

Slobodan Janković

Institute of International Politics and Economics

INVOLVEMENT OF FOREIGN FACTOR IN BALKANS WAR AND PEACE*

Abstract

Dissolution and dismemberment of Yugoslavia happened due to internal and foreign factors. Author presents how IR and peace research literature portrays the Balkan wars, reasons for their emergence, and the role of foreign factors. He aims at the mainstream narrative and explains results of the research that is less represented in publications and in University curricula on the subject. Text offers many insights in the role of the foreign factors from Great Britain and Vatican to Germany and USA in aiding, abetting and fomenting the wars for the Yugoslav heritage. New enemy and rationale were needed as an excuse for forming of the brave new world. Thus, author claims that dissolution and wars were pretext and sort of testing for the emergence of the dominance of the western model and globalisation followed by the demise of the nation state.

Keywords: Yugoslavia, Balkan conflicts, War for Kosovo, Foreign actors, Mainstream propaganda, Serbs, Croats, Kosovo and Metohija.

* This paper was created within the project Serbia in contemporary international relations: Strategic directions of development and firming the position of Serbia in international integrative processes – foreign affairs, international economic, legal and security aspects, funded by Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia, number 179029, for the period 2011-2016.

1. INTRODUCTION

Role of foreign powers in the dissolution and dismemberment of Yugoslavia, in set of wars and cold peace, with the creation of small states (Balkanides in words of Miloš Knežević)¹ in Western literature is often obfuscated, side-lined, or mostly presented as something that surprised West and other foreign actors. In that optic, foreign role emerged lately and in order to help.² Of course this approach takes into account that, primarily Western, countries design and realise their policies having in mind interests of other actors, having strong sense of philanthropy and just wish to help other peoples in need. This view is clearly divorced with reality, and we can assume that such writings are made with purpose of justification of evident foreign involvement in Balkan tragedy. This included use of bombings against Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, later aggression on Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that was presented as humanitarian intervention (in order to prevent mistakes of late involvement in war in Bosnia) and later enlargement of Western military alliance — NATO. This deception of public had major justification for the continued military expansion and spread of political control of Balkan countries and their relations. That is why Balkan conflicts are studied as something isolated of outside world and the regional, European and global context, as if nobody had influence from outside the war torn countries.

This approach is not reserved only for the IR scholars or former and current diplomats it is present also in the peace studies. With the peacenik lenses wars in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and conflict in Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (2001) happened and evolved due to internal reasons while foreign actors were standing aside and decided to be involved only at the end of the military confrontations.³ Everything happened without the

1 For example see: Miloš Knežević, *Mozaik geopolitike*, Belgrade 2008, p. 26.

2 For example: Susan Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*, The Brookings Institution, Washington 1995, pp. 17, 18.

3 See: Mathew Evangelista, *Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Routledge, Oxon, UK, 2005; In failed prediction: Jon C. Pevehouse, Joshua Goldstein, "Serbian Compliance or defiance in Kosovo? Statistical analysis and realtime predictions", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* August 1999, vol. 43 no. 4, pp. 538–546;

interference, interests, planning and encouragement of the foreign players. Somehow, war in former Yugoslavia, unlike the Middle East conflict or the civil war in Angola (1975-2002) is exclusively made by local actors. Can this be true? There is wide literature and documentation saying the opposite. But even somebody who is not a scholar but just a good reader and follower of the process of the Yugoslav disintegration, could not but see that European countries and United States were, and still are interesting parties. Added presumption would be that the conflict in Yugoslavia is connected with the development of NATO, resurgence of unified Germany, dissolution of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe, political and economic reshaping of the European and global landscape and the resurgence of the West-East confrontation.

“Until 1990s dominant ideological strife between communism and capitalism vanished. But the new one was rising. It is confrontation among globalism and modern society (political nationalism, classical democracy as a rule of majority and rule of law, importance of religious traditions as markers of society). One of the manifestations of this struggle was and is a *new spiral of violence* against sovereignty and modern world order (achievements confirmed after the Second World War), started with the wars against Iraq, Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina (NATO bombings in 1995), against Yugoslavia in 1999, Iraq again in 2003...⁴⁷”

We will present shortly the dominant literature on this issue. After that we will try to put the attention on the historical and geographical, and international affairs context that all influenced the Balkan wars in the last decade of the 20th century, claiming that outside players had important if not decisive role in the outbreak and the course of the civil wars in former Yugoslavia.

2. IMAGE OF YUGOSLAV WARS IN MEDIA AND IN ACADEMIA

Carefully crafted image of Serbs as bad guys still persists in the media and scholar mainstream. This image is propagated

4 Taken from: Slobodan Janković, “Collective Identity and Loyalty to National States in the Balkans”, in: Duško Dimitrijević and Ivona Lađevac (ed.), *Challenges of the 21st Century and the Region*, Proceedings of the Round table Conference, Belgrade 2013, p. 80.

also in Serbia and supported by various western funds. Thus, so called independent journalist media projects sometimes use out-right lies in reporting, in order to maintain dominant narrative. One of the examples is the reporting on the testimony of the former UN peace envoy and Japanese diplomat Yasushi Akashi in the trial on Serbian general Ratko Mladić, made on 24 November 2015 in Hague Tribunal. *Balkaninsight* and *BIRN*, reported that Mr Akashi agreed with the formulation that genocide was not one of the Bosnian government's official policies, but was a policy of the Bosnian Serb leadership, and that he said that Serbian army crime (in Srebrenica) was "worst".⁵ Both things are simply lies as Mr Akashi did not say anything of the sort in his testimony. 'His' words " "That is correct," and "worst crime" cited in article are nowhere to be found in the transcript of the testimony.⁶ Any attempt to confront preestablished story on the Yugoslav wars is welcomed with immediate attack. It is no strange therefore that in 2010, after an American historian, Charles W. Ingrao edited volume on dissolution of Yugoslavia, although he included many of the mainstream authors, this publication was immediately criticised for not being too harsh on Serbs, and for findings that also Bosnian Muslims, and particularly those led by Naser Oric in Srebrenica, did committ crimes against Serbian civil population.⁷

Of course the dissolution and breaking of Yugoslavia happened for both internal and external reasons. Radeljić noticed that analysis of the internal reasons or factors often focus "on two individuals: Slobodan Milošević and Franjo Tuđman, thus Serbian

5 BIRN, "UN Envoy: Serbs Committed Worst Crime in Bosnia", *Balkan Transitional Justice* 25 Nov 15, Internet, <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/witness-claims-all-sides-committed-crimes-11-24-2015/1418/3,07/07/2016>.

6 International Criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Mladic transcript, Tuesday, 24 November 2015, pp. 41761-41839, <http://www.icty.org/x/cases/mladic/trans/en/151124ED.htm,07/07/2016>.

7 Their "Response to Josip Glaurdić's review" they state: "We are flattered that *EEPS* attaches sufficient importance to our edited volume, *Confronting the Yugoslav Controversies*, to commission an eight-thousand-word review—which is even longer than some of the journal's full-length articles! Hence our amazement that *EEPS* would entrust a very junior scholar (PhD, Yale University, 2008) with such a task. Evidently the reviewer has friends in high places or, perhaps, there are scholars in high places who are counting on the reviewer to serve their agenda." Charles Ingrao and Thomas A. Emmert, *East European Politics and Societies* Volume 24 Number 2 May 2010, (310-315), p. 310.

and Croatian leaders at the time.”⁸ This reduction is often in mass media and close to how Western diplomacy depicted the situation. However, before Miln Kučan became secessionist, this president of Slovenia and its main communist leader is quoted in 1987 article of New York Times as saying “There is no doubt Kosovo is a problem of the whole country, a powder keg on which we all sit.”⁹ In that article by famous journalist David Binder, reports on Albanian secessionist nationalistic movement and danger for Yugoslavia. Binder writes “federal Secretary for National Defense, Fleet Adm. Branko Mamula, told the army’s party organization in September of efforts by ethnic Albanians to subvert the armed forces. “Between 1981 and 1987 a total of 216 illegal organizations with 1,435 members of Albanian nationality were discovered in the Yugoslav People’s Army,” he said. Admiral Mamula said ethnic Albanian subversives had been preparing for “killing officers and soldiers, poisoning food and water, sabotage, breaking into weapons arsenals and stealing arms and ammunition, desertion and causing flagrant nationalist incidents in army units.”¹⁰ There are dozens of reports like this in Western media before the fall of the Berlin wall and subsequent dissolution of communism. Already in 1990 things are changed and propaganda, especially in Austrian and German press against the Serbs is mounting, Serbs are slowly being dehumanized.¹¹

Serbian communist leadership tried on several occasions during the first half of the 1980s to get support of other republics to retake authority over the provinces of Vojvodina and particularly in Kosovo, but was always rejected.¹²

8 Branislav Radeljić, “Europe 1989-2009: Rethinking the Break-up of Yugoslavia”, p. 116, Internet, http://www.desk.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp/download/es_9_Radeljic.pdf, 07/07/2016.

