PREDRAG MILIĆEVIĆ

SIX AGGRESSIONS

OF THE WEST AGAINST THE SOUTH SLAVS IN THE 20th CENTURY

Sava Press' Note

Predrag Milićević's book *Six Aggressions of the West Against the South Slavs in the 20th Century* has been translated by Sava Press from the Russian original *Шесть агрессий Запада против южных славян в XX-м столетии,* published by Paleya-Mishin, Moscow 1999.

ISBN: 979-8-3074894-6-8

SAVA PRESS 2025

PREDRAG MILIĆEVIĆ

CONTENTS

PREFACE

IS IT ONLY THE YUGOSLAV TRAGEDY?

Dear reader, you hold in your hands an extraordinary and, in some ways, unique book. Its author is a Yugoslav communist, publicist and the son of the modest schoolteacher, Čedomir Milićević. Čedomir was subjected to horrific torment and ultimately a brutal death at the hands of Hitler's fascists in a concentration camp: much like the Soviet General Dmitry Karbyshev, he was doused with water in freezing temperatures until his body became a block of ice.

Predrag Milićević's own life has been steeped in the romance of the struggle for the freedom and independence of his people and country since his early youth. As a result, his life has been marked by unrest and danger. He became a member of the underground Union of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia and later took part in the preparations for an uprising against the fascist occupiers. This uprising occurred in 1941 and marked the beginning of a prolonged National Liberation War. As a fighter in an urban partisan trio and a member of a special reconnaissance group within the underground district committee, Predrag courageously and selflessly fought for the liberation of his beloved homeland. On this path, he fully experienced all the classic trials that befall a determined revolutionary communist. It is enough to say that he was captured by the Gestapo twice — and even schoolchildren know what that entails.

From the autumn of 1944, he fought in the ranks of our Red Army, and after the liberation of Yugoslavia from the fascist scourge, he became a communist.

Those were harsh, ominous years... From the very first lines of the author's dedication, one feels the breath of that bloody, fiery whirlwind through which the Yugoslav people and communists, including Predrag Milićević, had to pass. He dedicated the book

to his "comrades who fell in an unequal battle with the fascist aggressors for the freedom and independence of Yugoslavia." Predrag lists their names and surnames, and next to each name is a recurring refrain: killed, executed, hanged, fell in battle...

There is no need to retell the author's biography — the reader will familiarize himself with its key milestones. What is important to emphasize is that the path Milićević has travelled, and the gruelling years of struggle during which his own life was constantly at stake, give him the right to draw the sharp conclusions he presents in this book and to voice the unflinching criticism he directs at certain well-known writers and political figures on matters of principle.

His book, Six Aggressions of the West Against the South Slavs in the 20th Century, *unveils the essence of the "Yugoslav tragedy," the essence of the "aggressive actions of the United States and the West under its control" against Yugoslavia, from its formation to the end of the century. It constantly forces comparisons with how our own house was dismantled, how the "Soviet tragedy" occurred. These lessons are bitter, painful, but instructive. This book is a warning to the peoples of the world: look at how international imperialism operates to establish a "new world order" marked with the stamp "Made in the USA." Look, remember and remain vigilant. Today, it's the "Balkan knot"; tomorrow, it's Russia; and after that — everywhere else...*

By analysing the origins, objectives and nature of the six aggressions of the West against the South Slavs in the 20th century, Milićević exposes their common roots. I will briefly digress from the text of the book: when the latest, sixth aggression by NATO began, the Russian patriots, including Sergey Baburin, Deputy Chairman of the State Duma and Chairman of the Russian All-People's Union, demanded that the President and government support Yugoslavia not only with words but with actions. Yet the biased Russian media, which are an integral part of the fifth

column, posed the question: "Have you forgotten that it was because of Serbia that the First World War began? Do you want everything to repeat itself and for a Third World War to start?"

Milićević delivers a highly accurate diagnosis: "The primary and decisive cause of the inevitability of this global war under any pretext was not the assassination carried out by Gavrilo Princip, but the severe intensification of imperialist contradictions among the great powers of that time — France, England and Russia on one side, and the Central Powers of Europe, namely Germany and Austria-Hungary, on the other." As for the Third World War, it has, in effect, already been underway for two decades in an undeclared form. The root cause remains the same: the struggle of imperialist sharks for spheres of influence, for the redistribution of global wealth, for plunder and the seizure of colonies, and for the establishment of their "order," where only one law operates — the law of force, or more precisely, violence.

Predrag Milićević's book smells of gunpowder. Its pages reflect the glow of the fire of the war, and like history itself, they are stained with the blood of millions, as all six aggressions against the South Slavs were accompanied by monstrous atrocities committed by the "creators" of invasions — the conquerors, both covert and overt enemies. The pages of the book are searing, as many chapters were written in the immediate aftermath of the recent events in the Balkans.

Speaking of the driving force behind these aggressions and the roots of the tragedy faced by the multiethnic people of Yugoslavia, it is worth highlighting that Milićević provides a highly accurate diagnosis: the United States and international imperialism pursue their goals by "the cunning use of nationalism, separatism, the stoking of ethnic hatred, intolerance, arrogance, religious conflict and even pure racism with a religious undertone." He rightly observes that "leaders of nationalist movements, who pit workers of different nationalities against one another, pushing

their nations into fratricidal wars, are generously financed and actively supported by the aggressors. These leaders are glorified by the powerful Western media as nothing less than 'national heroes' and 'saviours of their homelands.'"

The Russian reader, applying this conclusion to our own context, can confirm it with numerous examples from everything that has transpired across the former USSR over the past 15 years, beginning with Gorbachev's ascent to power. The parallels drawn by the author himself between the "array of opportunists" — the "outright nationalists and separatists of the 1990s," the so-called "leaders," "popularly elected saviours" — from Tuđman, Havel, Kučan, Izetbegović, Zhelev, Iliescu, Berisha to Yeltsin, Shushkevich, Kravchuk-Kuchma, Nazarbayev, Shevardnadze, Aliyev and others, are absolutely valid. As Milićević notes, "all of them share a remarkably uniform record of 'achievements': inciting ethnic hatred, catastrophic declines in the living standards of their working populations, the plundering and squandering of national and collective wealth, and the unconditional subordination of their countries' national interests to those of the United States."

I also find the polemics Milićević engages in to be particularly valuable and instructive. A Serb by nationality, he critiques the Russian writer Yuri Loshchits for his novel Union, *which glorifies one of the leaders of the Serbian nationalists during the Second World War — the bloody General Draža Mihailović. Loshchits even attempts to link the present-day struggle of the Serbian people against the Western aggressors with the "struggle" and character of his "hero." However, Mihailović's Chetniks (a nationalist paramilitary organization) collaborated with the German fascist occupiers during the war against the National Liberation Movement, betrayed their own people and carried out bloody "cleansings" of the Muslim population that were marked by particular brutality. Thus, nationality in itself is not a sign*

or guarantee of nobility, justice, honesty or honour. What truly matters is the ideology a person adheres to. Mihailović is as much a "knight-general" as the bloody Ukrainian nationalist and collaborator with Hitler's occupiers, Bandera. It is no coincidence that after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Ukrainian nationalists erected a monument to Bandera, while the Serbian nationalists, almost simultaneously, erected one to Mihailović.

Such parallels — and there are many of them in the book — compel the reader to reflect, to analyse the history of his own country and the events unfolding today, and to draw conclusions, as the author himself has done. Milićević asserts that "nationalist 'leaders' and nationalist ideology primarily serve the interests of the wealthy elite of their own nations. Under the guise of deceitful rhetoric about protecting so-called 'national' interests, they obscure the class consciousness of the working people. To achieve this, they resort to preaching disdain for other nations and preparing the ground for inciting hostility between peoples."

Milićević also notes that "these 'leaders' and nationalists are, in most cases, willing — due to both objective and subjective factors — to betray the working people and the nation as a whole during times of crisis" This is particularly evident in Chapter 2. The titles of the essays alone speak for themselves. For example, "The Attitude of Bourgeois-Nationalist Parties and Their Leaders Toward the Occupiers and the People's Uprising" or "Treachery: A Revealing Story About How, in Certain Cases, a Bourgeois Nationalist Feels Closer to the German Occupier and the British Government Than to His Own Rebellious People."

He advises: "Take a closer look at the actions of the entire array of nationalist traitors during the Second World War — figures like Bandera, Ulmanis, Nedić, Pavelić, Quisling, Mihailović, nationalist White Guards such as Shkuro and Krasnov, or nationalist leaders like Antonescu, Tiso and Horthy. If we then add the nationalist separatists of the late 20th century men-

tioned earlier, it is not difficult to see who was — and continues to be — a despicable tool of the aggressive West."

The author's reflections and conclusions are based on a wealth of historical material, facts and testimonies — many of which are unfamiliar to the general reader, especially in Russia. This is because Milićević reveals the essence of what occurred in the Balkans from an insider's perspective. In this regard, Chapter 3, "The Period of 1948-1989," presents unique material that, in my opinion, stands out. Soviet citizens had only a vague understanding of this era. The postwar years, during which Yugoslavia transitioned to a pro-American orientation, were labelled under Stalin as the "Yugoslav tragedy." A book with this very title was even published and awarded a high honour. However, Khrushchev, who after Stalin's death began to dismantle everything associated with him, proclaimed Josip Broz Tito — as a direct challenge to the deceased Stalin — to be a "true Leninist" and started fraternizing with him. The "amazing, humane, market-driven democratic socialism" was declared a "Yugoslav miracle."

Milićević shows that during these years, a "gradual Americanization of Yugoslav society" was actually taking place. He describes all its stages and mechanisms in essays with strikingly descriptive titles: "A Lesson in How the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia Transformed From a Revolutionary Into an Implementer of Western Strategic Designs"; "Market-Based, Humane, Democratic, Self-Managing Socialism Funded by the West"; "Khrushchev's Role in Strengthening Titoism in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union"; "The Collapse of Titoite Illusions and the Price Paid for the Devil's Loans," and others.

The story of how "the Soviet bureaucratic elite, the Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev humanitarian intelligentsia, journalists and economists were all educated in the Titoite school," as told by the author of this book, is indeed "instructive." Milićević

traces how "On the foundations of Tito's betrayal and revision of Marxism-Leninism — what was dubbed 'reformism' — a significant faction of bureaucrats and intellectuals was nurtured under Khrushchev's leadership. This group, commonly referred to as the 'sixties generation,' and their irresponsible actions in the 1960s-1990s gradually led the powerful socialist state to catastrophe." Milićević details how, intoxicated by Titoite and Western propaganda, "a portion of Yugoslavs from that era could not foresee that their 'pioneering' role in undermining the monolithic Soviet Union and the CPSU during 1948-1980 would cost them dearly in 1991. They paid the price through the destruction and disintegration of their own country, the tragedy of fratricidal wars, NATO bombings and the imposition of American occupiers in the heart of the former SFR of Yugoslavia."

This section presents material that is unfamiliar to Russian readers, as the works of Yugoslav authors who honestly and impartially described the real situation in Yugoslavia during those years were not translated into Russian or published in the Soviet Union. Milićević, once again, provides these events " from within," analysing the role of the subjective factor in the destruction of his country, the Soviet Union, and its impact on global destinies. His conclusion: "...during the 1950s-1980s, the Tito regime was invaluable to the West as a Trojan horse in the fight against the socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union. It was an effective megaphone used to broadcast anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, anti-Russian and — quietly but unmistakably — anti-Slavic and anti-Orthodox messages."

"Why, then, is Yugoslavia no longer needed by the West? Why does the West now want to destroy it?" — this question arises from the pages of the book. Indeed, the answer may echo the well-known saying: "The Moor has done his duty; the Moor may go." Yugoslavia played its role as a Trojan horse against the USSR and the socialist camp to the fullest, and with the emergence of

Gorbachev's clique, its usefulness to the West disappeared.

However, it is essential to separate the wheat from the chaff: the people cannot be conflated with their rulers. Titos come and go, but the Yugoslav people remain. In the same way, today's Yeltsins and Chernomyrdins, who cared more about "saving face" for the aggressors than establishing peace in the Balkans, facilitated Slobodan Milošević's acceptance of NATO's terms under U.S. leadership and secured agreement for the effective occupation of Kosovo and Metohija. Predrag Milićević is correct in stating that "Chernomyrdin and his patrons betrayed not only Yugoslavia but also Russia." This is undeniably true.

At the same time, the West's most recent aggression against Yugoslavia also reaffirmed the unbreakable sacred bonds of brotherhood between our peoples. With every NATO missile and bombing strike on the long-suffering Serbian land, these bonds became stronger and more heartfelt. The belief of the Yugoslav peoples, and with them the author of this book, that the "brotherly Russian working-class comrades firmly stand on the side of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in its continued struggle for freedom and independence against the fascist militarism of the U.S. and NATO," is grounded in real-life truths and historical roots that stretch deep into the past.

Predrag Milićević's book is also valuable for its open confrontation with anti-communists and anti-Soviet elements of all kinds. The author proves with specific historical facts that in both wartime and peacetime, it was the communists — not the nationalists — who united the peoples and remained the true defenders and representatives of the interests of the working people. This is precisely why the West and its apologists build their policies on the principle of "divide and conquer," poisoning the minds and souls of people with nationalist and anti-communist intoxication.

However, the future belongs to the peoples themselves, who must decide their fate based on the solid historical foundation of

spiritual and blood brotherhood, guided by their class interests. In the 21st century, there must be no place for nationalism, interethnic hostility and religious discord — all those things that intoxicated the peoples at the close of the 20th century and were exploited and inflamed by the aggressive West as a powerful weapon to destroy once strong, multinational states.

We know that in time, even on ashes, green shoots will sprout, and with them, hope and life itself will be reborn. Restoring and reuniting our nations, which were torn apart so brutally, is within the power of the people, provided they come together and forever bury the nationalism that pits nations against one another. Predrag Milićević's book offers such hope.

NADEZHDA GARIFULLINA
July 14, 1999

DEDICATED TO MY SENIOR COMRADES WHO FELL IN AN UNEQUAL BATTLE WITH THE FASCIST AGGRESSORS FOR THE FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF YUGOSLAVIA

Zrenjanin Žarko-Uča, teacher, fell in battle
November 4, 1942

Aldan Lidija-Marija, high school student, fell in battle
April 8, 1942

Ankucić Lucija-Neca, university student, hanged
October 14, 1942

Anketa Dragomir-Draga, worker, fell in battle
November 12, 1943

Atsketa Petar-Pera, worker, hanged
June 21, 1942

Brankov Dejan, lawyer, fell in battle
October 24, 1942

Varyashka Jelena, university student, executed by firing squad
May 9, 1942

Ivkov Stanislav-Nisa, fell in battle
July 23, 1943

Jovanović Živa-Andra, teacher, killed by a traitor
June 13, 1944

Katić Živa-Deda, farmer, executed by firing squad
February 26, 1943

Knežević Sava-Galanski, fell in battle
June 18, 1943

Kornauer Rudolf-Rudi, worker, executed by firing squad
July 31, 1941

Mateić Mila, university student, hanged
June 21, 1942

Mišić Jovan-Joca, hanged
June 21, 1942

Milićević Čedomir, teacher, killed in the Uše concentration camp
December 1942

Muncan Slavko-Sava, university student, fell in battle
September 6, 1941

Petrov Bratislav-Braća, fell in battle
March 6, 1942

Petrov Elizabeta-Beba, university student, fell in battle
March 6, 1942

Petrov Dragica, university student, executed by firing squad
May 9, 1942

Radaković Jovanka, professor, executed by firing squad

September 19, 1941

Radišić-Petrov Olga, teacher, executed by firing squad
May 9, 1942

Stefanović Dragina, farmer, executed by firing squad
April 12, 1942

Stefanović Milan, farmer, executed by firing squad
April 12, 1942

Stefanović Momčilo, teacher, hanged
October 14, 1942

Stefanović Svetislav, civil servant, executed by firing squad
September 6, 1943

Stefanović Rela, teacher, fell in battle
January 6, 1944

Stefanović Strahinja, university student, fell in battle
November 4, 1942

Stojković Petar-Perica, high school student, executed by firing squad
August 12, 1943

Tot Friedrich-Fritz, worker, executed by firing squad
July 31, 1941

FROM THE AUTHOR

To understand and properly evaluate the political events, processes and catastrophes that swept through the working people of Yugoslavia like a fiery storm in the 1990s — or, to be more precise, to grasp the essence of the aggressive actions of the United States and the West under its control, initially directed against the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1990-91, and later against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia from its inception until the end of the 20th century — it is essential to focus on certain key events of the recent past. Without knowledge, understanding and analysis of these events and processes, it is easy for ordinary people to get lost in the whirlwind of tragedies. It is difficult to comprehend, for instance, the explosive disintegration of the seemingly stable SFR of Yugoslavia in 1990. It also seems unclear why, in 1998, the "winds of conflict" suddenly began blowing in the southern Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija (Kosmet). Where did the overwhelming hostility against this small South Slavic state come from among bourgeois figures like Hitler, Albright, Clinton, Schroder and their subordinate Spanish-German-Anglo-Saxon underlings like Solana, Kinkel, Blair, Cook and Gelbard, who so diligently barked and toiled to serve the interests of the United States?

The author has repeatedly observed that even educated experts can easily get lost "in the Balkan woods." This is especially true when considering the highly effective, yet entirely deceitful propaganda of the Western media, along with the eager collaboration of pro-Western Russian TV and radio channels. These channels — featuring the likes of Svanidze, Kiselev and Mitkova, who have been "bought lock, stock and barrel" — pour out streams of lies, wrapped in attractive packaging, onto an overburdened and exhausted working population, much like their Western counterparts. As for the

Western and pro-Western yellow press, there is little left to say.

In Yugoslavia — the state of the South Slavs — the key processes and events leading up to Western aggression, as well as the acts of aggression themselves, can be chronologically divided into six unequal periods:

1914-1940: The period of aggression by the German-Austro-Hungarian coalition, the formation of a small South Slavic kingdom, and the continuous attempts by two antagonistic groups of powerful Western states (Germany and Italy on one side, and England and France on the other) to subordinate Yugoslavia to their interests.

1941-1948: The period of aggression by Germany and its allies against Yugoslavia, the uprising of the peoples of Yugoslavia against the occupiers, and the heroic National Liberation War fought under the unyielding slogan of brotherhood and unity of Yugoslavia's working people. This was also the beginning of the construction of a socialist society in cooperation with the USSR.

1949-1989: The period of creeping aggression by the Anglo-Americans, marked by the gradual Americanization of Yugoslav society.

1990-1994: The period of the disintegration and partition of the SFR of Yugoslavia, the illegal establishment of puppet mini-states (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Macedonia) by the West, and, as a response to the absurd actions of the United States and Germany, the formation of the Republic of Serbian Krajina (RSK) in Serbian territories within Croatia and the Republika Srpska (RS) in Serbian territories within Bosnia and Herzegovina.

1995: The year of the defeat of the Serbian republics (RSK and RS) orchestrated by the United States and NATO. This was the year of the disgraceful Dayton Agreement and

the continuous attempts by the United States to bring the FR of Yugoslavia to its knees.

1996-1999: The preparatory work of American diplomacy and the CIA, aimed at dismantling the FR of Yugoslavia — now the last bastion of resistance to the strategic plans of the United States in the Balkans. This culminated in blatant U.S. aggression.

Before delving into the key periods of covert and overt Western aggression in the Balkans, it is necessary to address one persistent question that loomed over the heads of millions at the close of the 20th century: Why have the aggressive forces of the United States, along with the compliant five-hundred-million-strong "Golden" West, managed to achieve one easy victory after another and successfully implement their aggressive plans in the last decade of the century? What weapon has been their greatest ally in achieving this?

Of course, there are many answers to this question. There is their immense economic and military power — Tomahawk missiles, B-52 bombers armed with cruise missiles, a fleet of ultra-modern aircraft, missile cruisers, nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and much more. One cannot overlook an extremely significant factor: the highly skilled exploitation of internal unrest in the states targeted for destruction — those that refused to bow to American dictates and their "new order."

And yet, it is now plainly evident that the ease of these victories and the successful realization of their plans by the United States has been achieved through the cunning use of nationalism, separatism, the stoking of ethnic hatred, intolerance, arrogance, religious conflict and even pure racism with a religious undertone. Leaders of nationalist movements, who pit workers of different nationalities against one another, pushing their nations into fratricidal wars, are generously fi-

nanced and actively supported by the aggressors. These leaders are glorified by the powerful Western media as nothing less than "national heroes" and "saviours of their homelands." As often happens in history, tragedy turns to farce when Western media and their domestic collaborators, by any means necessary, attach labels like "extraordinary" or "outstanding" to these pitiful nationalist traitors.

Take a closer look, dear reader, at the array of these opportunists — the outright nationalists and separatists of the 1990s, the so-called "leaders," "popularly elected saviours" — from Tuđman, Havel, Kučan, Izetbegović, Zhelev, Iliescu and Berisha to Yeltsin, Shushkevich, Kravchuk-Kuchma, Nazarbayev, Shevardnadze, Aliyev and their ilk. All of them share a remarkably uniform record of "achievements": inciting ethnic hatred, catastrophic declines in the living standards of their working populations, the plundering and squandering of national and collective wealth, and the unconditional subordination of their countries' national interests to those of the United States. All of these "figures" possess a pathological lust for power, with blood on their hands up to the elbows.

Nevertheless, many of them continue to receive strong support from the United States and are glorified by the "democratic" Western media. Together with their entourage of sycophants, mercenaries and sellout intellectuals, they act as guard dogs, protecting the interests of the West's wealthy elite. At the same time, they safeguard their own ill-gotten wealth and the riches of homegrown oligarchs stolen from their own people.

It is no secret that nationalist "leaders" and nationalist ideology primarily serve the interests of the wealthy elite of their own nations. Under the guise of deceitful rhetoric about protecting so-called "national" interests, they obscure the class consciousness of the working people. To achieve this, they re-

sort to preaching disdain for other nations and preparing the ground for inciting hostility between peoples. As representatives not of their working classes but as agents of the wealthy upper class, these "leaders" and nationalists are, in most cases, willing — due to both objective and subjective factors — to betray the working people and the nation as a whole during times of crisis, in order to maintain their positions and protect the interests of their patrons. Take a closer look at the actions of the entire array of nationalist traitors during the Second World War — figures like Bandera, Ulmanis, Nedić, Pavelić, Quisling, Mihailović, nationalist White Guards such as Shkuro and Krasnov, or nationalist leaders like Antonescu, Tiso and Horthy. If we then add the nationalist separatists of the late 20th century mentioned earlier, it is not difficult to see who was — and continues to be — a despicable tool of the aggressive West.

The list of traitors to their people would be incomplete without mentioning the Zionists like Berezovsky, along with his "semibankirschina" clique, and nationalists like Barkashov, with their transparent yet far-fetched hope of becoming the mouthpieces of a fledgling but equally brazen class of nationalist entrepreneurs, whose thievery knows no bounds. These two wings of opportunistic looters — along with their ideological maskers — were spawned by the counter-revolutionary chaos of the late 1980s and early 1990s. They complement one another perfectly, whether in dismantling the socialist state or in clouding the class consciousness of Jewish and Russian workers. For the "masters" of the world, it could not have been more convenient.

Religious myths about "chosen peoples" (regardless of which one) might, on the surface, seem like echoes of the racial prejudices of Hitler's followers as we approached a new millennium. However, in the hands of the U.S. aggressors,

such myths represent a powerful weapon for inciting ethnic intolerance and hatred. The essence of the ancient guiding slogan of the slave-owning Roman emperors — *divide and conquer* — has been well understood by the Americans and, as life shows, effectively put into practice.

The violent nationalism of Hitler's regime — with its *Deutschland uber alles,* Aryan supremacy, racism and "new order" — is well known to humanity.

As for American nationalism, with its arrogant ideology that justifies bombing anyone, anywhere, anytime, in the name of "national security," and its attempt to impose Clinton-era versions of the American "new order," the peoples of the world and history itself will have their say. The same reckoning awaits the European bourgeois elite, which now loudly sings in harmony with the American aggressors.

However, in examining the role of nationalist movements and leaders in aiding aggressors, the author, being Serbian by nationality, considers it his duty to focus primarily and in greater detail on the Serbian and Yugoslav nationalist traitors, of whom, regrettably, there were far too many from the 1930s until the end of the century.

It so happened that, almost simultaneously, at the beginning of the 1990s, the Ukrainian nationalists, celebrating the collapse of the Soviet Union, erected a monument to Stepan Bandera, while the Serbian nationalists unveiled one to Draža Mihailović. The Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists glorified the 50th anniversary of the SS "Galicia" division, lavishly praising the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists' (OUN) "Legion of Ukrainian Nationalists" and its infamous battalions, "Nachtigall" and "Roland." Surviving Estonian and Latvian SS veterans, along with Lithuanian "Forest Brothers," marched triumphantly through the streets of Tallinn, Riga and Kaunas, serving as steadfast supporters

of the nationalist-separatist and counter-revolutionary governments of the Baltic states, which are now entirely subservient to American dictates. The modern Croatian nationalists and neo-fascists, led by Franjo Tuđman, President of Croatia, nostalgically revere their "Ustaše" legions. (The Ustaše were a fascist organization of the Croatian nationalists in prewar Yugoslavia, funded by Mussolini, the Vatican and Hitler. After defeating the Yugoslav royal army in April 1941, Hitler handed the Ustaše control over the "Independent State of Croatia." Having received power from Hitler, the Ustaše began a campaign of genocide against the Serbian population in the summer of 1941, aiming to create an ethnically pure "Greater Croatia.") Bosnian and Kosovo Muslim nationalists and fundamentalists, led by Alija Izetbegović — one of the leaders of the punitive Nazi SS "Handžar" division and now the president of Americanized Bosnia — mourn their broken SS divisions from the Second World War. They boast of their joint victories with the Americans and their conquest of the Serbian people in Bosnia in 1995. For their part, the Serbian nationalists work tirelessly to justify the betrayals of the Chetniks (a Serbian royalist nationalist paramilitary organization that collaborated with the occupiers during the war in their fight against the National Liberation Movement) during the years of 1941-44. Similarly, the monarchist and nationalist movements in present-day Russia attempt to whitewash the counter-revolutionary essence of the "White Movement" of the 1920s, the betrayal of Vlasov and the "Vlasovites," and the collaboration of Tsarist-Hitlerite generals like Pyotr Krasnov, Sergei Krasnov, Shkuro, von Panwitz, Domanov and Girey.

All these nationalist movements of the 1930s and 1940s, as history has shown, were reduced to serving, either openly or covertly, the German-Italian occupiers in their strug-

gle against fascism's main enemy — Soviet Russia — and in suppressing the national liberation and partisan movements. Despite this truth, which is obvious to the people, a new generation of nationalist movements try to cover up these disgraceful historical facts with lies and falsifications. Sharing similar views and historical ties, nationalist movements establish contact with one another as circumstances and opportunities arise, attempting to strengthen their positions.

In late 1992, for example, the magazine *Nash Sovremennik* published Yuri Loshchits' novel *Union,* and *Sovetskaya Rossiya* featured a review of the book by Moscow journalist E. Volodin on December 22, 1992. The reviewer, in full agreement with the author of *Union,* writes about the "hero" of the Serbian national resistance, General Draža Mihailović, and his Chetniks, who allegedly fought against the German-Italian occupiers. The review praises the "captivating image of the knight-general," placing him alongside the great Serbian national hero Karađorđe, who nearly two centuries ago rallied his people to fight for freedom, independence and a better future. Together with Russian units and volunteers, Karađorđe succeeded, through bloody battles, in re-establishing Serbian statehood after five centuries of Turkish rule. The author of the novel attempts to argue that the modern Serbian people's struggle against the Western oppressors and destroyers of Yugoslavia must be linked to the "struggle" and the figure of Draža Mihailović himself.

A little later, I will attempt to demonstrate the complete absurdity of Yuri Loshchits' claims about the "captivating" and "epic" image of Mihailović and his warlords, known as the Dražinovci. (Mihailović repeatedly conducted forced mobilizations of peasants under the cover of the German-Italian occupiers, though this is not the primary focus here.) However, it is difficult to resist asking Yuri Loshchits a single question: Would he agree, after first visiting today's Ukrainian nationalists, enjoying a hearty piece of salo, washing it down with good gorilka, or better yet, pepper vodka, somewhere near Ternopol, Drogobich or Ivano-Frankovsk, and having a detailed conversation with his hospitable hosts about their views on Stepan Bandera and his OUN members — would Loshchits agree to write about the "mighty, elegant and captivating image of the knight Bandera" and place him alongside, or rather shoulder to shoulder with, a truly epic hero, for example, Taras Bulba?

If his answer is affirmative, then any further discussion becomes utterly pointless. However, if his answer is negative, then it is necessary to calmly face the facts and the truth. In doing so, one must consider that the author of these lines personally experienced, alongside the Serbian people in Šumadija and Western Serbia, the savage terror of the Dražinovci during 1942-43. They kept villages and small towns in constant fear. Mihailović's Chetniks did absolutely nothing to interfere with the German occupiers, who were exporting everything they needed, and they diligently ensured that, God forbid, a partisan detachment from Kosmaj or Leskovac — one that had narrowly survived the brutal winter of 1941-42 — did not blow up such strategically vital German routes as Belgrade-Athens or Belgrade-Sofia. I must also note that, after the war, while being a "condemned man," I had the opportunity to come into direct, personal contact with the leaders and ordinary fighters of the OUN in the prison cells of Transcarpathia and Lvov. I heard firsthand, directly from their mouths, stories about the goals, strategies and tactics of the OUN, the history of their movement, their hatred of the Red Army, the Soviet government, everything Russian, and generally all "Easterners." I also learned of their extreme cruelty and ferocity in their deadly struggle against their pri-

mary enemy — Soviet Russia. Despite the tragedy of my situation at the time, I can only be grateful to fate that I was able to understand what nationalist movements truly are — not through the writings of so-called "social scientists" who glorify nationalist leaders, but through my own life experience.

