

eigners have exclusive rule over this country, and I believe this isn't good for this country or its citizens," said Spiric. He added, "If the international community always supports the High Representative and not the institutions of Bosnia-Herzegovina, then it doesn't matter if I am the head of that state, or Bart Simpson." Currently, Bosnia has no elected PM—not Spiric, Bart Simpson, or anybody else.

Laják's meddling with the tripartite system and his attempt to sideline elected leaders are only the latest intervention into Bosnian politics by the strongman that is the High Representative. This colonial figure has quite extraordinary powers. In 2003, a European think tank called the European Stability Initiative described Bosnia as "the European Raj." It argued that "in Sarajevo in the early twenty-first century, as in Calcutta in the nineteenth, foreigners play the part of 'benevolent despots.'" The ESI condemned the "unlimited authority of an international mission to overrule all of the democratic institutions of [Bosnia], a sovereign member of the United Nations."

How far does the High Representative's authority extend? Well, the Office of the High Representative can dismiss elected presidents, prime ministers, judges, and mayors without submitting to review by any independent appeals body. In 1999, the third High Representative, Wolfgang Petritsch, dismissed the elected Serbian mayor, Mile Marceta. According to ESI, Marceta, an eminent non-nationalist leader of a displaced Serbs' movement, was thrown out of office because his championing of Serbs' right to return to land from which they had been expelled during the civil war irked "international field officers, who resented [his] visibility and his impatience with their mission's lack of progress toward securing the right of return." The Office of the High

A Lebanese woman, who became a U.S. citizen through a sham marriage and obtained security clearances that led to sensitive jobs with both the FBI and CIA, will likely be deported to Lebanon,

where it is probable an attempt will be made to kill her because of her CIA affiliation. Nada Nadim Prouty, who resigned her position after it was revealed that she fraudulently became an American citizen, was not a spy for Hezbollah as some poorly informed media commentary has been claiming. She was recruited into the CIA as an operations officer because of her fluent Arabic and worked in the Baghdad CIA station on terrorist targets, where she was highly praised for her efforts. She first provoked interest in 2005 by breaking internal regulations by searching FBI databases for derogatory information on her new brother-in-law, whom she distrusted and who had attended a Hezbollah conference in Beirut. The CIA position required extensive background checks as well as a second polygraph exam that apparently did not address her sham marriage. According to a senior CIA official, there are no counterintelligence concerns about her CIA employment and no evidence that she was working for or passed on information to Hezbollah. Aside from breaking internal FBI regulations, the only charge against her, to which she pleaded guilty, was obtaining her citizenship fraudulently, but she faces possible jail time before being forced to leave the country.



There has been a tendency when drafting counterterrorism legislation to enable criminalization of thoughts and intents in addition to penalizing substantive plans.

A 23-year-old of Asian descent who called herself the "Lyrical Terrorist" has just become the first woman convicted under the draconian terms of Britain's new Terrorism Act. On Nov. 9, Samina Malik was found guilty at the Old Bailey. The jury was told that she had written extremist poems praising Osama bin Laden, supporting martyrdom, and discussing beheading. Malik, who worked in a bookstore and has denied all the charges, had earlier been found not guilty of the more serious charge of possessing an article for a terrorist purpose. She has said the poems she posted on websites were "meaningless" and claims to have only called herself the Lyrical Terrorist "because it sounded cool." But the police reported they had found a "library" of extreme Islamist literature in her bedroom, including *The Al-Qaeda Manual* and *The Mujahedeen Poisons Handbook*. The court also heard that she had written, "The desire within me increases every day to go for martyrdom" on the back of a cash-register receipt. She was convicted of having articles "likely to be useful to a person committing or preparing an act of terrorism." Now similar legislation is pending in the U.S. Congress. The Violent Radicalization and Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Act passed the House by a 405 to 6 vote and is awaiting approval by the Senate Homeland Security Committee, headed by Sen. Joe Lieberman. The act defines "homegrown terrorism" as "planning" or "threatening" to use force to promote a political objective and "violent radicalization" as the promotion of an "extremist belief system."

Philip Giraldi, a former CIA Officer, is a partner in Cannistraro Associates, an international security consultancy.