9 Taken from: David Binder, In Yugoslavia, Rising Ethnic Strife Brings Fears of Worse Civil Conflict, The New York Times, November 1, 1987, Internet, <http://www.nytimes.com/1987/11/01/world/in-yugoslavia-rising-ethnic-strife-brings-fears-of-worse-civil-conflict.html?pagewanted=all>, 19/03/2016.

10 Some of them in: ARCHIVE: Kosovo In the 1980s [Posted July 22, 1999], Internet, <http://emperors-clothes.com/articles/benworks/1980news.html>, 05/07/2016.

11 See more in: Slobodan Vuković, “Nemačka, Austrija i razbijanje Jugoslavije” (Germany, Austria and Breakdown of Yugoslavia), *Социолошки преглед*, Социолошко друштво Србије, Београд, vol. XXXV/2001, стр. 213–234.

12 See: Mile Bjelajac, „Kosovo — proizvodnja mita o 1987. i taoci politički korektnog govora“ (Kosovo – The production of the 1987 myth), *Nova srpska politička misao*, Vol. XIII/2006, стр. 248–249.

Already in 2003, IR scholar Raju Thomas noted: “Much of the writings during the conflict in the former Yugoslavia may be described as advocacy scholarship of varying degrees.”¹³ Peace scholarship differs, although still prevails the official narrative promoted by Western and NATO propaganda machinery that generally describes the events as totally autonomous until the West decided to end the war. This propaganda used amplifications of the number of victims (among Bosnian Muslims and Albanians), and taken for granted such ‘facts’ as genocidal and ethnic cleansing plans of the Serbian government and army (like fake NATO propaganda on non-existing operation ‘Horseshoe’ intended to ethnically cleanse the Kosovo province off Albanian population.¹⁴

Even Susan Woodward who in 1995 understood that the Balkan conflict is inseparable from the international context, believed that by 1994 it was of “little significance” and only then “emerged as the most challenging threat to existing norms and institutions that Western leaders faced.”¹⁵ Serbian historian Mile Bjelajac in 2006 listed many writings, biased and often written by journalists (like Tim Judah), by scholars adopting politically correct style (like Noel Malcolm) and those trying to maintain impassionate research (Lampe, Wachtel, Naimark).¹⁶ Bjelajac

13 Raju G. C. Thomas back in 2003 was Allis Chalmers professor in International Affairs at Marquette University. Raju G. C. Thomas (ed.), *Yugoslavia Unraveled: Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Intervention*, Lexington Books 2003, p. xiii.

14 There are many examples, and some of them will be presented in the text. One of them is when the German doctor in refugee camp in Macedonia in 1999, told for German media Die Welt, that (western) journalist did not want to see that the majority of the refugees where the “men of military age”. Why? Because it did not fit the propaganda that Yugoslav army killed masses of Albanian men. See in: Raju, G.C. Thomas, Wars, “Humanitarian Intervention, and International Law: Perceptions and Reality”, in: Raju G.C. Thomas, (ed.), *Yugoslavia Unraveled: Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Intervention*, op., cit, p. 190.

Kelly Greenhill noted also that this is fabrication. See: Kelly M. Greenhill, *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy*, Cornell University Press 2010, pp. 132-33, f.4. Greenhill developed this argumentation since she worked with Bary Posen on his text: Bary R. Posen, “The War for Kosovo: Serbia’s Political-Military Strategy”, *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Spring 2000), (pp. 39–84), pp. 52-53.

15 Susan Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*, Brookings Institution Press Washington D.C, p. 2.

16 In footnotes in pages Mile Bjelajac, „Kosovo — proizvodnja mita o 1987. i taoci politički korektnog govora“ (Kosovo – The production of the 1987 myth)”, op., cit, pp. 237–244, fts. 3–26.

offered vast body of documents and literature explaining faked myth lunched by last U.S. ambassador to Belgrade, Warren Zimmerman, of how Milosevic awaked as nationalist in 1987, 'when all started'.¹⁷

Textual design employed both by scholars and propaganda is used in order to justify role of western actors. NATO aggression against Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (24 March 1999 – 10 June 1999) that employed also ground troops attacks from Albania to the province of Kosovo and Metohija, is usually presented as 'NATO Intervention in Kosovo', even as 'air campaign', as it was something little bit more than exercise or in the worst case as 'bombing campaign'. Bombings included all territory of third Yugoslavia¹⁸ (Serbia and Montenegro) targeting military and civilian infrastructure across country. Largest and military alliance at the moment employed depleted uranium, cluster bombs, strategic bombers, guided missiles and all sort of modern military equipment against army of a 10 million country that had armed rebellion on the part of its territory (in Kosovo and Metohija).

Of course it is impossible to analyse totality of the peace studies literature on the Balkan wars even if we would limit it to the publications in English it would take at least a book to deal with. Therefore we will offer some representative authors and journals. There are various complicated schemes and even mathematic formulas that some authors use to offer 'clout of science', so popular in USA. Group of authors from northern European universities tried to explain that civil wars are outcomes of national economic misbalances and geographical position.¹⁹ As if these countries are somewhere in outer space and not on the planet Earth bordered with other countries and in complex net of political, economic and cultural influences also with the world outside the Balkans.

17 Ibid. Bjelajac shows how Zimmerman portraits Serbs as liars and nationalists, he does not know about the separatism of the Albanians, of the Albanian local government in the province of Kosovo from 1968 to 1989 and the ethnic cleansing of the province in that time of Serbs and all other non-Albanians.

18 I employ the term third Yugoslavia since the first was the Kingdom of Yugoslavia until 1941, then Socialist Yugoslavia until April 1992 and Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from 1992 to 2003.

19 Halvard Buhaug et al, "It's the Local Economy, Stupid! Geographic Wealth Dispersion and Conflict Outbreak Location", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, October 2011 vol. 55 no. 5 pp. 814–840.

Typical is approach of Timo Kivimäki, Marina Kramer and Paul Pash. This group of authors in their 120 pages study claims that “The international community proved toothless in handling the crisis and seemed to have misunderstood the conflict.”²⁰ They employ propaganda data even though they had at their disposal more accurate recent studies of the number of victims. Thus in the text, Kivimaki et al. claim that “the disastrous Bosnian War of April 1992 - December 1995, (which) killed about 200,000 people.” In the foot note, authors use different data: “The famous Uppsala conflict dataset, which only records direct casualties, reports only 12 900 casualties between (and including) 1992 and 1995. On the other hand, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) has stated that 102,622 were killed during the war, while the Bosnian Government and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) have estimated that the number of direct and indirect casualties might be double - up to 200,000 people”²¹ There are other researches with same or similar results published before this statement of 200.000 deaths, figure that was used by propaganda already in 1994.²²

There are graphs, mathematic formulas, ‘geocoded economic data’ that can show you whatever you want. According to group of authors, which used several graphs and complicated formulas two small municipalities in the Republic of Croatia, Dalj and Kostajnica have less probability for the civil war then

20 Timo Kivimäki, Marina Kramer and Paul Pash, “The Dynamics of Conflict in the Multi-ethnic State of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)*, Sarajevo 2012, (127), p. 17.