It is also well known that, under certain historical conditions, nationalist movements can play a positive role in the struggle for a nation's survival and existence. I believe it is necessary to emphasize that such movements can and should be utilized in progressive movements of modernity. However, helping nationalist organizations build their programs, their history, on lies, distortion of facts and deceit is unacceptable, as this will inevitably — regardless of anyone's intentions — lead to catastrophic consequences for the people and the destruction of the movement itself.

To understand why questions about the almost forgotten betrayals of more than fifty years ago are resurfacing once again, it is essential to study and analyse — not distort — historical processes, facts, events, and the actions of specific groups and individuals from the 1920s to the 1990s.

CHAPTER I

THE PERIOD OF 1914-1941

THE AGGRESSION OF THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE AND IMPERIAL GERMANY AGAINST SERBIA (1914-18) AND THE CREATION OF YUGOSLAVIA ON DECEMBER 1, 1918

When examining the reasons for the creation of Yugoslavia in 1918, Western-oriented researchers often claim that Yugoslavia was an artificial creation of the Treaty of Versailles, drafted under the direction of the victors of the First World War — England, France, the United States and Italy. According to this perspective, Yugoslavia was brought into existence as a result of political manoeuvring by Western powers seeking to establish a counterweight to the future ambitions of the recently defeated German state in 1918, while also solidifying their political and economic influence in the Balkans. Furthermore, this narrative suggests that Western strategists had the foresight to create a reliable barrier against the advancing "Bolshevik plague" of revolution. This claim is supported by the young King Alexander's staunch anti-Bolshevik stance and his close ties with the now-deposed Russian monarchy. However, the latter point is unlikely to have been of significant concern to Western strategists, as the victors in 1918 were actively preparing for military intervention in Russian affairs to crush the fledgling Soviet Republic through intervention and bloodshed.

Of course, all of the aforementioned factors played a certain role in later developments. However, a closer examination of the events unfolding in the Balkans at that time reveals that the determining factor in the creation of Yugo-

slavia was a less visible, yet very real internal force within the region. This force was the fervent desire of the South Slavic peoples — Serbs, Croats and Slovenes — to liberate themselves from the tyranny of powerful empires. The progressive idea of liberation and unification, born within the ranks of the working people as a response to the intolerable conditions of oppression and servitude, was in the air. It was embraced by the progressive segment of the emerging intelligentsia and the young bourgeoisie, eventually evolving into a political and material force.

Historically, the people of Central Serbia were the first to achieve independence in the 19th century through persistent and bloody struggle. However, large numbers of Serbs in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Lika, Kordun, Banija, Ravni Kotari, Slavonia and Vojvodina remained under the yoke of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Croatian people had endured over eight centuries of oppression at the hands of Austrian and Hungarian magnates. Meanwhile, the Slovenes, living under the shadow of imperial Vienna, faced the threat of complete Germanization. Consequently, the aspiration of the South Slavs to free themselves from foreign domination was natural, progressive and unstoppable. It is no surprise, then, that the aging empire was unable to halt the inevitable course of events. Naturally, there were significant challenges in achieving liberation and unification, and a great deal of blood was shed in the fight for freedom.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire had entirely opposite objectives. Pursuing its goal of complete domination over the Balkans, the empire annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908, thereby extending its reach to the western borders of Serbia and Montenegro. Serbia, a persistent obstacle, stood in the way of Vienna's plans to dominate Southeast Europe. As a result, in the quiet offices of the Viennese General Staff, preparations were meticulously made for aggression against the small but defiant neighbour, Serbia. The Austro-Hungarian leadership was searching for an appropriate pretext for military action — and, as Vienna saw it, such a "pretext" finally presented itself.

The Causes of the First World War

On June 28, 1914, a group of Bosnian students and workers, including Serbs, Croats and Muslims, who were members of the Austrian-banned youth organization Young Bosnia — which fought for the liberation of Bosnia from Austrian occupation — carried out an assassination of the heir to the Habsburg throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Franz Ferdinand was inspecting his occupying troops in Bosnia and arrived with great pomp in Sarajevo, the capital. The hand of Gavrilo Princip did not tremble, and the archduke was killed.

Although the Serbian state had no connection to the Young Bosnians, Austria-Hungary accused Serbia of the attack and, on June 23, 1914, issued an insulting ten-point ultimatum. Among its demands was the requirement that Austrian police conduct investigations within the sovereign territory of Serbia to examine the "possible" threads of a conspiracy. Germany backed Vienna. Serbia rejected the Austrian ultimatum and appealed to Russia, France and England to reason with Vienna. While negotiations among the great powers were underway, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia on July 28, 1914, and began its aggression. Montenegro came to Serbia's aid. Russia announced a partial mobilization of four border districts adjacent to Austria-Hungary in an effort to stop Vienna. However, on August 1, 1914, Germany declared war on Russia, with Austria in full support.

On August 3, 1914, Germany declared war on France,

and on August 4, 1914, England declared war on Germany. Thus began the First Imperialist World War.

The primary and decisive cause of the inevitability of this global war under any pretext was not the assassination carried out by Gavrilo Princip, but the severe intensification of imperialist contradictions among the great powers of that time — France, England and Russia on one side, and the Central Powers of Europe, namely Germany and Austria-Hungary, on the other. Amid the increasing unevenness of industrial development among these states, changes in the balance of economic and political power disrupted the equilibrium between them.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Germany surged ahead with a powerful leap in industrial development and sought a radical redistribution of global power to match its new economic strength. Steel production in Germany increased from 300,000 tonnes in 1870 to 14 million tonnes by 1914. In contrast, steel production in England during the same period grew from 700,000 tonnes to only 6 million tonnes. Previously lagging far behind not only England but also France in industrial development, Germany had, by 1914, surpassed both and taken the lead in Europe. Despite this, Germany controlled only small colonies with a population of 12 million, while the weaker England ruled over an empire of 400 million people. This glaring disparity and "unjust" distribution of global wealth underscored the central contradiction of that time, which played a decisive role in the outbreak of the imperialist world war. Germany sought to strip England of its colonial dominance, while England aimed to eliminate its most dangerous competitor.

The British Empire was determined to dominate the Middle East and its immense oil wealth. Similarly, the German Empire, along with its Austro-Hungarian ally, was eager to

seize the Balkans and Turkey to extend its reach to Baghdad and Mosul and take control of Middle Eastern oil.

Tsarist Russia, driven by its geopolitical interests, sought to eliminate its German-Austrian rivals in the Balkans, seize Constantinople, the Straits, Turkish Armenia, and annex the Western Ukrainian and Polish lands under Habsburg rule. Success in this endeavour would also significantly strengthen Russia's position in the Balkans.

French imperialism, on the other hand, was focussed on reclaiming Alsace and Lorraine, taking the resource-rich Saar Basin and the Rhineland, and eliminating the growing threat posed by its primary European competitor. Meanwhile, Germany dreamed of annexing French Lorraine, ousting the French from Morocco and taking over other Franco-Belgian colonies in Africa.

For the powerful nations of the world, war appeared to be the only means of quickly resolving these contradictions.

As the war unfolded, additional countries joined the conflict. On the side of the Central Powers — Germany and Austria-Hungary — Turkey entered the war on November 11, 1914, and Bulgaria on October 14, 1915. On the side of the Entente, Japan entered on August 23, 1914, followed by Italy on May 23, 1915, Romania on August 27, 1916, the United States on April 6, 1917 and China on August 14, 1917. In total, 33 countries with a combined population of 1.5 billion were drawn into the world war, and the total number of active armies exceeded 29 million soldiers.

And in this bloody whirlpool of the First Imperialist World War, which was started for the redistribution of global wealth, plunder and the seizure of colonies, only Serbia and Montenegro fought a National Liberation War against the German and Austro-Hungarian oppressors. On this issue, V.I. Lenin wrote: *"The national element in the present (imper-*

ialist) war is represented only by Serbia's war against Austria... Only in Serbia and among the Serbs do we see a long-standing national liberation movement, involving millions of 'masses of the people,' of which Serbia's war against Austria is a continuation."

Terror and Genocide by the Austro-German Occupiers Against the Serbian Population

The Austro-Hungarian and German attack on Serbia shook public life throughout the Slavic territories of the empire — Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Czechia, Slovakia, Slavonia and Vojvodina. Resistance grew against the brazen aggression of Vienna and Berlin against the small but proud state of Serbia. The occupiers responded with widespread repression. All prominent political figures with pro-Yugoslav orientations were placed under police surveillance. In Bosnia alone, 147 military tribunals were held, accusing the arrested of treason. For instance, in the area around the town of Trebinje, 78 people were hanged, and 30 residents were killed at the doorsteps of their homes. Austro-German troops executed Serbs without trial, exterminated Orthodox priests and intellectuals, and carried out massacres. On August 14, 1914, in the vicinity of the town of Foča, 126 residents of Serbian nationality were killed.

The aristocratic and "civilized" Vienna — as its intelligentsia and ruling elite still like to call themselves today — began carrying out genocide against the Serbian people in 1914. A prominent figure of Vienna's military junta and a favourite of the court, General Conrad, held a meeting on July 16, 1914 in Vienna with the nationalist leaders Franck and Horvat. At this meeting, they developed and approved a plan for the destruction of the Serbian population in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia and Slavonia. On July 23, 1914, the pro-Austrian newspaper *Hrvatska* wrote: "We declare a fight to the death against the Serbs," and on July 29, 1914, it added: "We must settle accounts with the Serbs once and for all and destroy them...!"

The genocide was carried out through: a) physical extermination; b) forced deportation; c) concentration camps. Entire villages were forcibly and completely driven toward the Serbian and Montenegrin borders or deported to desolate areas where they perished from hunger and disease. The most widespread extermination of the Serbian population, however, was carried out through the organization of concentration camps. In this regard, the Viennese elite were the first in Europe to implement such a massive and inhumane experiment. Later, Adolf Hitler, a former Austrian corporal, would "perfect" Austria's initiative after coming to power in Germany in 1933. To be fair, it should be noted that the United States were the pioneers of such hateful practices. Their so-called reservations, where people were herded solely based on racial or national identity, along with brutal persecution, mass killings, hunger, cold and deprivation of basic medical care, led to the mass extermination and genocide of Indians. It is well known that the very "civilized" United States, showing "remarkable" ingenuity, exterminated 17 million of its citizens of Indian descent.

In 1914-15, Viennese concentration camps sprang up like mushrooms. Jagar-Bihać, Višegrad, Arad, Nezsider, Thalerhof, Turon and Schoronek, scattered across Bosnia, Croatia, Hungary and Austria, make up only a partial list of concentration camps where tens of thousands of people perished. One notorious example was the Doboj concentration camp. Here, 16,673 men and 16,996 women of Serbian nationality were imprisoned behind barbed wire. Each barrack held

1,000 detainees.

In the Doboj concentration camp, prisoners were given just 100 grams of bread per day and nothing more. When a typhus epidemic broke out, tens of thousands of people perished. Meanwhile, in the Višegrad concentration camp, a strict German order was in effect: no food was to be given to the sick or emaciated. So there you have it, dear reader, the so-called *Rechtsstaat* — the "state of law" — as Vienna's self-proclaimed "elite," the leaders of one of the "civilized" centres of Europe, liked to refer to themselves.

The Situation on the Balkan Front

While the Austro-Hungarian Empire was carrying out genocide against the Serbian population in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, Vojvodina and Slavonia, the situation on the military front against Serbia unfolded in a way that surprised many. Despite being armed to the teeth and trained to the highest German standards, the Austro-Hungarian army suffered defeat after defeat from August 1914 to January 1915. Austrian General Oskar Potiorek, commander of the Balkan front, had a significant advantage in manpower and weaponry. Confident in his intelligence reports about the poor equipment of the Serbian army — which was also suffering from a severe shortage of ammunition — Potiorek assumed that his three armies would easily conduct a punitive expedition, quickly defeating Serbia and occupying its territory. Underestimating his opponent, Potiorek launched his offensive on August 12, 1914, with his three armies crossing the Drina River to begin their general advance. Serbian forces, however, put up fierce resistance. Over 12 days of continuous and bloody fighting, the Serbian army not only stopped but decisively defeated Potiorek's forces in the historic Battle of

Cer — the first Allied victory of the First World War. The Austrian troops fled in panic back across the Drina River. The Austro-Hungarian army suffered 25,000 fatalities, while Serbia's losses amounted to 16,000. At the same time, the Russian High Command requested that the Serbian army launch an offensive to ease the pressure on Russian forces in the Galician sector. Despite their heavy losses in the Battle of Cer, the Serbian army responded. They crossed the Sava River, began liberating Srem, and forced the Drina, driving the enemy back almost to Sarajevo.

Potiorek regrouped his forces and launched a second offensive on September 8, 1914. Once again, the Austro-Hungarian army encountered fierce resistance from Serbian forces. The offensive stalled, particularly after intense fighting at the heights of Mali Kamen and near Gučevo. Both sides suffered heavy losses in continuous attacks and counterattacks, with Potiorek losing nearly half his troops. A temporary lull ensued, which Potiorek used to replenish his ranks, bringing his army's strength to nearly 260,000 soldiers.

In early December 1914, the Austro-Hungarian forces launched their third offensive. Due to a severe shortage of ammunition, the Serbian army was forced to retreat into the interior of Serbia. After fierce fighting, they abandoned the capital, Belgrade. A decision was made to make a stand at the Kolubara River, where, fortunately, allied supply convoys carrying much-needed ammunition finally arrived.

The Viennese court celebrated, anticipating the imminent defeat and capitulation of Serbia. Emperor Franz Joseph sent a special congratulatory message to Potiorek on the capture of Belgrade, while the Turkish Sultan awarded him the highest Ottoman order. However, at Kolubara, in brutal hand-to-hand combat, Serbia's First Army, under the command of General Živojin Mišić, launched a counter-offensive, break-

ing through Potiorek's front. Serbian forces surged through the breach, and a general pursuit of the Austro-Hungarian army ensued. In panic, the enemy retreated toward the rivers Sava and Drina, finding safety only after crossing them. It was during this liberation of Serbian villages and towns that the soldiers of Serbia's pursuing divisions began to sing the now-famous song:

Our Sava, our Drina,
The Germans... to hell with them!

On December 15, 1914, Belgrade was liberated. By the end of December, not a single occupying soldier remained on Serbian soil. Emperor Franz Joseph unceremoniously retired his former favourite, General Potiorek, sending him into early retirement.

The Battle of Kolubara was the greatest victory of the Serbian forces in their struggle for freedom during the First World War. In the official British history of the war, it is noted: "There is talk of a miracle on the Marne, though there was no miracle there. But if one were to speak the truth, the true miracle would be the victory on the Kolubara."

However, the three offensives led by Potiorek inflicted heavy losses on Serbia. Out of the 250,000 soldiers at the start of the war, 132,000 were lost by 1915. During the first half of 1915, there was little activity on the Serbian front. Another danger loomed — a typhus epidemic. Over 600,000 people fell ill, and within six months, the epidemic claimed 150,000 lives. By 1915, the situation on the Allied fronts began to deteriorate. Germany and Austria-Hungary successfully halted the Italian offensive, thwarted the Allied attempt to seize the Dardanelles, and broke through the Eastern Front with their victory at Gorlice, occupying Poland, Lithuania and parts of Belarus. Meanwhile, Bulgaria began to align itself with Germany.

By the summer of 1915, it became clear that Vienna could not handle Serbia on its own, so Germany decided to eliminate the Serbian army using its own forces.

This task was entrusted to General August von Mackensen, the victor of the Battle of Gorlice. Under his command was the elite 11th German Army, which was deployed along Serbia's northern borders. Before the general offensive, Germany signed an agreement with Bulgaria's pro-German government, ensuring that Bulgaria would strike the Serbian forces from behind once the German attack began. Mackensen, mindful of Potiorek's failures, assembled a massive force of 800,000 troops. On October 6, 1915, German shock divisions crossed the Danube and launched their offensive. The Serbian army repelled the initial attacks, but on the night of October 14, 1915, the Bulgarian army treacherously attacked from the rear, cutting off all supply lines and the only route to the port of Salonika, Serbia's connection to its Allies in Greece.

Mackensen planned to surround and annihilate the Serbian forces in Central Serbia. The Serbian army was encircled three times, and each time they broke through. Retreating to the Kosovo Plain, Serbian forces sought to push through the Vardar River valley toward Salonika to unite with Allied forces. The Serbian command aimed to retreat through the Kačanik Gorge toward Salonika, but the Bulgarian army, having seized the heights of the Kačanik canyons, completely blocked the passes and prevented the Serbian army from executing its plan. To break the Bulgarian hold, an assault from the direction of Salonika was necessary. French General Maurice Sarrail, with his 156th Division, advanced from Salonika toward Strumica, awaiting orders to proceed further and join the Serbian forces trapped on the Kosovo Plain.

However, the British government strongly opposed a French offensive, leaving the Serbian army trapped in a "cauldron." This was one of the most tragic moments in history. From the north, Mackensen's German armies advanced. From the east, the Kačanik canyons, blocked by Bulgarian forces, barred the way. From the west, Montenegro was under attack by Austrian troops. To the south lay the impassable peaks of the Šar Mountains and the Prokletije range. In this desperate situation were 300,000 Serbian soldiers and more than 200,000 civilians — elderly people, women and children — retreating alongside the army. Mackensen offered the Serbian government and High Command the opportunity to sign an unconditional surrender.

The government and High Command rejected the German ultimatum and made the decision to break southward toward the Adriatic, traversing mountain trails and paths at the juncture of the massive Šar Mountains and the Prokletije range. Much has been written about this epic journey and the Golgotha endured by Serbian soldiers. Despite the extreme tragedy of the situation, the Serbian army did not surrender. They endured unimaginable hardships and "hellish torments" — hunger, the freezing cold of the mountain peaks, impassable terrain and deep snowdrifts. Yet, against all odds, they made it to the port of Vlora on the sunny Adriatic coast.

While General Mackensen attacked the Serbian forces, the Austro-Hungarian army launched a major offensive against Montenegro. The Montenegrins put up fierce resistance, particularly during the three-day battle near Mojkovac from January 5 to 8, 1916. However, the enemy's overwhelming superiority in manpower and weaponry ultimately decided the outcome of the struggle. On January 13, 1916, the enemy captured the Montenegrin capital of Cetinje. The king and government fled to Italy, but the Montenegrins did not

sign a capitulation. With their resistance, the Montenegrins provided fraternal aid to Serbia.

The Cost of the Struggle for Freedom

The losses were enormous. At the start of the German army's offensive in October 1915, the Serbian army had 420,700 soldiers under arms. As they retreated southward, engaging in continuous battles, they lost 120,000 men. By January 1, 1916, at Kosovo Plain, the Serbian army had 300,000 soldiers remaining. Of these, 220,000 made it through the Prokletije mountain range and reached the port of Vlora. The Allies transported the exhausted and devastated army to the island of Corfu. On Corfu, the number of soldiers fell to 150,000, as approximately 70,000 men succumbed to exhaustion, unable to recover. It was here that the army finally received a long period of rest and recovery. Seven new divisions were formed, and these were redeployed to the Salonika Front to hold the line alongside Allied forces. In the autumn of 1916, the Serbian army broke through the German-Bulgarian front, liberating the cities of Gorčevo and Bitola. This was followed by a period of positional warfare that lasted until the autumn of 1918.

The overall contribution of Serbia and Montenegro to the victory over the German-Austrian occupiers is reflected in stark numbers. In Serbia, 705,343 soldiers were mobilized and actively participated in the fighting — approximately 40 per cent of the country's male population. During the war, 369,815 soldiers and officers died in battle or from wounds, which amounts to 53 per cent of those mobilized, or, more simply, every second soldier. If one considers the total number of male casualties, one in five Serbian men died in the struggle for freedom and independence during this war.

The population in occupied Serbia also suffered significant losses. Research shows that more than 600,000 people died in concentration camps, from epidemics and from the terror inflicted by the German and Bulgarian occupiers during the Toplica Uprising in 1917. In total, Serbia lost one-third of its population in its fight for freedom and independence against the German-Austrian invaders.

The small nation of Montenegro also suffered greatly during the invasion. Out of 50,000 soldiers mobilized, 20,000 perished. Among the civilian population, 43,000 people died — one in four of the total population.

Key Opponents of South Slavic Unification and Obstacles to the Formation of Yugoslavia

Despite numerous obstacles, the idea of uniting the fraternal South Slavic peoples not only shone brightly but also moved closer to becoming a reality.

Serbia and Montenegro did not capitulate. In 1915, the "Yugoslav Committee" was formed in London, consisting of political representatives from all South Slavic peoples living under the yoke of German-Austro-Hungarian occupation. The committee began actively promoting the Yugoslav idea, addressing concrete proposals to Allied governments, publishing bulletins and memoranda, and informing the public about the struggle and aspirations of the South Slavs for unification.

Despite the enormous sacrifices made by the South Slavs in their fight against the German-Austro-Hungarian armies, the idea of their unification found little support among the Entente powers — England, France, the United States and Italy. As it turned out, these powers were trading the territories and lives of the South Slavs as they saw fit and to suit their

own interests.

Italy, for example, was vehemently opposed to any unification of the South Slavs. The reason was clear and significant: in exchange for joining the war on the side of the Entente, Italy had negotiated secret terms in the Treaty of London (1915) with England and France. According to these terms, Italy was promised Yugoslav territories, including Istria, Dalmatia and the South Slavic islands of the Adriatic, as a reward for its participation. England and France, meanwhile, in an effort to break the German-Austro-Hungarian coalition, began separate negotiations with Vienna. They assured Vienna that they would guarantee the integrity of the Habsburg Empire and would not tolerate the creation of any South Slavic states within its territory. In British ruling circles — not only among conservatives but also liberals — there was a prevailing belief that the Austro-Hungarian Empire should not be dismantled. It was seen as the only reliable counterweight to future threats from both Germany and Russia.

The well-known defender of the British Empire, Winston Churchill, noted in his memoirs that the destruction of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was the greatest tragedy and mistake of the First World War. In 1918, U.S. President Woodrow Wilson announced his Fourteen Points, outlining the goals and objectives of the United States in the war. For the South Slavs within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Wilson promised only cultural autonomy.

At the same time, it is important to remember that not everything went smoothly among the South Slavs themselves. The advocates of South Slavic unification — a progressive idea repeatedly praised by V.I. Lenin — were representatives of the young intelligentsia and bourgeoisie of Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia. They dreamed of freedom and sought to stand tall, systematically oppressed as they were by the capital of

Vienna and Berlin.

The Serbian ruling class, led by the tandem of the experienced and elderly Prime Minister Nikola Pašić and the ambitious young regent Alexander, believed that the Serbian people had borne the main burden of the struggle against the German-Austro-Hungarian occupiers. As a result, they naturally felt that Serbia should determine the conditions of unification. By "unification," they envisioned the creation of a centralized state under Serbian leadership.

The Yugoslav Committee, led by Ante Trumbić and representing the rest of the South Slavs, took a different view. They argued that since December 1915, Serbia had also been under the German boot, just like Croatia and Slovenia. Therefore, they considered themselves equal partners in the unification process, on the same footing as Regent Alexander and Prime Minister Pašić. This disagreement led to intense debates between the two visions of unification. Fortunately, these disputes were resolved with the signing of the Corfu Declaration.

It is worth noting some key moments that played a significant role in the development of subsequent events.

The Aging King Peter I, Colonel Apis and the Young Regent Alexander

Until 1903, Serbia was ruled by the Obrenović dynasty, which was closely aligned with Vienna and Berlin. As a result, there was no room for any policy aimed at liberating the Slavs from Austrian domination. In 1903, a group of Serbian officers, led by Major Dragutin Dimitrijević-Apis, overthrew the Obrenović dynasty and placed Peter I Karađorđević, the grandson of the legendary leader of the Serbian national uprising, Karađorđe, on the throne.

King Peter I (born in 1844), a man of liberal views and already advanced in age when he came to power, introduced a parliamentary regime and a unique form of peasant democracy. To the surprise of many, he ensured complete freedom of the press in Serbia, believing, as he put it, that "the Serbian people have the right to know everything." Another fascinating aspect of his character is that, in his youth, the future king of Serbia, Peter Karađorđević, under the pseudonym Petar Mrkonjić, actively participated in the Serbian uprising in Bosnia with his company of volunteers. Alongside his unit, he fought in bloody battles against the Turkish occupiers. Peter's character is further exemplified by an extraordinary act later in his life: at the age of 70, during the famous Battle of Kolubara in December 1914, King Peter fought side by side with his soldiers — mostly peasants — and personally joined them in a bayonet charge against the Austrian aggressors. Later, as his army was forced to retreat, the aging king endured the infamous "Albanian Golgotha" alongside his troops. He rejected outright the very notion of capitulation, which had been proposed by the German command.

In 1911, Colonel Dragutin Dimitrijević-Apis, seeking to intensify the struggle for the national liberation of all Serbs, organized the secret nationalist society "Union or Death," better known as the "Black Hand." Its political agenda of resistance against the occupiers dominated the Serbian military. Apis' authority and influence grew. At the same time, Apis was directly involved in deploying secret armed groups, the so-called "Komiti," onto Serbian territories occupied by the Turkish and Austrian Empires to carry out armed resistance against the occupiers. (The Komiti were the precursors to the Chetniks, the Serbian royalist, nationalist, paramilitary organization active during the 1920s-40s, which became more prominent after the destruction of the SFR of Yugoslavia.)

The son of King Peter, Alexander, the regent and heir to the throne, was the complete opposite of his father. Ambitious and authoritarian, Alexander was a proponent of centralized governance under his control and actively sought to intervene in the politics of those tragic days. A graduate of the Page Corps in Petrograd, he was deeply connected to the Romanov throne and Nicholas II. On the Salonika Front, aiming to secure his influence and personal rule and fearing the growing power of Colonel Apis, Alexander, together with Prime Minister Pašić, falsely accused Apis of allegedly organizing an assassination attempt on the heir to the throne. Colonel Apis and his comrades were executed on June 26, 1917. Apis' "Black Hand" organization was completely dismantled at that time. It is worth noting that one of its members was the then little-known junior officer of the Serbian army, Dragoslav Mihailović, about whom more will be said in subsequent chapters of the Yugoslav tragedy.

The Corfu Declaration and Unification Against All Odds

During 1916-18, both the Serbian government and the Yugoslav Committee received ample evidence that they, along with their people, were mere "bargaining chips" in the strategic games and negotiations of England, France, the United States and Italy, especially after V.I. Lenin published the secret terms of the Treaty of London of 1915. It became clear that from the Yugoslav idea of unification, the "Allies" would leave only scraps.

Taking this state of affairs into account, on July 20, 1917, a joint conference of the Serbian government and the Yugoslav Committee was held on the island of Corfu. The well-known Corfu Declaration was adopted, which announced the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It proclaimed that this would be a constitutional democratic and decentralized monarchy headed by the Karađorđević dynasty. The declaration affirmed the equality of the three nations, all religions, the equality of Cyrillic and Latin scripts, and other principles. The Montenegrin and Vojvodina Committees, after adopting their own declarations, joined the foundational Corfu document.

However, declarations alone were not enough — material power was needed to turn the dream of unification into reality. And such a force existed. The Serbian army, after resting from the bloody battles and the "Albanian Golgotha," reorganized itself. Reinforced by divisions of volunteers that included numerous Serbs from Bosnia, Herzegovina, Slavonia, Vojvodina, Lika and Krajina, as well as volunteers from Croatia and Slovenia, and even Serbs from America, the Serbian army took up positions on the Salonika Front and waited for the right moment to launch an offensive and liberate their homeland.

On September 17, 1918, the 2nd Serbian Army and the 1st Volunteer Army, supported by French divisions, began their offensive. The 2nd Serbian Army broke through the German defences. Through a breach 12 kilometres wide at Mount Kožjak, divisions poured through, capturing the Vardar River Valley and advancing northward. All four Serbian armies drove the enemy back. On September 29, they liberated Skopje, and on the same day, Bulgaria capitulated. On October 12, they liberated the city of Niš, and on November 1, they liberated the capital, Belgrade. Serbian forces crossed the Danube, Sava and Drina rivers, liberating Vojvodina, Slavonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and reached the Adriatic coast.

The final days of the Habsburg Empire were approaching.

The fall of this empire was the result of an objective historical process. It collapsed under the blows of its own citizens — Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Czechs and Slovaks — who longed for liberation. The break with the young Hungarian Soviet Republic only hastened its demise. Alarmed by national and social unrest, the Entente strategists made every effort in 1918 to preserve the Habsburg Empire, which they considered a reliable and necessary bastion of conservatism. However, no efforts by the strategists of the United States, England and France — from Wilson to Clemenceau — could save it. They were powerless to stop the progressive march of history at that time.

