

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Greenpeace suffers legal setbacks

by Emmanuel Grenier

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

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

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

Besieux, no longer a first offender since he roughed up an elderly person, was just convicted by the Hasselt Court of Corrections to three months in prison with a suspended sentence and fined 18,000 Belgian francs. He was prosecuted as co-defendant on charges of "violation and destruction of property" (the Belgian equivalent of breaking and entering) committed by Greenpeace militants at the Tessenderlo Chemical Factory in June 1992. He has also been sentenced to pay 525,000 francs in damages to the company. Above all, he is barred by law for three years from acting as spokesman. Besieux headed the anti-chlorine campaign in Belgium.

### **A vigorous reaction**

These judgments come down in the midst of other troubles. Last May, Greenpeace U.K. was forced to pay 240,000 francs to the ICI group after having alleged, without any proof at all, that their Wilton and Hillhouse production sites were the biggest polluters of the North Sea. Also in Great Britain, the Advertising Standard Authority penalized a Greenpeace advertisement, appearing in the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Independent*, on the grounds that it was "false, inappropriate, and in bad taste." The ad showed child with hydrocephalus—a congenital disorder that produces a severe swelling of the head—with the caption: "Victim of nuclear testing in Kazakhstan." The ad's text declared that "2,000 people are going to die in the next ten years from Sellafield's radioactive nuclear waste center" and claimed the nuclear industry "intends to spread radiation and the means of mass destruction all over the earth."

In France, Greenpeace beat a severe retreat on two fronts. In Marseille, 11 of its activists spent 36 hours in police custody, after having been caught red-handed in "aggravated theft." Wishing to protest against the production of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) by Atochem, they heisted 38 bottles containing these products from the warehouse of Dehon-Galex, a distributing company. Their plan was to ship the bottles back to the production site of Elf Atochem at Pierre Bénite in the Rhone. But the management of Dehon reacted immediately, alerting the police and providing descriptions of the Greenpeaceniks. Police commissioner Alain Gehin reacted quickly and firmly, and set up a systematic search which resulted in the interception of the two vans, the recovery of the goods, and the apprehension of the 11 activists. Three Frenchmen, four Spaniards, one German, one Portuguese, and one Turk were released after being interrogated by Judge Lucie Chapus-Bérard about the theft. They could receive from three months to three years in prison and up to 200,000 francs in fines. As part of the same investigation, town police searched Greenpeace's boat *Rainbow Warrior II*, moored at Port St. Louis on the Rhône, near Marseille, where it was running an anti-PVC and anti-dioxide campaign. The police search came up "negative," as no weapons were found on board.

Certain French authorities want to make it known to

Greenpeace that environmentalist "legitimacy" does not place them above the law. These events are not unrelated to the global campaign against Greenpeace carried out by the friends of Lyndon LaRouche, which is supported by the film "The Rainbow Man" by Icelandic producer Magnus Gudmunsson. This film, produced out of TV-2 Denmark and broadcast on television throughout Scandinavia, exposes certain practices of the movement (like the use of false documents, and collaboration with the terrorist group Earth First!). It has created a shock effect: Greenpeace has lost 50% of its members in Denmark and more than a third in Sweden. In Germany, distributor Böttiger Verlag is working to circulate the film, in the face of a green fascism which has penetrated high into the power structure.

In France, Editions Alcuin, which publishes *Nouvelle Solidarité* newspaper, *Fusion* magazine, and the journal *Industrie et Environnement*, has been at the forefront of the fight to circulate the film and the information that it carries. Greenpeace has sued the publisher four times in six months. In numerous articles, widely circulated in the industrial and scientific communities, these publications associated with Lyndon LaRouche have vigorously denounced the methods of Greenpeace. In their court papers, Greenpeace spoke of "an evil defamation campaign by Emmanuel Grenier and Editions Alcuin which it is urgent to stop."

### **Greenpeace backs down**

After having won the first trial in July, *Industrie et Environnement* has just won the second and the third, after a huge retreat by Greenpeace. The organization had attacked the newsletter for libel and requested and obtained a trial date from a judge. This accelerated procedure is generally chosen when one has a solid case and is sure to win. On Oct. 5, there was a big surprise when Greenpeace's lawyer asked the court for a postponement. The judge retorted that it was the lawyer himself who had chosen the speedy trial procedure, and refused to delay it, putting before the lawyer a choice: an immediate trial, knowing that the ruling against Greenpeace will be severe; or to ask to drop the two cases. Confused and sheepish, the lawyer chose the second option. Whereas the group had stated in its July suit that it is "urgent that their honor be made good," in October they refused to go to trial and sneaked off with their tail between their legs. In one of the cases, the trial deadline not having passed yet, Greenpeace could have restarted the procedure and sought a new court date—but chose not to.

These three legal victories did not go to the heart of the debate, which concerns the precise charges carried by *Industrie et Environnement*, but they are very significant in that it is the first time in its history that Greenpeace has sued a press organ for defamation. One trial is still on the agenda: *Fusion* magazine was sued by Greenpeace for defamation for an article titled "The Lies of Greenpeace," which appeared in the May-June 1994 issue.