21 Ibid, p. 14.

22 Study on number of victims in Bosnia war (1992-1995), using multiple sources and matching data in order to exclude the overlaps was published in 2010 by Jan Zwierzchowski and Ewa Tabeau. They reached the number of 104,732 war deaths, of which 65% were militaries and men were 90,1% of all war related deaths. As far regards the distribution among the groups, Muslims suffered for the 65% of all deaths – almost 58 thousand people (3,1 percent of the Bosnian Muslims) – Serbs lost 19,398 (or 1,4% of Serbs) which corresponds to 21,7% and Croats with 7,543 deaths had 8,5% of all deaths. Even Enciclopedia Britannica admits the number of around 100 thousands. Although this data are publicly available as the ICTY data, some authors still cite the number that western and Bosnian Muslim war government used for the propaganda purposes already back in 1994 (year before the war was over and last battles as well as the massacre of Srebrenica occurred at all). See on that in: Steven L. Burg, Paul S. Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention* (2nd ed.). New York: M. E. Sharpe (2000), pp. 169–171.

Moscow! Ofcourse, anybody with common sense would through away immediately some research that extrapolates data on poverty or economic wellbeing in some municipality, or even in village (Likosane) independent of history, intergroup relations, interest of regional and great powers and other factors that are actually determining for the outbreak of the civil war. They even compare regions of some state (Ethiopia, Somali region, or Dagestan in Russia) with the village in another (Likosane, Serbia). Economic results vary 82 times (for example from economic situation in Borena district of Ethiopia to San Sebastian in Spain), but still authors claim that the economy is behind ethnic conflicts!²³ Analysing the period of 1991-2000, authors of the study portray that Slovenia was Socialist Republic of Slovenia as part of the Socialist Republic of Serbia, while both changed names in 1991 (omitting socialist in the name), and Serbia was in that period part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia while Slovenia was independent country.

Albrecht Schnabel & Ramesh Thakur, peace researchers at the UN University in Tokio justified the NATO aggression against Federal Republic of Yugoslavia putting the blame on the “deliberate and strategic policies of Serbia’s ruling elites...”²⁴ As they claim “What was at stake was not only the fate of the ethnic Albanian population of Kosovo. It was also the standing and reputation of the major democratic countries involved in the NATO operation, and the credibility of NATO itself.”²⁵

Pevehouse and Goldstein (1999) engaged in the project of the PRIO (The Peace Research Institute Oslo) failed to predict the outcome of the “NATO bombing campaign” (agression) against FR Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) using varius variables and ‘daily scaled events’ in order to conclude that campaign will be finished with no changes on the ground, of course they failed.²⁶

23 Halvard Buhaug et al, “ It’s the Local Economy, Stupid! Geographic Wealth Dispersion and Conflict Outbreak Location”, op., cit, p. 15.

24 Albrecht Schnabel & Ramesh Thakur (eds.), *Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention: Selective Indignation, Collective Action, and International Citizenship* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2000) pp. 536.

25 Ibid.

26 Jon C. Pevehouse, Joshua Goldstein, “Serbian Compliance or defiance in Kosovo? Statistical analysis and realtime predictions”, op., cit.

When peace studies scholars deal with the involvement of the third party/outside player, they present it radically at odds with reality, namely in line with mainstream western narratives. For example Kathman in *Journal of Conflict Resolution* purports that “American and NATO officials feared that the rising violence risked Balkan stability, as ethnic cleansing risked a humanitarian crisis that threatened to envelop the region. The attraction to intervention was thus due in part to the conflict’s substantial risk of regional spillover... the explosive potential for the Kosovo conflict to infect the greater region, the US and NATO sought foremost to contain the conflict to Serbia, evidenced by the US National Security Council’s defined goals in the crisis to “promote regional stability and protect our investment in Bosnia” (Gellman 1999, 241). Four years prior, President Clinton made a similar justification for involvement in Bosnia, arguing that without military involvement, the violence would ‘spread like poison throughout the region’ ”²⁷ The exception to the rule is group of Scandinavian peace activists – scholars, gathered with Johan Galtung. This group of mostly radical leftists, engaged to teach and hold lectures worldwide, do criticize USA and western policies, like they do with Israeli politics toward the Palestine and the Muslim world in general. But they do it mostly ideologically.

Effectively, Pevehouse and others present the same picture as mainstreame IR researchers collaborating with State Department or with the Pentagon. Cuch as Ivo Daalder, who claims that it was Serbian decision to end the war by conquering Muslim enclaves that induced Clinton administration to change policy and engage in war in order to end it.²⁸

Slavoj Žižek, Slovenian philosopher and famous dissenter loved bz the system, together with Vaclav Havel, NATO apologist among many leftists loving wars in the name of peace and humanitarianism, reduces wars in Yugoslavia to Serbian attack on Yugoslavia, to Serbian and Milosevic nationalism and grab for power “It Was Serbian Aggression Alone, and Not Ethnic Con-

27 Jacob D. Kathman, “Civil War Diffusion and Regional Motivations for Intervention”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, December 2011 vol. 55 no. 6 (847-876), pp. 851, 852.

28 Ivo H. Daalder, “ Decision to Intervene: How the War in Bosnia Ended”, *Foreign Service Journal*, December 1998, Internet, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/1998/12/balkans-daalder>, 20/05/2016.

flict". Then it is no strange that he called NATO "the Left Hand of God"²⁹ It is no strange that this intellectual writings appear in the required literature for the course on humanitarian interventions (regarded as umanitarian) at the New York University, Department of Politics, whihc understands that occupation of Itaq and Afghanistan were in fact "intervention to protect human rights"³⁰

Jan Oberg together with colleagues and friends Johan Galtung and Hakan Wiberg eventually offered different picture after Galtung was initially in the mainstream.³¹ In fact Oberg publicized on his own blog in 2006, on the occasion of the death of the former Serbian president, Slobodan Milosevic in the Hague tribunal detention facility, long article that collects all prejudices on the guilt of one man — Slobodan Milosevic – and of the one side – Serbian side – so much present in the westernized media in the 1990s and after.³² Like it is usual in the mainstream media and scholarship perception and presentation of reality, he depicts Milosevic as the Hitler of the day, and Serbs, as the bad guys. He starts by approving the typical image crafted in London, Berlin and Washington: *"I think CNN, BBC and all the rest paint a much too flattering picture of Slobodan Milosevic. OK, they say that he was the butcher of the Balkans and that he was widely regarded as the architect of the Balkans carnage. CNN points out that he was responsible for 170.000 dead in Croatia, 250.000 in Bosnia, for the misery of today's Serbia and for the 800.000 refugees running when NATO began bombing Kosovo in early 1999. And, yes, Sweden's radio listeners were informed about a dozen of times that he started four wars and lost them.*

29 Slavoj Zizek, "NATO, the Left Hand of God", *Nettime* June 29 1999, Internet, <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-nato.htm>, 06/07/2016.

30 Anna Di Lellio, The Responsibility to Protect: Humanitarian Use of Force. – Material for course, Spring 2012, Internet, http://politics.as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/22034/Responsibility_to_protect.pdf.

31 Thus Galtung tried to purport that the wars in former Yugoslavia are wars of men against women! This is in line with many of the fantastical interpretations offered by Galtung, apologist of Chinese cultural revolution. In: Johan Galtung, „Četiri teze o jugoslovenskoj krizi“, *Komunikacija org*, Internet, http://www.komunikacija.org.rs/komunikacija/casopisi/fid/VI/d04/html_ser_lat, 10/02/2011.

32 Jan Oberg, "The real story: How Milosevic was much more evil than you ever knew # 1", TFF March 12-13, 2006, http://www.oldsite.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2006/Oberg_Slobo_1.html, 21/06/2016.

All fine and good and true too... I think his death is the right moment to tell you how I believe he, he alone, caused all the troubles."³³

Oberg (with irony behind) uses maximum inflation of number of deaths in wars and describes one-man conjure, of Milosevic who got connected with foreign actors and managed to destroy otherwise functioning state and society.³⁴ But as noted above when it comes to foreign actors and their role since the onset of the conflicts, most scholars are silent.