On December 1, 1918, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was proclaimed in Belgrade. After lengthy negotiations with the Allied powers — France, England, the United States and Italy — over disputed territories and borders, the new state was officially recognized by the Entente. In October 1929, the kingdom was renamed Yugoslavia. Everything that transpired in 1918 — the wave of events sweeping across Europe and slipping out of control, combined with the failures of the intervention against the young Soviet Russia — forced the Entente strategists to drastically change their tactics in 1919. Since it was no longer possible to save the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which had been so vital to preserving capitalism in Central Europe, they decided to rely on the young bourgeoisie of the emerging Slavic states. At the same time, they remembered that the young regent Alexander was an ardent supporter of the Romanov dynasty, which had been overthrown two years earlier, and thus a staunch advocate of the Entente's anti-communist agenda. In 1921, under the encouragement of his allies (upon whom he was economically dependent), Alexander became the organizer of the so-called Little Entente — an alliance of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania, which served as a kind of sanitary cordon against the growing influence of Soviet Russia.

Yugoslavia in the Postwar Years

The Attempts by Two Antagonistic Blocs of the "Civilized" West — England and France on One Side, and Germany and Italy on the Other — to Subordinate Yugoslavia to Their Interests

The South Slavic state of Yugoslavia, born from a bloody struggle for freedom, was, by global standards, a small kingdom in southeast capitalist Europe during the 1920s and 1930s. Nevertheless, occupying a central position in the Balkans, Yugoslavia became the dominant state in the region, something influential politicians from both the West and the East had to acknowledge.

Life in the young Yugoslavia, still largely patriarchal and agricultural, flowed in its own way within certain confines. The country was relegated to the role of a raw materials and agricultural appendage to the highly developed West, with its territories gradually being drawn into the vortex of new political and economic intrigues by the major European powers. At the same time, the further development of capitalism in Europe inevitably began to affect its peripheries as well. Capitalism knocked on the doors and windows of the South Slavic economy.

The transition to organizing large-scale capitalist production in the South Slavic lands had its own specific characteristics, shaped by its history.

The five-century-long Turkish rule over the territories of Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina led, as various studies show, to severe consequences. By destroying Serbian

principalities in these areas, eradicating Serbian feudal lords and initially introducing a tax collection system limited only to royal taxes, the Turkish authorities created the illusion that they might even improve the material conditions of the working population. However, very quickly, instead of the old relations of production, the powerful empire imposed and solidified its own occupation-based feudal order in the Turkish style.

Many towns and villages were destroyed, part of the population was killed and others were taken into slavery. The continuous Turkish-Austrian wars that swept through these territories during the 15th to 19th centuries only worsened the dire situation of the people. Such domination and bloody tragedies over the centuries not only delayed the natural course of societal development but also brought massive devastation to these lands. Furthermore, the industrially backward Turkish Empire hindered the process of initial capitalist development both in its centre and on its peripheries.

The much more industrially developed Austro-Hungarian Empire of the 19th and early 20th centuries inevitably began to involve its nearby territories in capitalist production. Thus, Slovenia, geographically the closest to Vienna, transitioned to large-scale capitalist production in the second half of the 19th century, while Croatia and Serbia began this transition in the early decades of the 20th century.

It is well known that the transition to capitalist modes of production is preceded by a period of primitive accumulation of capital. It is worth recalling that the highly developed countries of the West used external sources of accumulation on a massive scale. The peoples of Yugoslavia, on the other hand, not only lacked such opportunities but were themselves the aforementioned external sources of primitive accumulation for the highly developed countries. Naturally, within the

territory of Yugoslavia, the transition to capitalism was based on the brutal exploitation of the direct producers of material goods, accompanied by unprecedented violence and plunder. Despite this, capitalism in Yugoslavia emerged, dismantled the old structures, created new living conditions and accelerated its development.

Given the high level of livestock farming and the low cost of agricultural raw materials, industrialization in Yugoslavia initially focussed on light industry. The textile industry took the lead, followed by flour milling, leather processing, woodworking and mining. Metallurgy also began to establish itself. Production, trade and capital accumulation began to grow in Yugoslavia. On the eve of and during the Great Depression of the early 1930s, the process of capital concentration intensified sharply.

It is likely worth emphasizing the following even now. Both the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and socialist Yugoslavia possessed immense mineral wealth, particularly in non-ferrous metals. According to experts, no European country, aside from the Soviet Union, had such a quantity of strategic mineral resources as Yugoslavia. Statistical data on the extraction of non-ferrous metals placed Yugoslavia in the following ranks:

— Lead: 1st in Europe, 5th in the world.
— Aluminum: 1st in Europe, 2nd in the world.
— Chromium: 1st in Europe, 6th in the world.
— Antimony: 1st in Europe, 4th in the world.
— Mercury: 2nd in Europe, 2nd in the world.
— Copper: 2nd in Europe, 8th in the world.
— Zinc: 2nd in Europe, 8th in the world.

The most valuable strategic metal, molybdenum, was mined in Europe only in Yugoslavia and Norway, while the renowned mines Bor and Trepča were the largest in Europe.

These riches were the primary attraction for both the competing and non-competing Western powers, fuelling their appetites and predatory desire not only to control but, if possible, to dominate the territories of Yugoslavia. When analysing the incredibly aggressive behaviour of the United States, England and Germany toward Yugoslavia at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, analysts cannot ignore the above-mentioned wealth of Yugoslavia, which, in the convictions of the likes of the Klingers, Hitlers, Morgans and Krupps, should be controlled by them and not by some southern, and especially Slavic, people.

The growing demand for non-ferrous metals on the global market, particularly in light of preparations for the Second World War, became a new source of capital accumulation. Foreign investments began flowing into Yugoslavia's mining industry, causing it to rise sharply, pulling the rest of industrial production along with it. By 1938, the production of coal had increased 22 times compared to 1919, iron ore 30 times, copper 48 times, and lead and zinc 17 times, among others. Foreign capital successfully penetrated the Yugoslav economy and took commanding positions. Dictating its own terms, it naturally developed only the industries it was interested in. Wasting no time, foreign capital completely took over the extractive industries and ensured that they produced and supplied only raw ore, not processed metal. For example, in 1937, Yugoslavia produced 350,000 tonnes of bauxite, but only 300 tonnes of it were processed domestically. The same was true for zinc, lead and other metals.

It would be naive to think that the above-mentioned wealth, as well as other resources, even partially contributed to improving the well-being of the working people. Eighty-five per cent of Yugoslavia's industry was owned by foreign capital. Swiss banks controlled 19.5 per cent, British banks

16 per cent, German banks 15.5 per cent and French banks 13 per cent. They were followed by the United States, Italy, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands and others. Yugoslav capitalists from Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia controlled 15 per cent. Among them, the families of the young King Alexander, former Prime Minister Pašić and others stood out.

The situation in agriculture was no better. Of the country's 15 million population, nearly 12 million lived in rural areas. At the same time, 20,000 large landowners controlled 51 per cent of all arable land. In Yugoslavia's breadbasket, Vojvodina, 30 per cent of the rural population consisted of landless agricultural workers, 50 per cent were poor peasants, 15 per cent were middle-class farmers, and 5 per cent were kulaks and landlords, though they owned the lion's share of the land. With such a distribution, it is easy to imagine the hardships faced by the common people in the countryside. The urban proletariat had it even worse. It is no surprise that poverty, chronic unemployment, widespread illiteracy, tuberculosis, hunger and national oppression thrived in the country. Tens of thousands of people were forced to emigrate to other countries every year in search of a better life.

Political Life in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in the 1920s-30s

In the early years of its existence, several prewar nationalist-bourgeois political parties operated in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Among them were the Serbian Radical Party led by Pašić, the Croatian Peasant Party (HSS) led by Radić, the Slovene Clerical Party led by Korošec and the Muslim Community led by Spaho. Additionally, there were several postwar parties, such as the United Democratic Party, where Pribićević stood out. All these parties, to varying degrees, supported

the monarchy and represented and defended the interests of various bourgeois factions. The struggle between them centred around a key question: which nation's bourgeoisie would dominate in Yugoslavia? Since political power in the country was primarily seized by the Serbian bourgeoisie, the Croatian bourgeoisie moved into opposition, demanding federalization, confederation and the limitation of the king's centralist tendencies. Naturally, nationalism in its various forms became the main ideological weapon — the "protection" of the interests of one's own nation, allegedly "wronged" by others, who were, for some reason, "always" worse in certain respects than one's own.

In accordance with the agreement made during the proclamation of Yugoslavia's unification in 1918, elections to the Constitutional Assembly were held on November 28, 1920. As expected, the bourgeois parties took the lead. The Radical Party won 93 seats, and the Democratic Party secured 92 seats. A surprise for the ruling circles was the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY), which came in third, securing 59 seats in parliament.

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia was founded at a congress in Belgrade in April 1919. It adhered to revolutionary positions for transforming society, demanded the abolition of the monarchy and the proclamation of a republic following the example of Soviet Russia. The party joined the Third International. In municipal elections, the communists achieved significant success. In several industrial centres of Croatia, they won. They also won in the Montenegrin capital, Podgorica. In the municipal elections in Serbia in the summer of 1920, the Communist Party achieved a major victory. In the capital of Yugoslavia, Belgrade, the communists, led by the Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPY Filip Filipović, secured a majority, as they did in all major cities of

Serbia.

Frightened by the successes of the Communist Party and its growing authority among the broad working masses throughout Yugoslavia, King Alexander and his government issued the "Obznana" on December 20, 1920, declaring the Communist Party illegal. An unprecedented persecution of communists and trade unions began. The Communist Party defended itself steadfastly but was forced to go underground. Several prominent party leaders were killed or sentenced to hard labour.

King Alexander emerged as the central political figure. He actively worked to dismantle the liberal monarchic regime inherited from King Peter Karađorđević and aimed to establish his personal dictatorship. To diminish the significance of political parties and governments, he changed governments "like gloves," replacing 23 governments between 1919 and 1929. He relied primarily on the army, which, after the elimination of Colonel Apis, he had brought entirely under his control.

However, by failing to address the key issues of the state — the national question, the peasant question, and by supporting industrialists and foreign capitalists in their harsh exploitation of workers, Alexander led the country into a severe economic and political crisis over the course of a decade.

Unwilling to relinquish power, Alexander carried out a coup d'état on January 6, 1929, abolishing the last remnants of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, dissolving all political parties and establishing his personal dictatorship as a representative of the Serbian bourgeois elite. How did the nationalist bourgeois parties react? A portion of the leadership from each of these parties sided with the dictator and joined the government he appointed without question, obediently carrying out his directives. Another portion, after relatively mild intimi-

dation, silently accepted the monarcho-fascist dictatorship. Only the communists, operating underground, continued their struggle against the dictatorship, which ruthlessly suppressed them. For example, from January to September 1932, the dictatorship sentenced 82 groups of communists to long terms of hard labour. Alexander signed a decree stating that any activity directed against his regime would be punished by twenty years of hard labour or the death penalty.

In his foreign policy, King Alexander pursued a course hostile to Soviet Russia. As a result, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was the last country in Europe to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. He relied primarily on the Entente powers — England and France — in his foreign policy. Seeking to strengthen ties with his old allies from the First World War, King Alexander embarked on an official visit to France in October 1934.

Hitler, aiming to prevent the strengthening of Yugoslavia's ties with France, tasked the Gestapo with assassinating Alexander. On October 9, 1934, in Marseille, the Gestapo organized and carried out the assassination of the king. The assassin was also killed at the scene, and several direct accomplices were captured, while others were sheltered by Mussolini in Italy. As expected, the traces of the organizers disappeared. However, documents discovered after the Second World War revealed that the assassination was orchestrated by Gestapo agents. The immediate organizer, acting on the personal orders of Hitler and Goring, was Captain Hans Speidel, an assistant to the German military attaché in Paris.

It is interesting to note that Captain Speidel, who in 1934 was an assistant to the military attaché of Hitler's Wehrmacht, later became the commander of NATO ground forces in Europe in the 1960s!!!

After Alexander's death, due to the minority of his son

Peter II, Prince Paul was appointed regent. New elections were held, in which Milan Stojadinović, the leader of the reactionary political party Yugoslav Radical Union, emerged victorious. This party united not only the Serbian bourgeoisie but also the Slovenian and Muslim "elite." The HSS, remaining in opposition to the ruling circles in Belgrade, chose Vlatko Maček as its leader. He united all the opposition bourgeois parties and put forward demands for a parliamentary system and the resolution of the Croatian national question. In the parliamentary elections of 1938, the Yugoslav Radical Union led by Stojadinović lost votes, and the opposition, headed by Maček, won. Seeking a way out of the crisis, Prince Paul made concessions to Maček. The new Prime Minister Cvetković signed an agreement with Maček to create a new "banovina" (province) of Croatia. Maček joined the new government, which became known as the Cvetković-Maček government. This agreement essentially divided Yugoslavia into spheres of influence between the Serbian and Croatian bourgeoisie. However, it did not resolve the national question for the other peoples and only deepened the country's anti-democratic tendencies. The Croatian bourgeoisie, having achieved victory, began to intensify pressure on the working masses who demanded solutions to economic and social problems. Trade unions were banned, terror escalated, and many communists and trade union activists were sent to concentration camps. In foreign policy, the Cvetković-Maček government leaned toward a pro-German orientation, which greatly pleased Hitler.

By dividing the country into spheres of influence, Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian and Muslim politicians — along with their wealthy backers and the various bourgeois nationalist parties (from liberal-democratic parties like the Democratic Party and Slovene People's Party to the Yugoslav National Party and Yugoslav Radical Union, as well as openly nation-

al-fascist parties like Ljotić's) — showed no interest in resolving the country's pressing issues. These opportunists, who had secured votes through deceit, left their constituents behind and settled into their government seats with the sole aim of using their positions and wealth to increase their personal gains. Thus, it is no surprise that poverty, chronic unemployment, widespread illiteracy, tuberculosis, hunger and national oppression thrived in the country, forcing tens of thousands of people to emigrate each year in search of a better life. The authorities had no desire or ability to resolve these urgent issues and were quite content with the status quo, believing that nothing stood in the way of further enriching themselves.

The people's attitudes toward the existing situation varied. Of course, nationalist and religious prejudices, fuelled by the clergy and political demagogy, combined with illiteracy and widespread material hardship, played a significant role. The monarchy's ideological machinery also left its mark. Pessimists whispered about the end of the world, while naive optimists among the prosperous middle class turned a blind eye to the chaos, pretending that nothing out of the ordinary was happening. Others would say: "So what? We've seen worse! We survived, and look, we've even created a vast state, almost an empire..." Meanwhile, the communists, working deep underground, gathered the most steadfast and determined individuals for the future battles. Honest people could see that the situation could not continue like this for long — the opportunists would drive the country to a catastrophe on a national scale.

CHAPTER II

THE PERIOD OF 1941-1948

HITLER'S GERMAN AGGRESSION AGAINST YUGOSLAVIA. THE UPRISING OF THE YUGOSLAV PEOPLE AGAINST THE OCCUPIERS IN 1941. THE NATIONAL LIBERATION WAR. THE BEGINNING OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION IN COOPERATION WITH THE USSR.

The gloomy spring of 1941 was approaching, foretelling nothing good for the peoples of Yugoslavia. Germany had already conquered Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands and Norway, and forced France to capitulate. Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland had been conquered somewhat earlier. England, hiding behind the English Channel, had quieted down. All of Europe was under Hitler's heel. Preparing to attack the Soviet Union, Hitler aimed to seize control of the Balkans, and he was succeeding. Hungary, Romania, Turkey and Bulgaria joined the Tripartite Pact, just as they now bow down to NATO, having learned no lessons from the defeat of the aggressor. Hitler's only remaining tasks were to crush Greece's resistance and settle the question of Yugoslavia.

As mentioned earlier, the pro-German Cvetković-Maček government supported joining Hitler's Tripartite Pact but delayed making a final decision, fearing the people's anger — a fear that, as subsequent events showed, was well-founded. However, Hitler intensified the pressure and, through both threats and direct coercion, forced the corrupt government to join the pact. On March 25, 1941, Cvetković officially signed the act of Yugoslavia's accession to the Tripartite Pact. Under this agreement, Yugoslavia was obliged to supply raw materi-

als and labour to German and Italian military industries. All the mines came under German control. The Yugoslav government also committed to allowing German troops to pass through its territory to attack Greece.

When analysing these and subsequent events, it is crucial to consider that, historically, relations between the peoples of Yugoslavia on one side, and the Austro-Hungarian and German Empires on the other, had been hostile — and this hostility was the fault of the latter.

For centuries, these empires ruthlessly oppressed, plundered and killed the South Slavs. In turn, the Slavs defended their freedom and independence with weapons in hand. Therefore, the signing of the shameful pact was branded by the people as a great betrayal and a capitulation to a hated enemy — something they could not accept.

Powerful demonstrations shook the cities and villages of Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina and Montenegro. Leading the fight for national honour were the communists, who were joined by all honest patriots. Taking advantage of the situation, the pro-British faction of the bourgeoisie, together with British intelligence, carried out a palace coup, replacing the pro-German government of Cvetković-Maček with a pro-British government headed by General Simović. The act of accession to Germany was annulled. The successful fight against Cvetković's pro-fascist government demonstrated that the communists enjoyed significant authority among the people and represented a force capable of stripping traitors of power. However, these events also showed that the communists had not yet become a force capable of seizing power themselves. Through their anti-fascist demonstrations on March 26-27, 1941, the overthrow of Cvetković's government and the denunciation of the pact with Germany, the people of Yugoslavia delivered such a slap in the face to Hitler that, enraged, he

ordered the Wehrmacht to crush this defiant country.

It is important to note that the unwillingness of the Yugoslav people to submit to Hitler forced him to divert Wehrmacht forces to destroy Yugoslavia, delaying the implementation of his primary strategic offensive — the attack on the Soviet Union — by a month. This ultimately had an impact, albeit partially, on the outcome of his eastern military campaign, which ended in the Wehrmacht's defeat in the historic Battle of Moscow.

Germany's Military Attack and the Defeat of the Royal Army

Reasons for the Defeat

On April 6, 1941, German tank armies attacked Yugoslavia, defeating the royal army in twelve days and occupying the entire country. Many people could not comprehend how a state with a population of fifteen million, a freedom-loving people with centuries-old traditions of fighting occupiers and aggressors of all kinds, could lose the war so quickly and without resistance. Even Hitler did not expect such an easy victory. According to him, two things surprised him during the spring 1941 Balkan campaign: the heroism of the Greeks and the cowardice of the Serbs. However, it was not the Yugoslav people who were cowardly — they would prove Hitler's assessment wrong just months later through their heroic struggle against the occupiers. Historians typically note that the reasons for the April defeat lay in the general weakness of the country, the unequal industrial and military potential, the fact that the throne was occupied by a young, inexperienced king, and the overwhelming experience and strength of the Germans. While all of this played a role, the determining

factors were:

1. The pro-British government's refusal to honestly and openly rely on the strength of Soviet Russia.

2. The complete moral capitulation of the leaders of all nationalist bourgeois parties before Hitler.

3. Their unwillingness and inability to organize and mobilize the people to resist aggression.

4. The unprecedented corruption (by Serbian standards) of the upper royal officer corps, thoroughly infiltrated by enemy intelligence services.

Of course, within the overall betrayal of the high command, there were exceptions — heroic acts by individual patriotic officers. However, they could not prevent the catastrophe.

Speaking about the elite of the royal officer corps of the 1920s-1940s, it is important to keep in mind that this was a privileged, highly paid class of the royal court, raised on the ideas of Great-Serbian nationalism and meant to serve only the interests of His Majesty. At the same time, Yugoslavia, located in the heart of the Balkans where the interests of the Anglo-French allies and pan-German ambitions intersected, was systematically and seriously influenced by these forces. Just as the civil society of that time was permeated with pro-French, pro-British and pro-German sentiments, so too was the elite of the royal officer corps divided along these lines. Accordingly, both British, German and French intelligence services occupied the necessary positions of influence.

An inquisitive expert on Yugoslav issues at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century might ask: Where, then, were the pro-Russian sentiments in our brotherly Yugoslavia?

The fact is that in the early 1920s, a large portion of the White émigrés, led by Baron Wrangel, after being pursued

by the Red Army in the Crimea, initially found themselves in Turkey. Later, they were fraternally welcomed by King Alexander and settled in Yugoslavia, some permanently and others temporarily. The White émigrés — generals, officers, political figures, princes, counts, owners of mines, wealthy individuals, intellectuals and two corps under Baron Wrangel — brought with them not only the bitterness of defeat but also an unbearable nostalgia for their homeland, the sorrow of separation and uncertainty about the future. In short, they carried all the emotional weight that only a Slavic émigré can bear, something an outsider can at best only sympathize with. The White émigrés who permanently or temporarily settled in Serbian lands gradually adapted and began working in their respective professions. These were, for the most part, highly educated individuals. The author of these lines, during that time, studied in the city of Vršac at a gymnasium, where his teachers in geography, history and botany were professors from among the White émigrés. They taught us well, and we were grateful to them. Near the town of Vršac, about 25 kilometres to the south, there is a small town called Bela Crkva, where a cadet corps was stationed, and it was quite common to hear Russian speech and encounter officers there.

However, if truth is paramount, it is necessary to know and remember that the White émigrés brought with them a searing, deeply rooted hatred for Soviet Russia, which had exiled them and deprived them of all the material wealth, privileges and social status they had inherited — rightly or wrongly — from their forebears. Alongside this burning hatred for Soviet Russia, which somehow continued to live its own incomprehensible life, there was an equally fervent belief that this same "Sovdepia" (as they contemptuously called it) would soon collapse into oblivion, allowing them to return to their familiar lives, responsibilities, privileges and habits. This, too,

can be understood on a human level. King Alexander warmly welcomed the White émigrés, sharing their grief and hatred for Soviet Russia. The elite of the royal officer corps naturally adopted the same attitudes and hatred. The influence of the highly educated officer corps of the White émigrés on the upper ranks of the Yugoslav officer corps was overwhelming. This was facilitated by class solidarity, historical traditions, ties and much more. The dream of the White émigrés for the quick fall of "Sovdepia" and their return to their estates, palaces and societal positions was fully shared by the elite of the Yugoslav officer corps. Today, this may sound like a foolish joke, but in the late 1920s and early 1930s, conversations circulated in Belgrade's elite society, which included the upper circles of the White émigrés, about the possibility that, due to the tragedy that had befallen the Tsar's family and the anticipated imminent collapse of Soviet Russia followed by the restoration of the monarchy, Alexander I might be asked to ascend the Russian throne. And why not? His Highness was of noble blood, and look how much he had done for the Tsarist elite, for their preservation and prosperity! Moreover, how the horizons and opportunities for the elite of the friendly Yugoslav royal corps would expand under such new conditions! But none of these quiet dreams or officer fantasies were destined to come true, as Alexander I was assassinated by fascist mercenaries in 1934 in Marseille. As the Anglo-French allies increasingly abandoned their ambitions to eliminate Soviet Russia themselves, and the role of the strike force against communism was taken up by the nazis, the majority of the White émigrés began placing their hopes on fascist Germany. The elite of the royal officer corps, consumed by a fierce hatred of Bolshevik Russia, like the leaders of the bourgeois parties, divided into pro-German and pro-Anglo-French factions. As for the people, they were left to fend for themselves and, as subsequent events showed,

placed their trust only in their own strength and the strength of Soviet Russia.

The catastrophic defeat of the royal army in April 1941 in the war against the Wehrmacht was due not so much to the military might of Germany as to the defeatist attitude of the pro-German faction of the royal officer corps elite. The Gestapo had infiltrated the army with its networks, the fifth column paralysed it, and it became a matter of technicality to disarm it within ten days. The people did not want to fight under the leadership of such officers when mass betrayal was occurring before their very eyes, and divisions were surrendering one after another.

When the Moscow writer Y. Loshchits carelessly, in light of his future conclusions, drops the phrase that the Serbian peasant in 1941 viewed royal officers with great suspicion, he unintentionally, albeit in a very vague manner, lifts the curtain on the so-called secret behind the causes of the April 1941 catastrophe. The Serbian people were well aware of these causes, as all the betrayals played out before their very eyes, and there were hundreds of thousands of witnesses — soldiers who escaped captivity. Such treachery among the officer corps, especially its elite, had never been seen in the history of the Serbian state. And yet, the head of the counter-intelligence department of the General Staff of the Royal Army at this prewar time was none other than Colonel Draža Mihailović himself. Considering that Colonel Mihailović, throughout the entire epic of the National Liberation War of the peoples of Yugoslavia, was, alongside the Wehrmacht, a fierce opponent of it — and in doing so rendered an enormous service to Hitler — it is perhaps appropriate to briefly examine his personality.

Who was Draža Mihailović? A young officer of the royal Serbian army, he joined the officers' organization "Unifica-

tion or Death," led by the famous Colonel Apis — Dragutin Dimitrijević — during the First World War. After King Alexander's bloody crackdown on Apis and his associates, Draža Mihailović, although a member of this organization, rather quickly integrated into the elite of the king's officer corps. After graduating from the military academy, he held posts as a military attaché at Yugoslav embassies in several European countries, became an officer of the General Staff of the Royal Army, and later the head of the counter-intelligence department of the General Staff. Simultaneously, he was the leader of Chetnik organizations throughout Yugoslavia. The Chetnik organizations were semi-official, militarized units of Serbian nationalists, dedicated to serving the king loyally and generously subsidized by the royal court.

The Uprising of the Peoples of Yugoslavia Against the German-Italian Occupiers

The Attitude of Bourgeois-Nationalist Parties and Their Leaders Toward the Occupiers and the People's Uprising

After occupying Yugoslavia, Hitler divided it among his allies. Fascist Italy was given Montenegro, Kosovo and Metohija, parts of Dalmatia, Macedonia and Slovenia. Tsarist Bulgaria received parts of Macedonia and Eastern Serbia. Hungary was granted Bačka, Baranja, Međimurje and Prekmurje. With long-term goals in mind, Hitler created the so-called "Independent State of Croatia," which included not only purely Croatian territories but also all the Serbian territories of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Srem.

From April to June 1941, there was a brief lull. The people gradually began to understand and realize that they had been betrayed, that the billions extracted from them over the

course of two decades to maintain the army and its elite officer corps had been wasted. They saw firsthand that the officer elite was inept, rotten and catastrophically corrupt, and that with them — and with such allies as the fallen France and England hiding behind the English Channel — there was no hope of success. Their hope rested in themselves, in the militant, non-elite, freedom-loving youth from among the common people, in young reserve officers and, of course, in their historically proven ally — Soviet Russia.

The people were far removed from the intrigues of the royal court, the pro-English and pro-German governments and the unchecked hatred of the White émigrés towards Soviet Russia, a hatred they managed to pass on only to the royal circle and the elite of the royal officer corps.

Taking all of this into account, as well as the historically negative attitude of the Serbian people and South Slavs towards the perpetual aggressive expansion of German rulers into the Balkans, their desire to teach, suppress and enslave the Slavs, it was entirely natural that after Germany's attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, a wave of uprisings began among the peoples of Yugoslavia against the German-Italian-Hungarian-Bulgarian fascist occupiers, for freedom, independence and a better future for their homeland. The first shots of freedom-loving insurgents against the occupiers and their collaborators were fired as early as June 24-26 in the Nevesinje region of Eastern Bosnia, on July 7 in Serbia, on July 13 in Montenegro, and then gradually across the entire territory of Yugoslavia. At the forefront of this uprising stood the communists. They were the soul and backbone of this powerful popular movement against the occupiers. The role of the communists in the defeat of the fascist plague is immense. This is a well-known truth. However, for those who, under the avalanche of anti-communist propaganda that en-

gulfed Russia, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s, still do not understand, they should look at the statistical data on those killed, hanged, executed or tortured — active fighters of the resistance against fascism — members of communist parties, as well as members of other parties, from nationalist and social-democratic to liberal-bourgeois parties and movements, and compare the numbers. From Vladivostok to occupied Paris, from Murmansk to the Adriatic, the communists went into battle, rallying their peoples to fight for freedom and independence. Fulfilling their national duty, they understood perfectly well that under fascism there would be neither freedom nor a better future.

But that is not the focus here. What is very important and instructive today is to look at how, in that distant time in Yugoslavia, apart from the communists and the people, other parties and movements present in the public life of Yugoslavia behaved.

The Slovenian nationalists, liberals and clericals accepted the division of Slovenia between the Third Reich and Italy. The leading bourgeois party of Slovenia, the Slovenian People's Party, disbanded. Some of its leaders entered the service of the German and Italian occupiers. For example, the former ban (governor) of Slovenia, Dr. Natlachen, proved to be a man servilely loyal to the occupiers. These were the people who joined the delegation of citizens sent to bow before Mussolini and Hitler. Some bourgeois figures fled to London. And if it were not for the Slovenian communists and communists worldwide, the bourgeois nationalists would have fully accepted the further Germanization of beautiful Slovenia.

In Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the occupiers carried out a more cunning policy. The nazis, adhering to the old imperial principle of "divide and rule," began to incite national hatred between the Croatian and Serbian peoples.