Representative can veto candidates for ministerial positions without giving reasons for its actions. It can also impose legislation and create new institutions without estimating the cost to Bosnian taxpayers. And as Laják's recent actions showed, it can make changes to Bosnia's constitution without taking into account the views of elected officials.

When the Office of the High Representative was first set up after the civil war, it had very few formal powers. But in 1997, it slowly but surely started to intervene in Bosnia's internal political processes. In May of that year, the OHR purged the entire management board of the Bosnian Serb television broadcaster, after judging its programming to be inflammatory, and sent troops to occupy the broadcaster's offices and transmitters. Following this intervention by the OHR into the media life of postwar Bosnia, the Peace Implementation Council decided to grant it sweeping new powers so that it could continue keeping a check on Bosnia's naughty politicians, mayors, and media workers. This is when the OHR began to scale "the commanding heights of what amounts to a system of 'indirect rule,'" according to the ESI.

The OHR's powers came to be known as the "Bonn powers," and they were used extensively by High Representatives from the late 1990s onward. From 1997 to 1999, then High Representative Carlos Westendorp dispatched an average of four "impositions" every month; Paddy Ashdown, the failed British politician who was appointed High Representative from 2002 to 2006, issued around 14 "impositions" a month. These ranged from dismissing elected officials to intervening in the work of the police to chastising media outlets for transmitting allegedly nationalistic or inflammatory material. Between 1997 and today, the OHR has

become, in Nikola Spiric's words, a bunch of "foreigners" who exercise "exclusive rule" over Bosnia.

The ESI points out that there is a glaring contradiction between the Dayton agreement's professed aim of "democratizing" Bosnia and the reality of a High Representative who has become increasingly interventionist in everyday politics: "The vague and general criteria [of the Bonn powers] lead inexorably toward the open-endedness of the Utilitarians' civilising imperialism, which is ultimately incompatible with the objective of democratisation." Currently, Bosnia is dominated by this new breed of "civilising imperialism," where Raj-style rulers picked and imposed by the Peace Implementation Council have the power to call the shots in virtually every area of political life.

In some ways, this is worse than the situation in a place like Pakistan. At least the Pakistanis have the promise of meaningful democracy to look forward to, hopefully sooner rather than later. The people of Bosnia-Herzegovina have been "granted" democracy, but it is shallow and meaningless as long as their decisions can be overridden by the whims of appointed foreign rulers.

The response of the current High Representative to the protests against his recent actions is striking. He says that Prime Minister Spiric's concern with preserving consensus and representational legitimacy is "over-emotional, irresponsible and insufficiently rational." This is clearly how the OHR, which sees itself as being above the messy business of electoral politics, views democracy: as a kind of childish emotional outburst that must be controlled by the better parenting instincts of cool and collected outsiders. Perhaps Laják sees himself as the Homer Simpson to Spiric's Bart, occasionally having to strangle the troublesome

child elected by the Bosnian people in order to keep him in his place.

So why is there so little international outcry about the stunning powers of the High Representative and the way he impedes the democratic will? Liberals have long supported Western intervention in Bosnia. During the civil war, they demanded Western military action to crush the Serbs and defend the Bosnian Muslims. And they got what they asked for in NATO's bombing of the Serbs in 1994 and 1995 and America's arming and training of the Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims and its cajoling of these forces to continue fighting against the Serbs long after all sides were war weary and desperate for a settlement. Indeed, liberal commentators did a great deal to depict the people of Bosnia as "overemotional" and "irrational": they embraced the Bosnian Muslims as eternal victims who needed Western patronage and protection, and they wrote off the Bosnian Serbs as savages who should be punished.

Not surprisingly, the protectorate of Bosnia, overseen by an internationally appointed colonial master, is still built on such prejudices; every now and then the democratic wishes of the overemotional and irrational populace are overridden—for Bosnians' own good, of course.

Some argue the High Representative is a necessary evil, who keeps apart Bosnia's potentially warring factions. In truth, it is elected Serbs and others who want to preserve the postwar consensual set-up while the High Representative rips it to shreds in order to "streamline" his bureaucracy. It's time to face the reality: the biggest threat to peace in Bosnia is the increasingly arrogant and reckless foreign meddling in its internal affairs. ■

Brendan O'Neill is editor of spiked (www.spiked-online.com).