3. OUTSIDE ACTORS IN YUGOSLAV CRISIS AND WARS

During the Cold War Socialist Yugoslavia had important role as the buffer state in South East Europe. Likewise its independence of Soviet Union as a socialist country, gave her much support in the West as it represented the fracture inside Eastern bloc. This role was further emphasized when Yugoslav politics headed by Tito managed to gather many leftist regimes around the world in the Non Aligned movement, thus avoiding for many of the member countries to become fully cooperative with Moscow.

Hidden from the public sphere was the collaboration with the West since 1948 (when Belgrade defected from Stalin) and in years, 1954-1957, Yugoslavia was partly allied with NATO.³⁵

33 Ibid.

34 Slobodan Milosevic was among the most influential politicians in Yugoslavia in the second half of the 1980s but he was hardly nationalist, while Croatian president Franjo Tudjman had history of Croatian nationalism behind, Alija Izetbegovic (first Bosnian Muslim president) was arrested as Muslim fanatic who promoted Islamic revolution and political unification of Muslims from Morocco to China in 1970, well before important career of Slobodan Milosevic. See: Alija Izetbegović, *Islamska deklaracija*, Sarajevo 1970; Slovenian and Croatian politicians in Socialist Yugoslavia aimed to transform the country into confederation since 1950s. Croatian communist Vladimir Bakarić (From 1948 to 1969 he was the chairman of the Croatian Communist Party) was elected in 1952 in Politburo of Central Committee thus becoming one among 5-6 most influential persons in the country. Bakarić together with Edvard Kardelj, head of Slovenian communists and since 1966 second onl to Tito, was proponent of the transformation of the Socialist federal Yugoslavia into Confederation. See: Dušan Bilandžić, "The Marxist theoretician and revolutionary Vladimir Bakarić", *Politička misao*, Vol. XX 1983, No. 1, pp. (3-23), 6, 11.

35 On that see in: Leo Mates, *Nesvrstanost: Teorija i savremena praksa* (English version: *Nonalignment: Theory and Current Policy*, Institute

From 1950 to mid-1954 USA alone, and there were also Great Britain and France (until Algerian war), “invested approximately one billion dollars in military and economic aid...” with the aim of “full integration of Yugoslav forces into an effective system of collective security in the Mediterranean-Southern European-Middle Eastern front, fully consistent with NATO objectives.”³⁶ More billions were invested, loaned or donated until the 1980s.

Even before, British were providing economic aid to their man in Belgrade – Yugoslav president Tito. Ernest Bevin, British foreign secretary at the meeting in Washington (September, 14th 1949) dedicated to the creation of NATO, discussed situation on Yugoslavia with US colleagues. Bevin pointed British preference for communist leader, saying of Tito “although he was a scoundrel, was our scoundrel.”³⁷

In 1984 USA was still supporting Yugoslavia though it vowed for economic reforms that eventually destroyed Yugoslav economy, as noted by Canadian professor of economy Michel Chossudovsky.³⁸

of International Politics and Economics; Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., Oceana Publications, 1972 - Political Science - 543 pages), Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd 1970.

36 “The Ambassador in Yugoslavia (Riddleberger) to the Department of State”, No. 695 868.00/7–154: Despatch, Belgrade, July 1, 1954, in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952–1954. Eastern Europe; Soviet Union; Eastern Mediterranean*: Volume VIII, p. 1393, Internet, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v08/pg_1393, accessed on: 06/07/2016; More on Tito’s Yugoslavia cooperation with NATO in: Peter Vukman, “The Balkan Pact, 1953-58. An analysis of Yugoslav-Greek—Turkish Relations based on British Archival Sources”, *Mediterrán Tanulmányok (Études sur la région méditerranéenne, Szeged)* 22. 2013. 25-36.

37 “Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State” CFM Files, Lot M–88, Box 144, Memos Conv Formins and Sec Sep 1940, *Foreign Relations Of The United States, 1949. Eastern Europe; The Soviet Union, Volume V*, [WASHINGTON,] September 14, 1949, William Z. Slany, Rogers P. Churchill (eds.), United States Government Printing Office, Washington 1975, p. 956.

38 See in detail the results of the IMF and USA inspired economic reforms in Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia in: Mišel Čosudovski, *Globalizacija siromaštva i novi svetski poredak* (English version: Michel Chossudovsky, *Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order*, Global research 2003, pp. 376.), Artist Beograd 2010, pp. 403. On the economic destruction of Yugoslavia by mainly American and globalist IMF and World Bank see in chapter 17, pp. 279-300; On political still positive attitude toward Yugoslavia from Washington in 1984, see: “U.S. Policy Toward Yugoslavia”

But Yugoslavia was for long on the crash course, at least since the 1958. In that year Slovenian and Croatian party leaders were against Yugoslav identity and asked for the reforms, while Communist Party of Yugoslavia was already transformed into League of Communists of Yugoslavia, as of 1952, with 8 different organisations (6 of republics plus two of autonomous provinces of Serbia). According to the testimony of late Dobrica Ćosić, during that year, while preparing the statute of the new communist organization, leading Slovenian communist, Edvard Kardelj, told him “Yugoslavia is historically temporary creation. It is phenomenon and the result of imperialist epoch and constellation of international affairs in that epoch. With the development of the world integrative processes and with the overcoming of the imperialist epoch its peoples will go toward new associations and integrations.”³⁹ Ever since 1962 Tito, lifelong president, took the stance against the centralism and against the Yugoslav identity, supporting British and Croatian idea of strong autonomy for Croats and Slovenians and thus for other republics.

“Tito and the Party changed many policies over time, maintaining only one – fight against perceived and by communist proclaimed Serbian hegemony. There were eight members of more and more confederated Yugoslavia (officially Socialist Federal Republic) and eight economies. Serbia had less power than any other republic because the provincial governments had power of veto over local Serbian government and not *vice versa*. Old communist plan announced in 1924, when Communist Party rejected Yugoslav character and unified state, was further elaborated in the years 1925-1928 with the culmination of the Fourth Party congress in Dresden (Germany) in 1928. Then Communist Party of Yugoslavia called for the destruction of Yugoslavia and the creation of the Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia, Montenegro, Macedonia (to be united with parts of Greece and Bulgaria), Vojvodina of

(NSC-NSDD-133), National Security Decision Directives, FAS, <http://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-133.htm>, 18/03/2015.

39 “Jugoslavija je istorijski privremena tvorevina. Ona je pojava i rezultat imperijalističke epohe i konstelacije međunarodnih odnosa u toj eposi. Sa razvojem svetskih integracionih procesa i prevazilaženjem imperijalističke epohe, njeni narodi će poći u nove asocijacije i integracije”, quoted according to: Nikola Popović, “Kada je počelo razbijanje SFRJ?”, in: (Edited by) dr Branislava Knežić, dr Jovan Ćirić, *20 years since the Breaking - Up of the SFRY*, Institute of comparative law, Belgrade 2011.

which part inhabited with Hungarians could secede, and small Serbia of which parts inhabited with Albanians could secede. This congress of the Party culminated in the anti-Serbian stance condemning Serbs generally unlike other nations, were only bourgeoisie was condemned. Comintern headed from Moscow proclaimed and supported this policy since summer 1924, when Stjepan Radić, Croat nationalist went in Moscow.⁴⁰ This attitude against Yugoslavia which supported all secessionist non-Serbian movements, even of fascist Croatian Ustascia, lasted until 1935, when due to Hitler's rise, Comintern and the Communist Party in Yugoslavia embraced Yugoslav unity.⁴¹ However, it is interesting that British plan made in April 1943, for the internal administrative division of Yugoslavia after war was almost the same as the previous communist one. British secret service SOE planned the formation of Federation with the division of Serbian territories. This plan, named "The Basis Policy for Yugoslavia" with the date April 11th 1943, was first cited in 2011. It envisaged the division in three federal units (Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian), while Serbian should be utterly divided in provinces of Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Vojvodina.⁴²⁴³

"Dissolution of Yugoslavia through wars was just climax of never ended clashes, suppressed in 1945 that were revamping periodically (Albanian chauvinist protests in 1968, 1981, Croatian spring in 1971). As war evolved what was established of Yugoslav unity dissolved and new acclaimed states Slovenia and Croatia applying different methods pushed for the ethnic cleansing and ethnic homogenisation."⁴⁴

Craig R. Nation writes in 2003: "The 1990s saw numerous regional conflicts—Haiti, Colombia, Tajikistan, the Caucasus, Chechnya, Afghanistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, the Middle East, Somalia, Sudan, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Congo — that were comparable to or, in some cases, more destructive than the Balkan

40 Aleksa Đilas, *Osporavana zemlja (The Contested Country)*, Književne novine, Belgrade 1990, pp. 108, 123–129.

41 Ibidem.

42 Miroslav Svirčević, Апорија Устава СФРЈ од 1974. године (Aporia of the Yugoslav Constitution From 1974), in: Dr Branislava Knežić, dr Jovan Ćirić, *20 Years Since the Breaking - Up of the SFRY*, op., cit, pp. 150–152.