To this end, they created the so-called "Independent State of Croatia," which included not only Croatia and parts of Dalmatia but also Bosnia, Herzegovina and the region of Srem in Vojvodina, largely populated by Serbs. The occupiers entrusted the governance of this "entity" to the Croatian fascists — the Ustaše. Assisting the Germans in their domination of this territory was not only the Ustaše but also the treacherous policies of Croatia's mass petty-bourgeois party, the Croatian Peasant Party (HSS), which held significant influence over the population before the war. This liberal party, which had previously fought for national equality and social justice, shifted to nationalist rhetoric of intolerance, culminating in outright betrayal when the HSS leader, Maček, in the spring of 1941, called on party members to support the Ustaše leader Pavelić and thank Hitler for granting "independence," urging them to "live in love and peace with the mighty Reich." This policy of the Croatian liberal bourgeoisie led to the HSS losing its popular base. Some members joined the Ustaše, while others, confused by their leaders' demagogy and intimidated by the harsh reality, adopted a conciliatory stance during those tragic days, which played into the occupiers' hands. Only the Croatian communists, defending the ideas of brotherhood, equality and the freedom of peoples, stood up against the occupiers in Croatia. Unfortunately, in the summer of 1941, only a few supported them. In May-July 1941, the Ustaše, incited and supported by the Gestapo, began implementing the mad idea of an ethnically pure and "great" Independent State of Croatia. They began the mass extermination of the Serbian population. Europe had not seen such genocide since the Mongol and Ottoman invasions. In Serbian villages and towns, everything living was annihilated; people were shot, slaughtered, thrown half-dead into karst caves and hurled from cliffs, sparing neither children nor the elderly. In the

infamous Ustaše camp of Jasenovac, over three years, up to 700,000 people, mostly Serbs, were killed and annihilated. There could be no peace with the occupiers and their collaborators. The people rose to fight, defending their homes, children, wives and mothers. Leading the charge were the communists — ordinary people from the masses: peasants, students and workers.

Therefore, it is no surprise that by June 24, 1941, in the Nevesinje district of Eastern Herzegovina, an uprising had erupted. Over 3,000 insurgents had gathered there. And from Mount Bjelašnica and other surrounding mountains of Herzegovina, the proud anthem of the uprising people rang out like a battle cry:

From Bjelašnica, a spirit calls,
summoning Herzegovinians one by one,
Rise, dear brothers,
Russia has gone to war.

Germany crushed Serbia under its iron heel. Hitler, recalling the slap in the face dealt to him by the Serbian people on March 27, ordered that there be no leniency for Serbs — occupy them, and for any disobedience, shoot. Serving the Gestapo and the Wehrmacht was the Serbian quisling, General Nedić, also from the elite ranks of His Majesty's general staff, who became the direct "manager" of Hitler's affairs in Serbia. The prewar Serbian national-fascist, Ljotić, became the unifier of all Serbian bourgeois parties and their representative to the occupiers. A former royal minister of internal affairs of Yugoslavia headed the German commissariat for Serbia. A well-known Serbian nationalist and leader of Chetnik detachments openly aligned himself and his units with the occupiers. The young eighteen-year-old King Peter II and his government abandoned the country during the catastrophe and fled to London under Britain's protection. In London, the royal émigré government, fully dependent on England, strictly followed the course of His Majesty's government led by Churchill, adhering to the Truman-Churchill strategy: let the USSR and Germany bleed each other, and later decide who to support. No second fronts, no active involvement.

The émigré royal Yugoslav government appointed Colonel Mihailović as its minister of war, leaving him in the mountains of Serbia to oversee Chetnik organizations and report on the situation in the country. Some royal officers, loyal to the king and having escaped capture, settled in Serbia's mountain villages, relying on remnants of Chetnik organizations. They tied their fate to Mihailović and, like him, awaited directives from London. Liberal-democratic bourgeois parties with a pro-British orientation remained silent, dissolving into inactivity and fear of the formidable Wehrmacht, placing their hopes on the king, London and Draža Mihailović. Mihailović, at the start of his activities, sought to rely on the national-fascist Ljotić, hoping he would assist in organizing the terrified Serbian bourgeoisie politically. Later, Mihailović contacted the head of the occupation commissariat, Milan Aćimović. His tactic was clear: do not disturb the occupiers and wait for the tide to turn. In Montenegro, the nationalists, like the faction of the well-known nationalist-federalist Đurđević, quickly aligned with the occupiers. Another part of them joined Mihailović's organization and awaited orders.

During the hot summer of 1941, events in Serbia unfolded rapidly. As already mentioned, the National Liberation War for freedom against the occupiers, led by the communists, had begun. The uprisings achieved great success. Large territories of Serbia were liberated, and a free territory — even a partisan republic — was established. Chetnik organizations could not remain passive, as this led to a further loss

of their credibility among the people, especially since some Chetnik leaders, like the infamous Pećanac, had openly collaborated with the occupiers. Despite the snobbery of Chetnik officers, who looked down on the ragtag partisans who had taken up arms and wanted to fight the occupiers, and despite the Chetnik officers' hatred for communists, circumstances now required them to negotiate with the partisans as equals. From August to October, preliminary agreements were reached on joint actions against the occupiers. However, implementing the main strategic concept of the pro-British émigré government, Minister Mihailović and his commanders never intended serious cooperation with the National Liberation Movement. As events later showed, they abandoned the agreements previously reached in November 1941.

On the Role and Significance of the Serbian People in the National Liberation War of Yugoslavia

Before addressing some of the tragic moments that occurred during the National Liberation War against Hitler's aggression, it is necessary, in our view, to highlight the following in accordance with historical truth.

It was the Serbian people, led by the Serbian communists, who were the first in conquered Europe to raise the banner of resistance against fascism with their uprisings in Herzegovina on June 24 and in Serbia on July 7, 1941. It was precisely in these Serbian territories during the summer and autumn of 1941 that more than 80 partisan detachments were active, liberating a large area. The occupiers controlled only major cities — Belgrade, Kraljevo, Kragujevac, Niš, Valjevo and Šabac. Thanks to the selfless struggle of the partisans, a free partisan republic was established, and in its capital, the city of Užice, a parade of partisan troops was held on Novem-

ber 7, 1941 to mark the 24th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Throughout 1941, the partisans waged fierce battles against the occupiers and their collaborators. Only a hardened anti-communist from the 1990s, consumed by hatred, envy and primitive nationalism, could fail to understand and appreciate these historic achievements of the best sons of the Serbian people. Such a person is prone to bitter tears of hatred, memory lapses, feeble-mindedness and hallucinatory delusions.

Given that the newly-minted nationalist leader of Croatia, former Titoite general and Communist Party member Tuđman, along with his subordinate media, is making every effort to erase the Serbian people's contributions to the fight against fascism, it is necessary, in opposition to this falsehood, to emphasize the historical truth: the Serbian people were the backbone of the National Liberation War in Yugoslavia. Around them, all progressive forces of the South Slavs, including those of the Croatian people, rallied. To dispel the empty nationalist rhetoric of Tuđman and the Chetniks, it is best to cite the words of Tito, the commander-in-chief of the National Liberation Army and partisan detachments of Yugoslavia. He said these words not in the peaceful postwar years, but during the most difficult days of struggle in late November 1942, at the session of the First Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia in the city of Bihać, the capital of the free territory of the Serbian Krajina. Here are his words: "I must emphasize here the fact that the ranks of our National Liberation Army and the partisan detachments of Yugoslavia, from the very beginning until today, consist overwhelmingly of Serbs. It is specifically the Serbian, Montenegrin, Bosnian and Lika partisan detachments and brigades, composed almost entirely of Serbs, that have been and continue to wage relentless battles against the occupiers, Ustaše,

Chetniks and other enemies of the oppressed people. What does this prove? This proves that all the peoples of Yugoslavia... have their most reliable ally in the Serbian people. The Serbian people have made, and continue to make, the greatest sacrifices in blood in the fight against the occupiers and their vile servants — Pavelić's Ustaše, Nedić's police and Mihailović's Chetniks... Therefore, it is the sacred duty of the other peoples of Yugoslavia to join the liberation war against the occupiers and their collaborators together with the Serbian people to at least the same extent in the future."

Tito said this not because he loved Serbs more than Croats, but because during those most difficult days of the struggle, he relied on the Serbian partisan divisions and brigades that, in battles with the nazis and traitors, defended not only the country's freedom but also Tito himself. It was impossible at that time to speak anything but the truth. The former Yugoslav Army General Tuđman, who built his career after the war on the backs of these very Serbian partisans Tito spoke about, could not have been unaware of his commander-in-chief's words. All the more vile, therefore, are Tuđman's falsehoods today.

Bakarić, the former Secretary of the Communist Party of Croatia, was also correct when he said a year later, on November 29, 1943, at the Second Session of the Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ) in the liberated city of Jajce: "...At the First Session of AVNOJ in November 1942, we (Croats) were more representatives of the National Liberation Movement of the Serbian people in Croatia than representatives of the National Liberation Movement of the Croatian people. Now, in November 1943, the situation is changing..." Indeed, after the brilliant victories of the Red Army near Moscow and Stalingrad, on the Kursk Bulge and after the liberation of the Ukraine, seeing the heroic struggle of Serbian and Montenegrin partisan units, the masses of the Croatian people, who had been deluded, began to sober up. They started to view the "almighty Reich," the "independence" granted by Hitler and the atrocities of the Ustaše executioners and their genocide of the Serbian people throughout Bosnia and Croatia in a different light.

The calls of the heroic Croatian communists, who persistently and tirelessly explained that salvation could be found in brotherhood and unity with the fighting Serbian people, began to make sense. All of this together produced positive results, and Croatian workers gradually joined the National Liberation War of all the peoples of Yugoslavia. It must be noted that the remnants of the horrific Ustaše nationalism have persisted to this day. This is clearly evident in the 1990s, for example, in the activities and speeches of Tuđman himself, the leader of the nationalist thugs of today's Croatia.

Treachery

A Revealing Story About How, in Certain Cases, a Bourgeois Nationalist Feels Closer to the German Occupier and the British Government Than to His Own Rebellious People

The German command did not immediately take the uprising seriously, but when it realized that the partisan movement was growing stronger and could deal a strategic blow to the interests of the Third Reich, it launched a major offensive with its punitive divisions in late autumn 1941 on the free partisan territory, pressing the partisan detachments and breaking through the front in the north. And it was here, at the most difficult time for the Serbian National Liberation Movement, that Mihailović committed his first act of treach-

ery. The Chetniks treacherously opened the front to the Germans near Gornji Milanovac and Brajići. German punitive forces broke through the gaps with the aim of encircling and destroying the partisan detachments and the National Liberation Army. The Chetnik formations treacherously turned their weapons and also attacked the National Liberation Army. Caught off guard by this betrayal and suffering heavy losses, the army was forced to abandon the capital of the partisan republic, Užice, and retreat across the Drina River into the mountainous regions of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The occupiers burned hundreds of villages, shot, hanged and tortured thousands of people who sympathized with the National Liberation Movement. Following the German punitive forces, the Chetniks advanced like hyenas. While the Germans and their direct collaborators, the Nedić regime, controlled the cities, the Chetniks of Mihailović ruled the villages of Šumadija, Western Serbia, Pomoravlje and Central Serbia. Through bloody terror, they kept the rebellious population subdued — a fact that worked perfectly for the Germans. A submissive populace meant grain, corn, ore and anything else could be taken without resistance; strategic roads remained functional. The Chetniks, sinking their claws into the people like leeches, executed anyone suspected of harbouring resistance against the occupiers. And yes, executions were carried out with the Chetnik "kama" — a type of dagger. A term even emerged: "koljač" (slaughterer), used to describe someone who slits throats. The word "koljač" was whispered with horror in villages and hamlets. Mihailović and his warlords had it easy. Having established a convenient balance with the occupiers, they drank rakija, snacked on cold pork and waited for the war to end — letting the future unfold as it would. That was the situation in Serbia.

In Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the situation was, if

it can be said, even worse. The genocide of the Serbian people, conducted by Croatian and Muslim fascists — the Ustaše — under the auspices of the Gestapo and with the blessings of the Vatican, was carried out on a massive scale. Many documents and studies have been published about these horrific events. One of the thousands of examples of Ustaše atrocities is the massacre in the town of Glina in the Serbian Krajina, 50 kilometres south of the Croatian capital, Zagreb. The Ustaše herded 1,260 Serbian peasants and civilians into an Orthodox church, slaughtered them all and burned the church down. According to several specialized studies, the number of Serbs killed by the Ustaše in the fascist "Independent State of Croatia" is estimated at a minimum of 700,000.

In response to the genocide of the Serbian people and the atrocities committed by the Croatian and Muslim Ustaše, Mihailović's Chetniks, in line with their nationalist program of creating ethnically pure Serbian regions, committed genocide against Croatian and Muslim populations. Croatian and Muslim children, women and the elderly were also slaughtered. But who needed this? Who benefited from it? Clearly, the occupiers, both German and Italian. As long as the Croatian and Serbian peoples were annihilating each other, the German expansionists in the Balkans faced no serious threat. Only the National Liberation Army and partisan units, led by the communists, with their slogans of "Brotherhood and Unity" and "Death to Fascism, Freedom to the People," carried salvation to the people from mutual destruction. They united hundreds of thousands of people against the occupiers and their open and covert collaborators. This arduous struggle culminated in the Great Victory of the spring of 1945.

"Well, fine," the reader might say, "those are general statements. But where are the facts?" Unfortunately, there is no shortage of facts and evidence about the treachery and atroci-

ties of Mihailović's Chetniks. They have been published in dozens of volumes. Hundreds of names of young men and women who fell victim to Chetnik terror between 1941 and 1944 simply for wanting to fight against the occupiers could be cited. Photographs exist showing Mihailović's warlords cooperating with the German and Italian occupiers, and even with the Ustaše, whenever it served their shared goal of fighting the National Liberation Movement. The scope of this book does not allow for their inclusion, but if necessary, they could be published.

For illustration, I will provide only a few documents, figures and testimonies.

For example, here is an instruction from the Minister of War of the Yugoslav émigré government, now General Mihailović, dated December 20, 1941, to his commanders of Chetnik formations in Montenegro — Major Đorđije Lašić and Captain Pavle Đurić — ordering them to cleanse the Sandžak and Bosnia of Muslims and Croats:

"The goals of our units are as follows:

"1. To fight for the freedom of all our people under the banner of His Majesty Peter II.

"2. To create a Great Yugoslavia, and within it a Great Serbia, ethnically pure within the borders of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Srem, Banat and Bačka.

"3. To fight for the inclusion into our borders of still unliberated territories (Trieste, Gorizia, Istria and Carinthia), as well as Bulgaria and northern Albania, including Shkodra.

"4. To cleanse the state territory of national minorities and non-national elements.

"5. To establish direct borders between Serbia and Montenegro, and Serbia and Slovenia, by cleansing the Sandžak of Muslim inhabitants and Bosnia of Muslim and Croatian inhabitants."

And, of course, with such nationalist undertones in the order of the minister himself, what else could one expect besides tragedy?

Here is an example. On February 13, 1943, the Chief of Staff of the Lim-Sandžak Chetnik detachment sent a report to the Chief of Staff of Mihailović's Supreme Command on the genocide of Muslims in the Pljevlja, Čajniče and Foča districts. He literally wrote the following:

"The operations were carried out strictly in accordance with the orders and instructions. The attack began at the specified time. All commanders and units completed their tasks to general satisfaction.

"On the night of February 7, our units reached the Drina River and completed the combat operations by day. After that, they began cleansing the liberated territory. All Muslim villages in these areas were completely burned down, and not a single house was left standing.

"All property was destroyed except for livestock, grain and hay... During the operation, we proceeded with the complete extermination of the Muslim population, regardless of sex or age. Casualties: ours — 22 killed (including 2 accidental deaths) and 32 wounded. Among the Muslims — about 120 men and nearly 8,000 women, elderly and children.

"At the beginning of the operation, the Muslims began fleeing to Metaljka, Čajniče and the Drina River... About 2,000 escaped to Čajniče before we cut off their retreat routes. All other residents were exterminated."

According to the Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes and Fascist Terror, in the small town of Foča alone, the Chetniks killed 2,132 people from December 5, 1941 to January 20, 1942, including 280 children. Between

January 20, 1943 and 1944, they killed an additional 1,412 people, including 293 children.

Here is an example of documented collaboration between the Chetniks and the occupiers. Mihailović appointed the notorious Chetnik, Bajo Stanišić, as the leader of the Chetnik units in Montenegro. Despite receiving military aid from the British, Stanišić signed an agreement with the Italian occupiers for military collaboration against the National Liberation Army. The text of the agreement is quite revealing:

"The Committee of Montenegrin Nationalists of Podgorica and the Zeta Valley takes upon itself the following obligations:

"1. To wage an uncompromising fight against communism and the communists in Montenegro — this greatest international enemy.

"2. The leader of the Montenegrin nationalist units, Colonel Bajo I. Stanišić, will always remain in direct personal contact, or through his representatives, with the Supreme Command of the Italian forces in Montenegro throughout the duration of the agreement on joint actions against the communists in Montenegro.

"3. To exclude all politics from the movement he leads and to concentrate all efforts on the fight against communists.

"4. The Italian forces will ensure order in the cities, while in the villages, order will be maintained by the Montenegrin nationalists. Tasks concerning communications, railways and roads will be assigned by mutual agreement.

"5. The Montenegrin nationalists, regardless of the outcome of the war, will never fight against the Italian army.

"With mutual respect, trust and loyal relations, we will fully adhere to the commitments undertaken.

"Podgorica, March 5, 1942
"Colonel G. Baglione
"Colonel Bajo I. Stanišić"

It is difficult for the reader to imagine, but here, during the extraordinarily difficult period of the struggle of the peoples of Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, Europe and all of humanity against the brown plague — in March 1942, when thousands of anti-fascist fighters, Russians, Serbs, British, Poles, Croats, were being mowed down by fascist bullets — the Chetnik leader, Mihailović's subordinate Colonel Stanišić, and the fascist Colonel Baglione signed an agreement with "mutual respect" about how best to carry out their dark deeds against anti-fascists.

There are many such documents, as already mentioned. I will limit myself here to just three accounts of specific atrocities committed by the Chetniks.

Have you, dear reader, ever seen or heard of the photograph of Stefan Filipović, the People's Hero of Yugoslavia? This photograph has travelled the world. It has been displayed at photo exhibitions in many capitals — from Washington, London and Paris to Melbourne and Yogyakarta. It was once exhibited in Moscow as well. In the photo, a German officer captured the moment of Stefan's execution in the Serbian city of Valjevo in the spring of 1942. The public was gathered to witness the execution, and due to some German punctuality, the executioners, having placed the noose around Stefan's neck, delayed the hanging for 15 minutes because some senior Gestapo officer was late to the tragic spectacle. During these 15 minutes, the brave Stefan, with the noose around his neck, used the time to address the gathered crowd, urging them to fight for their freedom, to resist the invaders and their collaborators, and not to fear death for this great cause. In disbelief — "Is such a thing even possible?" — the German executioner captured Stefan with the noose around his neck, his fists raised high, his face determined and filled with hatred to-

ward the enemy, conveying his convictions and righteousness to the people surrounding him in his final moments. This is how the people remembered him, and this is how he entered history. I am writing about Stefan for another reason. He was not captured by the occupiers through some chance event. Stefan Filipović, the commissar of the Valjevo company of the partisan detachment, was captured through trickery by Mihailović's Chetniks and, after brutal torture, handed over to the Gestapo.

My father, Čedomir Milićević, a village schoolteacher, began organizing the Posavotamnava partisan detachment with his comrades in his region, in the hamlet of Mali Bošnjak in Western Serbia, after Germany attacked Soviet Russia. There were successes in the fight against the occupiers, as well as the bitterness of defeats. My father was involved in political and educational work and served as the commissar of the detachment. However, by the beginning of winter, after a major offensive by German anti-partisan divisions, the partisan detachments were forced to retreat to Bosnia. My father, however, was instructed by the command to remain in Western Serbia to organize an underground resistance and prepare new detachments for the spring.

One snowy February night in 1942, my father arrived in the village of Koceljeva, seeking shelter with an acquaintance. Someone betrayed him to the Chetniks, who surrounded the house and captured him. After beating and torturing him, Mihailović's Chetniks handed my father over to the Gestapo. In northern Norway, under the 76th parallel, at the Usen concentration camp for captured Serbian partisans, in November 1942, Čedomir Milićević and his comrades were punished for organizing an underground resistance and planning an escape. In the freezing polar night, the nazis "bathed" them until they turned into frozen blocks of ice.

Now, for the third example. On the western outskirts of Moscow lies the Kuntsevo Cemetery. Buried there are the remains of the truly legendary partisan Momčilo Đurić, a devoted son of the heroic Serbian people and all the peoples of Yugoslavia. Momčilo was born in the small village of Komirići in Western Serbia. His father died in the Balkan Wars, fighting to free the Serbian people from Turkish oppression. Left fatherless, Momčilo experienced the hardship of peasant labour early on, but to everyone's surprise, both work and study came easily to this young, handsome giant. His mother and two sisters were determined to give him a better life, and only their unwavering love and sacrifice enabled Momčilo to graduate from the Faculty of Law at the University of Belgrade. But then came the war in 1941.

Not far from Momčilo Đurić's native village, about six kilometres from the Drina River, lies the historic town of Bela Crkva. In this town, there is a monument — nine stone blocks. The artist who created this monument represented, in symbolic form, the first nine Serbian avengers of the people who rose to fight for the freedom and independence of their homeland against the German-Italian invaders and their collaborators. It was Momčilo Đurić and his comrades, led by the renowned Žikica Jovanović, who went into their first battle against the occupiers and domestic traitors serving them.

At this very place, the first shots were fired, proclaiming that the Serbian people would not tolerate the yoke of the invaders and their puppets. This occurred on July 7, 1941, a date that the Serbian people consider their national holiday. Momčilo Đurić became the commander of the Jadar partisan detachment and later the Valjevo partisan detachment. It was he and his comrades who stood their ground against advancing German divisions attacking the partisan republic. His fighters also protected the Chetniks until they crossed

over to the side of the occupiers. This united Valjevo partisan detachment, through its selfless struggle, ensured that the main forces of the Serbian people in rebellion could retreat across the Drina River into the mountains of Bosnia and Herzegovina without being encircled by the enemy. The Valjevo partisan detachment fought gruelling battles throughout the winter of 1941-42 against superior German forces, as well as Nedić's collaborators and the Chetniks. Only after exhausting their strength, in March 1942, did the detachment cross the Drina River and join the main forces of the Yugoslav National Liberation Army. Momčilo Đurić covered thousands of kilometres through the mountains and valleys of Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Serbian Krajina and Croatia in relentless battles against elite divisions of Germans, Italians, Croatian and Muslim Ustaše units, and Chetniks loyal to Mihailović, who saw it as their duty and honour to side with the occupiers in all major German and Italian operations against the National Liberation Army. Momčilo Đurić and his division liberated his native Western Serbia and the city of Valjevo in 1944, and, alongside the Red Army, helped liberate Belgrade. For his successful joint operations with the Red Army, Momčilo Đurić was awarded the Order of Suvorov.

The Chetniks of Mihailović took brutal revenge on the famed Serbian partisan. Remembering his successful campaigns against the German occupiers and their collaborators in Mačva, Pocerina and the Jadar region in 1941-42, and having heard from their fellow traitors about his effective actions against the occupiers in Bosnia and the Serbian Krajina, the Chetniks of Jadar continued their reign of terror over the local population. They stormed into a house in the village of Komirići, where Momčilo's mother and younger sister lived. In front of his mother's eyes, they first raped her daughter and then slit her throat. They then raped the mother and killed

her with a dagger.

All these tragic events, which highlight the betrayals by Mihailović's Chetniks, are now a distant past. One would think there is no need to recount such bitter memories. But no. Just 50 years later, there are people who, either out of ignorance or malice, driven by personal selfish interests, seek to whitewash what is black. Centuries of experience teach us that without knowledge of historical facts and processes, a person becomes disoriented, like wandering in a fog, and easily falls victim to the massive waves of lies — be they Goebbelsian, Gorbachevian, Clintonian, Yakovlevian, Tuđmanian, Draškovićian or Đukanovićian propaganda and demagogy.

And yet, Hitler's order to destroy the partisan National Liberation Movement in Yugoslavia at any cost was not carried out, despite the continuous offensives of punitive divisions. Neither the Gestapo, nor the satellite occupying forces of Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, nor the domestic traitors — the Ustaše, Nedić's collaborators, Draža's Chetniks — nor collaborators of all kinds, nor the occupiers' cunning attempts to ignite ethnic hatred and fratricidal wars helped. The National Liberation War grew in scale, and after the brilliant victories of the Red Army at Stalingrad, on the Kursk-Orel line and the liberation of the Ukraine, no Hitler, Gestapo or local traitors could stop this struggle.

The End of the War and the Initial Period of Socialist Construction 1945-48

The peoples of Yugoslavia, without any exaggeration, were the most reliable allies of Soviet Russia in its mortal struggle against Hitler's Germany. One only needs to objectively look at the facts and figures, to delve into the conditions in

which these peoples fought, and their aspirations and ideals that led them into battle. The struggle was brutal and merciless, like the clash at Kulikovo Field. The National Liberation Army and the partisan units of Yugoslavia, together with the 3rd Ukrainian Front of the Red Army, completely liberated the country and its capital, Belgrade, from the second half of 1944 to May 1945. And so, after the gruelling and exhausting four-year fight for freedom, at last came the blossoming, joyous, blood-stained May of 1945 — heartbreaking to the point of tears but nonetheless victorious. The peoples of the South Slavs, with the same triumphant slogan of "Brotherhood and Unity of Nations," set about rebuilding their devastated lands and constructing a new life, guided by the great ideals of socialism — equality and the brotherhood of working people. In those times, together with Soviet Russia, they were invincible. It is no coincidence that during that period, the representative of the powerful Western monopolies, President Truman, was seething in impotent rage, for he understood that despite the monopoly on the atomic bomb, he could only wave it like a priest waves a censer — and nothing more.

During the National Liberation War, the peoples of Yugoslavia, having continuously maintained territories liberated from the occupiers, began building their system of people's governance from the first days of the uprising. This system consisted of people's councils, headed by the AVNOJ. The leading role in this system belonged to the CPY. Within this framework, a broad political organization called the People's Front was established, encompassing all citizens willing to fight against the occupiers, regardless of their political or religious beliefs or national affiliation.

In accordance with the decision of the Yalta Allied Conference, held in the Crimea in February 1945, the AVNOJ was recognized as the provisional parliament of Yugoslavia.

Deputies from the prewar royal parliament of Yugoslavia were included in it, but only those who had not collaborated in any way with the occupiers. The AVNOJ passed a law on elections for a constitutional parliament, which was to decide whether the monarchy would continue to exist in the country. It also formed a provisional government headed by the General Secretary of the CPY, the Commander-in-Chief of the National Liberation Army and partisan units of Yugoslavia, Tito. Elections were held on November 11, 1945, and the People's Front won decisively, with 96 per cent of Yugoslav voters supporting its candidates. The bourgeois parties, due to their collaborationist policies with the occupiers or passive stance toward the occupiers' terror, lost all credibility among the people and suffered defeat. The newly-elected constitutional parliament adopted a declaration proclaiming the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia on November 29, 1945, which permanently abolished the monarchy. In line with the slogan of brotherhood, unity and equality for all the peoples of Yugoslavia, six federal republics were established: Serbia (with the autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Metohija, and Vojvodina), Croatia (without autonomy for Dalmatia and Krajina), Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Macedonia. The first president was elected as Tito, the Prime Minister of the provisional government and the leader of the CPY. The parliament also affirmed the initial gains of the socialist revolution in Yugoslavia. Private property was placed under state control and incorporated into the country's planned economy.

The main challenge facing the country and its leadership was the question of rebuilding the country, devastated and plundered by the occupiers.

Yugoslavia suffered enormous losses during the Second World War. Out of the 15,000,000 prewar population of

Yugoslavia, 1,706,000 people perished during the war. 3,500,000 citizens were left homeless. Two-fifths of the country's industrial potential was destroyed. A total of 289,000 farms were ruined. More than half of the railroads and the entire railway stock were destroyed. The scale of devastation is further illustrated by the fact that, excluding the losses of the USSR and Poland, Yugoslavia accounted for 17.6 per cent of the total national wealth lost by the rest of Europe and America.

Nevertheless, the enthusiasm that swept across the working people in 1944-45, following the victory over fascist Germany and the hard-won freedom achieved in arduous battles, naturally extended to the restoration of the national economy. The Anti-Fascist Youth, led by the League of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia, as well as trade unions, the Anti-Fascist Women's Front and the People's Front, worked together to rebuild homes, schools, railways, factories, mines, libraries and more. The results were not long in coming. By 1945, the railways were restored, and by 1947, industrial production had reached prewar levels.

At the end of the war, the Yugoslav People's Army numbered 800,000 people, primarily young individuals. After demobilization, young partisans returned to the classroom in schools, partisan gymnasiums, faculties and universities, and by 1948, the number of students far exceeded the prewar level. At the University of Belgrade alone, around 40,000 students were enrolled. The same trends were observed in the capitals of the federal republics and other major cities across the country.

It is important to note that during this period of general enthusiasm and freedom, people's courts continued to examine the vile and treacherous actions of collaborators and determine appropriate punishments. The former Minister of War

of the royal government, Mihailović, attempted to hide in the mountainous regions of Eastern Bosnia while retreating with his Chetnik units, similar to the Ustaše and German occupiers. However, under pressure from the National Liberation Army, the Chetnik units were completely destroyed. Mihailović's right-hand man, Voivode Kalabić, was captured and promised to help locate Mihailović, who had gone underground, which he accomplished in 1946. The Supreme Court of Yugoslavia, after reviewing all evidence in an open session, hearing numerous witnesses and listening to Mihailović's explanations, found him guilty and sentenced him to the highest measure of punishment — execution by firing squad. The sentence was carried out that same year. The property of convicted collaborators and the occupiers themselves was confiscated. As a result of these measures, by the end of 1945, 82 per cent of industry had been transferred to public ownership.

