reinforcements for the aggressors' forces on the Brčko battlefield. On 18 June Lieutenant-Colonel Stevan Nikolić, known as "Kriger", informed Srečko Radovanović, a Res. Maj., that General Delić from Belgrade, confirmed upon General Mlić's approval the reinforcement in 10 R-84 tanks and 10 armoured vehicles for the units stationed in Pelagićevo. Lieutenant-Colonel Predrag Manojlović, the Brčko barracks commander, ordered from Belgrade ammunition (calibres 30 and 29 millimetres) along with bazookas and hand grenades for the needs of garrisons stationed in Brčko and Bosanski Šamac. Upon the Belgrade Army District order, Lieutenant-Colonel Manojlović took out of VP 5055-19 Belgrade-Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Serbia 741,000
bullets, calibre 7.62 millimetres, mines, 740 pieces; 5,500 bullets, calibre 30 and 20 millimetres; and 120 hand grenades. The receipts for the ammunition were signed by the ex-JNA officers from Belgrade, Miroslav Janišić, M. Radojević and B. Stanisić.

A heavy truck loaded with artillery and infantry ammunition arrived at Pelagićevo from Belgrade in mid-June. According to some reports on the combat readiness of Yugo-Army units, even up to 450 tons of ammunition were destined to a front. Besides support in armament, the ex-JNA assisted the aggressors' forces on Brčko front in personnel too. Twenty officers from Serbia came to be engaged there. In Brčko, the so-called War Presidency of "the Serbian municipality of Brčko" has recently made a decision to citizenship papers of "the Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina" also to all the irregulars from Serbia and Montenegro, which would give them equal rights and obligations with other citizens of this so-called republic.

The data given in this enclosure is intended only to illustrate the continuing reinforcement of the aggressors' units on the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in both manpower and equipment coming from Serbia and Montenegro. The Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has at its disposition a substantially larger list of similar cases and all the relevant documentation.
Enclosure II

Information on the theft and removal of natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Serbia and Montenegro, the aggressors against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with the ex-JNA and federal institutions of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in cooperation with extremist and paramilitary forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, prepared a plan of aggression against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. A part of the plan was the destruction and theft of natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products. The realization of the plan started long before the armed aggression. Although we do not have complete information on the scale of the theft and removal of the natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products to Serbia and Montenegro, it can be said without hesitation that a large part of the entire property of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been taken to Serbia and Montenegro.

Since Serbia and Montenegro have been defined as aggressors against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina by United Nations resolutions, it is our intention to present by this information only a part of the theft and removal of the natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products.

In those regions of the Republic, where the human and international rights have been violated, the aggressor is also looting both State and individual property in order to take the looted goods to Serbia and Montenegro. The illegal felling of forests, the theft of livestock and property to be illegally transported and sold at markets in Serbia and Montenegro has caused great material damage to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The banks and other financial institutions have been robbed by Serbian and Montenegrin financial institutions and companies.

This information is aimed, with the purpose of partial documenting of the above-mentioned claims, to point to some of the major cases of theft and removal of natural resources, industrial equipment and finished products to Serbia and Montenegro. The full list with similar cases is much more extensive, but unfortunately it cannot be completed because of the war. The relevant institutions are still collecting the required documentation and information in order to provide a full picture of the situation.

- Industrial equipment of priceless value has been looted from several premises of the United Nations Information Service at Sarajevo and taken to Serbia;
- In June 1992, 27 heavy trucks loaded with finished and semi-finished products for military purposes were taken out of the Pretis enterprise at Vogošća near Sarajevo and taken to Belgrade;

/...
In the beginning of May 1992, several trucks loaded with spare parts for army transporters and tanks were taken from the Famos Enterprise at Hrasnica, near Sarajevo, and taken to the barracks at Pančevo, Serbia.

- Sixty engines and 50 gear boxes with accessories were also taken from Famos to Serbia, exchanged for raw material (steel and iron) via Macedonia, to be returned to Serbia and illegally confiscated;

- The Energoinvest Compressor Factory "Trudbenik" was also looted and its equipment taken to Serbia. The theft took place in May and June 1992;

- The equipment from the Furniture Factory "Varda", Višegrad was taken to Serbia in May 1992;

- Brčko Oil Factory equipment was taken to Serbia in June 1992;

- A substantial part of the aircraft factory "Soko", Mostar, was also taken to Serbia and Montenegro;

- A plan for the relocation of a major part of the production units of "Orao" Industries at Rajlovac, near Sarajevo, has been made, according to which the equipment was to be transported to Trsteni in Serbia;

- Several aircraft and helicopters, the property of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina were taken from Sarajevo Airport during May 1992;

- In May 1992, the aggressor looted and took to Serbia the major part of the Interplet factory at Koraj, Tuzla;

- The equipment of the Plum Drying Factory at Koraj, Tuzla, was also looted in May 1992;

- The aggressor is looting power directing it from the thermo power plants at Gacko and Ugljevik and the water power plants on the Drina and the Trebišnjica to Serbia and Montenegro;

- Trucks, buses, trains and locomotives were illegally taken from a score of transport organizations in the Republic ("Centrotrans" and "ZTP", The City Transport Organization of Sarajevo, etc.);

- Ore, semi-finished products and mining equipment were taken from a dozen mines in Eastern Bosnia to Serbia in May and June 1992;

- Numerous enterprises, institutions and organizations have also been looted, their equipment, along with investments and technical documentation, were taken to Serbia (processing factory at Sarajevo, Water Economy of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Famos factory, etc.);
A great number of medical institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina have been robbed of medical equipment, medicines and medical material which have been taken to Serbia and Montenegro.
Dear Secretary General,

Unfortunately, I am again in a position to inform you about the new crimes of the aggressor's aviation over the population of Corašče.

Today, the 22nd of August after 15:00 hrs. the air forces of Serbia-Montenegro bombarded the town of Corašče and its surrounding. By that occasion, only in the two small villages, 9 people were killed and more than 50 wounded.

As so many times before, the aggressor used cluster bombs, and is threatening with the use of poisonous gases.

In the name of the inhabitants of Corašče and surrounding places, in the name of the suffering innocent people, helpless children and the wounded, I am conveying to you their appeal, their cry to stop this pointless destruction and extermination of the population.

Please receive, Your Excellency, assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Alija Izetbegović
Notes of the Secretary-General's meeting with the Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina of the Organization of the Islamic Conference

Held at United Nations Headquarters on Thursday, 20 August 1992 at 5:15 p.m.

Present:

The Secretary-General
Mr. Feissel
Mr. Tharoor
Mrs. Aboulnaga
Mr. Warot

H.E. Mr. Nabil A. Elaraby
Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations

H.E. Dr. Kamal Kharrazi
Permanent Representative of Iran

H.E. Mr. Jamsheed K.A. Marker
Permanent Representative of Pakistan

H.E. Mr. Samir S. Shihabi
Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia

H.E. Mr. Kéba Birane Cissé
Permanent Representative of Senegal

H.E. Mr. Mustafa Akşin
Permanent Representative of Turkey

H.E. Mr. Engin Ansay
Permanent Observer of the Organization of the Islamic Conference

Subject: Bosnia and Herzegovina. Former President Najibullah and the evacuation of Kabul

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Speaking in his capacity as Chairman of the Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), the Ambassador of Turkey said that the Group had been following the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina with growing emotion and concern. In recent weeks, there had been moves among the 47 Member States of the OIC to convene a special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to debate the issue, so that the members of the OIC could express their
concern and contribute to a peaceful solution to the conflict. Their original plan had been to convene an emergency special session under rule 8b of the Rules of procedure of the General Assembly, but they had to give up the idea due to difficulties with the Security Council. They had then considered a plain special session under rule 8a, but rule 10 requested that the Secretary-General notify Member States at least ten days in advance of a special session, which would have postponed the debate after the London Conference on the former Yugoslavia and made it compete with the Summit meeting of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in Jakarta.

So, on the day before, the Contact Group had resorted to rule 15 to add to the agenda of the 46th session of the General Assembly a new item on the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The General Committee was due to meet the next day, and should it accept to put the new item on the agenda, the General Assembly would resume its 46th session on Monday 24 August.

The Contact Group of the OIC, which wanted to bring the Secretary-General into the picture and would appreciate his support, had prepared a draft resolution which would be faxed to the Secretary-General's office that afternoon.

The Ambassador of Egypt had two points to make. First, the draft resolution was non-confrontational. The Contact Group had met the day before with the Five Permanent Members of the Security Council to whom it had explained the fundamental principles which it wanted to see respected and implemented. Secondly, there were certain functions upon which the Contact Group hoped that the United Nations would consider embarking, such as the return of refugees and displaced persons.

The Secretary-General welcomed all the more the Contact Group's initiative since he shared their point of view and concerns. Bosnia and Herzegovina had been discussed at length in Security Council meetings and would be the main subject of the forthcoming London Conference. Among the five or six committees that the Conference was to set up, one would be dedicated to Bosnia and Herzegovina, another one would deal with the protection of minorities, and a third one with humanitarian assistance. The United Nations would co-chair the Steering Committee with the European Community, and discussions were still going on as to whether each of the working committees to be created would be co-chaired by the UN and the EC, or some would be chaired by the UN and the others by the EC.

If adopted, the resolution sponsored by the Contact Group would be an important contribution which the London Conference would certainly take into consideration. The Secretary-General suggested that the Non-Aligned Movement be mentioned in the
resolution and that the OIC address the NAM Summit in Jakarta to seek support for its ideas.

The Secretary-General reminded the Contact Group that Security Council resolution 770 called upon States to help the United Nations either nationally or through regional agencies or arrangements. Therefore, the OIC could play a role. The Secretary-General had insisted with the British authorities that the OIC be invited to attend the London Conference, but he did not know yet whether it would be represented by its President or its Secretary-General. Turkey had also been invited as Chair of the Contact Group on Bosnia and Herzegovina. This ensured that the OIC would be substantially represented in the London Conference and in a position to promote its views and ideas.

In London, the Secretary-General would call not only for short term humanitarian assistance for refugees, but also for their return and rehabilitation. Consequently, it would help the Secretary-General if the General Assembly resolution sponsored by the OIC mentioned the importance of rehabilitation.

The Secretary-General's final recommendation was for the Contact Group to press the OIC for some humanitarian assistance for Bosnia and Herzegovina. If the OIC wanted to strengthen its position, it should not let all humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina be provided only by Médecins sans Frontières and other NGOs.

The Permanent Observer of the OIC announced that the OIC would be represented at the London Conference by its Secretary-General. As far as assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina was concerned, he continued, the Islamic Development Bank had already contributed 21 million dollars. The Fifth Extraordinary Session of the Islamic Conference had passed a resolution asking its members to declare one day of solidarity with Bosnia and Herzegovina and created a fund to receive donations made by the public on that day.

L'Ambassadeur du Sénégal annonce que son Ministre des Affaires Etrangères l'a informé le matin même que le Président Abdou Diouf, Président en exercice de l'Organisation de la Conférence Islamique, souhaitait se faire représenter à Londres.

The Ambassador of Turkey mentioned that Turkey had granted asylum to 15,000 refugees, and that the funds raised country-wide during the day of solidarity with Bosnia and Herzegovina had been handed over to the Red Crescent. The Ambassador of Pakistan announced that his country had made a cash contribution of 10 million dollars, plus 20 million dollars worth of goods, to humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina.
TELEFAX MESSAGE

TO: H.E. Boutros-Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General of the United Nations

DATE: 20 August 1992

NO. OF PAGES: 5 (including cover)

REF.: The situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Please find attached a copy of the OIC draft resolution on the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, as discussed in the meeting with Your Excellency today.
The General Assembly,

Having Considered the item entitled "the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina",

Proceeding from the principles and objectives of the United Nations Charter, and guided by the need to implement those principles,

Aware of its responsibility to promote and encourage respect for international legitimacy,

Considering that the United Nations, pursuant to the provisions of the Charter, has a major role and responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security,

Recalling the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, UNESCO and the Commission on Human Rights, as well as the decision of the Economic and Social Council,

Noting that a large number of States have reserved their position regarding the succession of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by Serbia and Montenegro,

Deploring the grave situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the serious deterioration of the living condition of the people there, especially the Moslem and Croatian population, arising from the aggression of Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) and the paramilitary units from Serbia and Montenegro against the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which constitutes a threat to international peace and security,

Alarmed at the prospect of the fighting spreading to Kosovo, Sandzak, Vojvodina and other regions,

Expressing grave alarm at continuing reports of widespread violations of international humanitarian law occurring within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina including reports of mass forcible expulsion and deportation of civilians, imprisonment and abuse of civilians in detention centers, deliberate attacks on non-combatants, hospitals and ambulances, impeding the delivery of food and medical supplies to the civilian population, and wanton devastation and destruction of property,

Strongly condemning the practice of "Ethnic Cleansing" which constitutes a grave and serious violation of international humanitarian law,

Recalling the Secretary-General's report of 12 May 1992 (S/23900) in which he states that "all international observers agree that what is happening is a concerted effort by the Serbs of Bosnia-Herzegovina, with the acquiescence of, and at least some support from, JNA, to create 'ethnically pure' regions in the context of negotiations on the 'cantonization' of the Republic in the EC Conference on Bosnia-Herzegovina",

Expressing grave concern that no effective measure has been implemented to stop the abhorrent practice of "Ethnic Cleansing" or to reverse and discourage the policies and proposals that might encourage it,
Appalled at the continuing reports of widespread, massive and grave violations of human rights perpetrated within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including reports of summary and arbitrary executions, forced disappearances, torture, rape and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment and arbitrary arrest and detention,

Expressing grave concern that, despite repeated demands by the Security Council, the cease-fire agreed upon by all parties has not been respected,

Concerned that other demands in relevant Security Council resolutions, especially resolutions 752 of 15 May 1992, 757 of 30 May 1992, 764 of 13 July 1992 and 770 of 13 August 1992, have not been complied with,

Reaffirming the necessity of respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, political independence and national unity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and rejecting any attempt to change the boundaries of that Republic,

Reaffirming also the inherent right of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to individual and collective self-defense against aggression in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter,

Underlining the imperative need for an urgent peaceful solution to the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in line with the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, and in particular the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-recognition of the fruits of aggression, and non-recognition of acquisition of territory by force, and welcoming in this context the Conference on Yugoslavia, scheduled to be convened in London on 26 August 1992,

Commending the efforts of the Secretary-General, the Security Council, United Nations agencies and other international organizations including the Organization of Islamic Conference, the European Community, and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe,

Commending also the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) for its continuing action in support of the relief operation in Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

1. Demands that all parties to the conflict immediately stop fighting and to find a peaceful solution in line with the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law, and in particular the principles of respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity of states, non-recognition of the fruits of aggression, and non-recognition of acquisition of territory by force;

2. Demands also that all forms of interference from outside the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina cease immediately;

3. Demands further that those units of the Yugoslav People’s Army (JNA) and elements of the Croatian Army now in Bosnia and Herzegovina must either be withdrawn, or be subject to the authority of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, or be disbanded and disarmed with
their weapons placed under effective international monitoring, and requests the Secretary-General to consider without delay what international assistance could be provided in this connection;

4. Reaffirms its support for the Government and people of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in their just struggle to safeguard their sovereignty, political independence, territorial integrity and unity;

5. Recommends that the Security Council consider, on an urgent basis, taking all necessary measures as provided in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, to put an end to the fighting and to restore the unity and the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

6. Condemns the violation of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as massive violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, in particular the abhorrent practice of "Ethnic Cleansing", practiced by the forces of Serbia and Montenegro and their agents in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

7. Affirms that States are to be held accountable for violations of human rights which their agents commit upon the territory of another State;

8. Demands that the abhorrent practice of "Ethnic Cleansing" be immediately brought to an end, and further steps be taken, on an urgent basis, to stop the massive and forcible displacement of population from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as stopping all other forms of violation of human rights in the former Yugoslavia;

9. Calls upon all States and international organizations not to recognize the consequences of the acquisition of territory by force and of the abhorrent practice of "Ethnic Cleansing";

10. Demands that the International Committee of the Red Cross be granted immediate, unimpeded and continued access to all camps, prisons and other places of detention within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and that all parties ensure complete safety and freedom of movement for the International Committee of the Red Cross and otherwise facilitate such access;

11. Further demands the safe, unconditional and honorable repatriation of the refugees and deportees to their homes in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and recognizes their right to receive reparation for their losses;

12. Calls upon organs of the United Nations, and all international relief agencies to facilitate the return of the displaced people to their homes in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

13. Commends the untiring efforts and the bravery of UNPROFOR in securing the relief operation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

14. Urges all states to support the ongoing efforts to be taken in accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to all parts of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
15. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly, at its 47th session, on the implementation of this resolution;

16. **Decides** to remain seized of the matter and to continue its consideration of this item at its 47th session.
Protection of humanitarian assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ambassador Hannay handed the Secretary-General a letter from Mr. Hurd dealing with the international conference on Yugoslavia in London the following week and the question of the protection of humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina. The British authorities were currently thinking through the latter subject, in conjunction with the French and American Governments. Britain and France had made a firm commitment of political and military support for the humanitarian effort and wanted to begin coordination with the United Nations.

The following day, a mixed team of political and military experts would be meeting with Mr. Goulding, and hopefully with an official from the Department of Humanitarian Affairs, to begin this process. Prime Minister Major and Mr. Hurd hoped to continue it with the Secretary-General in London the following week. The British authorities were trying to develop a way to work "hand-in-hand" with the United Nations in Bosnia and to build on the "extraordinarily good work" which had already been accomplished by the Organization.

This would not be a heavily military approach but an operation to provide protection for humanitarian relief. It would be important for the British officials to talk to the experts in the Secretariat to see whether and how this could be done. The Ambassador stressed that the British authorities were
very flexible. The main consideration was not to lose what had already been gained by UNPROFOR and the UNHCR.