43 Slobodan Janković, "Collective Identity and Loyalty to National States in the Balkans", op., cit, pp. 83–84.

44 Ibid, p. 85.

war. Few of these contests have received anything like the intense scrutiny devoted to the Balkans, for reasons good and bad. The Balkans is a part of Europe, and therefore more accessible to scrutiny by the international media, and engagement by external powers, (bold by S.J.) than conflicts waged in less developed and approachable regions... The Balkans has been an object of international political competition for centuries, and many of the great European and Eurasian powers have long-standing interests in the region... It has likewise, and correctly, been perceived as a kind of testing ground for international conflict management efforts in the post-cold war era.

The Balkan war also posed world order concerns. The root cause of the conflict was the destruction of the multinational Yugoslav federation as a result of the rise of an intolerant and exclusionary nationalism among its constituent nations. How can the explosive demands of a politics of identity be contained in a world where the ideal of the ethnically pure nation-state is largely a myth and agendas for self-determination retain a tremendous destructive potential?⁴⁵

Dr Nation does not explain convincingly enough the attention made by western press to the conflict. He omits also the foreign involvement in the crisis, in break up or dismemberment (Raju Thomas) and in ensuing civil wars in Yugoslavia.

Vatican and Britain apart from Germany and Austria were longtime supporters of Croatian autonomy and eventual secession. British tried to exert influence on Yugoslav king Alexander I to grant autonomy for the Croats, but were rejected.⁴⁶ Roman Catholic Church since the victory of Serbian army in the First World War and subsequent creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians (to be renamed Yugoslavia in 1929) for the domination of Orthodox Serbs. It was also against Second Yugoslavia ruled by communists. Vatican organized ten years of the celebrations of the memorial of 1000 years of Christianity among Croats, since 1975-1984. It was clearly a subversive organization

45 R. Craig Nation, *War in the Balkans, 1991-2002*, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) August 2003, pp. vii, ix. Nation is professor of Strategy and Director of Russian and Eurasian Studies at the U.S. Army War College in Carlisle.

46 Милорад Екмечић, *Дуго кретање између клања и орања: Историја Срба у Новом веку 1492-1992*, Службени Гласник, Београд, 2010, стр. 414-415.

that similarly as in the first Yugoslavia gave foundation for the Croatian nationalist and chauvinist movement.⁴⁷

Immediately after it was clear that Germany will be reunited its' leadership dreamed of new, larger role. European politicians that wanted to create new political role for the future Union, also saw their chance, which was at the time compatible also with the Berlin and Vienna and soon with Washington. Although various authors tried to downplay any motive of Germany to promote its influence, as if political leadership do not even think of it, it remains that besides Vatican, official Berlin and Vienna where staunch supporters of the Slovenian and Croatian secessions. Germans tried their best also with the Kosovo Albanians (training FARK loyal to Rugova, and UCK later) but were overtook by Americans and British (which had stronger influence over UCK of Hashim Thaci, later to be so called Prime Minister of the secessionist Kosovo and Metohija). German BND and Austrian military intelligence at least since February 1996 have been training and cooperating with Albanian terrorist organisation UCK. BND head, Hansjörg Geiger, launched German involvement. "In 1996, BND Chief Geiger's deputy, Rainer Kesselring, the son of the Nazi Luftwaffe general responsible for the bombing of Belgrade in 1941 that left 17,000 dead, oversaw KSK training of Albanian recruits at a Turkish military base near Izmir.⁴¹ This Aegean port city was also the headquarters of an Albanian expatriate separatist group set up by the Turkish intelligence service, the MIT (Milli Istihbarat Teskilati, National Intelligence Organization) as early as 1982, which in 1993 was reborn as the Kosovo People's Movement (Levizja Popullore e Kosoves, or LPK).⁴⁷⁴⁸ German military agency (MAD) was also equipping and training Albanian secret services and Kosovo Albanian terrorist UCK.⁴⁹ However American private military company MPRI (Military Professional Resources, Inc.) already employed by Croatian government in war against Serbs, was training UCK.⁵⁰ American

47 See more in: Милорад Екмечић, *Дуго кретање између клања и орања: Историја Срба у Новом веку 1492-1992*, op., cit.

48 Cristopher Deliso, *The Coming Balkan Caliphate*, Westport: Praeger Security International, 2007, pp. 37–38.

49 "Kosovo: Ein deutscher Krieg?", Internet, <http://www.friedensnetz.de/Archiv%20Webseiten/Kosovo/Kosovo2.html>, 15/06/2017.

50 Cristopher Deliso, *The Coming Balkan Caliphate*, op., cit, p. 42; and Wayne Madsen "Mercenaries in Kosovo: The U.S. Connection to the KLA" THE

CIA and British SAS took over direct training of UCK in 1999. Albanian secret service SHIK and UCK on the other hand were also hand in hand with Al Qaeda and Chechen terrorists.⁵¹

Hungarian government authorised sale of arms to Croatia in 1990. They hardly did that without the agreement with some other European country.⁵² German role in the secession of Croatia is not dismissed even by famous Croatian communist, historian and member of intelligence apparatus during the Socialist Yugoslavia, Dušan Bilandžić.⁵³ argues that future Croatian president, then retired communist general, Franjo Tuđman went in Germany in 1988 to negotiate support for the secession with Chancellor Kohl and other senior figures in the German government.⁵⁴ Tuđman

PROGRESSIVE, August 1999; Michel Chossudovsky "Kosovo 'Freedom Fighters' Financed by Organized Crime," COVERT ACTION QUARTERLY, Spring-Summer 1999, taken from: Project Censored, Internet, <http://projectcensored.org/22-us-and-germany-trained-and-developed-the-kla/>, 15/06/2017.

- 51 Јелена Георгијевна Пономарјова, *Разбојничка држава: Косово у светској политици*, Еуро book, Београд, 2017, стр. 97–99.
- 52 Yugoslavia military dynamics of a Potential Civil War, CIA March 1991, C00372340, Internet, <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/1991-03-01.pdf>, 07/06/2016.
- 53 See in: "Debate on the wars in Croatia and Bosnia - Part I" by Dušan Bilandžić, Mile Bjelajac, Ivo Komšić, Denis Kuljiš, Martin Špegelj, *Bosnian Report* New series, No: 43-44, Bosnian Institute, Internet, http://www.bosnia.org.uk/bosrep/report_format.cfm?articleid=2965&reportid=167,02/07/2016.
- 54 "Reliable intelligence sources claimed in 1990, that in 1988 Mr. Tuđman paid a secret visit to the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and met with Chancellor Kohl and other senior Government Ministers. It was said that the aim of the visit was to formulate a joint policy to break-up Yugoslavia, leading to the re-creation of a new independent State of Croatia with international borders in the form originally set up by the German Chancellor, Adolf Hitler, in 1941. At a secret meeting in Bonn, the German Government pledged its political, financial, and covert military support for Croatia's secession from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia the intelligence source claimed such an action fitted neatly into Germany's strategic objectives in respect of the Balkans, which included bringing Roman Catholic Croatia and Slovenia within the German economic zone, gaining direct access to the Adriatic and Mediterranean, and securing a favored nation status with the oil and gas producing Arab states. The latter to be enhanced by recognizing Bosnia-Herzegovina as a predominantly Muslim nation state, an entrée to modern Europe for Islam along a traditional path from Turkey via Albania and the Serbian areas of Kosovo and the Sandzak occupied by Muslim majorities." In: T.W. Carr, "German And Us Involvement In The Balkans: A Careful Coincidence Of National Policies?", Associate Publisher, Defense & Foreign Affairs Publications. Presented at the Symposium on the Balkan War: Yugoslavia: Past and

was regular guests in Germany, where he officially spoke with senior figures, but not with the Ministers and Chancellor.⁵⁵ In fact both Slovenian and Croatian leadership developed ties with Germany and Austria, and they prepared the ground for the positive attitude and support of the Western nations for their cause before the conflict.⁵⁶