At the end of 1946, a law was passed nationalizing all enterprises and banks of national and republican significance. This act put an end to attempts by foreign capital to increase its influence and interfere in the internal affairs of the sovereign state. An important agrarian reform law was also adopted, stipulating that land should belong to those who directly cultivate it. The estates of landlords, large landowners and church landholdings were abolished. More than 800,000 hectares of arable land were transferred free of charge to 300,000 families of landless and poorest peasants. Another 300,000 hectares of land were allocated to the state agricultural sector. This reform created the preliminary conditions for the organization of large agricultural enterprises based on socialist principles.

In turn, the expropriation of capitalist property necessitated the creation of bodies for planning the entire state economy, which led to the development and approval of the first

five-year plan for the country's development at the highest level in early 1947. State planning yielded excellent results right from the start. By the end of 1947, industrial production had exceeded prewar levels by 30 per cent. The extraction of coal, production of steel, electricity and other sectors also surpassed prewar levels. Construction began on major industrial projects such as "Ivo Lola Ribar," Litostroj, the complex in Zenica and many others. Gradually, planned industrialization began, aligned with the needs of the country and the socialist camp.

The building of the foundations of socialism largely followed the well-trodden path of the Soviet people, naturally taking into account Yugoslavia's specific circumstances. All the positive aspects of the first socialist state were adopted, but unfortunately, due to both objective and subjective reasons, some negative elements of the Soviet system of that time were also adopted unknowingly. Thus, the first three postwar years passed.

The Role of the Subjective Factor in the Fate of the People

Now, in the mid-1990s, when the ruins of both the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia smoulder, it may easily seem that the reasons for their collapse are the same. However, upon closer examination, this proves to be largely inaccurate.

In the destruction of the Soviet Union, V.I. Lenin's warnings proved prophetic when he stated that if anyone could destroy Soviet Russia, it would be bureaucracy! Equally farsighted were the warnings of J.V. Stalin, who said that as Soviet society and socialism developed, class struggle within it would intensify! Indeed, from the vantage point of the late 1990s, it is evident that as the welfare of the Soviet people gradually

increased and as a systematic, effective form of control was absent (control that was neither formalized by bureaucracy nor dependent in any way on the authorities themselves), and with the sharp decline in systematic efforts to combat flaws and shortcomings in the management of socialist society after Stalin's death, there were only two paths for the USSR to follow in its further development.

Either the parasitic layers of society — unrestrained party elites, administrative bureaucracy, shadow economy operators, embezzlers, speculators — merging with the criminal underworld and in alliance with counter-revolutionary elements within and outside the country, will attempt to overthrow the Soviet system, which is based on public ownership. Only under these conditions can they launder the wealth stolen from the people over the past two to three decades in the chaos of counter-revolution. After the destruction of the workers' and peasants' state, they will seize additional material assets from public property, as much as they can.

Or the working people, at this stage of development, will prove wiser and, in a continuous struggle against parasitic elements, will overcome their ambitions, preserve Soviet power and socialist property, and move forward in the development of a state of social justice, eliminating along the way the existing and newly-arising flaws and deficiencies that enable parasitic elements to gain strength.

Of course, it must be acknowledged that the destruction of such a powerful socialist state as the Soviet Union was not solely the result of the degenerative activities of the party and administrative bureaucracy (which became unrestrained after Stalin's death and Khrushchev's rise to power, strengthening their economic and political positions in the 1960s-80s), but also the result of several other interrelated factors. These include the lack of further development of the theory of mod-

ern management systems for socialist society, in line with the remarkable achievements of science in the field of complex systems management in the second half of the 20th century. Also, the absence of self-regulation and the necessary negative feedback mechanisms in the management system of socialist society played a role. Excessive centralization of everything, without adequate objective and independent oversight separate from the executive power, accelerated the stagnation process. All of this, in turn, gave rise to the phenomenon of the cult of personality and subsequent waves of smaller "cult figures." These "cult figures," despite their incredible mediocrity and incompetence, were able to manipulate the system increasingly in favour of not only the bureaucracy that supported them and thrived under their rule, but also their personal interests. Under conditions of weak oversight and a lack of strict feedback mechanisms in the overly centralized system of social management, there arose the possibility of subjugating the system to the interests of an individual, whose direction of influence, as history shows, could be aimed either positively or negatively (like the fable of the good and bad king). The upper echelons of the Soviet party and administrative bureaucracy, in the absence of the most stringent control, supported these "cult figures," and were in turn supported by them. Gradually, they transformed into a parasitic caste increasingly disconnected from the interests of the people, more and more opposing their own interests to those of the people, until their moral degradation reached the level of unprecedented betrayal.

Of course, it is also necessary to take into account the systematic efforts of developed capitalist countries to destroy the socialist system at any cost, as well as a number of other factors, without which it is difficult to properly evaluate the causes of socialism's defeat.

It is remarkable, but true — more than ten years have passed since the open counter-revolutionary chaos began in Soviet Russia, which, in a hidden form, had started much earlier. It is hard to believe that in such an educated society, a scientific analysis of the causes of socialism's defeat has not yet been provided. Of course, some time is needed for the ideological fog of rabid counter-revolution to dissipate, for the tiresome whining of revisionists of all kinds — who have flourished so profusely in the atmosphere of defeat — to die down, and for society to calmly begin clearing the rubble. Counter-revolution will not stop life, and there is no doubt that the intellectual genius of Russia's working people will find the strength to solve the task of a scientific Marxist analysis of socialism's defeat today, and on that basis chart a path for the workers' struggle to achieve socialist ideals in the future.

However, if we return to the issue of Yugoslavia and its postwar period after 1948, it is necessary to now acknowledge an obvious truth: the devastating blow to the nascent socialist construction in Yugoslavia was not dealt by an emerging socialist bureaucracy. At that time, the administrative apparatus was just beginning to take shape, entirely dependent on the successes of socialist construction, and did not even dream of counter-revolution or the restoration of capitalism.

The blow in 1948 was delivered by a subjective factor, cultivated according to Soviet recipes on fertile Balkan soil — the cult of Tito's personality. There was centralization of power, there was a prominent personality, the cult flourished, but there were no effective restrictive mechanisms. Everything depended on how the subjective factor, the specific leading individual, would steer the ship of state and which winds they would direct its sails toward.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERIOD OF 1948-1989

THE GRADUAL AMERICANIZATION OF YUGOSLAV SOCIETY

A LESSON IN HOW THE GENERAL SECRETARY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF YUGOSLAVIA TRANSFORMED FROM A REVOLUTIONARY INTO AN IMPLEMENTER OF WESTERN STRATEGIC DESIGNS

The flirtation between the talented Western strategist Churchill and the leader of the Yugoslav communists, Tito, did not begin in 1948 but somewhat earlier. Tito's biographers write about this in the spirit of Western disinformation — rather vaguely and contradictorily. The Foreign Office itself and its loyal assistant, the Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), have remained silent on this issue for over half a century. However, as the saying goes, "You can't hide an awl in a sack." It is enough to compare the facts that have leaked out over time under circumstances beyond the SIS's control, and a clear picture of Tito's behaviour in 1948 begins to emerge for any reasonable person. Here are some of these astonishing facts for the reader to judge:

1. The very punctual executor of Comintern directives (iron discipline was a hallmark of the communist movement at that time), General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPY, Tito, despite being deeply underground, nevertheless established a secret radio station in 1940 to maintain contact with the Comintern in the home of a covert SIS operative, V. Velebit (?!).

2. On May 9, 1941, Tito illegally moved from Zagreb to Belgrade and lived in the bourgeois district of Belgrade in the villas of pro-British bourgeois figures — Ribnikar, Savićević, Petrović — directing the underground from there (?!).

3. As is known, the uprising of the people against the occupiers began immediately after June 22, 1941. A large part of Serbia was liberated straight away. The uprising was led by members of the Central Committee of the CPY, who, after a meeting on June 22, dispersed to their regions and were deeply involved in the events. Tito "delayed" joining the free territory for three months and arrived at the Kolubara partisan detachment in Western Serbia only on September 18, 1941.

4. On October 15, 1941, Tito arrived in the liberated city of Užice, where the main headquarters of the partisan movement was located. By this time, a British submarine had landed a delegation from the British General Staff on the Montenegrin coast of the Adriatic. The delegation included Captain Hudson from the SIS, two majors of the Royal Army in London and a telegraph operator named Dragičević. They travelled through the partisan-liberated territory of Montenegro and arrived in Užice, where they were received by Tito. What Tito and Hudson discussed remains unknown. The next day, Captain Hudson and both majors left to meet with Mihailović, while the telegraph operator Dragičević stayed with Tito to maintain telegraph communication with the Comintern (?!).

5. At the end of November 1941, the German command launched a major offensive on the free partisan territory and attacked Užice on November 29. The main headquarters and the remnants of the city's defenders retreated south to the Zlatibor mountain range and stopped in a place called Palisad, fearing that Tito had stayed behind in the city. Suddenly, after midnight, Tito appeared accompanied by Captain

Hudson, having reportedly been delayed in the basements of the Užice bank. How Hudson ended up there and what transpired remains unknown.

6. The main partisan forces retreated to the mountains of Bosnia and Herzegovina along with Tito. On February 25, 1942, Tito received information from Montenegro that a second mission of British intelligence was seeking contact with him and that they would arrive on March 19, 1942. The delegation included British Major T. Atherton, telegraph operator Donovan and General Nedeljković. On April 16, 1942, the British delegation left to meet with Mihailović.

7. In the spring of 1943, the main group of partisan units, having crossed the Drina, Piva and Tara rivers, found themselves in the mountainous areas of Montenegro near Mount Durmitor. The main partisan headquarters received reliable information that the German command was preparing a major offensive (the so-called Fifth Offensive) with the aim of encircling and completely destroying the partisan units concentrated in the Durmitor region. It was necessary to leave the dangerous area before May 20, before the punitive divisions could close the ring of encirclement. However, Tito, staying on a plateau near the Black Lake, delayed issuing the order for the timely withdrawal of partisan units from the area. He was waiting for the arrival of the 3rd British military mission, which was supposed to parachute onto the plateau. The mission arrived eight crucial days late. The punitive forces, along with the Chetniks, closed the ring. Finally, the delegation parachuted in at 2 a.m. on May 28, 1943. The mission consisted of six members, including two captains — B. Sporad and J. Deakin. Only the next day was the order given for the partisan units to break through the German encirclement. Since the Wehrmacht had ample time to strengthen the ring, the partisan units suffered enormous losses during the

breakthrough. Up to 20,000 were killed in the assault and breakthrough of enemy positions. Several thousand wounded partisans were finished off by the punitive forces.

8. In March 1944, British Prime Minister Churchill sent his trusted representative — his son, Randolph Churchill — to the partisan-liberated town of Drvar to meet with Tito. Randolph Churchill remained with Tito until May, after which he returned to his father with a detailed report on the work accomplished.

9. In August 1944, British Prime Minister Churchill, while in Italy, invited Tito to visit him. The General Secretary of the CPY gladly accepted the invitation. Tito's biographers — renowned historians such as I. Božić, S. Ćirković, M. Ekmečić and V. Dedijer — write in detail about these meetings: "Churchill and Tito met three times over the course of two days. The most important meeting was the first, held on August 12, 1944, from 12:00 to 1:15 p.m. On the Yugoslav side, only Olga Ninčić was present (?) to assist with translation, which meant she did not manage to draft any record of the conversation. On the British side, in addition to Churchill, the British diplomat Pearson Dixon was present and kept a record. At the subsequent meetings between Churchill and Tito, several other figures from the Yugoslav side were also present. Additional information about these meetings comes from what those participants learned through informal conversations regarding the content of the first meeting between Churchill and Tito."

In connection with the above, two obvious questions arise:

— Who was Olga Ninčić, that she alone was entrusted to be present at the first (as biographers call it) historic meeting between Churchill and Tito, even though prominent leaders of the National Liberation Movement and members of the

Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPY were nearby?

— What exactly was discussed in such a highly classified first conversation between Churchill and Tito?

It turns out that Olga Ninčić was one of Tito's associates and the daughter of a well-known bourgeois figure from royalist Yugoslavia, who had served as Minister of Foreign Affairs in the government of General Simović, which carried out the pro-British coup in Belgrade on March 27, 1941, with the participation of the SIS. Being the daughter of very affluent parents, Olga not only received a high-quality education but also had the opportunity to visit England before the war. There, it seems, she not only improved her knowledge of the English language but also expanded her understanding of various aspects of political and public affairs. Thus, it is only natural that she fully met the expectations not only of Churchill and Tito but also of the SIS, which was facilitating such a significant, secret and historic meeting in every sense. It is also not surprising that for many subsequent decades, she did not utter a single word about the substance of this first meeting between Churchill and Tito.

Regarding the content of the first meeting between Churchill and Tito, based on fragments of scattered information, informal conversations, memoirs and the actual subsequent actions of the involved figures, historians have agreed that Churchill and Tito discussed the following topics. First and foremost, Churchill was highly interested in the future social structure of the new Yugoslavia, as he envisioned it, and the implementation of this strategy. Tito provided comprehensive explanations on this issue. Having reached mutual agreement, they thoroughly discussed what and how to communicate about this meeting to Stalin and Roosevelt, especially given that the Red Army was about to enter the

Balkans. They also addressed the political elimination of Mihailović, who was no longer needed by the British, his collaboration with the occupiers and the matter of the Yugoslav émigré royal government in London.

Military cooperation on various aspects was discussed during the other two meetings, which were attended by generals from the partisan liberation movement.

Given the above, Tito's postwar behaviour becomes less surprising — provided one is not swayed by the incredible amount of fabrications and political chatter from Titoite and Western historians. The early period of socialist construction in 1945-47 was previously discussed, but it did not mention Tito's various actions that indicated his gradual preparatory steps towards distancing Yugoslavia from the socialist camp of nations. These steps were analysed in detail by J.V. Stalin and V.M. Molotov in their letters to Tito, Kardelj and Ranković. Initially, these letters contained mild, comradely criticism, pointing out inconsistencies in Tito's foreign and domestic policies, but gradually they adopted a principled tone, demanding precise answers and explanations. These letters were published in 1948 and can be found for those who wish to familiarize themselves with them. From the vantage point of the late 20th century, it is clear that tens of thousands of steadfast Yugoslav fighters against fascism, hundreds of heroic commanders of partisan units, talented leaders of the underground resistance, as well as J.V. Stalin and the Soviet leadership, underestimated the collusion between Churchill and Tito on August 12, 1944.

In 1948, the first stage of Churchill's successful strategic plan concluded with Tito transitioning into the Anglo-American camp.

By betraying the interests of the peoples of Yugoslavia, Tito, if he wanted to remain in power, first had to deal with the CPY and its living members, most of whom had been hardened in the bloody struggle against fascism, were pro-Soviet in orientation and unwaveringly believed in the justice of socialist ideals. Counting on the possibility of buying them off with positions or career opportunities was out of the question. The dismantling of the Communist Party was quietly prepared in advance and successfully carried out between 1948 and 1956. Of the 285,147 members of the CPY at the beginning of 1948, 218,379 were expelled — an overwhelming majority of whom had borne the brunt of the fight for freedom and socialism. All of them were repressed, and along with several hundred thousand non-party individuals, they endured the grind of horrific concentration camps — such as "Goli Otok," "Sveti Grgur," "Bileća," "Mermer," "Zabela," "Ugljan," "Gradiška," "Ramski Rit," "Glavnjača" and other "sacred" places within a system designed to break the human psyche and will according to the "democratic" models and methods of the "civilized" West.

Traitors in power always exact cruel revenge on the greatest sons of their people. As the Serbs say, "A turncoat is worse than a Turk" ("A traitor is worse than an enemy"). When Tito switched allegiance to the Anglo-Americans in 1948 and turned Yugoslavia into the main mouthpiece of anti-Sovietism, he asked Momčilo Đurić (the same famous partisan previously mentioned, who that sweltering summer of 1948 commanded the guard units of the Yugoslav People's Army), "Are you with me or against me?" Momčilo replied plainly that the peoples of Yugoslavia could only build a better future in alliance with Soviet Russia. There was no other path. Therefore, he would not stand against Soviet Russia, nor did he advise Tito to do so. Like tens of thousands of other Yugoslav communists, Đurić was arrested in August 1948.

Momčilo Đurić spent eight long years, from 1948 to 1956, in Tito's prisons. These renowned partisans, as well as tens of thousands of Serbian, Montenegrin, Croatian, Slovenian and Macedonian communists were subjected to such refined tortures that even the likes of anti-Soviet writers such as Rybakov, Solzhenitsyn, Granin, Yevtushenko, Voznesensky, Zakharov, Aksyonov, Soloukhin, Sakharov, Shafarevich and their ilk could not have imagined them even in their worst nightmares.

The creeping counter-revolution orchestrated by Tito was gaining momentum, and in its battle against its primary enemies — the members of the CPY — it far exceeded the "achievements" of the Gestapo. While the Gestapo sought to destroy people physically, Tito's counter-revolution aimed to break them morally and use them as tools of terror to intimidate the population. The goal was to break their will at any cost, turning them into feral traitors. During this period of "quiet" counter-revolution and brutal repression, the "humane" and "highly humanitarian" West remained silent, not even daring to mention human rights. Yet writers and intellectuals in Moscow, Russia and even the "civilized" West could have learned the horrifying, truly horrifying truth if they had wished, by reading books like *Beat the Gang* by Miroslav Popović, *In Tito's Factories of "Traitors"* by Milivoj Stevanović, the works of academician Dragoslav Mihailović, or the testimonies of women in *The Women's Camp on Goli Otok* compiled by Dragoslav Simić and Boško Trivunović, among other accounts from living and deceased witnesses who survived this nightmare.

Not a single one of these books has been translated into Russian, thanks to the "efforts" of the Sixtiers, Gorbachev, Yakovlev and others like them. Spreading this truth did not align with the interests of the pro-Western ideological manipulation of Russians carried out by the Sixtiers, nor did it align with the propaganda of Tito's "market-based, humane" socialism funded by the West, nor with the Sixtiers' plans for "reform," which, alongside other factors, destabilized the foundations of Soviet society. Given the abundance of factual material, it is, to put it mildly, inappropriate for Y. Loshchits to reference former members of the League of Communists, who are now nationalist-oriented writers like Ćosić and Isaković, when discussing this issue. During the tragic period of Tito's "quiet" counter-revolution in Yugoslavia from 1948 to 1960, they served as ideological henchmen of Tito in the destruction of the Communist Party. Only ideological defectors and opportunists are capable of such behaviour. After betraying their comrades, they defect, brush themselves off, settle comfortably into their chairs, pontificate about the horrific suffering of their former comrades-in-arms, and nonchalantly offer their "own" evaluation of these events and actions. Of course, their assessment is false, as they must whitewash themselves both before their children and before history.

Momčilo Đurić endured those eight years of continuous torture and ultimately emerged a moral victor. As a highly educated and honest man, he never confused timelines, the chronology of events, causes and consequences. He examined them in their development, always demanded a concrete analysis of a specific situation in serious discussions and was always ready to face the truth. In the fiery summer of 1941, when Tito, as leader of the CPY, pursued a political line of struggle by the peoples of Yugoslavia against the occupiers, for the freedom and independence of their homeland — supported by such a powerful and historically proven ally as Soviet Russia — Momčilo Đurić considered this course of action the only correct one. He fully committed to it with all his strength during the dark days of the Second World War. Personally, he supported Tito as a leader and even saved him from death three times. However, when Tito, corrupted by unlimited power and total lack of accountability, committed treason, Momčilo, despite the enormous cult of Tito by 1948, told him this to his face. For this, he paid a heavy price, as did hundreds of thousands of his like-minded comrades.

The West's Strategic Designs and Their Implementation Through Tito

Market-Based, "Humane," "Democratic," "Self-Managing" Socialism Funded by the West

What all this chaos ultimately led to for the SFR of Yugoslavia in 1989-91 is generally known. However, for a Russian — or more broadly, a Soviet person (understood as residents of all Union republics) — to understand the true causes of the Yugoslav catastrophe, especially under the crushing weight of more than a decade of unrestrained anti-socialist propaganda that engulfed Russia, is incredibly difficult.

"How could this happen?" exclaimed, in genuine disbelief, Moscow and St. Petersburg intellectuals from both the left and right, as well as newly-minted businessmen from among former physicists and linguists, workers and party officials who had lost power but stood on some form of Russian-Marxist-Orthodox positions. "How could this happen? We ourselves have been there, whether on tourist or party-administrative trips. What a prosperous country it was, not to mention its natural beauty! And how well they treated us!"

they cried out, sincerely and, unfortunately, often confusing divine grace with scrambled eggs.

To untangle the complex Balkan knot, with its internal contradictions and external intrigues, it is necessary to examine, at least broadly, the further development of Tito's "League of Communists," the nationalist movements in Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Macedonia. Of course, this must also account for the goals and interests of the West's leading force — the United States — as understood in specific periods and how they shifted in response to changing global circumstances.

After the Second World War, from which the Soviet Union emerged victorious, Churchill and Western strategists were not so much interested in seeing Yugoslavia as a capitalist country with the not-so-clever but obedient King Peter II at its head as they were in driving a wedge into the emerging socialist bloc of nations. These nations, empowered by the victory and strength of the Soviet Army, were attempting to build a more equal and just society than the one they had known before the war. The clever strategists of the West wanted not only to drive a wedge but, in the event of success, to fully exploit it, as the saying goes, "to the hilt." Thus, in 1948, Tito, having secured guarantees from the West, played the card of constructing socialism — not according to the "Soviet, Asiatic, totalitarian" model, but rather in the image of Western democracy: "foggy, legalistic, free from any constraints, market-driven and self-managed socialism." To lull the peoples of Yugoslavia, who had enthusiastically embarked on building a more just society compared to the prewar monarchy and bourgeois dictatorship, and who had recently achieved a remarkable and historically significant victory over fascism alongside Soviet Russia, mere slogans like "we will do it differently, not with those allies..." were insufficient. For this, Tito received

from the Anglo-American and international monetary funds the equivalent of "thirty pieces of silver" — thirty billion dollars — which played their "modest" role in temporarily and artificially raising the standard of living for a portion of the working population. Although Tito's so-called self-managed system, over a mere 20 years (from 1950 to 1970), created a class of nouveau riche, a decayed party elite, a massive number of unemployed, an increase in illiteracy among the lower classes and paved the way for the Americanization of society through the spread of American mass culture, pornography, drug addiction and prostitution — while fostering an obsession with material accumulation and profit as the primary goals of life — no immediate social upheaval was expected. Tito, to be fair, was fortunate. He opened the Western borders. For example, a Yugoslav passport was highly valued in the international criminal and mafia world because it allowed travel anywhere in the West without restrictions or oversight. Only the Eastern borders were closed, with strict and high-level control in place.

A massive army of unemployed Yugoslavs flowed westward. During this postwar period, Western monopolies needed low-skilled labourers and eagerly accepted guest workers from North Africa, Tunisia, Morocco, Turkey, Spain, the Middle East and now Yugoslavia. In this way, the unemployment problem — one of the key issues of the system — was temporarily solved.

Western strategists were eager for the construction of "humane, democratic, market-driven, self-managed" socialism with Anglo-American funding and their direct participation to become widely known — not just globally, but especially among the peoples of the socialist bloc. Tito's anti-communist, anti-Soviet, anti-Russian and anti-Slavic propaganda machine roared into full gear. A curious reader need only browse

through Yugoslav newspapers and magazines or listen to recordings of radio and television broadcasts from the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s to see the full picture. Anti-Soviet and anti-communist rhetoric flowed like a river, skilfully blending fabrications with factual critiques of shortcomings in Soviet society. After all, it is one thing when the *Voice of America,* the *BBC* or *Radio Free Europe* speak out against socialism, but the effect is entirely different when such things — wrapped in semi-Marxist phraseology — are said by a celebrated freedom fighter, a well-known communist, a former Comintern member and the leader of the "League of Communists," along with his associates. Tito, after all, was portrayed as someone who knew everything about this so-called "Evil Empire."

Building a "new market-based, democratic, self-managed, humane society" with Western money and in a Western style, Tito implemented a full decentralization of the economic system, delegating control to "his own" cadres in the national republics (more on these "cadres" later) and establishing their strong ties and subordination to Western monopolies. This widespread decentralization led to the absence of any central planning and resulted in the creation of six centres of economic power within Yugoslavia, each with its own independent networks, markets and interests. These centres, driven by the pursuit of profit (seeking to acquire as much as possible while contributing as little as possible), fostered nationalism and separatist tendencies. They simply awaited a convenient moment, pretext or set of circumstances to turn against each other. However, such a time was still to come. In the meantime, Tito's anti-communist propaganda machine was highly effective and proved immensely useful to American, British and German capital during the Cold War. This propaganda served the West faithfully and reliably, acting as Tito's repayment for the loans he received abundantly from them.

Khrushchev's Role in Strengthening Titoism in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union

A shift in policy inevitably affected the balance of political forces within Yugoslav society itself. Mention has already been made of the brutal crackdown Tito orchestrated against dissenting communists and the CPY between 1948 and 1955. For the sake of truth, it should also be added that, politically and psychologically, the resistance of the communists and their many supporters to Tito's treacherous policies suffered its final, lasting blow due to Khrushchev's misguided and crude attempt to win Tito back into the camp of Soviet allies between 1956 and 1958 through unprincipled overtures.

Unfortunately, Tito proved to be far more intelligent, calculating and cunning. By placing the full burden of responsibility for Tito's shift toward imperialism on the Soviet Union and proclaiming Tito as a "true Leninist," Khrushchev, constrained by his own limitations and personal ambitions, failed to grasp the long-term consequences of his actions for Tito and the West in their efforts to undermine the Soviet Union itself. Now, the cult of Tito's personality and his position within Yugoslavia were bolstered not only by the West but also by the East. As the number one "fighter against the villain Stalin," Tito was given carte blanche to do as he pleased. An artificial ideological rift was created within the Soviet Union's ideological monolith and the CPSU, allowing a flood of lies to flow through it — not just targeting Stalin but Lenin and socialism as a whole. Riding this momentum, Khrushchev expanded cooperation between the CPSU and Tito's "League of Communists." Hundreds of Soviet party and government delegations were sent to witness the "Yugoslav miracle" and learn how to build this "amazing, humane, market-driven democratic socialism," which so skilfully collaborated with

the "benevolent" Western monopolies and the "understanding" Western politicians. The narrative pushed by Yugoslavia and the West portrayed Western capitalists as eager to help the Yugoslavs — and indeed any other nation — build a market-based and humane socialism. Tito spared no expense in showcasing this "success" to Soviet officials and intellectual elites, generously hosting them and lavishing them with tours of well-stocked store shelves and luxurious resorts. Along the way, they were casually exposed to a wealth of anti-Soviet literature, fabricated in the West and widely translated and published in Yugoslavia. Anti-socialist works by Tito-aligned Yugoslav writers were also readily available, conveniently placed for Soviet guests to see and read.

Khrushchev realized his mistake too late, only crying out in 1962 that Tito was "not marching in step"! The elevation of Tito's authority among party cadres, as well as Moscow and Leningrad intelligentsia, was fuelled by the torrent of anti-Soviet, anti-socialist and pro-Western propaganda that erupted under the guise of the "fight against Stalin's cult of personality" during the years 1956-64. This propaganda echoed the rhetoric once promoted by Goebbels, later by Anglo-American sources and finally by Titoite propagandists. Tito's image as a leader was further bolstered by a clever narrative spun by the ideologists of Titoism. It claimed that Tito had the courage to confront the "tyrant Stalin" in 1948 during Stalin's lifetime, while Khrushchev, having loyally served Stalin during his life, only dared to criticize him posthumously after two years of silence. As the saying goes, "there's a world of difference between the two."

The Soviet bureaucratic elite, the Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev humanitarian intelligentsia, journalists and economists were all educated in the Titoite school. Among its alumni were poets like Voznesensky and Yevtushenko, playwrights

like Shatrov, novelists like Rybakov, economists like Abalkin and Popov, reformers like Shatalin, and even the Gaidar family (grandfather and son). Others included Aganbegyan, Bunich, Arbatov, Primakov, and figures like Afanasyev, Shmelev, Shaferovich and Govorukhin — not to mention individuals like Korotich, Bovin and Solzhenitsyn, who have tirelessly carried out their destructive work, openly supported by the American agencies. One cannot overlook the countless political figures as well, from Political Bureau members like Gorbachev, Lukyanov, Yakovlev and Shevardnadze, to leaders like Aliyev, Nazarbayev, Akaev and Zasokhov. Also included were hundreds of other party bureaucrats, officials in trade unions and the Komsomol, and Central Committee functionaries like Volsky, Travkin and Chernomyrdin. On the foundations of Tito's betrayal and revision of Marxism-Leninism — what was dubbed "reformism" — a significant faction of bureaucrats and intellectuals was nurtured under Khrushchev's leadership. This group, commonly referred to as the "sixties generation," was aptly described by V. Bondarenko as "a rotten and worm-eaten generation," which eventually became the West's fifth column. Whether in or out of power, their irresponsible actions in the 1960s-1990s gradually led the powerful socialist state to catastrophe, ultimately paving the way for a counter-revolution in Russia. But those are Russian problems.