The Secretary-General reported that he had that day received a letter from Mrs. Ogata, who was very preoccupied by the approach being envisaged. She feared that it could undermine all the work which the United Nations was doing in the region.

Ambassador Hannay complained that the objective of the plan had been misportrayed in the press. The United States was "way behind us" in its willingness to do anything to help. The British and the French were trying to scale down expectations and to explore how they could help the United Nations convoys reach their destinations. They envisaged a smaller operation than was being reported; moreover, they were not trying to draw on the resources of the United Nations.

The Secretary-General explained that he was concerned by the contents of Mrs. Ogata's letter since her views were those of someone who was on the spot; in conjunction with the Red Cross, UNHCR was performing the main humanitarian tasks. The Secretary-General fully understood the objective of the operation being considered by the British and French authorities, but Mrs. Ogata was afraid that even a marginal incident could complicate the whole humanitarian operation. He noted that the United Nations had managed to send food and humanitarian assistance to Gorazde.

Ambassador Hannay wondered whether Mrs. Ogata was suggesting that to help people as UNPROFOR had, the armoured personnel carriers had to be under UN control. The Secretary-General denied that she was saying this: she was warning that peace enforcement could complicate her mission.

International Conference on Yugoslavia

Turning to the arrangements for the international conference on Yugoslavia, the Secretary-General and Mr. Vance felt that the six working groups envisaged might be too many. Mr. Vance saw no reason why there should be a group on 'transparency'. The Secretary-General felt that the working groups should focus on Bosnia, minorities, succession issues, economic questions, confidence building measures and humanitarian matters. Ambassador Hannay suggested that there should be a liaison group instead of a working group on humanitarian issues. Mr. Vance added that such a liaison group could deal directly with the two co-Chairmen of the steering group.

The Secretary-General voiced concern that two co-Chairmen per working group could make the structure heavy, and he proposed instead that the Chairmanships of the working groups be divided between the European Community and the United Nations system.
Ambassador Hannay and Mr. Vance agreed that this might be the best solution. The Ambassador could recommend an expert in economic matters, which would fall mostly to the EC and in which there would be no real need for United Nations involvement. The EC also had a good lawyer who had dealt with succession issues and who could chair the working group on that subject. The Secretary-General had no objection to this. Ambassador Hannay undertook to transmit these points to London; he felt that his authorities would find it easy to agree to this approach.

The Secretary-General mentioned that there was a very good group of specialists in minority issues at the United Nations Office at Geneva. As for humanitarian questions, Ambassador Hannay felt that these should be handled primarily by the United Nations since it was doing most of the work in this field. Mr. Vance concurred. He and the Secretary-General agreed that the United Nations should chair a third working group.

Ambassador Hannay gathered that Mr. Fleischhauer had had a meeting that afternoon to discuss technical aspects of the conference on Yugoslavia. There was a need to reach agreement on "the objectives, the rules and the game plan". The Secretary-General then informed him that he would be arriving in London on 24 August and would therefore be able attend the Prime Minister's working luncheon on 25 August. Ambassador Hannay said that the group invited to the luncheon would be very small and that the intention was to reach agreement with "the main players" on the course of the conference. He confirmed that there would be a working dinner on 25 August for heads of delegations.

The Secretary-General then handed Ambassador Hannay a copy of Mrs. Ogata's letter, which the Ambassador read and described as "extremely useful". He obtained the Secretary-General's agreement that he could share it with his authorities. He assured the Secretary-General that the way the British and French Governments were approaching the issue of protecting humanitarian assistance was "the same as Mrs. Ogata". They wished to provide any help they could and would act in accordance with the same rules of engagement as UNPROFOR; they would not shoot unless they were fired on and they would be no more aggressive than the UN forces. If it helped the United Nations for them to serve under the command structure of UNPROFOR then they would have no objection and it would be possible that General Nambiar could be in overall control.

The Ambassador declared that UNHCR was doing "fantastic work". If the approach to provide protection was high-powered, this could destroy the whole operation. It was clear from Security Council resolution 770 that States would only be helping the United Nations to deliver humanitarian relief, not establishing a parallel operation. In short, while Mrs. Ogata did raise serious problems, the Ambassador did not view them as
insoluble. The Secretary-General explained that he only wished
to share with the Ambassador the preoccupations of one of the
main actors whose organization was performing an important job in
the region.

Ambassador Hannay, recalling the Secretary-General's own
idea, suggested that the United Nations "subcontract" some of its
work to the British and French; clearly, this would be on the
understanding that it would be a United Nations operation,
distributing United Nations humanitarian relief, under United
Nations control. The Secretary-General expressed his full
approval.

The Ambassador felt that Mrs. Ogata might have been
influenced by reports in the media, some of which were based on
"complete fantasy". There would be no aerial bombing. He
acknowledged, however, that the grounds for some of Mrs. Ogata's
concerns were real, including the question of how to incorporate
activities which were not strictly under the United Nations'
authority, so that there would be no cause for anyone to make
allegations of external intervention. Russian representatives
would be attending the meeting with Mr. Goulding the following
day, and Ambassador Hannay found their participation to be
positive: it could be extremely helpful to be able to show the
Serbs that the European approach was not anti-Serb.

Ambassador Hannay hoped that at some time the next week, the
Secretary-General, Mr. Hurd, Mr. Dumas and Mr. Kozyrev would be
able to discuss such questions. The concept of providing
assistance would take account of Mrs. Ogata's concerns and enable
the implementation of resolution 770.

Mr. Vance saw advantages to a combined approach with about
3,000 personnel involved, as long as they acted with caution.
The Secretary-General said that it would be important to remain
flexible. Ambassador Hannay suggested that the model which would
be elaborated for the protection of humanitarian assistance might
prove to be applicable for the supervision of heavy weapons.

The Secretary-General noted that Mrs. Ogata would be in
London for the conference, and Ambassador Hannay added that the
UNHCR representative would be present at Mr. Goulding's meeting
the following day and would therefore be reporting to her on the
details of the discussion. The Ambassador would inform his
authorities that the Secretary-General was satisfied with the
arrangements, except for the question of the working groups.
The Secretary-General replied that he indeed favoured a division
of the Chairmanships of the working groups between the EC and the
United Nations, a view supported by Mr. Vance, who warned that
the process would be less efficient if the groups were larger.
Ambassador Hannay promised to see if this would be possible and
would revert on this question.
Mr. Vance reported that Mr. Petrovsky had informed him that the Russian authorities might want one of their nationals to be a co-Chairman of a working group. It was possible that the United States would want the same. It would have to be decided beforehand whether such requests would be refused. Ambassador Hannay answered that the Russia and the United States might be represented on the steering group rather than by co-Chairmen. Mr. Vance's understanding had been that the steering group would consist primarily of the two co-Chairmen. Ambassador Hannay responded that while Mr. Vance and Lord Carrington would head the steering group at the beginning, it was not clear who else would be a member later on. There was talk of the Permanent Members of the Security Council being represented. Mr. Plumbly added that representatives of the EC troika might also be included.

Mr. Vance asked how this could be achieved without requiring an excessive staff. The two co-Chairmen of the steering group would collaborate directly with the working groups -- why introduce another layer? Ambassador Hannay acknowledged that the two co-Chairmen would guide the work of the steering group but, in time, other people would need to be involved and the Chairmen of the working groups would be part of the steering group. Mr. Vance reflected that this was the first he had heard of a permanent steering group. Mr. Plumbly believed that this had been raised both in Mr. Hogg's meeting with the Secretary-General and in Mr. Petrovsky's discussions in London.

Observing that the members of the steering group would have to be continuously present in Geneva, Mr. Vance wondered whether the British authorities foresaw representatives of the Permanent Five residing permanently there. The Ambassador supposed that the Ambassadors already resident in Geneva would fulfil that function which, he said, would not be a big role. Mr. Plumbly pointed out that the membership of the steering group had not yet been specified.

Ambassador Hannay undertook to convey Mr. Vance's reaction to his authorities. Mr. Vance said that the staff in Geneva would be expected to work "around the clock". The Ambassador suggested that perhaps the steering group could comprise the Chairmen of the working groups and a few other officials working in an honorific capacity. He would ensure that the British Government discussed this with Mr. Petrovsky when he returned to London.

Libya

After Ambassador Hannay had said that he and the Permanent Representatives of France and the United States would soon need to see the Secretary-General on the question of Iraq, the Secretary-General reported that developments relating to
Libya had been very complicated during recent days. Mr. Petrovsky had been due to deliver a letter from the Secretary-General to Colonel Qaddafi, but for three days the latter had refused to receive him. The Secretary-General suspected that Mr. Jalloud had told Colonel Qaddafi that the Secretary-General's letter was very aggressive. The Secretary-General had instructed Mr. Petrovsky not to deliver it until he was received by Colonel Qaddafi. Mr. Petrovsky had then had a long conversation with the Foreign Minister and had shown him the letter, which was, in fact, very polite. That afternoon, the Secretary-General had learned that Mr. Petrovsky would be received by Colonel Qaddafi.

Ambassador Hannay stated that Mr. Al-Baz had been very upset by his comments in the Sanctions Committee. The Secretary-General replied that the Egyptian authorities had backed him in his approach, which had now worked. However, Mr. Petrovsky had had to wait nearly four days, despite the assurance before his departure that he would be received.
Note to the Secretary-General

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA: YOUR MEETING WITH THE OIC

The five representatives of the Organization of Islamic Countries who are meeting with you tomorrow are likely to raise two issues: (a) the need to take more energetic measures in defence of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including ending UNPROFOR's policy of impartiality between the "aggressor" and the "victim"; and (b) the need for the Security Council to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina so that its Government can "defend itself against aggression." It is also possible that the OIC members might raise with you their desire to intervene directly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, perhaps under the provisions of resolution 770.

You may wish to respond by stressing that, whatever the merits of the conflict, the only way a United Nations peace-keeping operation can function is by being impartial between the parties to a conflict; taking sides ends all prospects of effective peace-keeping. In any case, you might mention that the "victim" has not conducted itself always as it should: the recent mining of the road from Gorazde, and the deliberate practice of firing at Serb positions from locations adjacent to UNPROFOR positions in Sarajevo, have been particularly deplorable. As to the arms embargo, that is a matter for the Security Council to decide, but you would have to point out that your mandate from the Security Council is for UNPROFOR to maintain the cease-fire.

Should your visitors raise the question of their involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina, you might wish to caution patience until the intentions of the original sponsors of resolution 770 become clearer.

Marrack Goulding
19 August 1992

cc: Mr Eliasson
    Mr Petrovsky
    Mr de Soto
Dear Secretary General,

in response to your letter dated 31 July, 1992, I requested the Committee of Senior Officials to meet on an urgent basis for preliminary consultations on 13 and 14 August, 1992. Following these consultations, I have the pleasure to communicate to you that the CSCE is willing to help the United Nations in carrying out peacekeeping activities including the establishing and managing of a mechanism for supervising the heavy weapons of the Parties in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In particular, the CSCE is prepared to co-ordinate individual or collective contributions by its participating States to these efforts.

The Helsinki Decisions provide the capability for the CSCE itself to establish and manage such a mechanism, although the possibility for the CSCE to act is dependent upon contributions from participating States, individually or collectively. To ensure an effective and co-ordinated response, the CSCE has established an ad hoc group which will examine relevant issues closely and report its conclusions to me.

I will inform you as soon as possible of the results of these consultations.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

His Excellency
Boutros Boutros GHALI
General Secretary
UN
New York
Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

While I am heartened by the concern of the Security Council for unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and its support for the work of humanitarian organizations, including UNHCR, I cannot but be disturbed by the possible implications of Security Council resolution 770 of 13 August 1992 for the work of my Office in the former Yugoslavia. It is preoccupying that UNHCR, which is the lead agency for humanitarian assistance to former Yugoslavia, was not consulted on the subject of the protection of humanitarian convoys prior to the adoption of such a resolution. Nevertheless, I would like to take this opportunity to convey to you my initial thoughts on this matter.

I know you share my concern for the continued feasibility of humanitarian operations and for the safety of UN staff. I fear, however, that these might be jeopardized by the type of military intervention possibly envisaged by the resolution. The general interpretation of the resolution, including press statements by some members of the Security Council, seems to imply the use of military escorts and/or military offensive force of a national or regional character in order to obtain the unimpeded delivery of humanitarian assistance, though there remain many questions regarding the modalities of such escorts.

Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General
United Nations Headquarters
New York, N.Y. 10017
I am very concerned that such military action might jeopardize the non-political humanitarian character of UNHCR's activities and thereby undermine our ability to function in an impartial, even-handed and secure manner throughout the affected region. It is also not clear to me how UNHCR would be associated with such forces, nor for that matter how these forces would divide responsibility with UNPROFOR. Furthermore, in the event that such military force is required, should we understand that the political, security and logistical conditions necessary for UNHCR operations, as referred to in your letter to me of 14 November, have lapsed, thereby indicating that it might be more appropriate that the other parties envisaged in paragraph 2 of resolution 770 should deliver humanitarian assistance?

The type of military intervention which raises these concerns is in contrast to two models in which the use of military components has been very valuable to UNHCR's delivery of humanitarian assistance. One is where Governments have generously provided expertise and logistical back-up for our operations, such as the provision of trucks, drivers, and the expertise which forms the basis of our Air Operations Team. The other is exemplified by our coordination with UNPROFOR, where UNPROFOR has successfully provided security and support which has enabled delivery of relief, particularly in the context of the Sarajevo airport. In this regard, I am pleased to report that on 15-16 August UNHCR, accompanied by five French APCs and two UNPROFOR light trucks and using UNPROFOR drivers, was able to send a relief convoy transporting 46 metric tons from Sarajevo to Goradze.

I am at your disposal to meet you anywhere at anytime to discuss with you the most effective means by which I can discharge my humanitarian mandate and would very much appreciate your direct views in regard to our further cooperation in the context of resolution 770. In the meantime, UNHCR will continue to seek to expand our delivery of humanitarian assistance to those in need in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is our experience that these efforts must involve ongoing negotiations with all the relevant parties in the field. Only by obtaining the agreement of those directly in charge and on the ground can such an operation be carried out in a successful and secure fashion. Any mechanism which ignores this reality is likely to fail in both the short and long term.

Sadako Ogata

Sadako Ogata
PRESS CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

At a press conference held today at Headquarters, sponsored by Bosnia and Herzegovina, Muhamed Sacirbey, Permanent Representative of that country to the United Nations, was accompanied by former world heavyweight boxing champion Muhammad Ali and representatives of American Muslim groups under the aegis of the Islamic Circle of North America.

In introductory remarks, Mr. Sacirbey said he had been contacted late on Sunday, 16 August, by members of the Muslim community of the United States concerning the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although particularly concerned about the sufferings of Bosnia's Muslims at the hands of "the fascists", their sympathy extended to all victims of aggression among the country's population. Yesterday and today they had met with members of missions to the United Nations. They now wanted to express their views on the situation, and had prepared a statement for the press.

Mr. Sacirbey added that he had held a lengthy discussion with Mr. Ali, who had shown not only complete understanding of the situation but a most moving compassion. He asked that questions intended for Mr. Ali be addressed either to himself or to a spokesman for the former champion, who, "as some of you already know", had difficulty speaking in a loud voice.

Mr. Sacirbey then gave the floor to the Imam Jamil Al-Amin, who introduced himself as "leader of the national community as well as of the community in Atlanta, Georgia". The Imam read a prepared statement on behalf of "the Muslim American leadership delegation on the Balkans crisis". That delegation consisted of representatives of the largest Muslim organizations in the United States as well as other noted Muslim Americans. It was visiting New York to meet with delegations of various countries and express its deep concern over the genocide taking place in Bosnia.

The Imam thanked Ambassador Sacirbey for informing the delegation on the latest developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina and giving it an update on the refugee situation in Europe. The delegation had met with the President of the General Assembly, Samir S. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), and the ambassadors of Pakistan and Turkey, and would later be meeting with other ambassadors. The Imam said that American Muslims had initially been encouraged by United States recognition of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which he characterized as "a multi-religious, multi-ethnic country, whose capital Sarajevo was renowned for its tolerance and referred to as 'the Jerusalem of the Balkans', where Catholics, Orthodox and Muslims had lived side by side". Regrettably, that tolerance had not lasted.

Reports of the concentration camps in which Bosnian Muslims were kept were reminiscent of accounts of Nazi concentration camps, he said. As
American citizens, the delegation members were distressed at the seeming failure of the United States and Western Governments to fulfil their commitment to defend democracy in a multi-religious society.

He urged the United States and the world to revoke the arms embargo that was "keeping Bosnia from defending itself". In the conflict, Serbia had an overwhelming quantitative and qualitative arms superiority. He called upon Governments, particularly in the Muslim world, to take advantage of last week's Security Council resolution 770 (1992) and ensure the constant and unimpeded delivery of relief supplies to Bosnia and Herzegovina, backed if necessary by military force.

Inspection of concentration camps, he continued, did not go far enough. Their occupants must be allowed safe travel to their homes, and ethnic cleansing campaigns must be stopped. The United Nations should at once investigate the war crimes that had taken place in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The delegation supported the call for a special session of the General Assembly to evolve solutions to the crisis. He stressed that as representatives of "six million American Muslims", the members of his delegation were aware that the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina was a human rights question, not a religious or racial dispute.

A correspondent then asked exactly where Serbia's arms were coming from. Mr. Sacirbey said that the Serbs, who had once been part of one of the largest armies in Europe, possessed vast weapons stockpiles. They were also receiving arms from across their borders and had production capacities of their own. They were pouring those arms into Bosnia and Herzegovina in an uninterrupted flow across all existing bridges and passes. Even as he spoke, he said -- even as peace negotiators in London and at the United Nations were attempting to negotiate agreements on humanitarian aid -- a vast "and tremendously significant new Serbian offensive" was under way.