USA already in 1990 and in 1991 decided to finance solely 'democratic forces' in Yugoslav republics and not Yugoslav structures themselves. "On Nov. 5, 1990, the U.S. Congress passed the 1991 Foreign Operations Appropriations Law 101-513. This bill was a signed death warrant. One provision in particular was so lethal that even a CIA report described three weeks later in the Nov. 27, 1990 New York Times predicted it would lead to a bloody civil war.

A section of Law 101-513 suddenly and without previous warning cut off all aid, trade, credits and loans from the U.S. to Yugoslavia within six months. It also ordered separate elections in each of the six republics that make up Yugoslavia, requiring State Department approval of election procedures and results before aid to the separate republics would be resumed. The legislation further required U.S. personnel in all international financial institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund to enforce this cut-off policy for all credits and loans.

There was one final provision. Only forces that the U.S. State Department defined as "democratic forces" would receive funding. This meant an influx of funds to small right-wing nationalist parties in a financially strangled region suddenly thrown into crisis by the overall funding cut-off."⁵⁷

Germany used the opportunity to unleash its newly gained strength (after the unification) and of course needed new allies for the future, reformed European Community. Just as Susan Wood-

Present, Chicago, August 31-September 1, 1995 London, Internet, <http://emperors-clothes.com/articles/carr/carr.html>, 05/07/2016.

55 See in: Milan Igrutinović, „Zapadna Evropa i raspad Jugoslavije”, u *Gradanski rat u Hrvatskoj*, 2013, Br. 9, Udruženje Srba u Hrvatskoj, Beograd, pp. 78–92.

56 Slovenian politician Rupel writes about it also. See in: Aleksandar Pavković, Peter Radan, *Creating New States: Theory and Practice of Secession*, Routledge, 2016, pp. 147, 155.

57 "Origins of the breakup—a U.S. law", <http://iacenter.org/bosnia/origins.htm>, 06/07/2016; Original document: H.R.5114 - Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991-101st Congress (1989-1990).

ward noticed “Step by step, they began to alter those institutions with little thought to what the result might be. Germany sent pilots to participate in a NATO-enforced no-fly zone over Bosnia (on April 9, 1993).

This decision required a revolutionary ruling by the constitutional court, allowing the use of German military power outside NATO frontiers for the first time since the Nazi defeat.”⁵⁸

But these changes by the German political leadership were partly greeted by the architects of the new role for the North Atlantic Alliance, dominated by Washington. “NATO used air strikes against the army of Bosnian Serbs, its first combat action since its founding.”⁵⁹ Later on, they will seal new rationale with the first war waged by NATO, of course, as usual, in the name of the higher moral reasons, it was 1999 and the war for Kosovo. It was the war that West needed.

After Croatia it was a high time for the Americans to appear as the major actor in the Yugoslav wars. According to the testimony of the Zimmerman himself (later he denied it), Alija Izetbegović withdrew his signature on the Cutilliero’s plan, signed previously by all three sides on 18 March 1992. David Binder quoted Zimmerman saying (to Alija Izetbegović radical Islamist who published on several occasions prior to war Islamic declaration, book in which he vows for the establishment of the Islamic state from Europe to China and for the war on infidels) “He said he didn’t like it. I told him, if he didn’t like it, why sign it?”⁶⁰ Izetbegović withdrew his signature on 28 March 1992. Referendum on the independence of Bosnia was already held without Serbian participation (Serbs were little more than 1/3 of population in Bosnia and Hercegovina), and the same day (1 March 1992) a Serbian was shot dead while flying the Serbian flag at the wedding ceremony in Sarajevo.

Next year, when the war was in full swing, Alija Izetbegović, according to the testimony of the wartime Muslim chief of police in Srebrenica, said to the delegation from Srebrenica that Clinton offered him to intervene militarily if 5000 Bosnian Mus-

58 Susan Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*, op., cit, p. 2.

59 Ibid.

60 Raju G. C. Thomas (ed.), *Yugoslavia Unraveled: Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Intervention*, op., cit, p. 9.

lims are to be killed by Serbs. Izetnebogiv also asked that what they think about the swap of Srebrenica, Žepa and Goražde for the Serb held territories around Sarajevo.⁶¹

In February 1995 in the presence of Roman Herzog, Germany's President at that time, Germany and Albania signed a common declaration of principle at Tirana. This declaration is rarely mentioned in the literature but nevertheless decisive because it promised to find a "solution to the Kosovo question" by advocating the right of self-determination for Kosovo's Albanians. [5] Advocating self-determination for Kosovo's Albanians, however, meant advocating their right to secede from Yugoslavia.

Not only was Germany prepraing the ground for the war on Kosovo, USA and NATO allies had their plans too. Manipulations with Račak and Rugovo, where Zugoslav army and police confronted armed Albanian secessionists were presented as massacres of civilians. Helena Ranta, finish patologist whihc led the forensic team on Račak later admitted the opressure American diplomat William Walker was exeerting, even physically, on her to write report that suits the US. needs.⁶² German, American and British diplomat where publicly manipulating public opinion in order to get approval for the war they wanted.

European elites where cheering the destruction of Yugoslavia. *Otto von Habsburg leader of Pan-Europa in French Le Figaro in August 15th writes* "Croats, being the civilized part of Europe, have nothing in common with Serbian primitivism the Balkans. Croatia's future lies in European Confederation to which the former Austor-Hungary could serve as the model to be followed."⁶³

When it came to Rambouillet even Henry Kissinger admits that "the Rambouillet text, which called on Serbia to admit NATO troops throughout Yugoslavia, was a provocation, an excuse to start bombing. Rambouillet is not a document that an angelic Serb

61 See in: Branka Magaš, Ivo Žanić, *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1991-1995*, Psychology Press, 2001, p. 237.

62 Matthias Küntzel, "How Germany paved the way to the Kosovo War", *Contribution to the 2nd International Hearing of the European Tribunal concerning Nato's war against Yugoslavia. Hamburg, April 16, 2000.* <http://www.matthiaskuentzel.de/contents/germany-and-the-kosovo>, 08/07/2016.

63 Taken from: T.W. Carr, "German and US Involvement In The Balkans: A Careful Coincidence of National Policies?", *Presented at the Symposium on the Balkan War, Yugoslavia: Past and Present, Chicago, August 31-September 1, 1995.*

could have accepted. It was a terrible diplomatic document that should never have been presented in that form.”⁶⁴

War against Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) or war for Kosovo (and Metohija) was an opportunity to apply the new just war, to use arms with depleted uraniums, casset bombs and affirm the role of NATO as the major guarantor of security in Europe.