Returning to the Yugoslav issue, we can only lament and regret the following: a portion of Yugoslavs from that era, blinded by Titoite and Western propaganda, could not foresee that their "pioneering" role in undermining the monolithic Soviet Union and the CPSU during 1948-1980 would cost them dearly in 1991. They paid the price through the destruction and disintegration of their own country, the tragedy of fratricidal wars, NATO bombings and the impos-

ition of American occupiers in the heart of the former SFR of Yugoslavia. However, it must be emphasized that the deeds of Tito and his government should not be conflated with the Yugoslav working people. Titoism and the prolonged Americanization (as subsequent events convincingly demonstrated) failed to break the Yugoslav people's faith in the greatness and strength of the Russian working people. Tito and the likes of Gorbachev may come and go, but the fighting brotherhood of the Yugoslav and Soviet peoples, forged during the brutal years of Hitler's aggression, along with centuries of military, cultural and economic ties, are far stronger than any Western or pro-Western propaganda. These bonds are deeply rooted in the consciousness of the working peoples and endure as a guarantee of future victories.

"Cadres Decide Everything!"

With the arrest, murder, exile and persecution of communists — what would now be euphemistically termed "repression" in Moscow — Tito urgently needed, between 1948 and 1952, to rely on new cadres who were firmly aligned with his anti-Soviet positions. But where could Tito and his inner circle find such people? After all, one cannot retrain individuals overnight! Where could they be found? Naturally, among the remnants of fascist elements in Croatia and Slovenia, among nationalist sympathizers of Mihailović in Serbia, and among Muslim nationalists in Kosmet and Bosnia. These elements, previously marginalized up until 1948, would serve as a loyal foundation in the fight against the communists and against Soviet Russia, which they saw as the root cause of their postwar grievances, defeats and hardships — and they hated it with all their hearts.

I will take the liberty of delving more deeply into the

postwar fate of these anti-Soviet elements within Tito's system of building a "foggy," "market-driven" socialism on Anglo-American money.

With the victories of the Red Army at Stalingrad, on the Orel-Kursk line and its advance to the Romanian border, the strength of the Yugoslav National Liberation Movement grew. Confidence surged that the end of German fascism was near and that victory belonged to us, the Slavs. The supporters of the occupiers, their servants and collaborators, steadily weakened — whether in Serbia with the followers of Nedić and Mihailović's Chetniks, in Croatia with the Ustaše and the Domobranci (Home Guard), in Slovenia with Rupnik's forces or in Macedonia with pro-Bulgarian elements. The ranks of Mihailović's Chetniks and Pavelić's Ustaše, bloodied to their elbows, dwindled further in 1945 as they retreated alongside the Wehrmacht. The Croatian Ustaše settled in their spiritual homeland of West Germany, while Mihailović's Chetniks mostly ended up in the United States. But why not in England, which had nurtured Mihailović, the war minister of His Royal Highness' government? Because Mihailović and his Chetniks were struck not only by the National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia and by their own deeply flawed nationalist ambitions (after all, Mihailović was not just a Serbian, but a Yugoslav war minister), but also by Churchill and the British establishment. Yes, the very Churchill who from 1941 to 1944 supported the royal Yugoslav government in London and its war minister with both arms and political backing. However, under the pressure of the successes of the National Liberation Movement and the enduring appeal of its old-fashioned yet timeless slogan — "Brotherhood and Unity of the Peoples of Yugoslavia" — Churchill shifted his strategy. This slogan, written in the blood of tens of thousands of fighters from Serbia, Serbian Krajina, Banija, Grmeč, Kordun,

Slavonia, Herzegovina, Lika, Montenegro, Srem, Kosmet and Slovenia, adorned the banners of the partisans. In contrast, Mihailović's political strategy, rooted in betrayal, nationalism and a policy of waiting for the right moment, proved unsustainable. Recognizing this, Churchill began providing military support to both sides — Mihailović's Chetniks and Tito's partisans — until the fall of 1944, when he began implementing his grand strategic plan: bringing Tito into his camp. This objective was fully realized by 1948. For these aims, and considering the overall situation on the frontlines in late 1944, Churchill ultimately sacrificed the royal Yugoslav government in London, King Peter II, and even the war minister Mihailović himself at the start of 1945. For Churchill and his circle, their own interests always came first, and he acted with a clear-eyed assessment of his own power and that of the Red Army. If we are to discuss the tragedy of Mihailović, one can at least understand on a human level the blow dealt to him and his movement by his own class allies — the English bourgeoisie. Despite their deep understanding of Mihailović, they nevertheless sacrificed their "brother in arms" for their own strategic interests.

However, lest I "cast a shadow" on the prominent anti-communist figure of Churchill and unjustly accuse him of sympathizing with communism, history presents us with yet another page of Churchill's actions.

During the period in question — specifically, the bright autumn of 1944, when the 3rd Ukrainian Front swept across northeastern Yugoslavia like a purifying hurricane — another national liberation movement was successfully operating further south, in Greece. The Greek National Liberation Army, led by the communists, was fighting against the German occupiers. Meanwhile, the Greek nationalists waited cautiously to see which way the tide would turn. And what happened?

Churchill landed a punitive expeditionary force of Her Majesty's troops in Piraeus, which, through bloody battles, crushed the Greek National Liberation Movement with fire and sword — not without Tito's support in 1948. Such is history, dear reader. The Greek king, his colonels and the nationalists fared far better than Mihailović and King Peter II.

As previously mentioned, after 1948, a turning point occurred for the nationalists in Yugoslavia — a shift, so to speak, in a "favourable direction," considering the unique characteristics and specificities of various Yugoslav regions. Having committed his betrayal, Tito was forced to rely on anti-Soviet nationalist elements. The "League of Communists" that Tito established (replacing the crushed CPY) opened its doors to anyone opposed to Soviet Russia, anyone aligned with Anglo-American interests, and anyone supportive of the policies of their "great" and "wise" leader. In 1950 alone, more than 400,000 new members joined the League of Communists. Careerists of every stripe flocked to its ranks. The party bureaucracy, purchased with American money and heterogeneous in both ideology and composition, increasingly decayed within the framework of market-driven, self-managed, decentralized, "democratic" socialism, progressively detaching itself from the pressing needs of the Yugoslav people as a whole until this estrangement reached its peak. A portion of Yugoslav communists — former CPY members who remained loyal to Tito after 1948 and were part of the League's elite — despite serving his cult of personality faithfully, gradually lost their standing. They were overwhelmed by the creeping counter-revolution and the growing Americanization of the country. Over time, these "old guard" figures lost ground to aggressive and self-assured younger cadres: managers, businessmen and other "go-getters" who knew exactly what they wanted for themselves. As this aging elite withered away and

retired from the political stage, they were left murmuring in Belgrade, Zagreb and Sarajevo restaurants: "What is happening, gentlemen?"

The nationalist and quasi-fascist elements that had infiltrated the League of Communists, rebranded as neo-communists, flourished. They travelled freely across Europe, took advantage of credit systems and engaged in all sorts of schemes to plunder "collective, worker-managed, self-governed" property. Meanwhile, their offspring filled the ranks of scholarship recipients sponsored by Western donors, from Rome to Madison. Public opinion was systematically shaped to glorify Western values and Western-style living became increasingly popular among the intelligentsia. The newly-minted businessmen, collaborating with directors of various enterprises to establish ties with foreign corporations, eagerly sought to rid themselves of the remnants of socialism once and for all. Supporting this transitional period, as well as Tito's cult of personality, were defectors from the dismantled Communist Party, the Ustaše, Chetniks and Muslim nationalists. Even though the pro-Western Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Montenegrin, Bosnian, Kosovar and Macedonian intelligentsias — divided into "national apartments" and feeding troughs by Tito — talked endlessly about their "unique" positions, citing figures like the infamous Đilas, Tito's general Tuđman, or leaders of the federal republics like Nikezić, Savka Dabčević, Latinka Perović and Tripalo, their supposed opposition and resistance were superficial. At their core, their activities during those years were driven by personal gain, careerism, inflated egos tinged with petty nationalism, open greed and their deep attachment to Tito's anti-Sovietism and Russophobia, which they cloaked in a state policy of anti-Stalinism and anti-Leninism.

The Peak of Titoism and "Market" Socialism Built on Western Money

Artificially Raising the Standard of Living and Creating a Temporary Middle Class

It is well known that Yugoslavia was a relatively small country, and the $30 billion Tito received was a substantial sum. Tito always had a penchant for living lavishly, and holding power only amplified this tendency. His 21 palaces and residences on the Brijuni Islands have already been detailed. He also created and pampered a powerful police force, and significant funds were allocated to maintaining his own party bureaucracy. However, these expenses alone could not exhaust the massive influx of money all at once. Funds also trickled into the development of tourism, the construction of strategic highways, representative hotels, the acquisition of licenses for the development of light industry and the establishment of joint ventures with "friendly" Western corporations. During the 1960s and 1970s, a convenient credit system emerged, allowing for the consumption and eventual squandering of portions of loans from the IMF. Ask any well-off resident of Belgrade or Zagreb how they managed to build such luxurious homes or acquire such fancy apartments. You'll inevitably hear something along the lines of: "Well, you see, I got a good loan back in the late '60s or '70s under very favourable terms, and then..."!

The artificially inflated standard of living, driven by loans, and the resulting emergence of a temporary "middle class," along with the ability to send up to 1.5 million young Yugoslav men and women to perform menial labour for Western corporations as "guest workers," created a stable illusion of prosperity. This illusion was further bolstered by the opening of Western borders for imports of all kinds. During that

seemingly golden period of the late 1950s to the 1970s, the pro-government press (and there was no other kind) heaped endless praise on the "successful market-driven, humane, self-managed, democratic socialism" of Tito's Yugoslavia. However, the same newspapers — such as *Politika*, *Borba*, *Vjesnik* and others — occasionally carried headlines that revealed cracks in this facade: "Our Number of Guest Workers Reaches 1,000,000," "9,000 Yugoslav Girls Cleaning Stairs in Vienna's Luxury Homes," "Horrific Living Conditions for Miners," "The Tragic Situation of Our Guest Workers' Children," "The Rise of Drug Addiction," "Pornography Floods Urban Newsstands" and so on. Newspapers also frequently reported on corruption scandals involving various managers and directors who looted self-managed workers' collectives and stashed their stolen funds in foreign banks.

Reflecting on that era 25 years later, a comfortable Yugoslav might counter: "So what? Those were just growing pains! But look at how we lived, how respected we were. Just think, 126 heads of state came to Tito's funeral!" A Russian observer might similarly exclaim: "So what? If only we had loans like that — what a life we could have!" To this last sentiment, a slight clarification is needed: for Russia to create a similar illusion of prosperity like Tito's Yugoslavia, it would have needed not $30 billion in loans but $300 billion — or $600 billion if accounting for all the former Soviet republics — and this without adjusting for dollar inflation over the years. The second requirement would be for the West to agree to take in 20 to 30 million future unemployed workers created by the chaos of market reforms. But let's be realistic. Tito earned his loans by "doing his job" — attacking the powerful citadel of socialism, which, until 1948, had been seen as unassailable. Gorbachev, meanwhile, reportedly received $100 billion while dismantling his country. But what could Yeltsin be offered? The fortress was already taken! Not $600 billion, not even $30 billion would be offered — unless, of course, the counter-revolutionary foundations imposed on Russia showed serious signs of collapse.

The Collapse of Titoite Illusions and the Price Paid for the Devil's Loans

Yugoslavia borrowed heavily and lived a uniquely extravagant life, though it was mired in debt. By the late 1980s, things reached a tragically comical point: reports appeared in the press claiming that the government's financial agencies no longer knew how much the state owed or to whom, prompting them to turn to foreign "experts" to untangle the mess. Any competent economic leader, let alone a statesman, understands (and ordinary people have long learned this lesson by heart) that debts to friends must be repaid sooner or later, and debts to the devil especially so. This reality, of course, doesn't apply to leaders who operate under the principle of *"après moi, le déluge"* ("after me, the flood").

The majority of Yugoslavia's 1.5 million guest workers — and often their wives — worked tirelessly in factories and plants, in hotels and hospitals, as street cleaners, or as bouncers in the brothels of Hamburg, Amsterdam, Munich, Wuppertal, Hanover, Zurich, Norrkoping, Graz, Gothenburg, Liege and other cities across the "developed" West. They worked hard to save enough money to return to their beloved homeland — affectionately called "Yuga" — to build a home, open a workshop and start anew on their own land. However, some could not withstand the harsh realities of Western life and sank to the bottom of that world, joining the ranks of lumpen elements, mafias and criminal gangs.

The heartbreaking tragedy of Yugoslav guest workers in

"civilized" Europe was poignantly depicted in the books *The Fifth Finger* and *People with Four Fingers* by Serbian author Miodrag Bulatović. These books were deliberately never translated into or published in Russian, thanks to the efforts of the same "sixties generation" intellectuals, as they would have dealt a severe blow to their beloved Titoism, reformism and Western idolization.

It is also crucial to remember that all guest workers were subjected to systematic ideological indoctrination by an Americanized European mass culture, blended with skilful social-democratic demagogy and supplemented by the insidious influence of Catholicism, Protestantism, fundamentalism and continuous propaganda from nationalist emigrant organizations such as the Ustaše, Chetniks and others. Meanwhile, the working class, under the artificial elevation of living standards for certain segments of the population, accompanied by propaganda glorifying profit at any cost, was fragmented by nationalist movements flourishing under the conditions of "market socialism." Tragically, in an atmosphere dominated by a cult of personality and rigid dictatorship, the working class was unable to unite in defence of its interests or those of the state.

Thus the years passed, drawing closer to the reckoning — economic collapse in 1989 and the bloody denouement in 1991.

On December 18, 1989, in his report to the parliament, the penultimate Prime Minister of the SFR of Yugoslavia, Ante Marković, spoke about the causes of the economic catastrophe that had engulfed the country. Based on economic analysis, he reached a bitter but honest conclusion: the **economic system** of "market-driven, self-managed, humane, democratic socialism," created by Tito following Western blueprints and built over more than thirty years with the help

of Western loans and allies, was unsustainable without annual, systematic subsidies from the IMF and other organizations. With the cessation of these subsidies, the system had "**run its course**." (Marković did not specify why the subsidies stopped — this will be discussed later. He focussed instead on possible ways out of the economic disaster.) According to Marković, by 1989, there were only two paths forward: either to return to a planned economy or to undertake, with eyes wide open, a complete restoration of capitalism with all its consequences. The first path, he admitted, was unfortunately unrealistic under the conditions of 1989, as it would require Yugoslavia to rely on the strength of the socialist bloc and the USSR. However, under Gorbachev's leadership, those states had weakened to the point where they could hardly help themselves, let alone others. The second path was feasible only if Western investments were guaranteed in full. Western capital, he said, would need assurances that it could purchase anything it desired in Yugoslavia — land, factories, mines, roads — and that this would be protected by a new federal law that had to be adopted immediately. Marković appealed to Western capital to accelerate investments and take command of their implementation.

And, as often happens, for the tragedy to turn into farce, Marković, sensing that the West would not be in any hurry with investments, was forced to appeal to Yugoslav billionaires — those who had fled to the West with stolen public funds and had been convicted by Yugoslav courts in the 1960s to 1980s — with a tearful plea to demonstrate "patriotism" and invest their wealth (amounting to around $7 billion) in the Yugoslav economy to set an example for Western capital. On the Yugoslav side, Marković declared, they would be guaranteed the same rights as Western capitalists.

Incidentally, the reader may notice a certain similarity be-

tween the "flight" of Yugoslav labour funds during the 1960s to 1980s and the "flight" of Russian labour billions to the same luxurious Western banks during the 1990s — with the sole difference being that Russian "fled" billions were at least an order of magnitude larger. This is hardly surprising, given that Russia is a much larger and wealthier country. What is surprising is something else. It turns out that even in Russia, there are misfit politicians and incompetent leaders who, like the former Prime Minister of the SFR of Yugoslavia Marković, hope that today's homegrown thief-businessmen will demonstrate their "patriotic" theft by setting an example for foreign investors, showing them how great it is to invest their capital in dubious ventures. Truly, the pinnacle of late 20th-century demagogy!

Of course, neither Western billionaires nor Yugoslav crook-tycoons living in the West rushed to Yugoslavia's aid. Either they had been informed or instinctively sensed with their gut feeling that the West's strategic and geopolitical interests had predetermined a third path for Yugoslavia at the dawn of the 1990s: total collapse and dismemberment of the country. Why?

Orthodoxy, Tito's Cult of Personality and the Administrative Borders of the Yugoslav Republics

Before attempting to answer why the "civilized" West charted a course for Yugoslavia's disintegration and fragmentation in the early 1990s, as well as why Yugoslavia unravelled so quickly, it is necessary to examine other factors that influenced this decision and facilitated the relatively easy implementation of this plan.

If we analyse the SFR of Yugoslavia through a religious lens, it is known that three republics — Serbia, Montenegro

and Macedonia — were predominantly Orthodox Christian. Two — Croatia and Slovenia — were predominantly Catholic. Meanwhile, Bosnia and Herzegovina was home to Orthodox Serbs, Serbs who had converted to Islam during the Ottoman rule and about 18 per cent Catholic Croat population.

It is important to note that long before the Turkish invasion of the Balkans in the 14th century, two religions — Orthodoxy and Catholicism — had been clashing on this territory since the 10th century. The Catholic expansion led by the Vatican, from the early Middle Ages to the present day, failed to take hold because, between the 10th and 14th centuries, Catholicism was not accepted by the Orthodox Serbian principalities and kingdoms located in the territories of what are now Montenegro, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina. The dividing line between Orthodoxy and Catholicism ran from Ravni Kotari on the Adriatic coast, through Lika along the Korana, Kupa and Sava rivers, and further to Pakrac. Even Bohemia and Moravia were Orthodox in the 9th century until the zealous servants of Rome blinded and expelled Methodius. The Turkish invasion in the 14th and 15th centuries destroyed the Serbian principalities and led to the spread of Islam in towns and villages of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as the Islamization of part of the Serbian population in these areas.

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, Bosnia and Herzegovina were occupied by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the dividing line between Orthodoxy and Catholicism shifted eastward — approximately to the Drina River, more precisely to the administrative borders of the Orthodox states of Serbia and Montenegro on one side and the Roman Catholic Austro-Hungarian Empire on the other. The struggle against Catholic expansion continued.

Small, freedom-loving Slavic states stood in its way, having defended their independence through long national liberation struggles against five centuries of Ottoman rule. Historical facts show that the prolonged struggle of the Serbian and Montenegrin people for their freedom was always supported by the Orthodox Church as much as it could. During the powerful national uprising of 1804-13, the Church openly sided with the insurgents. A hero of the uprising, Archpriest Mateja Nenadović, a close ally of Karađorđe, was not only his secretary, diplomat and chaplain for the troops but also, when needed, the commander of large detachments, often personally engaging in bloody hand-to-hand battles with the oppressors.

During the First World War, when small Serbia in 1914 rejected the ultimatum of the Catholic Habsburg Empire, the Serbian Orthodox Church once again stood by its freedom-loving people and provided whatever support it could. In 1939, the Vatican attempted to sow division within the Serbian Orthodox Church by pushing for the signing of the so-called "Concordat," an agreement that granted significant concessions to Catholicism, similar to the Greek Catholic Uniate Church in Western Ukraine. Patriarch Varnava of Serbia appealed to the people, gained their widespread support and rejected the Vatican's demands. The push for Catholic dominance was repelled, but Patriarch Varnava was poisoned as punishment for his defiance.

And during the Second World War from 1941 to 1945, Orthodox clergy were often found among the partisan detachments and in the National Liberation Movement. One such example was Priest Zečević, who joined the uprising and later participated in the highest bodies of the people's power on the free territories established by the partisans. Another was Priest Ivan Nikolić, who took part in the uprising against

the German occupiers and was an active participant in the resistance, for which he was captured and executed with a dagger by the Chetniks. Dozens of names could be cited of clergymen who, in those difficult times, sided with the people fighting for their freedom.

Of course, it must also be acknowledged that when the Orthodox Church became a state religion, it aligned itself with the ruling classes. However, these instances from peaceful times should not overshadow the historical truth that, in the difficult years of the fight for freedom, the Orthodox Church always stood by the people.

The Catholic Church, led by the Vatican, which controlled half the world, had dominated for centuries in all the great empires — from the Spanish and Portuguese empires with their innumerable colonies in the West, to the Holy Roman Empire, the Habsburg Monarchy, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the East. Naturally, it protected its own interests and served as a reliable support for the exploitative classes of these states. The historical conditions under which it existed and operated generally dictated its persistent, albeit not universal, reactionary nature.

If we examine its role in the Balkans, in Croatia, for instance, during the Middle Ages, it consistently sided with the "illustrious" ruling elites, primarily German and Hungarian magnates and feudal lords. Therefore, it is logical that while the non-state Orthodox Church supported the great revolutionary leader Karađorđe in his struggle for the freedom of the Serbian peasant masses, the wealthy Catholic clergy, with the blessing of the Vatican, captured and "crowned" another great son of the oppressed — Matija Gubec, leader of the Croatian peasantry in the 16th century fight for social and national liberation — with a white-hot iron crown.

There is no doubt that the Catholic Church also produced many brilliant minds and figures, such as Campanella, Giordano Bruno, Galileo Galilei, Muntzer, Copernicus, Hus and the Croatian archbishop Josip Juraj Strossmayer. However, almost all of them faced persecution from the Vatican. Strossmayer, for instance, was systematically targeted for merely agreeing with and promoting the idea of the brotherhood of South Slavic peoples.

It is well known that Protestantism dethroned the Vatican as the primary voice and ideological pillar of the exploiting classes. In its struggle with Protestantism for influence, Catholicism changed its strategy in certain regions. In Latin and South America, for example, it often presented itself as the defender of the downtrodden and oppressed. But that is in distant South America. Here, closer to home, in the Balkans, in its battle against Orthodoxy, Catholicism knows no mercy.

In the mid-20th century, the Vatican, with zeal worthy of a better cause, welcomed the creation of a fascist state by Hitler in 1941 on the ruins of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, led by the Ustaše. With the Vatican's blessing, the Ustaše carried out a genocide of the Orthodox Serbian population, who had lived on their ancestral lands in the Serbian Krajina, Bosnia, Slavonia and Herzegovina for centuries. In terms of savagery and brutality during the Second World War, this genocide can only be compared to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the Americans.

An equally logical move by the Vatican during the Second World War was this: in February 1942, the small region of Srem in Vojvodina, which Hitler had handed over to the newly-established Ustaše state, was suddenly targeted for forced conversion to Catholicism. The population of Srem was entirely Orthodox. Friars and Ustaše thugs were brought

in to inform the villagers of the decision. Naturally, the Serbian people, together with their Orthodox priests and under the leadership of the communists, rose in defiance and Srem became one of the strongholds of the National Liberation Movement.

So why, given this record of "contributions" in Yugoslavia under Tito, did the Catholic Church enjoy much greater freedom of action than Orthodoxy? To answer this question, we need to address one more issue.

There was one question that seemingly played no significant role for thirty postwar years but suddenly emerged at the forefront in the late 1980s and early 1990s — a question that became as sharp as a blade. This was the matter of the administrative borders of the six republics. After all, a Croat felt comfortable in Belgrade, Skopje and Ljubljana. A Serb lived peacefully in Slovenia, Bosnia, Osijek and Vukovar, among other places. The rallying cry of "brotherhood and unity" was fundamental during the war and in the first postwar years and appeared unshakable. However, upon closer examination of the administrative borders of the republics, an inquisitive expert in Yugoslav history and ethnography might raise several questions. For instance: Why was the Baranja region assigned to Croatia? Why doesn't Dalmatia, which historically never belonged to Croatia, have even a degree of autonomy? Why do large regions such as the Serbian Krajina, Lika and parts of Slavonia, inhabited predominantly by Serbs, lack autonomy in Croatia, while Serbia itself has two large autonomous regions (Kosovo and Metohija, and Vojvodina) that hold rights similar to republics? Why was Serbia itself reduced, as under Ottoman rule, to the borders of the "Belgrade Pashalik"? Why is the famous Montenegrin fjord of Boka Kotorska blocked off by a Croatian strip of land? And why does the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, if it was

established as an independent unit, have a laughably narrow access to the Adriatic Sea, just a few kilometres wide, while Croatia enjoys over a thousand kilometres of coastline?

Why was it that from 1948 onwards, the Cyrillic script was gradually pushed out of use under various pretexts, and even the famous Serbian plum brandies "Monastirka" and "Klekovača," which had been written in Cyrillic for over eleven centuries, suddenly started using the Latin alphabet? For the patriarchal Serbian peasant, this was incomprehensible — a nonsensical and unthinkable change.

So why did Tito, despite the fundamental slogans of brotherhood and unity, quietly and without much noise, prioritize Croatia and trim Serbia? These are clear violations of principles, and under certain circumstances, they could come to light and turn against the author of these violations. The explanation lies in a purely subjective factor, which, unfortunately, often operates under the influence of personal interests. Being of Croat-Slovenian origin, and prioritizing his personal interests above all else, Tito — who personally decided the issues of administrative borders — feared that from Serbia, the largest republic in terms of population, fighting spirit, economic strength and its immense contribution to the National Liberation Movement, as well as the sacrifices it made on the altar of freedom, a new leader could easily emerge. This leader might be wiser, more capable and more visionary, thus posing a threat to Tito's dominance. For this reason, it was necessary to undermine, diminish and constrain Serbia in various ways.

In pursuing this anti-Serbian policy, Tito seemed to conveniently forget the things he had said during the difficult days of November 1942. But what won't one do to hold on to power and glorify their own greatness? Tito even resorted to an open form of Bonapartism, forcing the obedient parliament to enshrine in the country's Constitution that he — Tito — was the lifetime President, and in the Charter of the League of Communists to declare that he — Tito — was the irreplaceable Chairman of the organization, which Tito claimed was communist (!?).

In this highly concentrated form, one can see the entire essence of Titoism and the so-called "democracy" of the system built with Western money. Tito's cult of personality suited the Anglo-Americans and the Vatican as long as he served them faithfully. The absence of feedback mechanisms or controls within the system of state governance further contributed to the inflation of Tito's cult of personality, as there were no checks or balances to restrain it.

Unfortunately, the cults of personality of leaders were also favoured by the elites of socialist states throughout the post-war period, and as is now clearly evident, they were one of the significant reasons behind the failures of systems of governance in socialist states. As is well known, to this day, there have been neither theoretical, scientifically substantiated developments nor serious practical measures fully eliminating this shameful phenomenon within the workers' movement. This phenomenon turned the leaders of socialist states into obstacles to social development and contributed to the catastrophic collapse of the first workers' and peasants' state — the USSR — in 1991, as well as to a significant defeat of the communist movement of the working people worldwide. Undoubtedly, the genius of the proletarian revolution, V.I. Lenin, would have addressed this shortcoming in the development of the theory and practice of socialist governance with his characteristic scientific depth and clarity. However, as is known, the counter-revolution, unfortunately, did not miss its mark when it delivered its blows to Vladimir Ilyich, inflicting a severe setback on both the necessary theoretical

advancements and the establishment of true people's governance under socialism.

Today, this issue has emerged as a pressing challenge that must be resolved by the leading figures of the workers' movement in the near future. As the reality of the late 20th century demonstrates, without resolving these issues and bringing them to the awareness of the working masses, there can be no serious consolidation of the forces of the workers' and communist movement or its progress toward future victories.

On the Political Forces and Parties in Serbia in the 1990s

In Serbia during the 1990s, there have been several dozen political parties and organizations. However, since most of them are small and do not play a significant role in the country's public life, we will focus only on the main political parties and movements. As in other countries, Serbia has left-wing parties or the so-called centre-left bloc, which includes the ruling Socialist Party of Serbia led by S. Milošević, who is currently the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Yugoslav Left party headed by Dr. M. Marković and the New Democratic Party led by Č. Mirković. To the left of these centrist forces stands the New Communist Party of Yugoslavia (NCPY) headed by the writer B. Kitanović. To the right of the centre-left bloc, but still holding positions defending the sovereignty and national interests of the FR of Yugoslavia, like the aforementioned parties, stands the Serbian Radical Party (SRP) led by Dr. V. Šešelj. Opposing these forces are reactionary opposition parties such as the Serbian Renewal Movement (SRM) led by the writer V. Drašković, the Democratic Party (DP) headed by V. Đinđić, the Democratic Party of Serbia (DPS) led by Dr. Koštunica and the Civic Al-

liance of Serbia (CAS) headed by V. Pešić. Briefly characterizing these political parties in Serbia, the following can be said:

The centre-left bloc, led by the Socialist Party, advocates for the independence and territorial integrity of the FR of Yugoslavia and a so-called democratic path of development. In complex international circumstances, with virtually no allies, and under conditions where the West, led by the United States, continuously intervened in Yugoslavia's internal affairs and sought to solidify its gains, the Socialist Party in power avoided direct confrontation with the U.S. up until 1998. It was forced to make concessions to their brazen demands. The socialists manoeuvred within the confines of American dictates, aiming to buy time to stabilize the situation of the country. In economic terms, the centre-left bloc supports so-called reforms, understanding this to mean the privatization of public and collective property. However, they emphasize a slow and cautious implementation of privatization, taking into account the preservation of the social gains of the working masses, which were achieved in the former SFR of Yugoslavia.

How compatible the concepts of privatization and the preservation of social gains are in an impoverished country remains to be seen.

The political program of the NCPY contains the following fundamental positions:

— The NCPY fights for the territorial integrity and independence of the FR of Yugoslavia.