Another correspondent then asked for Mr. Ali's personal opinions. At a nod from Mr. Ali, Ghais Askia, political advisor to the Imam Warith Deen Mohammed of Chicago, took the floor. He told correspondents that Imam Mohammed, who had frequently worked with the former champion, had been unable to attend the conference. He further told correspondents that Mr. Ali's presence indicated his support. Mr. Ali had always supported the mistreated. Correspondents knew his background, which was "self-explanatory". He wished, however, to reiterate that the conflict in Bosnia was not religious. "People from all over" -- Jews, Christians and Muslims -- were speaking out about it. Mr. Sacirbey then added what he called a "personal note". He had first met Mr. Ali in 1971, he said, when he was a very young man. Mr. Ali, who knew his background, had signed a photograph for him with the inscription, "Muhammed Ali, with all his love and support for the Muslims of Yugoslavia". He believed that Mr. Ali had not forgotten that love and support, and he thanked him 21 years later for coming to his countrymen's aid.

Another correspondent asked what was the current position of the international community in light of Security Council resolution 770. Mr. Sacirbey answered that in terms of results the resolution might never have happened. He noted that the first convoy had just reached Gorazde, but said that it had been a "horrendous trip", blocked at every turn and ultimately (more)
delivering inadequate supplies. It was time the international community started to implement resolution 770, and use both land corridors and the reopening of Tuzla airport in order to provide a wide swath into the Bihacs area where 300,000 people were now under intense pressure from hunger and shelling.

As for the Belgrade Government’s offer of a land corridor to the endangered area, and even the use of Belgrade airport, Mr. Sacirbey told a correspondent that that corridor was already functioning as a conduit for arms, and in any case he had no confidence in Belgrade’s good faith.

A correspondent asked what the United Nations was doing "to stop ethnic cleansing", particularly with the imminent onset of winter. He further asked what action, if any, was contemplated in bringing Yugoslav Prime Minister Milan Panic to justice for the crimes he was committing against humanity. Mr. Sacirbey said that apparently the Organization was doing no more than it had done before. Its efforts were inadequate, he said, and certainly it had taken no specific action to stop ethnic cleansing. There had been acts of great courage and of symbolic importance on the part of personnel of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) on the ground. But such acts were ineffective in the face of tank and artillery assault. The United Nations and the international community would have to be more resolute in order to overcome that.

As for the alleged crimes against humanity of Prime Minister Panic, he referred his questioner to the Imam Al-Jamil. The Imam said that specific queries to the Assembly President and representatives of Member States suggested it might be difficult to link events in Bosnia to the "specific and special" acts for which the defendants at the 1945 Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunal had been arraigned. But the question was still under investigation. His own delegation felt that "the criminality is blatant and clear" and had resolved on certain possible courses of action. Among those might be a mission to investigate conditions in Bosnia as well as to determine needed levels of aid.

To a question about the "significant new Serbian offensive" he had mentioned earlier, Mr. Sacirbey said it involved certain towns around Gorazde as well as a swath of northern and eastern Bosnia, where the Serbs were trying to consolidate territorial gains not only by military conquest but by ethnic cleansing as well. He added that he saw "no possibility of arrangement with these people". They had committed such terrible crimes that now they must finish off their victims completely in order to escape retribution. That was unfortunate, but he believed that such was the thinking of Karadzic, Milosevic and others responsible for the tragedy. He told another questioner that in his opinion Serbian forces now controlled 30 to 40 per cent of Bosnian territory.

Questioned about his Government’s contacts with Islamic ambassadors about bringing the issue of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the General Assembly, Mr. Sacirbey said he had been disappointed by the lack of action within the Security Council. As for the proposed General Assembly meeting, he said its aim was to encourage further action. It was meant to send a clear message
that what had happened to date was inadequate to the needs of the Muslim people of Bosnia and Herzegovina and of the other people in the country. His Government also wanted to raise specific issues of self-defence and the unity and integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

A correspondent asked Mr. Ali and the Muslim representatives if they favoured direct military intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as opposed to military protection of relief convoys. Answering for the Islamic delegation, the Imam Al-Jamil said that on such a question they would defer to Ambassador Sacirbey. The delegation members had enough confidence in his analysis of the situation to support his position. They would not independently call for any such action.

Mr. Sacirbey expressed his appreciation for the Imam's words. He reminded correspondents that his Government had not asked for ground troops on Bosnian soil. It had asked for the right of self-defence and for the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina to be lifted. It had also asked for limited air action to offset the tremendous military superiority in quality and quantity that the other side possessed, and most importantly to offset their uninterrupted supply line. He said he had heard expressed over and over again a reluctance to "fuel the fire" in Bosnia and Herzegovina by terminating the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina. But there was already enough fuel coming in. He suggested that if the world community really wanted to deal with the situation, it could at least cut that Serbian pipeline.
Note to Mr Aimé

MILITARY ESCORT FOR HUMANITARIAN RELIEF IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

In the absence of Mr Goulding and Mr Annan, I received a call today from the Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees, Mr Douglas Stafford, raising an urgent problem that will require a decision from the Secretary-General.

UNHCR has been informed by the French Government that 1100 French marines have left France for the Croatian port of Split, where they will arrive shortly (possibly tomorrow) pursuant to the provisions of operative paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 770. You will recall that the Secretary-General, in his letter of 12 August to the President of the Security Council, asked Member States intending to act on the basis of this resolution to advise him in advance. No notification in this respect from the French Government has been received by this Department.

Mr Stafford stated that UNHCR had been asked by the French to decide how and where these forces could assist UNHCR in the delivery of humanitarian relief. UNHCR has no intention of seeking French national escort for its convoys and will so inform the French.

However, UNHCR would like UNPROFOR escorts to continue to accompany it to deliver relief to other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina beyond Sarajevo. Indeed, UNPROFOR and UNHCR had just completed a successful mission to Gorazde over the weekend, in which UNPROFOR "pioneers" had successfully demined a stretch of road, permitting the convoy to return to Sarajevo. Mr Stafford expected this arrangement to continue.

I explained to Mr Stafford that Mr Goulding had left strict instructions affirming the Secretary-General’s decision that UNPROFOR would not continue to perform this function, which under resolution 770 belonged to Member States. Indeed, the weekend escort had been performed on the basis of arrangements made by the Deputy Force Commander of UNPROFOR during his mission to Sarajevo to reopen the airport there last week. With the passage of resolution 770 a new situation had come into being, in which UNPROFOR would confine itself to the tasks for which it was equipped, i.e. the implementation of the 5 June agreement in Sarajevo and military observer duties in Bihac.

Mr Stafford expressed grave concern about this decision. The Gorazde relief mission had been warmly applauded by the international community and such trips would have to continue. UNHCR could not undertake the missions without UNPROFOR escort. On the other hand, if UNPROFOR declined to participate, UNHCR could not accept intervention by national or regional agencies using force on its behalf. The result would be that UNHCR could
not deliver aid to Gorazde (and other places elsewhere in Bosnia and Herzegovina) and the United Nations would be condemned internationally. He urged that the Secretary-General’s decision be reconsidered and indicated that the High Commissioner, Mrs Ogata, would be writing to the Secretary-General shortly about the problems posed for UNHCR by resolution 770.

You may have seen from Mr Annan’s Note to the Secretary-General on 14 August that this problem was anticipated in the meeting of the Yugoslavia Task Force under his chairmanship that day. For the UN to perform some tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina and refuse to do others risks becoming an unviable position. Meanwhile, forces are arriving in the area in response to a Security Council resolution and a UN agency is in the unenviable position of having to tell them they are not needed.

I would be grateful if you would bring this issue to the attention of the Secretary-General at your earliest convenience. A further meeting of the Yugoslavia Task Force under the Secretary-General’s own Chairmanship might be particularly useful following Mr Goulding’s return tomorrow.

Shashi Tharoor
17 August 1992
14 August 1992

PRESS CONFERENCE BY BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Alia Lujanovic, a traffic engineer from the town of Brcko, stated at a press conference this morning that he had been an eyewitness in a Serbian detention centre in Bosnia and Herzegovina to tortures, rapes and systematic murders. The press conference was sponsored by the Mission to the United Nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose Permanent Representative, Muhamed Sacirbey was present.

The 53-year old Mr. Lujanovic told correspondents that he had endured 52 days in confinement during which he had witnessed many atrocities. A correspondent asked whether the camp in which he was detained had been run by Serbs. He replied yes.

Asked about how he came to escape from the camp, he told of quarrels between what he described as Chetniks (irregular Serbian forces) former members of the Yugoslav National Army and local Bosnian Serbs who opposed the maltreatment of prisoners. Many Serbian civilians had expressed concern over humanitarian conditions in the camps, he said. When local Serbs came to the camp on 23 June, some 35 persons were released from detention. He recognized a Serb with whom he had worked in the municipal government of Brcko and prevailed upon him to assist with his release.

Mr. Sacirbey, the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina then asked Mr. Lujanovic whether the abuses in the camp appeared to be systematic or random. The latter replied that every evening from 4 p.m. to midnight, 20 to 30 people were tortured by those running the camp. Some prisoners were shot and killed; others had their throats cut. The victims were then buried on the grounds of a factory nearby. When asked whether he had been tortured himself he said that on three different occasions he had been kicked and beaten with clubs and rifles.

Had torture been applied to those suspected of spying or some other activity, or did it appear to be indiscriminately applied? a correspondent asked. Mr. Lujanovic said everyone in the camp had been tortured. The guards seemed to have lists of names -- mostly of targeted Croatian Catholics and Bosnian Muslims. He added that one Serb he knew of had been killed in the camp while trying to help Muslims to escape.

Asked for details of his arrest and subsequent detention he said that when his town was overrun by Chetniks and Serbian forces he had fled to the basement of a building. On taking over the town, the invaders had captured civilians and detained them at a mosque where they were verbally abused and tortured, with particular references made to their Muslim religion and Turkish ancestry. For example, against their religious principles prisoners had been forced to eat pork. Copies of the Koran were torn up and thrown at them. Men were held on the ground while the guards jumped onto their chests...
from a tabletop. Two men tried to escape through a window; one escaped, and the other was tortured for 48 hours until he died. All 300 detainees in the mosque had been forced to witness the act.

Half of those imprisoned in the mosque were then moved to Luka, a primarily Serbian suburb of his town, he said. There they were confined in an abandoned restaurant and made to sleep on a concrete floor. During the night, Chetniks entered the restaurant and beat the prisoners with metal rods and clubs. The guards had seized a Catholic Croat woman and raped her in front of the group - and in front of her father and her children. The Chetniks had produced a list of names and ordered those individuals to lie down for their throats to be cut. Those who refused were beaten and stabbed. All had been killed.

A correspondent asked if he had any opinion on whether the massacres were ethnically or religiously motivated. Mr. Lujanovic answered that he was not a political person. When the conflict broke out he had not wanted to take up arms, but now he regretted that he had not. The main reason for the massacres appeared to be Serbian hegemony. Serbs wanted to take over much of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina; Serbian soldiers had told them that the Muslim population of the area should be reduced by 20 per cent, and that all Croats should be expelled to Croatia.

Asked when he had come to the United States, he said he had arrived on 11 August at the invitation of the United States Senate. He had been released from detention in his town, on 26 June, into the custody of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Did the goal of Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina appear to be the expulsion or extermination of local residents? He replied that the intention appeared to be that part of the Muslim population should be subdued, others should be expelled or exterminated, and the rest should be "Christianized". He had seen a Muslim "Christianized" in Bosnia and Herzegovina; Serbs had carved a cross into his forehead and tortured him until he agreed to change his name from "Amir" to "Alexander".

A correspondent asked what one of the Security Council resolutions on Bosnia and Herzegovina passed yesterday called for the United Nations to gather information on war crimes. Would he be able to identify his tormentors? Mr. Lujanovic replied that he had recognized certain individuals from Bosnia and Herzegovina, but that others appeared to have come from Serbia. Those coming from Serbia had probably been operating under assumed names.

A correspondent asked what action he wished to see, Mr. Sacirbey said that he had noted that the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
had refused to assist with the expulsion of 28,000 persons from Western Bosnia. The UNHCR appeared to be encouraging people to stay in their homes; he complimented the organization for its "wisdom".

Why had the United Nations not said "we are with you" to those people? he asked. Where were the troops to morally and physically support the Bosnians? Unarmed officials of UNHCR were helping; it was unfortunate and unfair that the people of Bosnia were not being allowed to help their countrymen in the camps. People were dying in the camps with the knowledge that no one would help them. His Government regretted that it could not do more to stop the atrocities.

He went on to say many Serbs had been faced with the choice of opposing Serbian aggression and dying, or getting "sucked into" the flow of ethnic cleansing. Blood had been spilled on the hands of innocent Serbians by the failure of the international community to act. The international community had failed to help Serbs who had wished to "preserve their humanity".

In response to a correspondent who asked whether his Government had made any progress on its talks with the Government of Turkey, Mr. Sacirbey said he was not personally responsible for those bilateral arrangements. Turkey seemed to be fulfilling its responsibility as a member of the international community, although no leadership seemed to be emanating from the "big Powers".

Serbian Prime Minister Milan Panic had told the Government of Turkey that he would stop the atrocities, a correspondent said. Did Mr. Sacirbey have any comment? Mr. Sacirbey replied that Mr. Panic could not fulfill that promise. "Either he is insincere or he has been visiting his own pharmacy."
RESOLUTION 771 (1992)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 3106th meeting, on 13 August 1992

The Security Council,


Noting the letter dated 10 August 1992 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations (S/24401),

Expressing grave alarm at continuing reports of widespread violations of international humanitarian law occurring within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina including reports of mass forcible expulsion and deportation of civilians, imprisonment and abuse of civilians in detention centres, deliberate attacks on non-combatants, hospitals and ambulances, impeding the delivery of food and medical supplies to the civilian population, and wanton devastation and destruction of property,

Recalling the statement of the President of the Council of 4 August 1992 (S/24378),

1. Reaffirms that all parties to the conflict are bound to comply with their obligations under international humanitarian law and in particular the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and that persons who commit or order the commission of grave breaches of the Conventions are individually responsible in respect of such breaches;

2. Strongly condemns any violations of international humanitarian law, including those involved in the practice of "ethnic cleansing";
3. Demands that all parties and others concerned in the former Yugoslavia, and all military forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, immediately cease and desist from all breaches of international humanitarian law including from actions such as those described above;

4. Further demands that relevant international humanitarian organizations, and in particular the International Committee of the Red Cross, be granted immediate, unimpeded and continued access to camps, prisons and detention centres within the territory of the former Yugoslavia and calls upon all parties to do all in their power to facilitate such access;

5. Calls upon States and, as appropriate, international humanitarian organizations to collate substantiated information in their possession or submitted to them relating to the violations of humanitarian law, including grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions, being committed in the territory of the former Yugoslavia and to make this information available to the Council;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to collate the information submitted to the Council under paragraph 5 and to submit a report to the Council summarizing the information and recommending additional measures that might be appropriate in response to the information;

7. Decides, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, that all parties and others concerned in the former Yugoslavia, and all military forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, shall comply with the provisions of the present resolution, failing which the Council will need to take further measures under the Charter;

8. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.
RESOLUTION 770 (1992)

Adopted by the Security Council at its 3106th meeting,
on 13 August 1992

The Security Council,


Noting the letter dated 10 August 1992 from the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations (S/24401),

Underlining once again the imperative need for an urgent negotiated political solution to the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enable that country to live in peace and security within its borders,

Reaffirming the need to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Recognizing that the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina constitutes a threat to international peace and security and that the provision of humanitarian assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina is an important element in the Council's effort to restore international peace and security in the area,

Commending the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) for its continuing action in support of the relief operation in Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Deeply disturbed by the situation that now prevails in Sarajevo, which has severely complicated UNPROFOR's efforts to fulfil its mandate to ensure the security and functioning of Sarajevo airport and the delivery of humanitarian assistance in Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina,
pursuant to resolutions 743 (1992), 749 (1992), 761 (1992) and 764 (1992) and
the reports of the Secretary-General cited therein,

Dismayed by the continuation of conditions that impede the delivery of
humanitarian supplies to destinations within Bosnia and Herzegovina and the
consequent suffering of the people of that country,

Deeply concerned by reports of abuses against civilians imprisoned in
camps, prisons and detention centres,

Determined to establish as soon as possible the necessary conditions for
the delivery of humanitarian assistance wherever needed in Bosnia and
Herzegovina, in conformity with resolution 764 (1992),

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations,

1. Reaffirms its demand that all parties and others concerned in Bosnia
   and Herzegovina stop the fighting immediately;

2. Calls upon States to take nationally or through regional agencies or
   arrangements all measures necessary to facilitate in coordination with the
   United Nations the delivery by relevant United Nations humanitarian
   organizations and others of humanitarian assistance to Sarajevo and wherever
   needed in other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

3. Demands that unimpeded and continuous access to all camps, prisons
   and detention centres be granted immediately to the International Committee
   of the Red Cross and other relevant humanitarian organizations and that all
   detainees therein receive humane treatment, including adequate food, shelter
   and medical care;

4. Calls upon States to report to the Secretary-General on measures
   they are taking in coordination with the United Nations to carry out this
   resolution, and invites the Secretary-General to keep under continuous review
   any further measures that may be necessary to ensure unimpeded delivery of
   humanitarian supplies;

5. Requests all States to provide appropriate support for the actions
   undertaken in pursuance of this resolution;

6. Demands that all parties and others concerned take the necessary
   measures to ensure the safety of United Nations and other personnel engaged in
   the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

7. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the Council on a
   periodic basis on the implementation of this resolution;

8. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.
FULL

LETTER DATED 13 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Due to the fact that I have not been asked to speak before the Security
Council today with respect to the resolutions pertaining to the Republic of
Bosnia-Herzegovina, I am transmitting to you a copy of the speech I had
prepared for delivery to the Security Council.