To Strike A Nation

“There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time,” Governor Coolidge telegraphed AFL President Sam Gompers during the

Boston police strike of 1919. The telegram elicited thunderous approval from Middle America and won Coolidge the nomination for vice president on the 1920 ticket of Warren Harding. Three years later, “Silent Cal” was president.

Even before 1919, America had endured dangerous strikes. When steelworkers at the Carnegie plant at Homestead on the Mon River protested a cut in wages, Henry Clay Frick closed the plant. Workers struck. Barges loaded with Pinkertons came up river from Pittsburgh. A battle ensued. Ten workers and three detectives died.

Sympathy for the strikers vanished when the young anarchist, Alexander Berkman, a lover of Emma Goldman, lied his way into Frick’s office and tried to assassinate him.

Frick transferred production to other plants and broke the union. From Skibo Castle in Scotland came a wire from Andrew Carnegie: “Life worth living again! Congratulate all around.”

A year after Homestead came the Panic of '93 and the falling prices that depression produced. In 1894, Pullman car workers went on strike to protest wage cuts of 25 to 40 percent. Railway workers across America, rallied by Eugene V. Debs, were urged to strike in sympathy.

Atty. Gen. Richard Olney sent troops and 3,600 deputy marshals to Chicago and enjoined Debs from interfering with the delivery of U.S. mail. Violence erupted. Trains were derailed. Again, the strikers lost the country. Debs called for a general strike of all workers in Chicago. The call went unheeded.

The strike was broken, Debs turned to socialism, and would be imprisoned by Wilson for sedition in World War I. Pardoned by Harding, the old socialist was invited to the White House where Harding greeted him: “I have heard so damned much about you, Mr. Debs, that I am very glad to meet you personally.”

Pullman was as close to a general strike as America came.

In May 1926, Britain faced a general strike in sympathy with coal miners whose wages had been slashed when production fell along with prices after the war, and the U.S. and German coal flooded the markets. A foolish decision by the chancellor of the exchequer to revalue the pound at \$4.86, and thereby overprice British exports of coal, was responsible, charged John Maynard Keynes.

This brings us to the point. The transport workers’ strike in France that shut down Paris’s airports and stalled trains, joined for 24 hours by hospital workers, postal employees, telephone repair crews, teachers, students, and air-traffic controllers in something like a general strike may be a harbinger of things to come. Europe may be entering an era of strikes not against an industry but against the government, the people, the nation.

For the strikers in France are protesting reforms that will face every labor force in Old Europe. Virtually every nation there has voted benefits for civil servants, students, and retirees that the productive sectors cannot afford, if those nations are to compete in the global economy. Benefits voted by socialist

governments are going to be cut by conservative governments. That is why Nicolas Sarkozy won the French election over the Socialists’ Ségolène Royal.

Like all of Europe, France is facing a time of austerity. The high wages of government workers, the reduced working hours, the long vacations, the early retirements, the generous pensions, the health benefits all have to be paid for. Even in Paris there is no free lunch. Somebody pays the bill for *La Dolce Vita*.

As the public sector has become a heavier and heavier burden, an overtaxed private sector is rebelling, refusing to bear the cost. What this strike says is that both halves of the nation are willing to endure pain rather than lose any more of what they have.

When the pie is expanding, as it has since World War II, each may receive a larger slice. When the pie is no longer expanding, or shrinking, the battle for more can only be won at the expense of the other.

At this writing, Sarkozy remains committed and defiant. He was elected to do in a harmonious way what Maggie Thatcher did in a confrontational way, when she broke the power of Old Labor, and what Reagan did in a decisive way, when he fired the air-traffic controllers who had struck against the public in violation of their contracts.

Message for America: Before voting national health insurance, we had best address the huge, existing, unfunded mandates of Social Security and Medicare. For dealing with them will cause the same pain for taxpayers and beneficiaries that Frenchmen are experiencing today.

Message for the West: Socialism has reached the end of the line. If the rebellion of the producer class fails, the nation goes under. ■