— The NCPY rejects any form of U.S. and allied dictate, including the presence of UN election monitors in Serbia, and demands from the international community full respect for the sovereignty of the FR of Yugoslavia, in accordance with international law recognized by all humanity.

— On matters of internal economic policy, the NCPY

holds that the working people of Yugoslavia can secure their future and preserve their social achievements only through the continuation of building their socialist homeland. The NCPY does not recognize any encroachment on public socialist property, arguing that the dissolution of public ownership into diverse forms of private ownership inevitably leads to the restoration of capitalism, with all its globally recognized consequences — including turning Yugoslavia into a semi-colony of the Latin American type. This process, they assert, would inevitably lead to Yugoslavia becoming a strategic NATO base in the Balkans and the complete loss of sovereignty.

The NCPY proposed that the bloc of leftist forces unite in a single front based on these fundamental principles. However, for both objective and subjective reasons, the left bloc did not move forward with such a coalition. It seems that the time for such a people's front has not yet arrived. The communists of Yugoslavia believe that their political influence among the masses is steadily growing and that the working people's struggle for the country's independence and socialism still lies ahead.

The far-right parties of Drašković, Đinđić, Pešić and Koštunica attempted to unite into the opposition bloc "Zajedno" ahead of the autumn 1996 elections. They campaigned under various nationalist slogans, often contradictory, yet this did not stop them from aligning with the Western aggressors and, to the shame of all, grovelling before the United States and Germany. Their entire agenda was directed against the Socialist Party and focussed on promoting unconditional submission to Western dictates. Western support was not long in coming. Nonetheless, they lost the federal parliamentary elections on November 3, 1996. Subsequent events clearly demonstrated how invested the U.S. was in salvaging the faltering credibility of their protégé, Drašković. This was not

limited to material support. Figures such as Clinton, Kohl and Madeleine Albright, alongside the entirety of the "civilized" Western media, were mobilized. Praise poured in for the "democratic nationalist" Drašković, accompanied by threats against Milošević. Despite all of this, the "Zajedno" coalition led by Drašković lost the municipal elections in Serbia on November 15. To rescue their favourites, Drašković and Đinđić, the U.S. and Germany applied immense pressure via the UN and the European Community's OSCE, threatening to reimpose economic sanctions on Serbia. They twisted Serbian President Milošević's arm and forced an outrageously brazen decision — to declare the "Zajedno" coalition as the winners of the municipal elections. The leaders of the "Zajedno" coalition, Drašković and Đinđić, celebrated their apparent victory, dividing power in the cities. However, amid infighting over lucrative positions, disputes, scandals, and the insatiable ambitions and greed of their leaders, the "Zajedno" coalition collapsed by early 1997.

But that was not the end of the story. As previously mentioned, the results of the parliamentary and presidential elections on September 21, 1996 showed that the direct U.S. proxy Drašković and his SRM party suffered a significant defeat, falling from leading positions to third place. Another faction of the pro-American "Zajedno" coalition — Đinđić (DP), Pešić (CAS) and Koštunica (DPS) — realizing they would not gain voter support, decided to boycott the elections on September 21, 1997. According to experts, this ill-considered decision led to their exit from the political stage, and they can now realistically be spoken of only in the past tense.

The SRP achieved significant success in the 1996 elections, becoming the second-largest and most influential party in Serbia. The national radicals had already gained popularity due to their militancy and the efforts of their volunteer units

in fighting against the neo-Ustaše in Croatia and Muslim fundamentalists in Bosnia, who began committing genocide against the Serbian population in the Serbian Krajina and Bosnia in 1991-92. Facts show that it was not the bureaucratized remnants of Tito's "League of Communists" but the volunteers of Šešelj and his then-ally Željko Ražnatović-Arkan who responded to the cries for help from the Serbian Krajina in Croatia, where the neo-Ustaše began committing atrocities. Furthermore, Šešelj's and Arkan's units came to the aid of the Republika Srpska in Bosnia when the Islamic nationalists and mercenaries from the Middle East attempted to use terror to break the Serbs' will to live freely on their land rather than as second-class citizens in an Islamic state on historically Slavic, Orthodox territory. At the same time, it is essential to remember that nationalist movements often carry unhealthy tendencies that can manifest under certain conditions, as will be discussed further. However, the people's struggle for independence and the resolution of internal problems without external interference and dictates has always had a progressive character. Thus, the involvement of Vojislav Šešelj and his party in this struggle positively influenced the Serbian people's morale. For example, when Šešelj, running against U.S. proxy Milan Panić in Serbia's presidential elections in the 1990s, transferred his 20 per cent of votes to the Socialist Slobodan Milošević, thus helping secure a hard-fought victory against the American aggressors, this demonstrated the progressive aspirations present in his party.

In the first round of the republican presidential elections on September 21, 1997, SRP leader Dr. Vojislav Šešelj came in second behind the Socialist Zoran Lilić, pushing the U.S.-backed candidate Drašković out of the race. Šešelj strongly opposes any servility toward the U.S. and the West in general. His speeches frequently emphasize the necessity of an alliance

with Russia and strengthening ties with Slavic nations like Belarus, the Ukraine and the Russian Federation. Economically, Šešelj considers privatization a necessary component for the country. Known for his sharp wit and oratory skills, he never hesitates to deliver biting critiques. His televised speeches and parliamentary appearances, particularly those where he denounces capitulationists and traitors such as Drašković, Đinđić, Pešić and Plavšić, or refutes slander, gain widespread popularity. While many may not agree with his nationalist positions, they admire his wit and eloquence.

These are the successes, challenges and defining characteristics of Serbia's main political parties in brief.

The Nationalist Movements in Serbia

As previously mentioned, the rise of economic power centres across Yugoslavia's republics between 1950 and 1990 was accompanied by the growth of nationalism, including in Serbia. However, the nationalist movements, although they supported Tito, did not play a dominant role within Serbia itself. This contrasted with Kosmet, where the Albanian nationalists, as events in the 1960s and 1970s show, infiltrated the highest levels of power under Tito's lenient policies. These nationalists continued the genocide against the Serbian population of Kosmet, a process that had begun under the fascist occupation during the Second World War. At the close of the 20th century, in the midst of the horrors of American military aggression and their highly sophisticated propaganda efforts aimed at deceiving both their own citizens and the European public — where truths were systematically distorted — this glaring fact of genocide against the Serbian population has been completely silenced. Such historical truths are inconvenient for the U.S. aggressors.

However, in Serbia, the nationalist Chetnik movement was also gradually gaining traction. Like any movement, it surrounded itself with myths, old symbols and semi-forgotten traditions rooted in the nationalist frameworks of the *komita* and later the Chetniks. Leaders of nationalist currents emerged, nationalist parties were formed, and these parties, such as the SRP led by Dr. Vojislav Šešelj (who is also the leader of today's Chetnik movement), the SRM by writer Vuk Drašković, the DPS led by Vojislav Koštunica and the DP led by Zoran Đinđić, played a notable role, as discussed in the previous section.

All these parties, from 1991 to 1998, were in opposition to the ruling Socialist Party of Serbia, headed by the president of the Serbian Republic, Slobodan Milošević. The aforementioned opposition parties also engaged in fierce competition among themselves during election campaigns, vying for votes and seeking to boost their ratings. They formed alliances and, depending on the situation, changed allies — in other words, they played political games. However, the SRP, led by Dr. Šešelj, maintained a principled stance on defending the national interests of the FR of Yugoslavia. In 1998, a particularly challenging year for Serbia, the Radicals' leader, Dr. Šešelj, once again supported President Milošević and the ruling Socialist Party. He became Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Serbia, strengthening the unity of Yugoslav society in the process. The other nationalist parties, led by Drašković, Đinđić, Koštunica, Pešić and others, demonstrated astonishing inconsistency, especially given the difficult circumstances. For example, the blatant aggression of the U.S. and the almost unanimous anti-American stance of the Serbian masses forced the SRM leader Drašković to seemingly "reassess" his behaviour. He reversed his position entirely, condemning the Western aggressors and supporting President

Milošević and the people of the FR of Yugoslavia in their fight against a common enemy. By joining the nationwide coalition against NATO aggression, Drašković was appointed Deputy Prime Minister of Yugoslavia. However, as the Serbian saying goes: "A wolf changes its coat but never its nature." It was, therefore, unsurprising that in March 1999, Drašković once again switched sides, aligning himself with the American aggressors. Acting on their signals, he attempted to sow discord in the unity of Yugoslav society, for which he was promptly expelled from the government.

All these fluctuations among the nationalist parties in Serbia during the period from 1991 to 1999 essentially reflect the instability of the petty-bourgeois masses. Their shifts closely mirrored the ebbs and flows of popular forces, as well as the intensification or weakening of the aggressive efforts of the U.S. and the West as a whole.

And yet, in the end, unexpectedly for the United States, all their efforts combined led to an incredible unity among the peoples of Yugoslavia in their determination to defend, at all costs, the freedom, dignity and independence of their homeland.

In any case, the support of the nationalist movements in one form or another, under varying political conditions, for the ruling Socialist Party and its leader, Slobodan Milošević, speaks to the presence of progressive tendencies within the nationalist movements that align with the interests of the working people of Serbia. It is entirely unnecessary for the reasonable and freedom-loving forces within today's nationalist movements to perpetuate lies about the "glorious deeds" of Mihailović while ignoring his crimes or spreading myths to the public, as Vuk Drašković, the leader of the SRM and a former member of the League of Communists, is doing. Drašković should know that no movement rooted in lies, de-

ceit and betrayal has ever led to anything good. At the same time, it must be kept in mind that the nationalist movements and parties, due to their social heterogeneity and national narrowness, often become pawns in the games of big capital and its intelligence services — not to mention the risk of sliding into the betrayal of national interests, the pursuit of ethnically pure territories and even genocide. General Mihailović pursued such policies of betrayal, ethnic cleansing and retaliatory genocide during the Second World War. And history, in part, repeats itself. When the neo-Ustaše in 1991 followed in the footsteps of the Ustaše of 1941 and attempted to repeat the genocide of the Serbian people in the Serbian Krajina of Croatia, and in 1992 in Bosnia and Herzegovina, some neo-Chetnik nationalist formations, blinded by the old ideology of Mihailović's Chetniks, resorted to ethnic cleansing, the destruction of mosques and Catholic churches. These actions were skilfully exploited by the West and its mass media to turn their populations against Yugoslavia and the Serbian people. After all, this was an echo of the crimes of the Ustaše and Chetniks from fifty years ago. It is high time for everyone who claims a leading role in the nationalist movements to recognize this.

Today, in these tragic days for Serbia, Montenegro and the new Yugoslavia, one can only wholeheartedly welcome the progressive segment of Moscow's and Russia's intelligentsia, which, defying the treacherous policies of the ruling class, speaks out in support of the just struggle of Serbia, Montenegro and the FR of Yugoslavia.

However, the intelligentsia — especially the highly educated Moscow and Russian intelligentsia — is what it is precisely because it is capable of analysing facts, conducting a scientific assessment of a specific situation and examining everything in motion in order to draw the correct conclu-

sions. One cannot, in an effort to curry favour with the monarchist segment of the Serbian nationalist movement, distort history by remaining silent about Mihailović's betrayal during the tragic days for the Serbian people from 1941 to 1944. One cannot justify the massacre of Muslim populations carried out by Mihailović's Chetniks by pointing to the even more brutal atrocities committed by the fascist Ustaše. Nor can one counter the massacres perpetrated by Croatian nationalists in their "struggle" for an ethnically pure Greater Croatia with a similar "struggle" for an ethnically pure Greater Serbia.

The unshakable and foundational slogan of the brotherhood and unity of the peoples of Yugoslavia in their fight against the aggressors is not the invention of some dubious "historical" figure. It is a genuine battle cry of hundreds of thousands of brave individuals — Serbs — who participated in the great struggle for the freedom of Yugoslavia's peoples in 1941-45 and bore the heavy burden of victory. Why, then, should this slogan not be raised on the banners of the progressive nationalist movements?

Of course, it is not easy for those who sympathize with the nationalist movements and tendencies in Serbia to come to terms with the truth about Mihailović's betrayal during the years 1941-44. On a human level, one can understand the desire to repaint the past — or better yet, embellish it — and transform it into something more palatable, even heroic. But salvation cannot be found in falsehoods, especially not in the great cause of fighting for the freedom and better future of one's people.

All the more critical is the task of the fraternal Moscow and Russian intelligentsia to analyse and assist the Serbian nationalist movement in the delicate process of freeing itself from illusions, myths and lies. Of course, in the turbulent sea of historical events governed by patterns, there are always ex-

ceptions, but these only confirm the rules. Among the Chetniks, there were individuals who, during the war, came to understand the disastrous nature of Mihailović's strategy and actions, as well as the depth of his betrayal, which allowed his elite units to collaborate with the occupiers. These individuals crossed over to the side of the National Liberation Movement. The fact that Mihailović's children participated in the struggle alongside the National Liberation Army of the Serbian people for their nation's freedom and independence, and for a better future for the people, was not a betrayal of their father, Mihailović. One cannot betray treachery itself. It is likely that in those far-off, peaceful, prewar days, Mihailović raised his children in the spirit of the great traditions of the Serbian people. Thus, during their people's fight for freedom, it was natural for them, as young patriots, to join the National Liberation Movement. In the course of that struggle, they came to see the full depth of the chasm represented by the Chetnik policies during the years 1941-44. Had Mihailović been less devoted to the elite of the royal court, less hostile toward Soviet Russia and less entangled with British intelligence services — which supported him until 1944 only to discard him like a beaten card — there is no doubt that he too would have joined his daughter and son in their righteous fight for freedom.

Incidentally, Mihailović's daughter was arrested and imprisoned in Tito's infamous dungeons not because she was Mihailović's daughter, but because, as a principled person, she refused to trade the ideals of her youthful struggle for the West's "gruel." She steadfastly stood on the position of unbreakable friendship between socialist Yugoslavia and Soviet Russia — an enduring bond of friendship between the Serbian and Russian peoples.

Having examined some key issues in the political life

of Yugoslavia from the 1940s to the 1990s, one can likely, by looking truth in the face, attempt to answer the pressing question: "Why...?"

CHAPTER IV

THE PERIOD OF 1990-1994

WHY YUGOSLAVIA WAS NO LONGER NEEDED BY THE WEST

When analysing the subsequent tragic events that unfolded in the early 1990s across the beautiful expanse of the SFR of Yugoslavia, a reasonable question may arise for the reader: why did the United States — and along with it, the IMF and the West as a whole — suddenly cease their generous financial support of the Tito regime, which had lasted from 1950 to 1985? Why did they abruptly reverse their policy toward Yugoslavia by 180 degrees in the late 1980s?

What led the so-called "civilized" West to decide on dismantling and destroying Yugoslavia? Why had Yugoslavia ceased to be necessary? What forces pushed the West down this path?

As many Soviet tourists who visited the blooming Yugoslavia would often remark, everything seemed to be just fine there. Even the infamous traitor Mikhail Gorbachev, while visiting Belgrade's Terazije Square shortly before the Yugoslav catastrophe that would lead to its dissolution and a bloody civil war, had the audacity to say with a smug smile, "Things will get even better for you!" In reality, things were good, but only for a time, only for certain groups of people, and only much earlier.

An objective analysis reveals that **during the 1950s-1980s, the Tito regime was invaluable to the West as a Trojan horse in the fight against the socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union. It was an effective megaphone used to broadcast anti-Soviet, anti-socialist, anti-Russian and — quietly but unmistakably — anti-Slavic and anti-Orthodox messages.**

However, all things eventually come to an end. Tito died in 1980, and by the mid-1980s, Yugoslavia's role as a megaphone of anti-Soviet propaganda had become completely unnecessary. It seems unbelievable, but the bitter facts speak for themselves: they are stubborn things.

Now it was no longer Churchill, **but the "Iron Lady" herself who found within Soviet Russia actual proponents of anti-Soviet ideas — ardent enemies of communism and counter-revolutionaries — led by Gorbachev and his cohorts from the ranks of the "Sixtiers," the corrupt party bureaucracy and the sharks of the shadow economy.**

This naturally raised a legitimate question for the West: what to do with the obsolete and, thanks to the destructive work of Gorbachev and his allies, completely unnecessary megaphone — Yugoslavia?

As the saying goes, nature abhors a vacuum. With Yugoslavia drowning in debt and lacking reliable allies, the powerful forces of German capital — whose ambitions had been dulled until the second half of the 1980s but were now reignited — turned their gaze toward the region. Germany, now the main European proxy of America, saw its old goal resurface: access to the warm seas of the Adriatic, along with fulfilling its longstanding dream of settling accounts with its historical thorn in the side — Yugoslavia (Serbia), the nation that had twice tripped up German expansionist ambitions, in 1914 and 1941. What is particularly interesting is how both external and internal forces were marshalled to achieve their goals in this newly-created geopolitical environment.

By the early 1990s, the alignment of these forces was more than favourable for the West. West Germany, having absorbed East Germany, had become a truly dominant power in Europe. Meanwhile, Russia — historically an ally and de-

fender of Serbia and Yugoslavia — had, thanks to the betrayal of the Gorbachev-Yeltsin tandem, been brought to its knees before the West, begging for handouts. Under such conditions, breaking apart Yugoslavia, especially with the blessings of Slovenia and the United States, became child's play for Germany — a mere matter of technical execution, as they say.

The internal alignment of forces in Yugoslavia at that time also favoured its destruction. The party bureaucracy of the "League of Communists" had completely lost its credibility with the people, which made it easier for the West to implement its plans.

A New Wave of Aggressiveness Among the Separatist Forces

The nationalist movements in Croatia, Slovenia, Kosmet, and Bosnia and Herzegovina were receiving systematic and powerful support from Germany, the United States, Western monopolies, the Vatican, Muslim emirs and influential financiers. This political, moral and — most importantly — material support, in the form of personnel and weaponry, led to a new surge of aggressiveness among the nationalist groups. They were simply waiting for a signal to tear Yugoslavia apart and were prepared to fight one another for territory if necessary. The composition of the leadership of the former Yugoslavia at that time also facilitated the country's rapid disintegration. The Federal Presidency, headed by President Stjepan Mesić, an ardent separatist and a Croat by nationality, was utterly ineffective during this critical period, engaging in nothing more than empty rhetoric. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, Mesić even boasted that as president, he had successfully fulfilled his mission to dismantle the country. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs was headed by Lončarević, while

the Prime Minister was Marković — both Croats. The commander of the Yugoslav army, Kadijević, was also a Croat, with his deputy, Brovet, a Slovene. The air force was led by Jurjević, and intelligence services by Mustać — both Croats. None of these figures made any effort to prevent the country's collapse. It is, therefore, unsurprising that the nationalist and separatist forces, which had violated the Yugoslav Constitution, were not met with a firm response from the army. What about the Serbian faction of the ruling elite? In essence, they behaved the same way. Bred under Tito in the spirit of constantly looking over their shoulder to see what the "Anglo-American-German uncle" might say, focussed primarily on their own interests and clinging to their comfortable positions, they were, during this catastrophic period, unparalleled in their verbosity — at best, neutral observers of the unfolding events.

Fully aware of the political situation in Yugoslavia, the architects of the country's future disintegration introduced the idea of further "democratization" of society and the need for new, multi-party elections. The decayed Tito-era "League of Communists" suffered a resounding defeat in these elections across the republics. In Slovenia, it garnered only 7 per cent of the vote, and in Croatia, no more than 13 per cent. In Croatia, the elections brought the nationalist Franjo Tuđman to power; in Bosnia, the Islamic fundamentalist Alija Izetbegović; in Macedonia, the nationalist Kiro Gligorov; and in Slovenia, the nationalist Milan Kučan. Almost all of them were remnants of the Tito-era League of Communists. One particularly sinister figure is Alija Izetbegović. During the Second World War, he served in the infamous 13th Waffen-SS Handžar Division, which fought against the Soviet Army at Stalingrad and earned its notoriety as a brutal force used by the nazis against the National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia.

Izetbegović was one of its organizers. For his crimes, he was tried by a people's court in 1945. However, he continued his activities, this time as a nationalist, fundamentalist and separatist. These controversial figures, who for various reasons aligned themselves with nationalist movements, spent some time in opposition to the ruling elite of the "League of Communists," paving the way for nationalism while waiting for their moment to seize power. Tuđman and Kučan were deeply tied to German politicians and capital, while Izetbegović was connected to Islamic extremists in Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Iran. In unison and almost as if on command, they began promoting separatist slogans, calling for secession from Yugoslavia and the creation of independent states. Ironically, they cited Lenin's principle of the right of nations to self-determination, including secession, to justify their actions.

Only in Serbia and Montenegro did progressive forces, distancing themselves from the decayed leadership of the "League of Communists" — which was torn apart by nationalist ambitions and represented the interests of regional centres of economic power — pursue a different path. By organizing a socialist party, they campaigned under the slogan of preserving a united and indivisible Yugoslavia and emerged victorious. The people of Serbia and Montenegro demonstrated in the elections that they would not obediently execute the will of German and American strategists aiming to dismember and enslave their own country.

The Violation of Basic Norms of International Law by the West

At the same time, German and American diplomacy displayed a shocking level of haste in pushing European states to recognize the newly-formed entities of Slovenia, Croatia,

Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Macedonia. This recognition came in blatant violation of basic decency, diplomatic protocol and elementary norms of international law. In this effort, they succeeded. As a result, the events in Yugoslavia in 1991, spurred on by the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and France, escalated rapidly into fratricidal wars. The West actively stoked internal problems that the peoples of these regions could have resolved peacefully and mutually agreed upon if external, artificially introduced instigators of national intolerance (Germany, the United States, Italy and Turkey) had been kept in check. The German leadership had sufficient knowledge of the Balkan issues, as they had been "involved" in Serbian and South Slavic affairs during both world wars. However, American "strategists" approached the situation recklessly and superficially, owing to their well-known lack of education, brazen overconfidence and characteristic lack of culture.

Given the systematic bias of pro-Western propaganda and its sophisticated disinformation campaigns, it is necessary to delve into some of the aforementioned complexities. The matter is as follows:

As is well known, the Ottoman Empire, in its advance into Europe, first encountered fierce resistance from the Serbian people. After defeating the Serbian principalities in Southern and Central Serbia, as well as in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and after capturing the central part of the Balkans in the 14th and 15th centuries, the Ottoman army reached the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Following several unsuccessful Ottoman campaigns to capture Vienna, the unstable border between the two empires settled along the Una River, which flows south to north through Serbian territories to the Sava River. From there, the border followed the Sava River eastward to Belgrade, where the Sava flows into the

Danube. The Serbian population living east of the Una River and south of the Sava remained under Ottoman rule, while the Serbian population west of the Una and north of the Sava fell under the control of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is essential to emphasize that the Serbian population has lived on these lands for more than 1,200 years. Historical evidence confirms this, including a Frankish source from the year 822, and the renowned Croatian historian N. Klaić acknowledges that ancient documents mention the name "Serb" as early as the 8th century, long before the name "Croat" appears in historical records.

The Austro-Hungarian Empire, concerned about continuous Turkish aggression, 400 years ago created an autonomous region called "Military Krajina" from territories compactly populated by Serbs (along the border with Turkey, west of the Una River and north of the Sava and Danube Rivers) with the aim of defending the empire from Turkish raids. "Military Krajina" and its Serbian population were granted certain rights and were directly subordinate to Vienna until the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. "Military Krajina" was never part of any Croatian state, especially considering that no Croatian state even existed at that time. The Croatian people, living compactly west of "Military Krajina," were directly subordinated to Hungarian magnates starting in 1102 and had no statehood of their own until the Hitler-led aggression of April 1941. It was then that Hitler established the "Independent State of Croatia" (NDH) with the sole purpose of fuelling ethnic hatred between the Croatian and Serbian peoples. To achieve this, he handed control of the NDH to the Croatian fascists — the Ustaše. The people of Serbian Krajina rose up and, through their heroic struggle, dealt a decisive blow to both the Wehrmacht and the Ustaše, becoming one of the strongholds and driving forces of the Yugoslav National Liberation Movement. After the victory over fascism in 1945, during the organization of administrative borders within the federal republics of Yugoslavia, Serbian Krajina (whose territory is equivalent to two Montenegros or three regions of Kosmet) was "gifted" to Croatia by Tito, much like how the Crimea was "gifted" to the Ukraine by Khrushchev. Even "autonomy for Serbian Krajina" was not implemented. However, to appease concerns, the "Declaration on the Fundamental Rights of Citizens in Croatia" of May 9, 1944 included the following in its first paragraph: "The Croatian and Serbian peoples in Croatia are fully equal." Additionally, Article 11 of the 1947 Constitution of the People's Republic of Croatia stated: "Serbs in the People's Republic of Croatia are equal to Croats." For a time, all was calm — administrative borders did not interfere with work, brotherhood or young love. "What does it matter — administrative borders? Work wherever you want, live wherever you want, marry whomever you want!" optimists would say. However, when the former Titoite general Franjo Tuđman, who had risen to prominence during the suppression of the CPY between 1948 and 1956, proclaimed the creation of an independent Croatian state in February 1991 as the leader of the nationalists, separatists and neo-fascists, things changed dramatically. On December 22, 1990, Tuđman unconstitutionally and forcefully reclassified the Serbian population of the Serbian Krajina into a "national minority." In response, the people of Serbian Krajina, which fell within Croatia's administrative borders, unanimously declared in their referendum: "In that case, we proclaim our 'Republic of Serbian Krajina,' secede from Croatia and remain part of Yugoslavia as an independent entity."

It is well-known that the RSK was destroyed in 1995 by the neo-fascist militias of Croatia under the leadership of the United States. Together, they committed an unprecedented

genocide against the 600,000-strong population of the RSK. Meanwhile, Western and pro-Western media, along with so-called human rights organizations, eternally disgraced themselves by pretending that neither the RSK nor the genocide had occurred, claiming there was nothing to discuss. In light of this, I am compelled to briefly present the sparse facts, dates and events leading up to the genocide of the Serbian people, perpetrated by Tuđman's neo-fascist militias under the direct supervision of Bill Clinton.

On February 24, 1990, Tuđman, in connection with the creation of the NDH by Hitler in 1941, stated that the NDH was not a quisling creation and the greatest fascist crime (an unprecedented genocide of over one million Serbian residents — P.M.), but rather the realization of the historical aspirations of the Croatian people.

On July 25, 1990, at Tuđman's proposal, his parliament adopted the decision to make the "chessboard" the coat of arms of Croatia — a flag of the fascist NDH and a symbol hated by all the peoples of Yugoslavia. In response, a Great Serbian Assembly was held in the town of Srb in Serbian Krajina, where, in the presence of 200,000 Serbs, the Serbian National Council was established, and a declaration of the sovereignty and autonomy of the Serbian people was unanimously adopted.

In December 1990, Tuđman prepared a decision declaring that the laws of the SFR of Yugoslavia would no longer apply in his Croatia. In response, on December 20, 1990, the Presidium of the National Council of Northern Dalmatia and Lika adopted the Constitution of the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina. They were joined by the Serbian National Council of Western Krajina — Slavonia, Baranja and Western Srem.

In February 1991, Tuđman made the unconstitutional

decision for Croatia to secede from the SFR of Yugoslavia. In response, on February 28, 1991, the Serbian National Council of all Serbian Krajina unanimously decided to secede Krajina from Croatia and proclaimed the Republic of Serbian Krajina. The people of Serbian Krajina declared this unanimously, based on the existing constitution of the SFR of Yugoslavia, their more than thousand-year history and the fundamental human right to live on their land as they wish, not as dictated by the so-called "civilized" Western barbarians.

Only someone like Clinton, by virtue of his position as the president of the world's sole superpower and due to his narrow, purely American education, could pretend not to know — or perhaps genuinely not know — the history, mistakenly assuming, like Hitler, that he is allowed to reshape the lives of nations according to his own measures, provoking the nationalist elements of one people against another. Indeed, General Tuđman, who united the Croatian nationalists and neo-fascist Ustaše sympathizers and dreamed of an "Independent State of Croatia" within the borders once outlined by Hitler, naturally could not accept the decision of the people of Serbian Krajina. Thus, an attempt was made by newly-formed police and militarized neo-Ustaše forces to pacify the rebellious Serbian Krajina, with the "hidden" goal of creating an ethnically "pure" Croatia. But it is well known that ethnically "pure" territories can only be created through terror. And so, once again, the genocide of the Serbian population began — another attempt, just like 50 years ago. However, it is important to remember that Serbian Krajina, Banija, Kordun and Lika were among the strongest bastions of the partisan and National Liberation Army of Yugoslavia, which fought successfully against both the occupiers and their Ustaše accomplices under the most challenging conditions of the Second World War. Therefore, in 1991-92, both the old warriors and

the younger generation took up arms and did not allow the newly-minted Ustaše to approach their homes.

Of course, the Orthodox people of Serbian Krajina were fully aware that behind Tuđman stood Germany, NATO and an aggressive America. However, their love for their native land, national pride, the promised support from Belgrade in 1991 and the hope that Russia would not remain silent gave them the strength to fight against the Croatian neo-fascists. Thus began the bloody civil, fratricidal war (after all, Croats and Serbs are essentially brothers) between Tuđman's government and the people of Serbian Krajina. At last, the Americans achieved their first military-strategic success in the Balkans, as they managed to introduce their forces into this hotspot. True, they initially sent not their own marines but UN "blue helmets." These "peacekeepers" conveniently established themselves in the Balkans at the very beginning of the 1990s.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the situation became no less catastrophic. Alija Izetbegović, a fervent Muslim nationalist and fanatical Islamic fundamentalist, upon coming to power, declared as his goal the absurd idea of creating an Islamic state in the centre of Yugoslavia. It is difficult to imagine a more insane idea. This nonsense was encouraged by Tito himself, who had proclaimed that the Serbs in Bosnia, who had converted to Islam during five centuries of Turkish rule instead of remaining Orthodox, constituted a separate nation. He officially classified them as "Muslims." The absurdity of this idea is evident, but such things are possible under the unchecked cult of personality of Tito. To better grasp the absurdity of this notion, one could compare it to the following piece of fantasy: it would be like proclaiming Western Ukrainians, who had adopted Greek Catholicism under Vatican pressure, as a "Uniate nation," demanding the creation of an independent state with the goal of joining either Italy or, better yet, the Vatican State.