May I ask your kind assistance in circulating the attached speech as a

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative
Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Distinguished Delegates:

Let me first most sincerely thank this distinguished body for providing me with the opportunity to speak on behalf of my country, even if some of you may be uncomfortable with what I may have to say.

I commend you for your courage and sense of fair play and your efforts to be balanced, while at the same time I may be critical of the inadequacy of the response. I truly know that many have laboured to produce a meaningful result. I believe that others have continually resisted doing the absolute minimum to respond to this human tragedy.

None the less, I thank all of you for your dedication of time and conscience.

What did Bosnia and Herzegovina used to be? It was a land of peaceful green hills and planted fields. Of towns and cities where Catholic and Serbian Churches, mosques and synagogues shared our skyline for centuries. A place of learning and art, libraries and skilled artisans.

It was also where I as a young boy learned how to read the Koran, received gifts from Santa Claus at Christmas, and painted eggs on Easter.

What is Bosnia and Herzegovina today? It is a land where the hills and villages resound with the echo of the aggressor's guns, where churches, mosques and synagogues are desecrated and graveyards are razed. Where parks and backyards once filled with carefree children and happy parents are now make-shift cemeteries. A place of torture and concentration camps, starving children and dismembered corpses. Young boys are castrated, girls raped and orphans murdered.

As horrifying as this suffering is, these are only symptoms of a disease called "ciscenje" - "ethnic cleansing".

The resolutions contemplated here are at best only an attempt to marginally deal with the symptoms of this illness, and only some of the symptoms. This body must ultimately and urgently treat this disease.

Regrettably, there has developed a wide gap between the words and the deeds of the international community.

"Ethnic cleansing" has been introduced to our land by the Belgrade regime. It has provided the financing, weapons, many troops and, most importantly, the inspiration and philosophy for "ethnic cleansing".

This has all been done in the name of a "Greater Serbia".
It represents a fascist philosophy designed to maintain the absolute power and privileges of the discredited political, bureaucratic and military leadership of Serbia.

On 12 May 1992, His Excellency, the Secretary-General, accurately described the situation. He reported to the Security Council:

"All international observers agree that what is happening is a concerted effort by the Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the acquiescence of, and at least some support from, the Yugoslav Army to create 'ethnically pure' regions in the context of negotiations on the 'cantonization' of the Republic in the European Community Conference on Bosnia-Herzegovina chaired by Ambassador Cutiliero. The techniques used are the seizure of territory by military force and intimidation of the non-Serb population ..."

Universally, the international community has identified the aggressor, has condemned in the strongest terms the crimes against humanity, and has been virtually impotent in providing creative leadership and actions to help solve the crisis.

One has to wonder why still today we fail to take necessary immediate action to stop "ethnic cleansing" as it has reached catastrophic epidemic proportions.

All steps so far have only addressed some of the symptoms. They are a mixture of stop-gap measures and discredited methods. We are concerned that some of those efforts have the same effect as the ancient practice of "bleeding". In effect, this "treatment" is serving to weaken the patient.

Our people are truly grateful for the relief efforts feeding and healing the people of Sarajevo, and for the brave, noble and selfless efforts of the men and women of UNPROFOR, the UNHCR, the Red Cross and other relief organizations.

Attempts at mediation and evenhandedness have caused reports to be issued equating the victim with the aggressor. Other credible reports of the magnitude of the suffering and the extent of the Serb fascists' atrocities have been totally omitted or misdirected in a futile attempt at evenhandedness and in pursuit of the failed avenue of mediation.

A misdirected former UNPROFOR commander in Sarajevo exhibited the extent to which victims have been vilified in this process by blaming the valiant bus driver and volunteers accompanying orphaned babies and toddlers from Sarajevo when Serbian extremist snipers murdered two of these young souls as they tried to escape.

Certainly, the epidemic afflicting our people since the first reports of Serbian extremist atrocities and "ethnic cleansing" campaigns has proven the futility of current mediation efforts. Even as the contemplated resolutions
are discussed, the proponents of a Greater Serbia are blackmailing the valiant relief workers in Bosnia and Herzegovina to become the tools for the "ethnic cleansing" of 28,000 non-Serbs; ironically, their only other choice is to send these unfortunate people to their graves.

Earlier this week The Associated Press quoted Jose Maria Mendiluce, special envoy in the region for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, as saying, "We cannot continue to be blackmailed and put in this dilemma everyday." He said, "We are not here to facilitate the criminal policy that is being followed in those areas, forcing people to leave houses through harassment and threats."

Obviously, these criminals continue to dictate the terms to the international community, rather than the other way around.

For how much longer?

We have continually asked for help to stop this aggression. We have asked for air action to help offset the overwhelming weapons superiority of the Belgrade regime and its surrogates, to knock out the heavy weapons besieging our cities, to interdict the resupply lines coming from Serbia and Montenegro, and to neutralize the Yugoslav Air Force attacking our population with cluster bombs and even napalm.

We do not ask for nor do we want foreign ground troops.

We will provide the ground forces to defend our country, to face the aggressor and even to escort relief.

We are even prevented from exercising our most basic right of self-defence. While the Belgrade regime and its surrogates continue to pour increasing numbers of more sophisticated weaponry into Bosnia and Herzegovina, we must defend ourselves with light weapons.

But truth may be our only weapon, and it is our greatest weapon.

The truth is, we have become the modern world's Warsaw Ghetto of 50 years ago, abandoned by many, deprived but together. We, the Muslims, Croatians, Serbs and Jews and others resisting a fascist philosophy of an ethnically cleansed, morally soiled Greater Serbia fear that these marginal steps are only designed to delay our imminent extinction as a country and as a people.

We see the world abandoning democracy, freedom, tolerance and coexistence while appeasing intolerance, aggression and terrorism by those clearly responsible for crimes against humanity.

Ethnic cleansing is not a diplomatic or political problem.

It is a human rights problem.
It is a crime against all of us.

It cannot be dealt with through negotiations.

In fact, to re-emphasize the Secretary-General's words of 12 May which point out the fallacy of past appeasement with the current most tragic results:

"All international observers agree that what is happening is a concerted effort by the Serbs ... to create 'ethnically pure' regions ..."

Ethnic cleansing must not be excused, legitimized, appeased. It must be dealt with through the force of international law. And the victims must not be vilified or their plight sidestepped.

I believe you share with me the view that the victims of the aggression, the maimed, the concentration camp inmates and the murdered are not the culprits.

All victims whether from Serbia or Bosnia-Herzegovina share a very dismal future unless the more fortunate resolutely defend them against aggression.

While poor in means to defend ourselves, we are still wealthy in our courage and resolution to resist injustice and intolerance.

What does membership in the United Nations mean to Bosnia-Herzegovina today? As a Member, why doesn't collective security apply to us? As a member of CSCE, why don't the Helsinki Accords apply to us?

We have been placed on an equal footing with the very perpetrators of this great crime against humanity. The distinction between victim and aggressor has been blurred intentionally.

These questions are not only relevant to Bosnia-Herzegovina, but to all Members of the United Nations. The very credibility of this Organization rests on the successful handling of this crisis.

Our only weapon is the truth. And the truth shall set us free. That is our last best hope.
The credibility of the United Nations rested on the successful handling of the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Muhamed Sacirbey, the Permanent Representative of that country to the United Nations, told correspondents at a press conference this afternoon.

Reading a statement which he had planned to make to the Security Council today, Mr. Sacirbey said the Council draft resolutions were "too little, too late" and attempted only marginally to deal with the symptoms of the disease of "ciscenje" -- or "ethnic cleansing". The disease itself must be urgently treated.

There was a wide gap between the words and the deeds of the international community, he continued. The international community had identified the aggressor and had condemned the crimes against humanity in the strongest terms, but had been virtually impotent in providing creative leadership and actions to help solve the crisis. He wondered why the world had failed to take immediate action to stop "ethnic cleansing" despite it having reached epidemic and catastrophic proportions.

"Ethnic cleansing" had been introduced to his country by the Belgrade regime, he said. That regime had provided the financing, weapons, troops, and the philosophy and inspiration for "ethnic cleansing". That had all been done in the name of a "Greater Serbia". It represented a fascist philosophy designed to maintain the absolute power and privilege of the discredited political, bureaucratic and military leadership of Serbia.

While welcoming international relief efforts in Sarajevo, he said international attempts at mediation and even-handedness had equated the victim with the aggressor. "We have been placed on an equal footing with the very perpetrators of this great crime against humanity." The distinction between victim and aggressor had been blurred intentionally.

The continuing reports of Serbian atrocities had proven the futility of current mediation efforts. Reiterating his request for international air strikes, he said such action could neutralize the heavy weapons besieging Bosnian cities and help offset the weapons superiority of the Belgrade regime and its surrogates. Air support would also help neutralize the Yugoslavian Air Force which was attacking Bosnia with cluster bombs and even napalm. Bosnians, on the other hand, were forced to defend themselves with light weapons. "We are prevented from exercising our basic right of self-defence", he said.

(more)
"We see the world abandoning democracy, freedom, tolerance and coexistence while appeasing intolerance, aggression and terrorism by those clearly responsible for crimes against humanity", Mr. Sacirbey said. "Ethnic cleansing" must not be excused, legitimized or appeased. It must be dealt with through the force of international law. The victims must not be vilified or their plight side-stepped.

Asked if he considered the Security Council draft resolutions as appeasement, he said the resolutions did not make a clear distinction between victim and aggressor, nor did they define the means by which the aggression could be stopped.

Asked to comment on the reports that Turkey was contemplating sending troops to assist Bosnia, he said that Bosnia had asked to be able to exercise its right of self-defence. Any country that wished to come to Bosnia's assistance was welcome, and that included Iran and Israel, he said.
The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the Secretary-General’s Note DPKO/SG/92 of 3 August on the supervising of heavy weapons in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The United Kingdom is giving active consideration to the Secretary-General’s request and is consulting its partners in the relevant regional organisations. The United Kingdom will communicate again with the Secretary-General when these consultations have been concluded.

The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations avails himself of this opportunity to renew to the Secretary-General of the United Nations the assurance of its highest consideration.

UNITED KINGDOM MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK
12 AUGUST 1992
Dear Ambassador,

The Secretary-General has asked me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 7 August about an "UNPROFOR report on concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina" dated 2 July.

It is not clear to which document you refer. I am not aware of any UNPROFOR report on this subject dated 2 July. The two documents which are already in the possession of your Mission and have indeed been widely circulated by you to the media and other Missions are dated 3 and 8 July respectively. As you are aware, they are memoranda from the Coordinator of Civil Affairs in UNPROFOR's Sector North to the Deputy Director for Civil Affairs in UNPROFOR's Headquarters which, at the time in question, were temporarily located in Belgrade. They are internal United Nations documents and the Secretary-General would be grateful for any assistance which you and your Mission can provide in enabling him to determine how their unauthorised disclosure to non-United Nations personnel took place.

As regards their contents, you will have seen that they detail information which had become available to UNPROFOR's Sector North about alleged (and probable) human rights violations in neighbouring parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, outside the United Nations Protected Area in Croatia for which Sector North has responsibility. You will also have noted from the documents that UNPROFOR conveyed this information to the humanitarian agencies concerned, primarily the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and had been recommending to the ICRC that it increase its representation in the area in question. UNPROFOR's decision to deal with this matter at the

His Excellency
Mr. Muhamed Sacirbey
Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations
New York
local level was in accordance with the standard practice of United Nations peace-keeping operations and with the recognised division of labour between them and the humanitarian agencies. You are no doubt aware that the Geneva Conventions ascribe to ICRC the responsibility for monitoring the conditions in detention centres in wartime.

Yours sincerely,

Marrack Goulding
Under-Secretary-General for Peace-keeping Operations
Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mission to the United Nations

August 07, 1992

H.E. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General
United Nations
New York, New York

Your Excellency:

I would like to request from your good offices, on behalf of my Government, the July 02, 1992 UNPROFOR report on concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This report has been widely discussed in the media around the world, and if such a report does exist, my Government requests its immediate availability.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Muhamed Sacirbey
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Belgrade, fax: 38-11-669-367


To: HIS EXCELLENCY  
SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali

Your Excellency,

having a due respect towards the utmost concern of the international community for achieving diplomatic and peaceful solution for Yugoslav crisis and regarding the future Conference as an ultimate way in that sense, we find ourselves highly obliged about serious preparations for taking our part at the Conference, and contributing to its success.

We are glad to inform You that, despite all the difficulties we have, You are probably familiar with, we have already started our preparation activities for the Conference. In that course, it would be of great significance and help for us if You could supply us with the full list of participants to the London Conference about Yugoslavian Crisis, the timetable of Conference, schedules and other relevant documents, in case they are available. May I be free to say that time is of crucial significance for us.

Please, accept expressions of our special esteem.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the  
Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina  

[Signature]
LETTER DATED 7 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In response to the statement the President of the Security Council issued on 4 August 1992, and of the request for further information regarding concentration camps and ethnic cleansing, I submit the following information for review.

I have not forwarded this document to the Secretariat for their review since I would consider it likely that they would have received it through channels. None the less, I would request that the Secretariat verify the authenticity of this document.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the attached information as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative
MEMORANDUM

RESTRICTED

Annex

Sector North
8 July 1992

Subject: Arriving refugees from Bosanski Novi (BH)

On 7 July 1992 a group of 18 persons arrived in Sector North from Bosanski Novi (BH) asking for protection and assistance to cross the CFL towards Zagreb or other foreign countries. The Civil Affairs Officer interviewed the group and arranged for the crossing on 8 July 1992.

The following information is based solely on the statements of these persons who have asked for anonymity for security reasons. In Bosanski Novi (BH) the Muslim ethnic group (28 per cent) continues to suffer persecution, deportation and intimidation from Serbian armed groups. The beginning of this crisis is traced back to the end of April 1992.

The persons interviewed reported that all Muslims living in the town and in the neighbouring villages are ready to leave the area towards Croatia or other destinations in Europe. Previously we reported that the stadium of Bosanski Novi is one of the places where hundreds of persons have been held for screening, following which they are expelled from the area towards unknown destinations.

Reportedly all Muslims are forced to sign papers asking them to "voluntarily leave" under the following conditions:

- Leave behind all personal property (including cars, personal effects, etc.);
- Swear that they were permanently leaving the area and that they will never go back to their houses.

Following compliance with these conditions, they are issued a declaration from the local TDF Commander and the Militja (or the Mayor) allowing them to leave their opstina of residence. They are generally forced to leave in the direction of Dvor.

It is reported that the local authorities in Dvor do not seem surprised at the arrival of the forcefully removed persons. They even show a cooperative effort to facilitate their way towards Croatian controlled territories.
A calculated strategy to "cleanse" the area of Muslims appears to have intensified beginning in May 1992. House burnings, deportations, summary executions, shooting in the houses, etc., are part of the present situation in the towns and villages along the north side of the BH border (Bosanski Novi, Bosanska Kostanjica and Bosanska Dubica). Reportedly, the Militja does not seem to intervene. Some Mayors and other Serbs working in the opstinas have also been reported as trying to help the Muslims to leave their houses safely. In Bosanski Novi the Military Police is reported to have its HQ in Hotel Una. There are reports of brutal torture in this hotel.

The persons interviewed believe that the political leaders know what is happening. Some of them attest to allegations that some high-level politicians in the SDS party are known to have given orders for actions against Muslims. Some of the refugees tell of a retaliatory policy of "one Serbian killed in the front line, one Muslim man will be killed". All the men interviewed had been held for some days in the stadium of Bosanski Novi before being expelled. They report that every day some 30 new detainees arrive in the stadium. When the stadium is full the guards take some of them away to unknown destinations. Some witnesses report that in the first 15 days of May some 200 persons taken out of the stadium were shot dead nearby.

Based on these interviews, the persons estimated that some 5,000 persons may try to cross the bridge between Bosanski Novi and Dvor in the coming days.

To: DCA/DDCA, UNPROFOR, BELGRADE
cc: UNHCR, ZAGREB, ATT.: OSE
    ICRC
    DANBAT, ATT.: MAJOR JENSEN
    CHIEF, CIVPOL/DVOR/KOSTANJICA
    UNHCR PROTECTION/FO, TOPUSKO
    CIVIL AFFAIRS LIAISON OFFICE, ZABREB
LETTER DATED 5 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In response to the statement the President of the Security Council issued on 4 August 1992 (S/24378) and of the request for further information regarding concentration camps and ethnic cleansing, I submit the following information for review.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the attached information as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Subject: Humanitarian aid

I refer to your subject memo of 1 July 1992.

The football field in Bosanski Novi (BH) is clearly visible from the town of Dvor in the UNPA. Further to our many previous reports on this, let me clarify that our sense of frustration is not, as stated in Mr. Magnusson's subject memo to the FC, our "inability to investigate this matter". I believe you have received a stream of reports not only of Bosanski Novi, but also for other flash points along the border with BH (Bihac, Cazin, Velika Kladusa and Bosanski Dubica). In those reports, we highlighted the following points.

We believe the football field detainees are only a tip of the iceberg involving the concerted action of local Serbian authorities in BH trying to establish a Serbian Republic of BH, free of Muslims. In that process, the Mayors, the Milicijia and TDF of Bosanski Novi, acting in unison with their counterparts, not only in the UNPA (Dvor and Kostanjica), but also with Bosanski Dubica, Banja Luka, Prijedor, Sancki Host and Kljuc. The Serbs appear to be engaged in a determined process of forcefully disarming Muslims where they are clearly a small encircled minority, such as in Bosanski Novi, or besieging their city totally, such as in Bihac. Apparently the football field is the holding ground where Muslim groups are detained while their houses are being "searched", the men isolated and transported to concentration camps.