4. ACHIEVEMENTS

Results of the foreign involvement and of the local actors in the Balkan wars was creation of six states (with occupied Kosovo recognized as a state by more than 100 nations). These small states are in bitter diatribes among themselves and often have internal conflicts (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, but in some measure also Serbia and Montenegro). Neither one of the newly, or for the first time after centuries (or for the first time in history at all) independent states has population of 10 millions. Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had slightly larger population but was attacked and later with the “help” of EU mediators was dissolved.⁶⁵ Leadership of all countries is willing to bring their country into EU, but at the same time, they are bad neighbours. These small countries, mostly with bad economies are more subjected to the western pressures then it was the case with Yugoslavia. Serbia remains object of satisfaction for the grievances and interests of its newly bordering countries. Political elites are mostly corrupt and often with authoritarian tract. Peace among them is official, a cold peace, supported by the presence of NATO, and filled with constant incidents on religious and ethnic bases. This kind of peace where no two former Yugoslav republics have resolved all border disputes and others may be labeled as cold peace. In Bosnia and Hercegovina, in Croatia, in Macedonia interethnic tension is still high. All republics are affected with low demographic rates, while foreign companies are taking over national markets and what is left of production.

64 Henry Kissinger, *Daily Telegraph*, 28 June 1999.

65 See on that issue in: Миша Ђурковић, *Илузија Европске уније*, Catena Mundi, Институт за европске студије, Београд 2015, стр. 278.

5. CONCLUSION

It is interesting enough that at the dawn of the new world order Balkans and Middle east were set on fire. All federal countries in former socialist lager in Europe were dissolved and Yugoslavia was doomed to be testing ground for justification of the new doctrine of humanitarian intervention. Balkan tragedy started at the beginning of the postmodern era of globalisation of politics and the dominance of the western powers. They are the product of the long process of the country dissolution that traces its origins back in 1950s, due to separatist tendencies of some of the constituent nations and because of the development of the Albanian secessionist movement and later Serbian request for the equal rights among the Yugoslav republics.

Involvement of foreign actors in the dismemberment of Socialist Yugoslavia and in fomenting subsequent wars was clearly significant, but it was also game of control between USA nad British, ascending Germany and Turkey.

As Soviet Union collapsed and the pact of Warszawa was dissolved peacefully West did not get the chance to win the Cold War by arms. Balkan wars were important playground not just for the promotion of the new role of NATO and humanitarianism, but were also a seal of the victory over the eastern enemy won also by arms, whereas Serbs, led by Slobodan Milosevic, were presented as both communists and nationalists. Accordingly, Western engagement against the Serbs had a propaganda image that served both old and new notions of enemy (first communists then nationalists).

Importance of the Balkan wars is particularly essential in inventing the new role for NATO, as tool of imperial policies of USA and global elites controlling politics of Western countries and for the promotion of the humanitarian interventions (backed by highly publicized moral underpinning – humanitarianism). In 2009, Guardian author concluded, “Nato’s intervention over Kosovo in 1999 was an important precursor to the invasion of Iraq four years later.”⁶⁶

66 Ian Bancroft, “Serbia’s Anniversary is a timely reminder”, Guardian 24 March 2009, Internet, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/mar/24/serbia-kosovo>, 05/07/2016.

In an review on humanitarianism, as a new rationale for the wars and expansion of influence, Simon Reid-Henry concludes and repeats phrase, so much present in contemporary literature on the interventionism: "Quite what has changed is usually drawn between the failure to act in Bosnia and in Rwanda and the not unrelated overreaction in Kosovo: in short, the point at which humanitarian discourse was taken up as the secular argument super omnes for intervention by the international community, no longer acting in the name of civilisational mandates, but in the name of human rights."⁶⁷

This rationale was to be used and still promoted as various rights to react, protect, basically new blatant excuse for the wars, appropriations and humanitarian and 'protective' crusades from Haiti to Libia, Mali and wanted but obstructed 'humanitarian intervention' in Syria.

If dismemberment and following wars over the Yugoslav heritage were not an experiment (testing ground) they surely were welcomed. It was a chance to defeat the idea of the national state, to put a negative light on nationalism (only on Serbian) and in the same time destroy the remnants of the only socialist governments in Europe (in Serbia and Montenegro). Globalists, on their hard road to new world order without national states got their moment. Zimmerman, one of many American diplomats that share this globalist conviction, wrote concerning Balkan conflicts, "The world needs to get away from the nation-state ... as an operating concept and as a value system."⁶⁸ Globalist elites sought demise of the nation state, or better said, of sovereign state. The history has not stopped and continues to unfold in its linear movement. Conflicts in the former Yugoslav Republics were quiet until 2016. Macedonian crisis and broader deepening of the Russo-American confrontation in Syria and general public paranoia against Russia and East in western mass media tend to warm cold peace in the Balkan Peninsula.

67 Review essay: On the politics of our humanitarian present, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2013, volume 31, pages 753-3 760 http://www.forensic-architecture.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Reid-Henry_ReviewEssay.pdf

68 According to: "Threatened Peoples, Threatened Borders: World Migration and U.S. Policy", Reviewed by *David C. Hendrickson*, *CAPSULE REVIEW* May/June 1996 Issue, Internet, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/capsule-review/1996-05-01/threatened-peoples-threatened-borders-world-migration-and-us>, accessed on 06/07/2016.

Literature

- Documents

International Criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, Mladic transcript, Tuesday, 24 November 2015, pp. 41761-41839, <http://www.icty.org/x/cases/mladic/trans/en/151124ED.htm>, 07/07/2016;

“*Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State*” *CFM Files, Lot M-88, Box 144, Memos Conv Formins and Sec Sep 1940*, Foreign Relations Of The United States, 1949. Eastern Europe; The Soviet Union, Volume V, [WASHINGTON,] September 14, 1949, William Z. Slany, Rogers P. Churchill (eds.), *United States Government Printing Office, Washington 1975*

“Origins of the breakup—a U.S. law”, <http://iacenter.org/bosnia/origins.htm>, accessed on: 06/07/2016; *Original document: H.R.5114 - Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991* 101st Congress (1989-1990);

The Ambassador in Yugoslavia (Riddleberger) to the Department of State”, No. 695 868.00/7-154: Despatch, Belgrade, July 1, 1954, in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1952-1954. Eastern Europe; Soviet Union; Eastern Mediterranean*: Volume VIII, p. 1393, Internet, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v08/pg_1393, 06/07/2016;

“U.S. Policy Toward Yugoslavia” (NSC-NSDD-133), National Security Decision Directives, FAS, <http://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-133.htm>, 18/03/2015;

Yugoslavia military dynamics of a Potential Civil War, CIA March 1991, C00372340, Internet, <https://www.cia.gov/library/readingroom/docs/1991-03-01.pdf>, 07/06/2016.
- Books, articles and internet

Ђурковић Миша, *Илузија Европске уније*, Catena Mundi, Институт за европске студије, Београд 2015.

Екмечић Милорад, *Дуго кретање између клања и орања: Историја Срба у Новом веку 1492-1992*, Службени гласник, Београд 2010.

- Кнежевић Милош, *Мозаик геополитике: Идентитет-транзиција-српско питање*, Институт за политичке студије, Београд, 2008.
- Пономарјова Јелена Георгијевна, *Разбојничка држава: Косово у светској политици*, Euro book, Београд, 2017.
- Bancroft Ian, “Serbia’s Anniversary is a timely reminder”, *Guardian* 24 March 2009, Internet, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/mar/24/serbia-kosovo>, 05/07/2016.
- Bilandžić Dušan, “The Marxist theoretician and revolutionary Vladimir Bakarić”, *Politička misao*, Vol XX/1983, No. 1, pp. 3–23.
- Binder David, “In Yugoslavia, Rising Ethnic Strife Brings Fears of Worse Civil Conflict”, *The New York Times*, November 1, 1987, Internet, <http://www.nytimes.com/1987/11/01/world/in-yugoslavia-rising-ethnic-strife-brings-fears-of-worse-civil-conflict.html?page-wanted=all>, 19/03/2016;
- BIRN, “UN Envoy: Serbs Committed Worst Crime in Bosnia”, *Balkan Transitional Justice* 25 Nov 15, Internet, <http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/witness-claims-all-sides-committed-crimes-11-24-2015/1418/3>, 07/07/2016;
- Bjelajac Mile, „Kosovo — proizvodnja mita o 1987. i taoci politički korektnog govora (Kosovo – The production of the 1987 myth)”, *Nova srpska politička misao*, Vol. XIII (2006), No. 1-4, pp. 235–262.
- Buhaug Halvard et al, “It’s the Local Economy, Stupid! Geographic Wealth Dispersion and Conflict Outbreak Location”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, October 2011 vol. 55 no. 5, pp. 814–840.
- Burg Steven L, Shoup, Paul S, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention (2nd ed.)*. New York: M. E. Sharpe (2000), pp. 169–171.
- Vukman Peter, “The Balkan Pact, 1953-58. An analysis of Yugoslav-Greek—Turkish Relations based on British Archival Sources”, *Mediterrán Tanulmányok (Études sur la région méditerranéenne*, Szeged) 22. 2013. pp. 25–36.