The UNHCR representative and Civil Affairs have pieced together reports from Muslims who recently have taken refuge under UNPROFOR protection in Dvor and Kostanjica. There are reported concentration camps at the following locations:

- **KERATERM**: Located at a railroad station in Prijedor en route to Banja Luka. 100-200 Muslims believed to be here under extremely bad conditions.

- **TRNOPOLJE**: Also located at a railroad station in Prijedor, direction Banja Luka. A refugee camp for women, children and old men.

/...
- **OMARSKA**: Located in a purely Serbian village. Reportedly a camp for Muslim men and local Muslim authorities prior to Serbian take-over of control, particularly in Prijedor.

- **MANJACA**: Outside Banja Luka. A large camp reportedly including Croatian soldiers taken prisoner in the fighting in Kostanjica.

The treatment of Muslims and other minorities in the camps is reportedly atrocious, with regular beatings, deprivation of food and water, poor shelter, etc.

Today in a meeting with the ICRC and UNHCR, the above subject of humanitarian aid was discussed. The ICRC informed us that they will be deployed in BH and took the information we had on the subject. They also informed us that the ICRC will deploy a delegate or two, specifically in Sector North, to be located either in Vojnic or Glina. This in our view is a very positive step which we had recommended to the ICRC as a matter of urgency.

Our frustration arises from our inability to do anything other than write reports and stand by since UNPROFOR has no operational responsibilities across the border. In recent days, the situation has deteriorated and has now begun to spill over to the UNPA. We have seen a mounting number of desperate people who have crossed over to seek refuge and protection from UNPROFOR. Yesterday, one Mustafa Ogorinac swam across river Una at [illegible] in the morning from a camp in Bosanski Dubica. He is now under UNPROFOR protection along with two other persons. He shows signs of physical abuse and punishment.

In a separate communication (CIV/AFF/06/96, dated 30 June 1992) I appealed to the Special Envoy of the UNHCR for one temporary measure to help to cope with the situation while waiting for the ICRC and UNHCR to resume their operations in BH. We have requested a minibus with driver to help in transporting the escapees to safety since UN vehicles are not to be used for humanitarian purposes. Any assistance you can lend on the acquisition of the 16-20 seater minibus and driver is most appreciated.

To: Ms. Y. Auger, DDCA (Belgrade)

cc: Mr. M. Magnusson (Zagreb)
Annex II

Public announcement published by the News Agency of Bosnia and Herzegovina on 1 August 1992

The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina have published a list of the detention camps existing on the territory of the Republic at present under the occupation of the aggressor. There exists reliable information that such camps also exist in Serbia and Montenegro.

The aggressors, in pursuit of their planned "ethnic cleansing", have packed into these camps the entire non-Serbian population of given areas. We calculate that some 130,000 citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at present concentrated in 96 such camps.

The world community is shocked by these figures. Sadly, at the same time, there exists a tendency in certain publications and in certain circles to claim that such camps only exist on "the other side". Our side.

The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina categorically state that on the territories under the control of its legal authority, no such camps exist. On the contrary, this Government has for a long time now been inviting humanitarian organizations, as well as other international bodies, and in particular the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to come here and verify for themselves this stated fact. The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina now renew this invitation, from the motive of demonstrating as clearly as they can the sufferings of these incarcerated people, and of having them set free as soon as possible.
In view of the grave and deteriorating situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with regard to the most serious violations of human rights and international law, involving acts of interference and armed intervention by a foreign country, threatening international peace and security, I have the honour to request, on behalf of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, an urgent emergency meeting of the Security Council, with formal debate, to consider the situation there and take appropriate collective measures as provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter to restore peace and stability in the region.

I should be grateful if the text of the letter could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
Muhamed Sacirbey, Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations, this afternoon told correspondents that his Government had formally requested that the Security Council conduct a formal open meeting to debate the situation in his country, as well as the Council draft resolution being contemplated.

Asked for his reaction to the pending draft resolution, he said all he knew about the proposal had come from news sources and some political leaders. The draft, he said, aimed only at the symptoms and not the illness. The illness of the conflict was "ethnic cleansing".

A correspondent asked whether the proposed resolution would do anything at all to ameliorate the suffering. Mr. Sacirbey said that it might even encourage the ethnic cleansing programme. In order for the "other side" to be prevented from carrying out that activity, it must be confronted with the full force of the law. If the international community only addressed the symptoms, the illness would continue: if the illness was addressed, the symptoms would disappear.

Would the draft resolution amount to appeasement? he was asked. Less appeasement than a week ago, he said, but it was still inadequate and intended only to "comfort public opinion" and shield world leaders from responsibility for the continuing war. Talk in the media of "ancient hatreds" and "ethnic hatred" and "civil war" was not accurate. In Bosnia, he continued, Croations, Muslims, Serbs and Jews and others faced a militancy from Serbs originating in Serbia and Montenegro, with a philosophical base in Belgrade. Under the proposed Security Council resolution, the civilian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina was being "fattened up before the slaughter" with no means to defend themselves.

How could he be sure that a Western air strike would not drive away the Serbians? He answered that his fighters did not have weapons; the Serbians were pounding away at Bosnian cities with new supplies of weapons which they received without fear of interdiction. The Yugoslav Air Force sent its planes to attack civilian populations with napalm and cluster bombs. On that basis, any steps aimed at addressing those tactical disadvantages would help.

Another correspondent asked what it was that his Government wanted. "Our people want the ability to defend themselves", he replied. An arms embargo was in place on Bosnia and Herzegovina, while the "other side" enjoyed an unlimited supply of weapons. The embargo currently in place had allowed Serbia to take military actions against civilians without fear of being resisted on the battlefield. In Sarajevo, some 50,000 people were ready to defend their Republic, but the Government only had enough weapons to arm 5,000.
Did he have any update on the situation in the concentration camps? a correspondent asked. Was there any new information as to whether the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) had gained access to them? Mr. Sacirbey said that he had not received any documentation of the analysis that the United Nations and ICRC apparently carried out on the situation a month ago. It was inadequate to say that the other side would let camps be inspected. What right did they have to hold civilians prisoner in the first place?

If ICRC visited all the camps and liberated the last "torture chamber in the basement of some municipal building", where would the liberated detainees go? Mr. Sacirbey asked. They might then be wiped out by ethnic cleansing; the United Nations might in fact be effectively assisting the ethnic cleansing process which was the source of all problems in the region.

A correspondent said that Radmila Milentijvic, Minister in the Government of Yugoslavia, had stated in a Headquarters press conference earlier today that there had been "equal suffering" on the part of all three ethnic groups -- Serbians, Croatians and Muslims. Some 500,000 Serbians had been forced into Serbia, she said.

He answered that there had been suffering on all sides. But in the areas held by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, there were Serbs faithful to his Government. Shells launched by Serbians were landing on Serbs, as well as others. No ethnic cleansing campaign had been ordered by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Serbians served in that Government and in its defence forces, he said. "Many of them are our heroes", he said.

Another correspondent said that on Friday, 7 August, Mr. Sacirbey said that there were no camps for Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but Minister Milentijvic had provided a list of camps that she said held Serbs. Did he have any comment?

Mr. Sacirbey said his Government maintained no concentration camps for any ethnic groups. There were prisoner-of-war camps. The Government controlled only a very limited area, and those sites were very easy to access.

He was then asked about a call made by Minister Milentijvic that all sides should participate in peace talks aimed at resolving the crisis. He answered that "she should take her own advice". Belgrade kept sending in new weapons, tanks, artillery and sorties of jets against civilians.

Did Bosnians intend to "fight it out to the end"? he was asked. He said it would be better if they had never had to take up arms in the first place; men and women in Bosnia and Herzegovina were willing to fight to defend their country to make sure relief supplies got into the country. His Government was trying to absolve the international community of the responsibility of providing ground troops; the issue of ground troops had been used as an excuse to avoid taking more resolute action.

It was not a question of fighting to the last man; it was a question of repulsing aggression from the outside which, once dealt with resolutely, could be defeated promptly and convincingly, he continued. Those responsible for

(more)
ethnic cleansing were conscripts -- most of whom had no stomach for ethnic cleansing -- and criminal elements who had gone to Bosnia and Herzegovina to plunder. Like any other criminals, if confronted with the force of law, they would flee. His Government had no choice but to fight; they were surrounded. The only other option seemed to be for the international community to "bus us all out as refugees". And that was no solution to the problem.

A correspondent said that at her press conference, Ms. Milentijvic had proposed that the United Nations might administer the whole area of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a demilitarized zone, pending a new referendum. Would that be tantamount to accepting the ethnic cleansing programme? he asked.

Mr. Sacirbey said that it was interesting that she had been talking about "another referendum" when a fair one supervised by the international community had already been approved. The Serbs believed that they had managed to cleanse a whole country, and that, by keeping the inhabitants out as refugees, they might enjoy a majority. Why did Belgrade feel so confident in proposing solutions for the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina? he asked. That was because their philosophy, right down to its execution, had been mandated from the top.

A correspondent noted that former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher had called for an end to the arms embargo on Bosnia; did he have any reaction? Mr. Sacirbey said Mrs. Thatcher was a distinguished, wise political figure. "We thank her."

What had he meant when he said that political leaders had sought a Security Council resolution to "shield" themselves? Mr. Sacirbey answered that what one saw on television and news reports were merely the symptoms of the crisis. International leaders were dealing with those, shielding themselves against further scenes like those played out in the media. Without more resolute action, underneath nothing would change.

What were in fact the root causes of the crisis? he was asked. He said the ethnic cleansing campaign being carried out by the Serbian regime. A large number of Serbs were fighting against that regime in Belgrade. What those individuals were most unhappy about was the introduction of a fascist philosophy and the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Did he take no satisfaction in the fact that Bosnia and Herzegovina was getting a Security Council resolution? In reply, Mr. Sacirbey answered that force needed to be used against the causes of the problem rather than against its symptoms. No one seemed to be talking about reversing aggression.

Was the resolution principally designed for "domestic consumption" in various countries around the world? He answered that any action that might involve the use of force would require courage and consideration of consequences. If the international community was willing to risk troops, why not risk them once in the safest possible way -- via air action -- to deal with the root causes of the war. And why not allow the community in Bosnia and Herzegovina to act in concert with the international community to do away with the ethnic cleansing campaign?

(more)
He was not suggesting that air strikes could end the fighting, but they could be an important military and psychological factor in offsetting the logistical superiority of the other side, whose soldiers were "living a normal life" in the hills of Bosnia and Herzegovina, while their guns continued to pound away at the civilian populations of the area. Those individuals must be made to realize that they would not be allowed to enter Bosnia and Herzegovina without facing international punishment.

Now that the Commission on Human Rights had decided to meet on the alleged atrocities of the camps, what impact would that have on the ground? a journalist asked. Mr. Sacirbey said that was a needed response; but it would have been more appropriate in the context of addressing the crimes that had been committed. The Commission's meeting, as set out, would not address what was needed to stop those crimes from being committed.

There were now demands on 300,000 non-Serbs around the city of Bihac to leave or be exterminated, he said. That behaviour continued after the camps had been shown on international television. The media coverage seemed to have had no effect on those "merciless aggressors".

A correspondent said that in her press conference earlier, Ms. Milentijvic had asserted that 300,000 Serbs had been forced to leave Bosnia and Herzegovina because of an ethnic cleansing campaign. Did he have any comment?

Mr. Sacirbey said that he did not know the details of that case, but he did know that Serbs were playing high-level roles in the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina and were responsible for executing its war of defence. It was not possible to conclude that those persons would be responsible for the ethnic cleansing of their own kinsmen.

Was it conceivable that those persons had felt compelled to leave? "Absolutely", he responded. There were many reasons why people would feel compelled to flee conflict, but there was no philosophy -- as there was in Belgrade -- of ethnic cleansing. The claim of Bosnia and Herzegovina to international legitimacy was predicated on the concept of coexistence and tolerance. "That's what our whole history was all about, and that's what we hope our future will be", he said.

Regarding his hope that the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina would be lifted, how realistic did he feel that hope was? He answered that last week the chances seemed poor; lately, they seemed to be a little better. but he was not convinced that he had support for the idea in the Security Council. "We need to wake up the world", he said. Those who thought that opening up concentration camps to inspection and delivering food to persons enduring shelling would solve the problem were mistaken. The problem was ethnic cleansing.

A correspondent then asked about recent press reports stating that United Nations officials were undecided as to how to proceed in the city of Bihac -- whether or not to evacuate non-Serbs to protect them from shelling or to leave them in place and thereby frustrate the ethnic cleansing campaign. Mr. Sacirbey said those questions should not have to be faced by anyone. The ethnic cleansing campaign had only offered those persons two choices -- to

(more)
leave or to be wiped out. There should be a third option, which was staying. Whatever means were necessary for those persons to stay -- including self-defence -- should be employed.

How did he feel about the United Nations having assisted in the evacuation of 10,000 persons to Croatia yesterday? He said that it seemed that even while that was going on, no one at the United Nations was asking "how do we stop ourselves from being tools of ethnic cleansing"? By dealing with the symptoms of the problem, the international community was assisting -- unwittingly, but effectively -- in a campaign of ethnic cleansing. "It's not an easy call", he said.

* *** *
FOR INFORMATION OF UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT ONLY
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7 August 1992

PRESS CONFERENCE BY BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Muhamed Sacirbey, Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations, this afternoon made available to correspondents three documents concerning the situation in his country. After noting highlights in the documents, Mr. Sacirbey went on to answer correspondents' questions.

The first document, he said, was a memorandum dated 8 July from "Sector North" of the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR), addressed to UNPROFOR Headquarters in Belgrade. The memorandum was also addressed to, among others, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Zagreb and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). It was based on information received from a group of people who reached Sector North from the town of Bosanski Novi in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 7 July, seeking protection and assistance to cross over to Zagreb or other foreign countries.

The information in the memorandum, "based solely on the statements of these persons who have asked for anonymity for security reasons", indicated that the Muslim population of Bosanski Novi continued to suffer persecution, deportation and intimidation at the hands of Serbian armed groups. All Muslims living in the town and neighbouring villages were ready to leave the area for Croatia or other destinations in Europe. It had previously been reported, the memorandum said, that hundreds of persons were being held in the stadium of Bosanski Novi and other places prior to being expelled to "unknown destinations".

All Muslims, the memorandum continued, were reportedly forced to sign papers indicating that they were leaving voluntarily, abandoning all personal property and undertaking never to return to their homes. Following compliance with those conditions, they were allowed to leave, generally in the direction of Croatian-controlled territories.

The memorandum went on to say that "a calculated strategy to 'cleanse' the area of Muslims" appeared to have intensified beginning in May. House burnings, deportations, summary executions, "shooting in the houses" were "part of the present situation". While "some Mayors and other Serbs" in the region had reportedly tried to help Muslims leave in safety, there were reports of "brutal torture" in the hotel in Bosanski Novi where the Military Police were headquartered.

Further, according to that memorandum, the persons interviewed believed that high-level politicians in the Serbian Democratic (SDS) party had given orders for actions against Muslims. Some of them mentioned a retaliation policy of one Muslim killed for each Serbian killed in the front line. They reported that 30 new detainees arrived in the Bosanski Novi stadium every (more)
day. When the stadium was full, guards removed some detainees and took them to unknown destinations. Some witnesses reported that in the first 15 days of May, some 200 persons removed from the stadium had been shot nearby.

The second document Ambassador Sacirbey made available to correspondents was a copy of his letter dated 7 August to Li Daoyu, President of the Security Council, forwarded to Mr. Dacyu along with the memorandum previously cited. In the letter Ambassador Sacirbey said he had not sent the document to the Secretariat "since I would consider it likely that they would have received it through channels". He also requested that the information in the memorandum be circulated as an official Security Council document.

The third document was another letter, dated 7 August from Mr. Sacirbey, to Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, requesting on behalf of his Government "the July 02, 1992 UNPROFOR report on concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina". The letter went on to say: "this report has been widely discussed in the media around the world, and if such a report does exist, my Government requests its immediate availability."

After reading out portions of the UNPROFOR memorandum of 8 July, the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina gave correspondents the floor. He was asked whether he believed that "a volume of information had been withheld" and whether the United Nations was involved in a "cover-up" of the existence of concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He referred his questioner back to yesterday's remarks by the representative of the New York Liaison Office for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Albert Alain Peters, indicating that certain documents had "in fact not been released". He himself still did not have access to all documents, and as he understood it, there was a more comprehensive memorandum "floating around". Mr. Peters had said it was sent to the ICRC, to various other United Nations agencies and to the European Community monitors. However, his Government still had not obtained a copy of that document, and neither had the Security Council.

Another correspondent, noting that the memorandum was dated 8 July, asked how did Ambassador Sacirbey feel about receiving a copy of it only today, a month later? "I feel betrayed", he answered. He had been asking the United Nations, "personally and as nicely as possible", to report all instances of deliberate Serbian blocking of relief convoys and similar violations of agreements. It was his understanding that the United Nations mandate in Bosnia and Herzegovina was based on the concept of the cooperation by all sides. He did not see how the United Nations continued to cooperate with a side involved in crimes against humanity, torture, murder, starvation and expulsion of civilian populations, nor why the Organization expected "such people" to cooperate in humanitarian activities.

Asked whether he believed that the United Nations had failed his country, he said "there are at least 50,000 people who think so". To a question about the letter addressed to the Secretary-General, he said that what he sought was the document that had been discussed in the media and that Mr. Peters had supposedly made available to the ICRC, the European Community and other bodies, but which neither the Security Council nor his own Government had seen.
Mr. Sacirbey was asked whether any particular group might benefit from having such information withheld. He answered that some people, including his own Government, believed that the war could be settled through negotiations and diplomatic channels. The question was, with whom should they negotiate? There were certain parties who believed they should "continue to negotiate with war criminals".

A correspondent referred back to Mr. Peters' remarks yesterday to the effect that the document was being withheld pending further checking. He asked whether Mr. Sacirbey believed that any Government had exerted pressure on the United Nations not to release the document in question. He replied that he was aware of at least two documents that seemed to suggest there was "something very vile" going on, which involved thousands of lives.

How long would checking the authenticity of that document take? he then said. He would have thought the response time would be shorter. On the other hand, he should not be surprised, for he, and the Security Council, had already asked the Secretariat for information regarding the opening of Tuzla airport. He had also been speaking for a month about the starving civilians of Gorazde, and had been asking the Secretariat about possible options for getting food and medicine into that town. Nor had a request from a member of the Security Council for an airdrop of desperately needed supplies to Gorazde been answered, he added.

Concerning what was going on in the concentration camps, he said, most of the murder had occurred outside those camps in the initial stages of the ethnic cleansing campaigns. That was where people had been most terrified and where the aggressor's intention had been to make the civilian population flee. He believed that the situation in Gorazde was in fact probably worse than in any concentration camp. He felt it was appropriate to speak of Gorazde, and to some extent Sarajevo, in terms of the Warsaw Ghetto of the Second World War. These were people "just like the Jewish resistance of 50 years ago" who were holding out against torture, murder and expulsion, and no one was coming to their help.

Another correspondent asked if Mr. Sacirbey had reason to believe that any Governments were reluctant to intervene militarily and were therefore putting pressure on the United Nations to suppress the information. He had no evidence for such an assertion, he said. But he noted that Mr. Peters had said he had passed along the comprehensive memo -- "which none of us has seen" -- to the European Community.

There were therefore at least some nations, some individuals, who knew what was going on, he said. He asked what "the various mediators" had known during the peace talks in London. Had it not been "a relevant part of those talks" to deal with and to stop what was being done on the ground by Karadzic's forces, he went on, and to bring those responsible to justice? But in the final analysis, there should be no talk with war criminals. "Ethnic cleansing" was not a diplomatic or a political problem but a human rights problem.

A correspondent referred to Western reluctance to become involved on the ground in the conflict. Mr. Sacirbey asked why -- given that reluctance -- (more)
the international community persisted in refusing to give his country the right to defend itself. Why was there still an arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina? Why, like the defenders of the Warsaw Ghetto, were his countrymen being not only not helped but deprived of the means to defend themselves. What they asked of the international community was not United States or European ground troops but the means to defend themselves against overwhelming odds, against sophisticated weapons.

Telling another correspondent that he had received no response to his request for information from the United Nations concerning human rights violations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, he acknowledged that the Organization had been reporting on "ethnic cleansing" activities virtually every day for the past month. But, he said, what was not being reported was the raw brutality of what was going on, the kind of brutality inseparable from the concepts of ethnic cleansing and concentration camps. He repeated that the situation under discussion was not a conflict between equally matched parties.

He was then pressed to say whether he expected the United Nations, when involved in a conflict of this kind, to provide his Government with detailed evidence on the activities of the other side. Should the Organization be expected to provide information on his own Government's activities to the other side? He said that unlike the "other side", his Government was the legal Government of the country, recognized by the United Nations, and had the right to know.

A correspondent then pointed out that the memorandum made available today was "unconfirmed" like all the other reports on the situation. Mr. Sacirbey answered that unconfirmed reports could be wild rumours but could also be undocumented yet sober assertions. Questioned about the possible existence of concentration camps on the Bosnia and Herzegovina side, he said that no such camps existed, and reiterated his Government's invitation to the ICRC or any other international body to visit at any time in order to confirm his claim. To a last question as to what he thought of the Secretary-General's assertion that the conflict in his country was a "rich man's war", he said anyone who had seen last night's CNN footage from his country would be under no illusions about "rich men's wars".

* *** *

3773B
Compte rendu de l'entretien du Secrétaire général avec le Représentant permanent adjoint de la France

Au Siège des Nations Unies, le 6 août 1992 à 13 h 00

Présents :

Le Secrétaire général M. de Soto
M. Warot

S.E. M. Jean-Marc Rochereau de la Sablière
Représentant permanent adjoint de la France auprès des Nations Unies
M. Pierre Ménat
Conseiller

Objet : Projet de résolution du Conseil de Sécurité sur la Bosnie-Herzégovine

L'Ambassadeur annonce que son Ministre, M. Roland Dumas, l'a chargé de recueillir les idées du Secrétaire général sur les moyens de faire parvenir une aide humanitaire aux villes assiégées de Bosnie-Herzégovine et d'assurer au Comité International de la Croix Rouge (CICR) un libre accès aux camps de détention dans ce pays.

La France envisage en effet de soumettre au Conseil de Sécurité un projet de résolution articulé en deux volets :

1) Le Secrétaire général désignerait un Représentant spécial sur place, qui aurait pour mission d'obtenir l'accord de toutes les parties, y compris les autorités de fait, pour le libre passage des convois humanitaires ainsi que l'accès du CICR aux camps.

2) Simultanément, le Conseil de Sécurité appuierait l'acheminement de secours vers les villes assiégées par des convois humanitaires accompagnés d'une escorte armée.
Dans l'esprit du Gouvernement français, cette initiative serait adoptée dans le cadre de l'opération actuelle de maintien de la paix, et son exécution serait subordonnée à l'accord des parties. Cependant, deux questions se posent : Qui aurait la responsabilité des convois ? Qui aurait la responsabilité de l'escorte armée ?

Toujours selon le Gouvernement français, la responsabilité des convois serait assumée par le HCR et celle de l'escorte armée par la FORPRONU. Le Gouvernement français a en effet une nette préférence pour un engagement accru de l'ONU et un élargissement du mandat de la FORPRONU.

Si toutefois, pour les raisons techniques et financières qu'il a déjà évoquées, le Secrétaire général considérerait comme impossible un élargissement du mandat de la FORPRONU, le Gouvernement français serait prêt à envisager avec ses partenaires une solution ad hoc selon laquelle les escortes armées seraient fournies par l'Union de l'Europe occidentale (UEO), sous une couverture aérienne assurée par les Américains.

Le Secrétaire général répond que le projet français soulève une première difficulté : ce matin même, le Représentant des États-Unis est venu l'informer que son Gouvernement préparait un projet de résolution envisageant un éventuel recours à la force pour assurer le libre passage de l'aide humanitaire. Il y a donc une contradiction fondamentale entre le projet français, qui prévoit d'obtenir l'accord préalable de toutes les parties, et le projet américain qui s'en dispense. L'Ambassadeur observe que le projet américain ressemble fort à une résolution 678 bis.

Le Secrétaire général signale que le scénario français n'envisage pas le cas d'une escorte armée à qui on interdirait l'entrée dans une ville assiégée. Dans ce cas, explique l'Ambassadeur, l'escorte armée pourra utiliser la force. Pour se défendre ou pour forcer le passage ? demande le Secrétaire général. L'Ambassadeur répond que les escortes armées prévues par le projet français feraient un usage défensif de leur force. Mais à supposer que cette escorte soit arrivée devant une ville assiégée et qu'on lui en interdise l'entrée, essaiera-t-elle de passer en force ? interroge à nouveau le Secrétaire général. L'Ambassadeur répond derechef que l'escorte ferait seulement un usage défensif de sa force. Le Secrétaire général demande encore si une escorte armée entrerait éventuellement de force dans une ville assiégée. L'Ambassadeur répond que, s'il interprète correctement ses autorités, l'escorte ne se forcerait pas un passage. Elle se contenterait de se défendre si elle était attaquée. Le convoi humanitaire n'aurait de toute façon pas besoin de se frayer un passage par la force, explique l'Ambassadeur, puisque le projet français s'inspire des opérations de maintien de la paix traditionnelles, avec accord de toutes les parties négocié par le Représentant spécial du
Secrétaire général. M. de Soto fait remarquer que les forces de maintien de la paix de l'ONU ont toujours eu le droit de se défendre. Dans le cas du projet français, la différence est-elle seulement que les escortes seraient mieux armées? L'Ambassadeur répond par l'affirmative.

Rappelant que le président Bush doit faire une déclaration sur la Bosnie-Herzégovine le soir même, le Secrétaire général craint de se trouver en présence de deux projets de résolution concurrents et contradictoires. L'Ambassadeur demande alors si le dispositif envisagé par ses autorités paraît "jouable et intéressant" au Secrétaire général. Plus que le projet américain, convient le Secrétaire général, mais le président Bush doit faire sa déclaration le soir même. Parlant en son nom personnel, l'Ambassadeur estime que les Français, les Américains et les Britanniques devraient "s'asseoir autour d'une table". M. de Soto ajoute que l'ONU devrait être invitée à cette table à cause de la FORPRONU. "Nous avons une approche différente de celle des Américains, même si l'objectif est le même, et il faudra bien qu'on en parle", observe l'Ambassadeur.

Comme il l'a dit le matin même au Représentant des États-Unis, le Secrétariat général préférerait qu'il soit fait appel à d'autres forces que celles de l'ONU. En effet, il est important de garder la FORPRONU comme position de repli en cas d'échec de l'autre opération. En ce qui concerne le dispositif imaginé par les Français, le Secrétariat général trouve qu'il n'est pas très différent de ce que l'ONU fait actuellement. M. Ménat en convient, mais fait remarquer qu'il y a une différence de degré, sinon de nature, entre les convois humanitaires auxquels l'ONU fournissait seulement des chauffeurs, et les convois accompagnés d'une escorte armée prévus par le projet français.

L'Ambassadeur signale que ses autorités voudraient mentionner le chapitre VII de la Charte dans leur projet de résolution parce que ce dernier implique une couverture aérienne. Le Secrétariat général tient à consulter ses collaborateurs avant de se prononcer sur cette question.

M. de Soto informe l'Ambassadeur que le général Mladic, chef des forces serbes de Bosnie-Herzégovine, a fait savoir à l'ONU qu'au cas où le Conseil de sécurité adopterait une résolution du genre de celle qu'envisagent les Américains, les Serbes considéreraient la FORPRONU comme une force hostile et n'hésiteraient pas à prendre des otages. L'Ambassadeur fait valoir le fait que le dispositif français prévoit la présence sur place d'un Représentant spécial du Secrétaire général pour obtenir l'accord des parties et que les convois seraient formés par le HCR.

Selon le Secrétaire général, à partir du moment où l'on fait intervenir une force aérienne, on passe à un degré supérieur, et
il y a intérêt à faire appel à une organisation européenne. M. de Soto souligne que le Secrétaire général a demandé aux Américains d'inclure dans leur projet de résolution une référence aux pays ou aux organisations qui seraient éventuellement chargés de faire respecter la résolution. L'Ambassadeur déplore que, "dans le texte américain, les Nations Unies deviennent "très lointaines", tandis que le projet français leur accorde une grande importance."

Le Secrétaire général, par contre, voit un net avantage à ce que les Nations Unies restent "lointaines": cela protège les missions humanitaires et la FORPRONU et permet d'espérer que les 12 000 hommes de cette dernière ne seront pas pris en otage. L'autre différence avec le projet américain, insiste l'Ambassadeur, c'est que le dispositif français prévoit de passer en douceur, avec l'accord des parties. "Mais si vous n'obtenez pas l'accord des parties, nous nous retrouverons dans la même situation qu'aujourd'hui, observe le Secrétaire général. Et si vous passez de la défensive à l'offensive, vous changez toute la situation."

"D'après ce que je comprends, reprend l'Ambassadeur, notre type de schéma aurait quand même davantage votre intérêt qu'une résolution 678 bis?"

"Oui, mais... répond le Secrétaire général. Quel que soit le schéma, américain ou français, ma priorité est de protéger le personnel de la FORPRONU dans sa mission de maintien de la paix."

L'Ambassadeur précise que le dispositif français permet d'imager qu'il y ait "coupure sur les plans financier et technique". Ce serait la deuxième fois en deux ans que les Nations Unies donneraient un blanc-seing pour conduire une opération. Le problème, souligne le Secrétaire général, c'est que les troupes des Nations Unies servent d'otages, ce qui empêche de passer à une opération relevant du chapitre VII de la Charte. A partir du moment où l'on se lance dans une telle opération, les 14 000 hommes de la FORPRONU deviennent les ennemis de l'une des parties, alors que leur position stratégique et leur armement ne les y préparent absolument pas.

Si l'élément militaire était confié à l'UEO ou à l'OTAN, est-ce que le même type de problème se poserait? s'enquiert l'Ambassadeur. M. de Soto rappelle que les Serbes de Bosnie ont fait savoir que toute opération bénéficiant de la caution du Conseil de sécurité les amènerait à considérer ipso facto la FORPRONU comme une force hostile.

Si l'opération se déroule dans la logique militaire que prévoit le projet américain, reprend l'Ambassadeur, le danger sera plus grand que si elle se déroule dans le cadre du projet français, fondé sur des négociations conduites par un
Le Secrétaire général lit à l'Ambassadeur une note d'information rédigée par M. Goulding : "Si le Conseil de Sécurité devait autoriser une intervention militaire contre les Serbes de Bosnie-Herzégovine, le danger serait considérable pour les éléments de la FORPRONU dans ce pays. Le général MacKenzie nous a informés que le général Mladic disait publiquement qu'il considérerait alors les membres de la FORPRONU comme des éléments hostiles. Le général MacKenzie estime que le général Mladic prendrait probablement des otages et que les conséquences probables d'éventuels sévices sur les otages n'auraient aucun effet dissuasif sur lui. Il est par conséquent essentiel que si le Conseil de Sécurité était saisi d'un projet d'intervention militaire, on donne suffisamment de temps à la FORPRONU pour se retirer de Bosnie-Herzégovine. Maintien de la paix et imposition de la paix ne sont pas compatibles."

L'Ambassadeur rappelle que le projet français est basé sur des négociations et sur l'accord des parties. "Mais si les Serbes veulent maintenir leur siège et refusent de négocier, où est la différence?" interroge le Secrétaire général.

L'Ambassadeur demande alors si le Secrétaire général ne croit pas que la présence d'une force aiderait son Représentant spécial à négocier le passage des convois humanitaires. Le Secrétaire général répond que le personnel de l'ONU sur place estime qu'il faudrait déployer plusieurs dizaines de milliers de militaires pour assurer le libre passage des convois humanitaires.

L'Ambassadeur, qui doit rendre compte du présent entretien à ses autorités, demande si le Secrétaire général pourrait soutenir la démarche de la France auprès du Conseil de sécurité. "Si vous obtenez une aide matérielle, nous revenons à un blanc-seing accordé à d'autres organisations, auquel cas c'est à l'OTAN que je préférerais donner ce blanc-seing", répond le Secrétaire général.

"Vous préféreriez cette solution à un système mixte comme le nôtre?" s'étonne l'Ambassadeur. Le Secrétaire général explique que le dispositif mixte envisagé par le Gouvernement français présente deux inconvénients : il crée une distorsion dans le système des Nations Unies en lui imposant un effort colossal en faveur de la Bosnie-Herzégovine, et il met en danger la FORPRONU. Par contre, si un blanc-seing était donné à l'OTAN, il ne resterait qu'un seul de ces deux inconvénients, à savoir le danger auquel serait exposée la FORPRONU. Si elle devait absolument choisir entre les deux formules française et américaine, l'ONU aurait donc intérêt à donner un blanc-seing à une organisation régionale ou à une coalition d'Etats.

L'Ambassadeur ayant répété que le projet français prévoit la présence d'un Représentant des Nations Unies pour négocier avec
les parties, M. de Soto lui fait remarquer que l'ONU mène déjà des négociations sur le terrain. A cet argument, le Secrétaire général ajoute une raison d'ordre pratique : il faudrait au moins une semaine pour trouver un Représentant spécial, une autre semaine pour le nommer, et ensuite deux mois pour qu'il se familiarise avec le pays et avec les parties. Tout cela prendrait beaucoup trop de temps. L'Ambassadeur proteste que si l'on renonce au dispositif français, on s'engage dans une logique de la force, ce à quoi le Secrétaire général oppose que "ce que vous proposez, nous le faisons déjà." L'Ambassadeur fait valoir qu'avec le projet français, ce serait fait "en plus musclé." Le Secrétaire général considère qu'une présence plus musclée risque de tourner mal, en plus de nuire à la crédibilité de l'ONU.

L'Ambassadeur croit savoir que ses autorités cherchent à éviter un blanc-seing, sur quoi le Secrétaire général observe que "nous cherchons tous à éviter un blanc-seing."

L'Ambassadeur souhaite aborder un dernier point relatif au contrôle des armements lourds en Bosnie-Herzégovine : le Gouvernement français a des doutes sur la capacité de la CSCE à organiser ce contrôle. M. de Soto l'informe qu'une lettre à ce sujet a déjà été envoyée par le Secrétaire général à la CSCE avec copie à l'OTAN et à l'UEO.

Le Secrétaire général déclare que l'important pour l'ONU, c'est d'obtenir des garanties qu'on va l'aider avant de commencer l'opération, pour éviter de se retrouver dans une situation où il faudra dix mois pour mettre une force sur pied.

L'Ambassadeur signale que la veille, au Conseil de Sécurité, un problème étonnant a surgi : "le Représentant de la Croatie est venu raconter à plusieurs membres du Conseil quelque chose de tout à fait différent de ce que contenait sa lettre sur l'extension du mandat de l'ONU au contrôle des frontières."

Revenant à la question bosniaque, le Secrétaire général constate que, quelle que soit la position qui sera prise, l'ONU aura de graves problèmes. Il se demande si l'on n'aurait pas intérêt à rester dans le cadre des efforts actuels et à maintenir le statu quo, "à moins que vous ne décidiez d'y mettre le paquet, ce qui serait très différent." Le Secrétaire général fait remarquer que l'ONU réussit à distribuer beaucoup de secours malgré toutes les difficultés. L'Ambassadeur déplore au contraire que ces secours soient limités à Sarajevo et n'arrivent ni à Goradze ni à Tuzla.