- Vuković Slobodan, "Nemačka, Austrija i razbijanje Jugoslavije" (Germany, Austria and Breakdown of Yugoslavia), *Социолошки преглед*, Српско социолошко друштво, Београд, vol. XXXV/2001, no. 3-4, pp. 213–234;
- Galtung Johan, „Četiri teze o jugoslovenskoj krizi”, *Komunikacija.org*, Internet, http://www.komunikacija.org.rs/komunikacija/casopisi/fid/VI/d04/html_ser_lat,10/02/2011;
- Greenhill Kelly M, *Weapons of Mass Migration: Forced Displacement, Coercion, and Foreign Policy*, Cornell University Press 2010;
- Daalder Ivo H., “ Decision to Intervene: How the War in Bosnia Ended”, *Foreign Service Journal*, December 1998, Internet, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/1998/12/balkans-daalder>, accessed on 20/05/2016;
- “Debate on the wars in Croatia and Bosnia - Part I” by Dušan Bilandžić, Mile Bjelajac, Ivo Komšić, Denis Kuljiš, Martin Špegelj, *Bosnian Report* New series, No: 43-44, Bosnian Institute, Internet, http://www.bosnia.org.uk/bosrep/report_format.cfm?articleid=2965&reportid=167,02/07/2016;
- Deliso Christopher, *The Coming Balkan Caliphate*, Praeger Security International, Westport, 2007.
- Evangelista Mathew (ed.), *Peace Studies: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Routledge, Oxon, UK, 2005.
- Zizek Slavoj, “NATO, the Left Hand of God”, *Nettime* June 29 1999, Internet, <http://www.lacan.com/zizek-nato.htm>, 06/07/2016;
- Igrutinović Milan, „Zapadna Evropa i raspad Jugoslavije”, u *Građanski rat u Hrvatskoj*, 2013, Br. 9, Udruženje Srba u Hrvatskoj, Beograd, pp. 78–92.
- Ingrao Charles, Emmert, Thomas A., “Response to Josip Glaurdić’s review”, *East European Politics and Societies* Volume 24 Number 2 May 2010, pp. 310–315.
- Janković Slobodan, “Collective Identity and Loyalty to National States in the Balkans”, in: Duško Dimitrijević and Ivona Lađevac (ed.), *Challenges of the 21st Century and the Region*, Proceedings of the Round table Conference, Belgrade 2013, pp. 79–95.

- Carr T.W., "German and US Involvement In The Balkans: A Careful Coincidence of National Policies?", *Presented at the Symposium on the Balkan War*, Yugoslavia: Past and Present, Chicago, August 31-September 1, 1995.
- Kathman Jacob D., "Civil War Diffusion and Regional Motivations for Intervention", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, December 2011 vol. 55 no. 6, pp. 847–876.
- "Kosovo: Ein deutscher Krieg?", Internet, [http://www.friedensnetz.de/Archiv%20Webseiten/Kosovo /Kosovo2.html](http://www.friedensnetz.de/Archiv%20Webseiten/Kosovo/Kosovo2.html), 15/06/2017;
- Küntzel Matthias, "How Germany paved the way to the Kosovo War", *Contribution to the 2nd International Hearing of the European Tribunal concerning Nato's war against Yugoslavia*. Hamburg, April 16, 2000.
- Magaš Branka, Žanić Ivo, *The War in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, 1991-1995*, Psychology Press, 2001.
- Mates Leo, *Nesvrstanost: Teorija i savremena praksa* (English version: *Nonalignment: Theory and Current Policy*, Institute of International Politics and Economics; Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., Oceana Publications, 1972 - Political Science - 543 pages), Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, Beograd 1970.
- Nation R. Craig, *War in the Balkans, 1991-2002*, Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) August 2003.
- Oberg Jan, "The real story: How Milosevic was much more evil than you ever knew # 1", TFF March 12-13, 2006, http://www.oldsite.transnational.org/SAJT/forum/meet/2006/Oberg_Slobo_1.html, 21/06/2016;
- Kivimäki Timo, Kramer Marina, Pash Paul, "The Dynamics of Conflict in the Multi-ethnic State of Bosnia and Herzegovina", *Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES)*, Sarajevo 2012.
- Pavković Aleksandar, Radan Peter, *Creating New States: Theory and Practice of Secession*, Routledge, 2016.
- Pevehouse Jon C., Goldstein, Joshua, "Serbian Compliance or defiance in Kosovo? Statistical analysis and realtime predictions", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* August 1999, vol. 43 no. 4, pp. 538–546.

- Posen Bary R., "The War for Kosovo: Serbia's Political-Military Strategy", *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Spring 2000), pp. 39–84.
- Popović Nikola, "Kada je počelo razbijanje SFRJ?", in: (Edited by) dr Branislava Knežić, dr Jovan Ćirić, 20 years since the Breaking - Up of the SFRY, Institute of comparative law, Belgrade 2011;
- Radeljić Branislav, "Europe 1989-2009: Rethinking the Break-up of Yugoslavia", p. 116, Internet, http://www.desk.c.u-tokyo.ac.jp/download/es_9_Radeljic.pdf, 07/07/2016;
- Review essay: On the politics of our humanitarian present, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 2013, volume 31, pages 753–760 http://www.forensic-architecture.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Reid-Henry_ReviewEssay.pdf;
- Schnabel Albrecht, Thakur Ramesh (eds.), *Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention: Selective Indignation, Collective Action, and International Citizenship*, United Nations University Press, Tokyo, 2000.
- Thomas Raju G. C. (ed.), *Yugoslavia Unraveled: Sovereignty, Self-Determination, Intervention*, Lexington Books 2003.
- Chossudovsky Michel, *Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order*, Global research 2003.
- Woodward Susan, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*, Brookings 1995.
- "Threatened Peoples, Threatened Borders: World Migration and U.S. Policy", Reviewed by *David C. Hendrickson*, *CAPSULE REVIEW* May/June 1996 Issue, Internet, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/capsule-review/1996-05-01/threatened-peoples-threatened-borders-world-migration-and-us>, 06/07/2016;

Слободан Јанковић

**УМЕШАНОСТ СТРАНОГ ФАКТОРА
У БАЛКАНСКИ РАТ И МИР****Резиме**

Некадашња социјалистичка Југославија и Блиски исток по расформирању Источног блока бивају изабрани за показна места наредног правца уређења врлог новог света. Поред унутрашњих разлога, аутор разматра улогу страних сила и њихов интерес за разби-распад Југославије и последично стварање низа мањих држава – балканида (Кнежеввић). Аутор посебно истиче улоге САД, Велике Британије, Ватикана и Немачке у расиривању ратова, њиховом трајању и коначно начину решавања. НАТО агресија је између осталог послужила за практиковање и проглашење новог разлога за постојање тог војног савеза. Истовремено то је послужило и за потврду победе и једину могућност Запада да и војно победи једну бившу комунистичку земљу чиме се симболично запечаћује победа. Аутор закључује да је простор бивше Југославије можда послужио као вишенаменско експериментално подручје, уз опаску да је хладни мир на Балкану у кризи од 2016. године.

Кључне речи: Југославија, балкански конфликти, рат за Косово, страни фактори, главна пропаганда, Срби, Хрвати, Косово и Метохија.

* Овај рад је примљен 11.марта 2017. године а прихваћен за штампу на састанку Редакције 30. маја 2017. године.