M. de Soto souligne qu'avec les images des camps de détention et les interventions de M. Clinton et de Mme Thatcher, l'opinion publique est en train de changer. Le Secrétaire général se demande si ces camps sont bien réels ou s'ils sont un effet de la guerre de propagande. En tout cas, conclut
l'Ambassadeur, il faut que le CICR puisse le vérifier. S'ils existaient, ce serait d'une gravité exceptionnelle.

Eric Warot
17 août 1992
Notes of the Secretary-General's meeting with the Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States

Held at United Nations Headquarters on 6 August 1992 at 10:15 a.m.

Present:

The Secretary-General
Mr. de Soto
Mr. Warot

H.E. Mr. Alexander F. Watson
Deputy Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations
Mr. Robert T. Grey, Jr.
Minister Counsellor

Subject: Bosnia and Herzegovina. Libya. Angola. Nagorno-Karabakh

US draft resolution on Bosnia and Herzegovina

The Ambassador was under instructions to apprise the Secretary-General of the President of the United States' intention to make a statement at the end of the day on Bosnia and Herzegovina. The United States was drafting a resolution urging the Security Council to take all necessary measures, without excluding military means, to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Sarajevo and other parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The draft resolution took off from where the leaders of the G7 countries had left on 7 July when they had pleaded for the safe passage of humanitarian road convoys to Sarajevo. The failure of the 17 July London agreement was putting pressure on the Security Council to consider other means to ensure the delivery of humanitarian aid, including to cities like Goradze and Tuzla, especially in view of the current ethnic cleansing and the massive refugee problem.
The US draft resolution, the Representative continued, called upon the United Nations and its Member States, in cooperation with Bosnia and Herzegovina, to take all necessary measures to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The US authorities, who were aware that this might put UNPROFOR at greater risk and that the United Nations' force might not be the appropriate instrument to carry out the resolution, were examining other possibilities. In the meantime, they hoped the Secretary-General would support their initiative.

The Secretary-General asked who would implement the resolution. The Ambassador said that his Government was flexible as to which body would. The Secretary-General suggested that it might be in everybody's interest to specify the responsible body in the text of the resolution. The Ambassador objected that Washington was not thinking of any kind of military intervention. The Secretary-General reiterated that the Security Council should let it be known that such or such State or organization would be asked to enforce the resolution, as it would both give credibility to the resolution and help UNPROFOR. The Ambassador said that the Secretary-General was right and stressed that his Government did not want to burden UNPROFOR.

Mr. de Soto explained that the Sarajevo airport operation was exclusively humanitarian. Therefore, it should be considered whether the combination of UNPROFOR and another operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina did not put UNPROFOR at risk, in which case UNPROFOR should be withdrawn from Bosnia and Herzegovina before the other operation began.

Answering a query from Mr. de Soto, the Ambassador said that, as presently written, the US draft resolution "called upon the Security Council, in cooperation with the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to take all necessary measures to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina."

The Secretary-General wondered how to maintain the credibility of UNPROFOR in the Sarajevo airport operation, while another operation which did not exclude military means was going on. Mr. de Soto noted that the draft resolution specified that the new operation would be carried out "in cooperation with the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina." The Ambassador recalled that during his discussion with Mr. de Soto the night before, he had stressed that the US Government did not wish to see the United Nations stop distributing humanitarian assistance and carrying out its other humanitarian activities. Mr. de Soto underlined the contradiction inherent in having simultaneously one operation based on the cooperation of all parties in the Sarajevo airport area and another operation calling for the cooperation of only one party. The Ambassador interjected that,
far from negating the first operation, his Government wanted to support it. The Secretary-General pointed out that "the moment you have enforcement, you have a contradiction between the two operations", and therefore the resolution should make a clear distinction in order to protect UNPROFOR. The operation of enforcement might fly the UN flag, but it had to be implemented by a regional organization, a State or a coalition of States like in the case of Iraq.

The Ambassador, who at that point was not speaking for his authorities, said that he did understand the Secretary-General. However, the United States Government had hoped that the mere passage of the resolution would have the desired effect. The Secretary-General called that effect "dissuasion" and remarked that the last few months had shown that dissuasion would not work in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It made it all the more necessary to prepare a fall-back position and to specify how the resolution would be implemented, should it fail to dissuade the parties to the conflict.

The Ambassador expected the same differences to arise within the Security Council about who should do what as there already were amongst Europeans on WEO versus NATO. The Secretary-General encouraged the US Government to draft its resolution in a way that would suit the United States' concerns as well as the United Nations'.

Libya

Broaching the subject of Libya, the Secretary-General announced that he had postponed Mr. Petrovsky's trip to Tripoli because he was hoping to be given the Three's list of demands within two or three days. The Ambassador said that he would be as frank with the Secretary-General as the Secretary-General had been with him. There was "a little bit of confusion" amongst the French, the British and the Americans, who were supposed to meet the next day. In preparation for that meeting, it would be very helpful if the Secretary-General could give his views to the Ambassador.

The Secretary-General was flexible. All he wanted to do was to carry out the Three's decisions. This being said, he recalled that the original plan was to have a first step whereby the Libyans would give as much information as possible to the British about their contacts with the IRA and to the French about the bombing of the UTA aircraft; a second step with the inspection of terrorist training camps in Libya; and a third step with the delivery of the two suspects of the Lockerbie bombing. The French and the British had been in favour of proceeding from step one to step two, but the United States had raised objections on the ground that it was too easy to destroy camps or hide them.
August 6, 1992

Secretary General Boutros Ghali
United Nations Headquarters
New York, NY 10017

Dear Mr. Secretary General,

I am writing to convey my deep distress about the current situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. In particular, an increasing number of reports indicate that the Serbian forces are conducting mass murders at concentration camps in Bosnia and Serbia. This, combined with the continued "ethnic cleansing", shelling of purely civilian targets, and sniper fire directed at women and children, has compelled me to urge the United Nations to take a more active role in ending these Nazi-like atrocities and bringing the civil war to a close.

Mr. Secretary General, clearly the time for talk has passed. Trade sanctions have had no impact on the ferocity of the Serbian onslaught. Diplomatic efforts by the United Nations have been valiant but, while the United Nations negotiated, the Serbs continued their murderous conquest. What began as a territorial dispute has developed into genocide. The United Nations cannot remain on the sidelines while tens of thousands of innocent civilians are massacred.

Therefore, I call upon the United Nations to utilize military force to guarantee the safety of all civilians in the Balkans, to bring an end to the genocide and to force the warring parties to stop the fighting.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Mavroules
Member of Congress

NM/kjc
cc: President George Bush
The Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina
PRESIDENCY

TO: Mr. Boutros Ghali
Secretary General of the UN

Embassies of: China
Japan
Russia
France
Greece

August 5, 1992

Dear Sir,

When thinking of writing to you I was in great trouble - how to, because of the objectivity, avoid my personal deep feelings of what I am going to say, because the official communication should not include personal emotions. But, it is hard to avoid it when describing human sufferings.

You are familiar with the problem, it deals with a terrifying phase of the planned extermination of our nation.

Our cities, just like yours, have been full of bouquets of beautiful girls, who are joy for their parents, love for young men, beauty in the streets, our hopes in schools and universities, and biological reproduction for the nation. It sounds horrible that selective crimes left us without that population category. Do not think I have lost my mind telling you we have lost them. About

Lun generations of most beautiful girls and women are half in-
sane, infected with AIDS, beaten up, raped, and driven to Muslim bordellos (houses of shame). They are our granddaughters, daughters, sisters, young mothers, our cousins, our cherished, our beloved, our hopes, our national reproduction.

The long cherished friendship, companionship, neighbourhoud, godfather relationships and family relationships between the nations were hiding two kinds of population attitudes. One of the Serbs who believed in everything that it looked like, and the other of Moslems who have been preparing for years to deny it. Registers of Serb girls for their future "purpose" were created by their Moslem teacher (such registers were found in Zvornik).

The infernal plan, according to which all male Serbs (all ages) were to be killed and girls to bear Muslims, is changed in its conception in a sense that it would be better that those poor girls, if they survive, bear sick Serbs, infected with AIDS (if they stay fertile after all the sufferings), and such half-insane Serb mothers would be quite desirable to raise future Serb generations.

Infernal, really.

Regardless of how the Moslem controlled territory is out of reach, even for the humanitarian organizations and the UNPROFOR, we inform you that we have come into possession of data that Burjellia with Serb girls forced to go there exist at the following locations in Sarajevo: Railway Station, Primary School "Petar Dokic", Sport Center "Skenderija", hotel "Zagreb", dormitory in Radiceva Street.
August 5, 1992

H.E. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Secretary-General
United Nations
New York, NY 27522

Your Excellency:

I have received the enclosed list and accompanying request from Sarajevo. The list contains the names and diagnosis of some of Sarajevo's most desperately ill and injured children who need treatment outside, in Italy, Denmark and Great Britain.

The request is simply to arrange for their flight out from Sarajevo airport. The UNPROFOR forces in Sarajevo have indicated that they need directions from Your Excellency in order to authorize the evacuation.

Italy, Denmark and Great Britain have indicated their willingness to accept these children for treatment. We ask the Secretariat to respond as quickly as possible in view of the urgent needs that these children have.

May I request your kind assistance in directing the cause of this most urgent action.

Excellency, let me take this opportunity to once again express my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Muhammed Sacirboy
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative
PRESS BRIEFING BY FORMER SARAJEVO SECTOR COMMANDER FOR UNPROFOR

At a press briefing this afternoon, Major-General Lewis MacKenzie, former Sarajevo Sector Commander for the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR), answered questions concerning the latest attacks on Sarajevo airport, the potential outcome of unilateral military intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the possibility of the "imposition of peace" on the region by the United Nations. General MacKenzie was on his way back to Canada to resume national service.

Before opening the floor to questions, Nadia Younes read out the following statement, attributable to a spokeswoman for the Secretary-General:

"The Secretary-General condemns today’s shelling of Sarajevo airport, which has obliged the United Nations to suspend humanitarian flights on three occasions during the day. These attacks on the airport, which appear to have been deliberate, have jeopardized the safety of both United Nations personnel and aircraft, as well as the security of humanitarian supplies. The Force Commander of the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR) has therefore recommended, in consultation with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), that United Nations operations at Sarajevo airport be suspended for a period of 72 hours, effective 1800 hours local time today. The Secretary-General has accepted this recommendation.

"During this period, the Deputy Force Commander of UNPROFOR, Major-General Philippe Morillon, will travel to Sarajevo to assess the situation and to seek from all parties a reaffirmation of their commitment to the 6 June agreement which made it possible to reopen the airport. In particular, he will endeavour to re-establish the cease-fire, which has been increasingly violated in recent days, and obtain serious commitments from the parties to adhere strictly to it in future. After 72 hours and in light of General Morillon’s report, a decision will be taken with regard to the future of the operation, in order to ensure that the United Nations can continue the safe and uninterrupted delivery of relief supplies to Sarajevo and its environs.

"In the meantime, the United Nations and its humanitarian agencies will continue to make every effort to deliver relief supplies by land to the strife-affected regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina". (Press release SG/SM/4788)

A correspondent asked whether the latest attack on Sarajevo airport put the human airlift operations in permanent jeopardy and whether General MacKenzie favoured a larger military operation in the field to ensure that humanitarian efforts were carried out. General MacKenzie replied that the shelling was not a new development. The airport was, in fact, located at the crossroads of Dobrinya, Butmja, Lukavica and Ildza, where territorial gains were being attempted by both sides. In the past five weeks, rounds had landed as close as 100 metres from the airport. Although the airport had not
been hit earlier, there had been the disturbing incident of five rounds landing in and around the UNHCR building and the French company. He did not interpret recent events as a deliberate escalation of the conflict, however, and hoped it was an anomaly.

General MacKenzie went on to say that the world did not realize the scope of the military operation that would be required to guarantee secure ground corridors for the delivery of humanitarian relief. Since the favoured weapon by both sides was artillery, a 40-kilometre-wide corridor would need to be cleared -- 20 kilometres on either side of a supply road. He added that too much attention was being focused on Sarajevo at the expense of other areas in the country which were much worse off. Sarajevo was faring quite well with the airlift. The corridors cleared by a larger operation should thus head towards those smaller towns and villages, not Sarajevo.

Asked if he supported opening Tuzla airport as an alternative to Sarajevo and what obstacles stood in the way of that action, General MacKenzie replied that "the obstacles in the way of that is there's a bloody war going on". He outlined the chronological four-step process that had been envisioned when UNPROFOR went into Sarajevo -- a cease-fire; a centralization of all weapons under UNPROFOR observation; the opening of secure corridors; and the opening of the airport. The Force had carried out the last step, yet both sides had failed to live up to their responsibility for the first three. Going into Tuzla without a cease-fire would result in the same problems as in Sarajevo.

A correspondent said there was an impression in the press that an air strike on the artillery in Bosnia by the United States or some other country would end the war. Did the General agree? "Pilots -- and I love them -- have a habit of going home and getting a good night's sleep after they do their job", General MacKenzie replied. A 24-hour air presence could not be maintained over the city. While there was a possibility that an air force could knock out the artillery in such a difficult terrain, he wondered whose artillery would be attacked.

The same correspondent replied that Serbian artillery would be the target. General MacKenzie cautioned that there were two sides involved in the conflict and both were using artillery. He went on to say that, contrary to popular perception, a massive amount of artillery was not being used to bombard Sarajevo; in fact, the amount of shelling had been relatively reduced. Of course, he said, it was despicable that civilians were the primary target. If a military strike were carried out against the artillery, United Nations peace-keeping forces would be viewed as being on the side of those doing the bombing and would inevitably be taken hostage since they did not have the capacity to defend themselves for more than a 48-hour period. If the aim was to sacrifice the peace-keeping forces, then a military action should be taken. The question presented an extremely difficult ethical problem.

A correspondent asked what ethical difficulty there was in siding with the sovereign Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was only defending itself. General MacKenzie replied that he had been in the country as a peace-keeper with "an absolute obsession with impartiality". The UNPROFOR was the "only game left in town" -- its mandate was restricted to Sarajevo -- and
if it began to condemn one side or another, it would lose its ability to function as a peace-keeping force. Impartiality was essential to maintain links with both sides. Political issues were left to the diplomats, political leaders, the Security Council and the European Community. He was simply a soldier doing a soldier's job of impartially mediating between the two sides since "everybody else has abandoned Sarajevo".

The same correspondent remarked that there was an impression abroad that the United Nations was selling Bosnia and Herzegovina down the river as it watched an independent country being carved up. General MacKenzie said he would leave that dilemma to be resolved by the international community. If it were asked who were the bad boys in the conflict, different answers would arise on different days.

A correspondent asked about the accuracy of a statement made by the Bosnian representative to the United Nations that Serbian military hardware outnumbered that of Bosnia by 100 to 1. General MacKenzie said that was confidential information. The UNPROFOR teams sitting on the Presidency weapons and the Serbian weapons were not even allowed to talk to each other for fear they would inadvertently discuss numbers. Recent evidence indicated that there were more Presidential weapons than Serbian weapons that had not been declared and placed under UNPROFOR observation. As a result of that balancing process, an equal number of weapons on both sides were not under observation. However, he reiterated, the amount of shelling in Sarajevo was relatively little compared to three months ago although "it's still bloody too much".

Asked if the Serbs were better armed than Bosnians, General MacKenzie said they absolutely were. Large amounts of mortars and artillery were concentrated in areas around Sarajevo and some positions had been shelled for up to four hours, and taken casualties and fatalities before they responded. None the less, there were elements on both sides making efforts to stop the fighting.

Had the Serbian artillery moved closer to the airport? a correspondent asked. "The beauty of mortar and artillery was that they are just as effective at maximum range as minimum range", General MacKenzie replied, and did not have to be moved. The airport had been taking fire on the runway and the parking area over the last three to four days, which indicated the strike was intentional.

Asked what he knew about the concentration camps in Bosnia, General MacKenzie said he could not pass judgement although he had received protests from both sides about such camps. Explaining that the UNPROFOR mandate only covered opening Sarajevo airport and delivering humanitarian relief, he said the Force had no responsibility outside the city.

Had there been death threats against him and which side had they come from? a correspondent asked. General MacKenzie said there had been threats, but he wasn't unique as threats had also been made against both Serbian and Presidency leaders and others in a position of authority in Sarajevo. When asked if the threats had prompted his departure, General MacKenzie said UNPROFOR was his ninth peace-keeping mission and he had never been driven away (more)
by death threats. However, he took some credit in being one of the first to receive death threats by fax.

Asked if he had intelligence information on what was going on in the concentration camps, General MacKenzie said he had none. National intelligence agencies and the diplomatic corps would know much more than the Force. Impartiality was crucial to the success of UNPROFOR and its mandate was simply to open the airport although everyone in Sarajevo had thought it had come to stop the war. It had been difficult to get across the message that ending the war was the responsibility of the two sides. Similarly, protests about the detention camps had been directed towards UNPROFOR, although it had no authority to take action, because it was the only organization flying an international flag.

To a question on whether it was feasible for the United Nations to fight for peace, General MacKenzie replied that peace-making was a political and diplomatic function, but the imposition of peace was a military action. The dilemma was when peace should be imposed. If the attempt was made before fighting broke out, it could justifiably be interpreted as interference in the internal affairs of a country. When UNPROFOR went into Sarajevo, the city was considered a relatively neutral location to headquarter the operations in Croatia. When war broke out, and the European Community and other organizations had left, the peace-keeping forces had to become peace-makers. It had been thought, however, that once the Force opened the airport and humanitarian relief was provided, the political process would begin and the atmosphere for a cease-fire would be established. However, things had not worked out that way.

What action was taken on complaints about concentration camps? a correspondent asked. Were they put into a drawer? General MacKenzie replied that he compared and analysed the complaints and determined camp locations. He then sent the information on to Force Commander Satish Nambiar, who presumably analysed it in the same way, though he had a greater number of sources to consult with. General Nambiar had most likely discussed his findings with Headquarters in New York.

A correspondent asked who was supplying arms in Bosnia. It had been reported in U.S. News & World Report that the Russian Federation, with the knowledge of President Yeltsin, was supplying the Serbs. General MacKenzie replied that he could not speculate on that. However, the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA), having pulled out of Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, had a tremendous concentration of its own weapons in Serbia. The former Yugoslavia had also been an arms supplier and there were still many factories in which Serbs, Muslims and Croats were working side by side to produce hardware. He asked which war there had been in which somebody did not make money.

When asked for a clarification of the UNPROFOR mandate in the context of a full-scale war, General MacKenzie said the Force had been authorized to implement the Sarajevo airport agreement. The two sides who had signed the agreement had committed themselves to: reaffirm the 1 June cease-fire; concentrate all their heavy weapons within range of the airport under UNPROFOR observation; assist in opening secure corridors; and to open the airport. The (more)
fourth step had been achieved. The UNPROFOR also had a mandate to mediate, he added. It had upset one particular side when UNPROFOR met with the other, looking upon it as collaboration. Each party wanted the Force to side only with it.

Asked to sum up what he had left behind, General MacKenzie said the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was deteriorating. It had been thought that opening the airport and delivering 210 tonnes of humanitarian aid daily to Sarajevo would improve the situation. However, both sides seemed to be moving further apart. The Presidency refused to talk to the Serbs in Bosnia -- whom they viewed as instigating a war of aggression -- and would only speak with Belgrade or the Yugoslav People’s Army. That was understandable from a political point of view. If the two sides would not even talk to each other, however, the problem could not be resolved unless one side won and the other lost, and a lot of innocent people were killed as was happening in Bosnia.

Asked how his departure from UNPROFOR came about, General MacKenzie said the Canadian battalion was returning to Croatia. Forces from France, Ukraine and Egypt were coming into Sarajevo and a sector commander would be chosen from among those nations. In the meantime, the deputy commanding officer, Colonel Davout, was acting as commander of the sector.

To several questions on his views on peace enforcement, General MacKenzie said that would be a phenomenal military undertaking. Looking back at the events of the Second World War, Germany, he said, had 37 divisions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and had not been able to keep the peace. There had been over a million casualties then. To put a force on the ground as in the Gulf war, an enormous, sophisticated infrastructure was needed and that did not exist in Bosnia. From a military and technical point of view, it would be an enormous challenge.

Moreover, he went on, there would be the problem of coping with the hate generated after the military forces left. Even if the leaders in Bosnia proposed a peace agreement, he was not sure the people were ready to accept it. "We’re talking about an intensity of hatred I have never run across before in my life", he said. He added that an attempt to implement the London Peace Accord would not be any easier because it too was predicated on a cease-fire.

With regard to the United Nations ability as a peace-keeper, he said the Organization had a good historical record, but it took a lot of time to establish observer missions. For instance, after five months of operations in Sarajevo, the Force was still awaiting some vehicles and communications apparatus. The problem of world-wide contracting was significant. It also took a lot of time to coordinate the efforts of a number of nations.

A correspondent commented that the French Chief of Staff had said that he could do in three days what it took the United Nations three months to do. General MacKenzie said any single military force could respond more quickly than the peace-keeping forces. But UNPROFOR involved 29 nations and thus had the moral authority that a single force could not have. The peace-keeping forces had the authority of being backed by the vast majority of nations.

(more)
To several questions asking whether the Secretary-General had been wrong in refusing to send peace-keeping forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina although they had been requested, General MacKenzie said it was an anomaly to send forces into a sovereign nation before fighting began. The problem was extremely complex. Could UNPROFOR have stopped the war in Bosnia if it had been dispatched earlier? a correspondent asked. General MacKenzie said he was talking about a force of a couple of thousand people in a country with a terrain like the Adirondacks, facing 3 to 4 million people, most of whom were armed. The United Nations had already sent 14,000 troops into Croatia. Where would the funding for troops for Bosnia have come from? It was important to address the question from a practical point of view. He hoped peace-keeping was a growth industry.

 Asked if he believed there was no way to impose peace short of a diplomatic agreement, General MacKenzie said he had not said that. A military operation, however, was monumentally difficult, complex and expensive. And once the forces had left, he wondered how the hate generated among the people would be resolved. After all, no one was going to put an occupation force into Bosnia and Herzegovina for the next 20 years.

* *** *
General Satish Nambiar  
Force Commander of UNPROFOR  
ZAGREB

Dear General,

The Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina is strongly protesting against a heavy rocket attack the Yugoslav Army Airforce has carried out today on Rogoj and Trnovo, places near Sarajevo. A large number of refugees from Goražde, Nevesinje, Gacko, and other towns in Eastern Bosnia, that were gathered in Rogoj and Trnovo, were the target of this attack. Rogoj and Trnovo are under control of the Bosnian Armed Forces.

We expect this attack will be condemned by UNPROFOR, and that the UN Security Council will be informed about the escalating aggression of the Yugoslav Army against the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

For the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina  
HAJRUDIN SOMUN  
State Adviser

CC: UN Security Council  

The Office of the UN Secretary General  

PHONE: 38 71 61 03 40; 66 49 41; 66 48 97; fax 66 49 42
Your Excellency,

We have to inform you that despite all our peace-making efforts Moslem side started an overall offensive in Sarajevo, central and northern parts of Bosnia.

As you know, Serbian side was the one that initiated all cease-fires so far, was prepared to discuss the constitutional rearrangement, put its artillery around Sarajevo under UNPROFOR control and sent the required list of its heavy weaponry. Unfortunately, Moslem side boycotted all these actions.

On top of that, the Moslem-Croat coalition declared war to Bosnian Serbs and on July 22 signed a military pact. Unless the international community exercises its influence, especially through the UNPROFOR reports from Sarajevo, the war will escalate in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbian side will be forced to take all necessary defensive measures.
SERBIAN REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

PRESIDENCY

TO: UNPROFOR

Deputy of General Mackenzie

Dear Sir,

As you know Moslem forces launched an offensive two days ago. Moslem artillery in Sarajevo was constantly active all the time.

We expect that in your current reports you will testify that Serbian side never opened the fire first and in all cases informed you when it had to respond for defensive purposes.

We are sure that your current reports can help that war should not escalate in Bosnia. As you know, Serbian side gave all peace initiatives. However, during the last cease-fire, signed in London on July, 19, Moslem forces occupied the town of Trnovo and attacked in other parts of central and eastern of Bosnia.

President of Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Secretary General,

Since the time of our last meeting on March 3, the enormity of the responsibilities that have been thrust upon you only magnifies the skill and courage with which you have approached your awesome tasks.

As you can imagine, our organization too has been buffeted by the various tragic developments which have appeared on the international scene. The situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina — a problem with which you have been formally seized now for months — is one such development.

You were kind enough during our meeting to offer your assistance to us whenever it were possible. I therefore take the liberty of attaching material relating to a humanitarian project we hope will come to realization within a short time.

Yesterday, July 29, Vice-President of the World Jewish Congress, Judge Israel Finescei of London, President of our national affiliate, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, entered into an agreement with the relevant parties from Sarajevo, relating to the free and safe exit from that city of members of the Jewish community.

Three separate bilateral agreements of an identical text were signed with Mr. Haris Silajdjić — Minister of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia for the Moslem side, Mr. Radovan Karadjić — President of Serbian Republic of Bosnia for the Serbian side, and Mr. Mate Boban — leader of Herzeg-Bosna for the Croat side. The text is attached.

As we are now proceeding to make the concrete arrangements for the realization of this planned evacuation, we wanted to bring it to your attention, in the hope that we may through your good
AGREEMENT

BETWEEN

THE BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

AND

THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF BOSNIA

1. In recognition of the humanitarian needs of the Jewish community which at present remains within the city of Sarajevo,

The Board of Deputies of British Jews

has this day reached an agreement with

The Foreign Minister of Bosnia

whereby permission is given to enable those members of the Jewish community living in Sarajevo who wish to leave the city to do so without any fear of harm, attack or any other adverse consequence.

IT IS AGREED that members of the Jewish community living in Sarajevo should be free to make arrangements to leave Sarajevo in groups including members of their extended families and close friends (who would not necessarily be Jewish). These people would be free to leave Sarajevo in one or more convoys. The precise arrangements for their departure would be made between representatives of the Jewish community in Sarajevo, the authorities having control over the territories through which they will pass, and if possible United Nations observers.

IT IS AGREED that on the day or days of their departure from Sarajevo, a ceasefire would remain in force. It is intended that the date of departure for the first convoy should be 5 August 1992 or such other date as may be designated by the Jewish community in Sarajevo; any subsequent convoy would leave Sarajevo 14 days after the first convoy.
H.E. Boutros Boutros-Ghali


offices receive whatever assistance might be necessary from the relevant
U.N. personnel and forces. As more details are available, I will, with your
kind permission, seek to have further contact with you and/or your staff on
this matter.

In thanking you for whatever assistance you can render in this matter,
may I also repeat what I had previously told you — that is, the World
Jewish Congress stands ready to render whatever services it can perform on
your behalf in support of the universal principles of the United Nations to
which we have long dedicated ourselves.

With deepest appreciation,

Sincerely yours,

Edgar M. Bronfman
President
IT IS AGREED that the convoys would be assured of a free and safe passage through and from Sarajevo and the surrounding territory. The Foreign Minister of Bosnia will issue orders to ensure that this right of safe conduct is fully respected by all troops for whom they have responsibility. The convoy will be guaranteed safe passage across the checkpoint at the agreed exits of Sarajevo.

IT IS AGREED that the members of the Jewish community after leaving Sarajevo will be accommodated, fed and supported by international Jewish organisations.

IT IS AGREED that protection will be sought from United Nations observers, who will be requested to accompany the convoy for a distance of ten miles beyond the checkpoint at the agreed exits from Sarajevo.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED that members of the Jewish community who leave Sarajevo in this way will have the right to return and reclaim their properties. Their homes will be sealed and protected from invasion.


On behalf of THE BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

[Signature]

On behalf of THE FOREIGN MINISTER OF BOSNIA

[Signature]
TO: Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky
Under-Secretary-General
for Political Affairs

THROUGH:

FROM: Carl-August Fleischhauer
Under-Secretary-General
for Legal Affairs
The Legal Counsel

DATE: 7 August 1992

SUBJECT: Request for Circulation of documents by Bosnia and Herzegovina

1. Reference is made to your note of 6 August 1992 seeking guidance from this Office on a request by the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina that certain documents including a restricted Secretariat memorandum be circulated as official documents of the Security Council.

2. In principle our opinion is that requests from member States that documents be circulated should not be subject to approval or disapproval by the Secretariat. However, as the Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina himself has asked that the authenticity of the restricted Secretariat memorandum be verified, his request implies that circulation should not occur until the authenticity of the memorandum has been verified.

3. The Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina should therefore be informed of the above-stated understanding of his request and that meanwhile authentication of the restricted memorandum is being established by the Secretariat.

7 August 92

Copies sent to - Mr. Feissel - for action
Mr. de Soto - for info.
Ms. Chan - for info.
August 07, 1992

H.E. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali  
Secretary-General  
United Nations  
New York, New York  

Your Excellency:  

I would like to request from your good offices, on behalf of my Government, the July 02, 1992 UNPROFOR report on concentration camps in Bosnia and Herzegovina.  

This report has been widely discussed in the media around the world, and if such a report does exist, my Government requests its immediate availability.  

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.  

Sincerely,  

Muhamed Sacirbey  
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
6 August 1992

Mr. Fleischhauer,

The secretariat servicing the Security Council has brought to my attention a letter to the President of the Security Council from Ambassador Sacirbey, Permanent Representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the United Nations (attached), as well as a restricted internal secretariat memorandum (also attached), not obtained through regular secretariat channels, on humanitarian aid in Yugoslavia. Ambassador Sacirbey's letter requests the secretariat to verify the authenticity of the memorandum as well as to circulate the Secretariat memorandum as an official document of the Security Council. Mr. Petrovsky has asked me to seek your guidance as to what advice we should give the President of the Security Council.

Mitch Werner

In your absence, el close
to pursue this course of action.

Mitch
August 05, 1992

H.E. Mr. LI Daoyu
President, Security Council
United Nations
VIA FAX 963.7878

Your Excellency,

In response to the statement the President of the Security Council issued August 4th, 1992 and of the request for further information regarding concentration camps and ethnic cleansing, I submit the following information for review.

I have not forwarded this document to the Secretariat for their review since I would consider it likely that they would have received it through channels. Nonetheless, I would request that the Secretariat verify the authenticity of this document.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the attached information as official documents of the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Muhammed Sacirbey
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
August 05, 1992

H.E. Mr. LI Daoyu
President, Security Council
United Nations
VIA FAX 963.7878

Your Excellency,

In response to the statement the President of the Security Council issued August 4th, 1992 and of the request for further information regarding concentration camps and ethnic cleansing, I submit the following information for review.

May I ask for your kind assistance in circulating the attached information as official documents of the Security Council.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

Sincerely,

Muhamed Sacirbey
Ambassador and Permanent Representative
MEMORANDUM

RESTRICTED

Subject:  Humanitarian Aid

I refer to your subject memo of 1 July 1992.

The football field in Bosanski Novi (BH) is clearly visible from the town of Dvor in the UNPROFOR. Further to our many previous reports on this, let me clarify that our sense of frustration is not, as stated in Mr. Magnusson's subject memo to the FC, our "inability to investigate this matter". I believe you have received a stream of reports not only of Bosanski Novi, but also for other flash points along the border with BH (Bihac, Cazin, Velika Kladusa and Bosanski Dubica). In those reports, we highlighted the following points.

We believe the football field detainees are only a tip of the iceberg involving the concerted action of local Serbian authorities in BH trying to establish a Serbian Republic of BH, free or Muslims. In that process, the Mavroc, the Milicijia and TDF of Bosanski Novi, acting in unison with their counterparts, not only in the UNPROFOR (Dvor and Kostanjica), but also with Bosanski Dubica, Banja Luka, Prijedor, Banja Most and Kljuc. The Serbs appear to be engaged in a determined process of forcibly disarming Muslims where they are clearly a small encircled minority, such as in Bosanski Novi, or besieging their city totally, such as in Bihac. Apparently the football field is the holding ground where Muslim groups are detained while their houses are being "searched", the men isolated and transported to concentration camps.

The UNHCR representative and Civil Affairs have pieced together reports from Muslims who recently have taken refuge under UNPROFOR protection in Dvor and Kostanjica. There are reported concentration camps at the following locations:

- KERATERH: Located at a railroad station in Prijedor en route to Banja Luka. 100-200 Muslims believed to be here under extremely bad conditions.

- TEROPOLJE: Also located at a railroad station in Prijedor, direction Banja Luka. A refugee camp for women, children and old men.
OMARSKA: Located in a purely Serbian village. Reportedly a camp for Muslim men and local Muslim authorities prior to Serbian take-over of control, particularly in Prijedor.

MANJACA: Outside Banja Luka. A large camp reportedly including Croatian soldiers taken prisoner in the fighting in Kastanioca.

The treatment of Muslims and other minorities in the camp is reportedly atrocious, with regular beatings, deprivation of food and water, poor shelter, etc.

Today in a meeting with the ICRC and UNHCR, the above subject of humanitarian aid was discussed. The ICRC informed us that they will be deployed in BH and took the information we had on the subject. They also informed us that the ICRC will deploy a delegate or two, specifically in Sector North, to be located either in Vojnic or Glin. This in our view is a very positive step which we had recommended to the ICRC as a matter of urgency.

Our frustration arises from our inability to do anything other than write reports and stand by since UNPROFOR has no operational responsibilities across the border. In recent days, the situation has deteriorated and has now began to spill over to the UNPA. We have seen a mounting number of desperate people who have crossed over to seek refuge and protection from UNPROFOR. Yesterday, one Mustafa Ogorinosi swam across river Una at 5 in the morning from a camp in Bosanski Dubica. He is now under UNPROFOR protection along with two other persons. He shows signs of physical abuse and punishment.

In a separate communication (CIV\AFF\06\96, dated 30 June 1992) I appealed to the Special Envoy of the UNCA for one temporary measure to help to cope with the situation while waiting for the ICRC and UNHCR to resume their operations in BH. We have requested a minibus with driver to help in transporting the escapees to safety since UN vehicles are not to be used for humanitarian purposes. Any assistance you can lend on the acquisition of the 16-20 seater minibus and driver is most appreciated.

Regards,

TO: Mr. Y. Auger, DOCA (BELGRADE)
CC: Mr. M. Magnussen, SAGREB
BH PRESS
Novinska Agencija Bosne i Hercegovine
News Agency of Bosnia and Herzegovina

news item no 4

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina have published a list of the detention camps existing on the territory of the Republic at present, under the occupation of the aggressor. There exists reliable information that such camps also exist in Serbia and Montenegro.

The aggressors, in pursuit of their planned "ethnic cleansing", have packed into these camps the entire non-Serbian population of given areas. We calculate that some 130,000 citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina are at present concentrated in 96 such camps.

The world community is shocked by these figures. Sadly, at the same time, there exists a tendency in certain publications and in certain circles to claim that such camps also exist on "the other side". Our side.

The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina categorically state that on the territories under the control of its legal authority, no such camps exist. On the contrary, this Government has for a long time now been inviting humanitarian organisations, as well as other international bodies, and in particular the International Red Cross and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, to come here and verify for themselves this stated fact. The Presidency and the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina now renew this invitation, from the motive of demonstrating, as clearly as they can, the sufferings of these incarcerated people, and of having them set free as soon as possible.

Sarajevo, 1. August 1992

Information Service
Presidency, Republic of
Bosnia and Herzegovina