Izetbegović, spurred on by Germany, Turkey and the Islamic emirates, declared independence and Bosnia and Herzegovina's secession from Yugoslavia. The Orthodox Serbian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which is nearly as numerous as the Muslim Serbs, unanimously voted in their referendum that if Izetbegović's plans were realized, they would establish the Republika Srpska in the territories inhabited by Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina and, as an independent republic, remain within the FR of Yugoslavia. The Croatian leader Tuđman, taking advantage of the chaos, laid territorial claims to Bosnia and Herzegovina and deployed his troops onto its territory. Izetbegović and his nationalists attempted to create an ethnically pure Islamic state, resulting in an even bloodier fratricidal war, fuelled by the West and the Middle East. The Serbs of Bosnia and Herzegovina were forced to take up arms. Like their brothers in the Serbian Krajina, they understood that Izetbegović was backed by the United States, NATO, Turkey and the Arab Emirates, but they did not yield to the aggressors. They relied on their own strength and, of course, hoped for the promised assistance from Serbia and for Russia not to abandon its brothers in their time of need. Meanwhile, Clinton and his diplomacy persuaded the Muslim and Croatian nationalists to unite in their struggle against the Orthodox Serbian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Through various unscrupulous intrigues and Western interference, the fire of fratricidal war was stoked, claiming tens of thousands of lives. The Americans gained a second "hotspot" to introduce "peacekeepers." In the heart of the Balkans, in the city of Sarajevo, the first contingent of "peacekeepers" arrived — comprised of Turkish army troops (!?).

It is worth recalling that during Tito's absolute rule, in the period of his extensive cooperation with the West, the intelligence services of England, the USA, Germany and France did not sit idle. In relatively favourable conditions, they trained a sufficient number of promising, relatively young (what we now call) "agents of influence," who today, with grey streaks in their hair, well-trained and seasoned over the years, determine the fates of the territories entrusted to them. As if in a school theatre, the specialists pull the strings — Tuđman dances, Izetbegović dances, Čičak, Panić and the pro-Western intelligentsia dance, as do the various commanders of the neo-Ustaše, neo-Chetniks and neo-fundamentalists, along with many others who Western and Eastern monopolies have cast as little Napoleons in nationalist and separatist movements, the executors of U.S. schemes. And at the same time, rivers of blood are flowing, the youth are dying, honest representatives of the people are falling, struck down by bullets from around corners. Against the backdrop of the dead, wounded, hundreds of thousands of refugees, a catastrophic drop in living standards, ruined towns and villages, disease, hunger and cold, the demagogy imposed by the West about their "blessed form of democracy," parliamentary games and vote-counting sounds grotesque. In this whirlwind of chaos and terror, on the ruins of former Yugoslavia, there seems to be no room for elementary questions — can the working people unite to fight for jobs, shelter, free medical care, free education for their children, peace, human rights and our collective freedom? These questions, like unattainable dreams, vanish into the wild nationalist and religious orgies of people driven mad. Through its puppets and media, the West has so thoroughly sown discord and hatred among the peoples, fuelled by spilled blood, that it has become nearly impossible to ask the simple question — "For God's sake, my Croatian

brother, Serbian brother, Muslim brother, who is it that has so divided us, the working people, to the point where we cannot even recognize our common enemy?"

When analysing the events of 1990-94, credit must be given to all those Western strategists of the late 1980s and early 1990s, to all those architects of bloodshed — Reagan, Bush, Kohl, Clinton and the bloodthirsty Albright to match them. They achieved much in their schemes. Nevertheless, the American-German plans were not fully realized. The SFR of Yugoslavia was torn apart; Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Macedonia were severed. These former republics were turned into mini-states with puppets at their helm. However, speaking broadly, their success was not absolute. Although the Americans gained strategic access to the Balkans, although they managed to sow discord among the peoples and nurture significant enmity, Serbia and Montenegro united into the new FR of Yugoslavia, and with the socialists and communists at the head no less. They even extended an invitation to their brothers — Slovenes, Croats, Bosnians, Herzegovinians and Macedonians — to join the FR of Yugoslavia at any convenient time. They dared to voice their disagreement with the American-German policies and accused them of aggressive interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, of violating basic international legal norms.

The Blockade and Continuous Interference in the Internal Affairs of a Sovereign State

The global policeman, the USA, was not accustomed to such defiance. The command rang out: "Don't you know your place? Look, we brought the giant Soviet Russia to its knees, and you barely even register on the globe. Crush

them!" However, it was still too early to crush them entirely. But to smear them with dirt, drown them in a sea of lies — that was possible. To impose a blockade, strangle them economically, force them to surrender with the skeletal hand of hunger — that was also within reach. And so the spectacle began; a shameful chapter was opened, even for the UN and the Security Council.

A shameful chapter was also opened in Russian-Serbian relations, when the tandem of Yeltsin-Kozyrev, following the orders of their American-German masters, betrayed and trampled on the centuries-old fighting friendship between the Russian and Serbian peoples, their fraternal ties.

The West and Yeltsin needed to justify their actions at any cost. Streams of lies, slander and disinformation poured across the globe about the so-called atrocities of these Serbian "bandits" — how they were allegedly killing, raping, committing atrocities and tormenting the poor Croatian and Muslim nationalists. Here, any honest person could clearly see the true worth of the much-vaunted objectivity of the Western press, radio and television. The technique of ideological manipulation was at its peak. European and American citizens were horrified, gasping in shock and approving further interference in Yugoslavia's internal affairs by the Americans and Germans, who had now dragged the French, British, Belgians and others into this aggression. Of course, the Americans were in charge, donning the mantle of "peacekeepers."

Events in Serbia and Montenegro, however, were not unfolding according to the Americans' script. As previously mentioned, the "League of Communists," nurtured by Tito in the spirit of unconditional support for all his actions, had gradually degraded, rotted and disintegrated. The fight for socialist ideals, deeply rooted in Serbia since the time of the renowned advocate for social justice Svetozar Marković, was

revived by the newly-formed Socialist Party of Serbia, which distanced itself from the decaying bureaucratic apparatus of the League of Communists.

In the difficult days of 1991-92, when the entire international reactionary front, led by German and American power brokers and the Vatican, along with nationalist and neo-fascist accomplices in Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, was tearing the country apart and falsely blaming Serbia and Montenegro for the tragedy they themselves had orchestrated, the socialists of Serbia and the communists of Montenegro stood united in defence of the national dignity and honour of the newly-formed FR of Yugoslavia. The people supported them in this noble endeavour.

The United States immediately demanded multi-party presidential elections in Serbia, relying on the powerful Western media. Their logic was simple and, as they believed, foolproof. After all, if their media could brainwash all of Europe, there was no reason to fear the self-awareness of some Serbs.

The American strategists had one ace up their sleeve — a certain Panić, a Serbian by nationality, a cyclist by profession, an American citizen and a businessman. They had earmarked him to take on the role of the new Serbian president (similar to Somoza or Duvalier), replacing the popularly supported Milošević. A massive Western campaign of deceit, disinformation and threats was launched. It was claimed that Panić had significant connections in the United States, that he would establish economic and political relations, lift the Western blockade and direct threats were issued: if Panić were not elected president, the United States would begin bombing Serbia, including Belgrade. So, the threats by Madeleine Albright to bomb Serbian cities in 1998 were merely a repetition and continuation of U.S. aggression dating back to 1991.

The Serbian people were not intimidated by the threats

and firmly stood in defence of their national interests. They refused to kneel before the American and German aggressors blessed by the Vatican. Once again, as in ancient times, the old freedom-loving slogan was heard: "Better the grave than to live as a slave." No German-American money, no powerful Western ideological brainwashing, no strike groups with American aircraft carriers *Kennedy* and *Saratoga*, the British *Ark Royal*, the French *Clemenceau*, missile cruisers like *Gloucester* arrogantly demonstrating their power along the Montenegrin coast of the Adriatic and blockading ports, and no wailing of G-15, G-18, G-11 and AWACS planes helped the American puppet.

The Serbian people delivered a resounding slap to the American politicians Bush and Clinton, as well as Kohl and the Pope, by electing their own leader — someone who served the interests of their people, not the aggressors.

How did the "civilizers" respond to the natural desire of the people of the FR of Yugoslavia to resolve their internal issues independently, without outside dictates? The Russian people had no opportunity to see with their own eyes how these "fathers" of the highly developed West tried to literally strangle the people of Yugoslavia with the bony hand of hunger between 1992 and 1995. All these Clintons, Kohls, Thatchers-Majors, Mitterrands-Chiracs spared no effort or resources in organizing the most brutal economic and political blockade of Yugoslavia. The country was blockaded at sea by the fleets of the U.S. and NATO. Every border crossing was manned by UNPROFOR police. All supplies of oil, gasoline, gas and medicine were cut off. Air, rail and road transportation was completely banned. All political, trade and cultural ties with the outside world were severed. The republic's skies were controlled by American aviation units. UNPROFOR police jeeps roamed the cities and towns. Hunger, cold, a lack of basic medical supplies, the seizure of its airspace, the capture of the Adriatic and constant threats of bombings — these were the tools of Clinton and his company's "peacekeepers." And amidst all this, there was endless chatter about American humanism and human rights! Under the guise of their inexhaustible stream of deceitful rhetoric, they carried out their dark deeds, creating one bloody hotspot after another, staging new bombings and causing immense suffering for refugees, columns of distressed children, mothers and the elderly.

If we briefly characterize the difficult period of 1990-94, it is necessary to highlight the following. By late 1994 and early 1995, the United States, while continuing to tighten the blockade and threaten to bomb the defiant Serbs, moved toward implementing their plans for military action, openly aiding Croatian and Muslim pro-fascist elements. During this time, three republics — the Republic of Serbian Krajina, Republika Srpska and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia — waged a difficult struggle against U.S. and NATO aggression and intrigues, tragically without a single ally.

CHAPTER VI

THE YEAR 1995

THE UNBRIDLED AGGRESSION BY THE U.S. AND THE WEST AGAINST THE SERBIAN REPUBLICS AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Between 1991 and 1994, U.S.-German strategists came to realize that, under any circumstances, the main obstacles to achieving their goals in the Balkans would be the Republic of Serbian Krajina in the western Balkans, Republika Srpska in the centre and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia itself, comprising Serbia and Montenegro in the eastern Balkans.

The Western hawks — or as their obedient global press calls them, "peacekeepers" — did not hide their reasoning, which essentially boiled down to the following: if these Serbs, these Serbian republics, refuse to understand what we are saying to them, if they refuse to heed our ultimatums, then they must be destroyed. The best course of action, they believed, would be to annihilate them all at once, in a single blow — provided, of course, that the RSK in Croatia and RS in Bosnia united into one state, and that the FR of Yugoslavia openly came to the defence of its Serbian brothers in the RSK and RS. As is well known, for various reasons, such unification never occurred, and the West decided to destroy these republics one by one. Thus began the even more tragic year of 1995.

The Destruction of the Republic of Serbian Krajina

The first blow was directed at the Republic of Serbian Krajina, the westernmost of the Serbian republics, which provided the Serbs with access to the Adriatic Sea. Credit must

be given to the Americans: they spared no effort or resources in pursuing their plans. They prepared meticulously for this strike over the course of an entire year, up until the summer of 1995. Preparations were carried out on all fronts, from the massive indoctrination of Europeans and Americans with tales of the "bandit Serbs'" atrocities, to a propaganda blitz in support of the Croatian "fuhrer" Tuđman and the stoking of Croatian hatred toward their Serbian brothers. Simultaneously, the military aspects of the campaign were carefully planned and financially supported. The head of U.S. military intelligence, Fred Soyster, was relieved of his duties and relocated to the Croatian capital, Zagreb, where he oversaw the military preparations of Tuđman's army. Over the course of 1994, this army was transformed from a militia into a 200,000-strong regular army modelled after the U.S. Armed Forces. In blatant violation of the UN-imposed embargo banning the supply of arms to all warring parties in Yugoslavia, the Americans armed Tuđman's army "to the teeth." This army received an enormous amount of military equipment, including Mi-24 attack helicopters, MiG-21 fighter-bombers and numerous armoured personnel carriers of Soviet manufacture, which had been gifted to West Germany by Gorbachev following his betrayal of East Germany and subsequently handed over to Tuđman. The Americans also provided a full suite of intelligence data and gave Tuđman the green light to execute Operation "Storm."

On the very first day of the U.S.-Tuđman offensive, planned for August 4, 1995, American disinformation specialists disabled all the communication systems of the RSK army. A sinister provocation was carried out as an overwhelming wave of disorganizing commands was broadcast via radio and telecommunications across the republic. Both the civilian population and military units were told, alleged-

ly on behalf of the republic's highest leadership, to retreat to Bosnia. Following the retreating population, the army too began withdrawing based on these false commands. What could the 600,000-strong population of the Serbian Krajina possibly oppose to the combined onslaught of America and the Croatian neo-fascists? Only 40,000 poorly armed militia members, lacking allies and led by a command structure unable to cope with the complex challenges posed by those tragic days for the Republic. Under continuous bombardment and fire from U.S.-backed Ustaše artillery along the entire front, the peaceful people of Krajina fled, abandoning their ancestral homes. The young and old alike retreated — terrified to death, destitute, hungry, sick — women, mothers, children, the elderly with bundles on their backs, alongside disoriented militia members, through Bosnia and the main highways of Slavonia into the FR of Yugoslavia, losing their weakened loved ones during this tragic retreat.

Thus fell the RSK. Thus was crushed the westernmost outpost of humanity, social justice and Orthodoxy. If we speak in the language of Moscow's state strategists, it was also the westernmost outpost of Russian geopolitical interests in Europe as a whole and the Balkans in particular.

The Attempt to Destroy Republika Srpska in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Following the successful military operations in August 1995, the West decided to capitalize on this momentum in its subsequent actions. The next objective for U.S. strategists became the rapid elimination of the Bosnian obstacle — the liquidation of Republika Srpska in Bosnia. Of course, the Americans quickly devised a plan for this military operation. However, due to the lack of time, this plan, in its crude simplicity, could easily be mistaken for the script of an American Western — plenty of blood, but no humanity. See for yourselves, dear readers.

First, on August 28, 1995, a 120 mm shell was launched at the Markale market in Sarajevo by CIA agents. The shell exploded on a crowded street, killing 68 people and wounding 85 others. Without wasting time, NATO, led by the Americans, immediately set up its own commission, which, within a mere 24 hours (!?), concluded that the shell had been fired from Serbian positions. The commander of the Army of RS, General Ratko Mladić, promptly proposed to UNPROFOR Commander General Rupert Smith that a mixed commission of specialists from America, Russia, Serbian and Muslim sides be formed to conduct an objective investigation and establish the truth. The proposal was rejected. The American side was reminded that in February 1994, a year earlier, a mortar shell had been fired at the same Markale market, killing 37 people and wounding 200. Back then, the American commission also claimed that the Serbs were responsible, but later, the real culprits were found among the Muslim side. This prior finding was ignored by the Americans in the 1995 incident.

Russian Colonel Anatoly Demurenko, who in August 1995 was serving as Chief of Staff for UNPROFOR in the Sarajevo sector, conducted his own investigation and refuted the NATO commission's claim that the shell had been fired from Serbian positions. In an interview with journalists, he stated that a responsible commission investigating such an incident would need at least several days, if not weeks, to reach any reliable conclusions. According to him, it was impossible to issue a credible conclusion after just a few hours of work. He emphasized that the Serbs were wrongly accused and that NATO's decision to punish RS with airstrikes was, at the very least, poorly thought out. Colonel Demurenko

presented graphs and calculations from his investigation and stated, "I have materials that show the Serbs are not guilty of this crime, but I cannot disclose them now. I have received a categorical order from my superiors not to provide any materials after my initial interview, which I gave to *ITAR-TASS*." When asked by journalists whether he feared becoming a victim of a sniper, a car explosion or arrest, the colonel replied that he had been threatened several times by unidentified individuals but added, "I am a soldier, and such things do not worry me. What concerns me," he said, "is that I cannot, due to the prohibition, share the details of my investigation. Perhaps everything will become clear in a few days." Indeed, within a couple of days, everything "fell into place." Colonel Demurenko disappeared. He vanished from *ITAR-TASS*, from the pages of the global press and from everywhere else. He was simply gone, forgotten, as if he had never existed. Like in a children's fairy tale, where the magician waves his hands and declares, "He's gone — here one moment, gone the next." The Americans, in fact, are masters at eliminating unwanted witnesses. Let us recall their "magnificent" operation to eliminate 26 witnesses to the assassination of their own president. And here, who cares about some Russian colonel conducting an independent investigation into their activities!

The NATO commission pointed the finger at the Serbs as the culprits of the explosion, and that was enough for the then-infamous puppet of American policy, UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, to hastily "request" NATO to punish the Serbs. His "valiant" forces launched air and artillery strikes on Serbian military positions. But that was not all — he gave NATO military commanders carte blanche to carry out a massive military operation against RS.

What followed was beyond comprehension, even for "respectable" American and European bourgeois, who had been

fed tales of the "peacekeeping" efforts of America, NATO and the UN. It turned out that American F-4 Phantoms, French Mirages, German Tornados and British Harriers were mercilessly bombing Serbian positions as well as civilian towns and villages. Under their cover, Muslim fundamentalists, together with Croatian neo-Ustaše units, launched an offensive across the entire front, capturing territories of RS. During just three weeks in September 1995, as NATO observers boastfully reported, 4,500 combat sorties were carried out over the territory of RS. And remember, this territory is smaller than the Moscow region! (How these actions from three years earlier echo the savage grin of Clinton the "sex hero," his sinister sidekick Albright and the pack of European lapdogs like Major, Chirac, and their German, Italian and Spanish servants of the American monopolies. With bandit-like ferocity, they howled throughout the fall of 1998 about the need to bomb and annihilate those same Serbs! But the discussion about the Western aggression against the FR of Yugoslavia in 1998-99 will come later.)

And once again, Serbian blood flowed. Columns of refugees stretched out — barefoot, poorly clothed, exhausted and starving — children, mothers and elderly people fleeing northward to Banja Luka, trying to escape the atrocities of the NATO vultures, fundamentalists and neo-Ustaše forces. The author of these lines had the chance to witness this tragedy firsthand and would not wish anyone to endure such suffering. Despite the brutal attacks by NATO, RS, though it lost nearly a third of its territory in Southwestern and Western Bosnia, managed to withstand the aggressors' onslaught. By the end of 1995, it held its defensive positions along the line of Sanski Most, Ključ, Banja Luka, Doboj and Brčko. After the bloody battles fought by the Army of RS against the combined forces of the United States, NATO and their

accomplices from the neo-fascist units of Izetbegović's fundamentalists and Tuđman's national separatists, a period of precarious equilibrium set in. Unable to destroy the Army of RS, the aggressors turned to their favourite and well-tested tactic — twisting the arms of Serbian leaders through "peaceful" means, employing threats and blackmail.

On November 20, 1995, at the U.S. military base in Dayton, Ohio, after a month of threats involving intensified bombings, economic blockades and the extension of military actions onto the territory of the FR of Yugoslavia, the "peacekeepers" managed to twist the arms of the Serbian leaders. They forced the Serbian President Slobodan Milošević, acting on behalf of the entire Serbian people, to sign the disgraceful so-called Dayton "Peace Agreement," or, more accurately, to accept the American dictate.

Under this dictate, RS lost a third of its territory, as well as its capital — Sarajevo, a city where over 120,000 Serbs resided. The Orthodox Republika Srpska was compelled to join the artificial Muslim-Catholic entity contrived by Clinton. This state formation is extremely unstable and volatile but remains in existence for now as a necessary tool of the United States in the Balkans. As a result of the Dayton dictate, the Republic of Serbian Krajina was erased not only physically but also legally. It was as though the proud RSK and its 600,000 Serbian inhabitants had never existed. The Americans achieved their most significant strategic success — the official permission to establish a military base in the heart of the Balkans. Without delay, they deployed a 20,000-strong force there. The United States achieved yet another crucial strategic success. The Dayton dictate demonstrated to the entire world that Russia had been entirely sidelined from participating in resolving global issues in the Balkans.

Thus, as a result of successful aggressive actions from September to November 1995, the only remaining obstacle to the realization of U.S. strategic plans in the Balkans was the FR of Yugoslavia. Both before and after the Dayton dictate, the U.S. made no secret of its hatred and claims against the FR of Yugoslavia. Even then, they were threatening the FR of Yugoslavia with the so-called "international Kosovo problem" they had fabricated but postponed bringing it to the forefront until they had fully consolidated their power in Bosnia.

The Yeltsin-Kozyrev Tandem in Action

A fair question might arise: how did the Russian leadership respond during this tragic period from 1991 to 1995, when the West, emboldened by its unchecked impunity and led by the United States, was crucifying the Federal Yugoslavia like Christ on the cross, and crushing the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Republika Srpska, Russia's most reliable allies in its history, with missile and bombing strikes, leaving them bloodied and in ruins? To objectively answer this question, it is necessary to recall the well-known facts of that time.

The UN and its Security Council, under the dictate and leadership of the sole superpower, the United States, adopted over 70 resolutions (!) during that period aimed at the demonization of Yugoslavia. It is important to remember that the Russian leadership of that time not only supported all these resolutions but were also co-authors of many of them. They supported economic sanctions against Yugoslavia and allowed UN forces to use military force. They backed the economic blockade of Yugoslavia and even participated in its illegal dismemberment. Following Germany's lead, and in violation of the basic norms of international law, they hurried to recognize the illegal separatist secessions of Croatia, Slovenia, and later Bosnia and Macedonia from the Yugoslav state.

NATO's command justified its criminal actions — carried out jointly with the neo-fascist Ustaše and Muslim formations it had nurtured in July-September 1995 — with the sinister and disgraceful UN Security Council Resolution No. 836. This resolution permitted massive airstrikes, artillery and missile attacks not only on Serbian positions but also on civilian infrastructure. Where were Kozyrev and Yeltsin, and their international affairs specialists, when this resolution was adopted? Why did they not veto this blatant, outrageous injustice? They were right there, of course, and could not veto it as they were active co-authors of the resolution. This was one of the peaks of Kozyrev's openly treacherous activities. And how many other vile deeds were committed by this cowardly yet insidious traitor, a zealous executor of tasks set by the U.S. State Department? Russia, under Kozyrev at that time, never once vetoed any of the Security Council resolutions that were openly directed against the Serbs and Yugoslavia.

When Yuli Vorontsov, Russia's former representative at the UN, spoke out in the Security Council against a resolution prepared by the Americans and their allies that legalized the sharp intensification of sanctions against Yugoslavia in April 1993, and when he prepared to veto it, a shrill order came from Kozyrev in Moscow: "Do not dare; abstain!" At the time, certain satisfied individuals in the foreign press joked that the Russian leaders, instead of vetoing, had simply "wet their pants."

The terror organized by the Americans in the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Republika Srpska and carried out by their mercenaries from the fascist Croatian and Muslim units continued into 1995. The Russian Duma of that time proposed a number of measures, including the use of a veto, to halt NATO's strikes against the Serbian people during those tragic days. But it turned out the Duma did not realize there

was no place to use a veto because NATO already had all the necessary UN documents granting them the authority to use force at the discretion of NATO commanders. This had been prearranged by none other than the ill-fated Yeltsin-Kozyrev tandem. As a result, all those discussions in the Russian Duma in 1995 and its proposals regarding the Yugoslav tragedy were, on the one hand, purely for domestic consumption and, on the other, a smokescreen behind which the Americans and NATO calmly carried out their plans. The Duma proposed unilaterally lifting sanctions and the economic blockade, as well as removing the arms embargo on Yugoslavia. These noble intentions, however, remained just that — noble intentions. On September 8, 1995, Yeltsin promised the Serbs something "hot." And indeed, had the Serbs received modern defensive systems, NATO's planes, which rained death upon towns and villages, would have been swept from Yugoslavia's blue skies like so many crows. Unfortunately, all of Yeltsin's and the Duma's promises of that time remained nothing more than empty words on paper. Or take October 1995, when the press reported that Russia had decided to deliver gas to Serbia. It later turned out that it was not for the Serbs and not to Serbia, but rather through Serbia's gas pipeline to Bosnia — and not as aid to the Bosnian Serbs, who were under attack from the Americans, but to Sarajevo, to the Muslims under Izetbegović, the former SS officer. And so, it became evident that all of Yeltsin's supposed threats toward the West at the time were nothing more than an attempt to put on a brave face while playing a losing game.

Yes, and what could one expect when the Foreign Minister Kozyrev, during a televised interview after meeting with Clinton's National Security Advisor, E. Lake, in the fall of 1995 — at the height of the American destruction of the Serbian republics — loudly declared: "There are no funda-

mental differences in the approaches of the U.S. and Russia on this issue, and the initiatives of both sides are aligned in the same direction" (???). Truly, those who say that arrogance knows no bounds are right! What can be said about Russian policy toward Yugoslavia from 1990 to 1995 when it was Yeltsin himself who advised the Serbian President Milošević to impose a blockade along the Drina River on Republika Srpska, promising in return to lift the harsh sanctions against Yugoslavia through the UN Security Council. Under pressure from the Americans and taking Yeltsin's promise into account, Milošević likely made one of the heaviest decisions of his life — he closed the Drina border and refused military aid to his brothers in Bosnia. And what happened? As always, Yeltsin failed to fulfil his promise. On this matter, the West praised both Kozyrev and Yeltsin for their "successful diplomacy," for it was they who managed to drive a wedge between Yugoslavia and Republika Srpska, between President Milošević and President Karadžić.

So how can one characterize the policies of the Yeltsin-Kozyrev tandem? That they servilely followed in the wake of Clinton and Kohl's policies is common knowledge. That they were not allies of Yugoslavia, they proved unequivocally. That their friends were on the opposite side of the conflict, they repeatedly made clear themselves. As for the moral, strategic, geopolitical and humanitarian dimensions of such policies, the reader can easily make his own judgement.

In those difficult days of 1995 on the Balkans, the struggling Serbian people always knew that the Russian people were a great nation. They believed that Yeltsin, or some other future president of Russia, would eventually understand the truth — that the leader of such a powerful country, as Russia was and could be again, should not be harnessed alongside a political aberration like Kozyrev, nor should he serve the

interests of the American strategists attempting to implement a "new order" reminiscent of Hitler's "new order" of 1938-44. They firmly believed that the enormous moral factor of the historically proven brotherly friendship between the Russian and Serbian peoples, combined with the equally immense desire of the overwhelming majority of the Russian people for an independent foreign policy, could compel Yeltsin to realize the necessity of a sharp change in his actions toward the FR of Yugoslavia and the Serbian people as a whole.

After all, it is one thing when in 1995 columns of hundreds of thousands of Serbian children, mothers, elders and fighters — lacking modern weaponry — retreated under continuous fire from NATO, accompanied by the mockery and sneers of Kozyrev. It is quite another matter if those Serbian fighters had been armed with modern weapons at that time. It is one thing to endure the ruthless economic blockade of Yugoslavia imposed by the U.S., whose bony hand of hunger sought to literally strangle a brotherly nation, and quite another if Russia had lifted the blockade and provided economic assistance to its brotherly country. In that same 1995, Yugoslavia wrote with gratitude about the 13 wounded Russian volunteers who fought under the harshest conditions in Bosnia on the side of the Serbs. Meanwhile, the corrupt Russian television of the time, through the words of the Western lackey Karaulov, insulted them across Russia, calling them mercenaries, bandits, thugs and murderers — epithets that apply first and foremost to Karaulov and other pro-Western traitors on Russia's bought-and-paid-for television channels. How different it would have been if Russia in 1995 treated those noble young men with the same respect as pre-Gorbachev Russia. Everyone, except for the "new Russians," the "Karaulovs" and other Western hirelings, knows that for two centuries, the pride and glory of Russia were its volunteers who fought in the moun-

tains of Yugoslavia on the side of their Serbian brothers in 1805-12, 1876-78, 1914-17 and 1941-45. Let us remember the revered names in Russia: Raevsky, Isaev and O'Rourke, and the fallen Russian volunteers in battles at Malajnica, Shtubik, on Varvarin Field and Deligrad, near Loznica and Leshnica. The classics of Russian and world literature — Leo Tolstoy, Ivan Turgenev, Fyodor Dostoevsky — immortalized the exploits of Russian volunteers in their brilliant works. That's how it was until the Karaulovs started appearing on Russia's television screens. It should also be noted that the Karaulovs have no less audacity than the Kozyrevs, both in slandering their own people and in their tenacity to remain afloat under any circumstances.

In that same 1995, the blue waters of the Adriatic were crossed only by American aircraft carriers, the *Saratoga* and the *Roosevelt*, which blockaded Yugoslavia by sea. The situation in the Serbian part of the Balkans would have unfolded very differently if, alongside those American vessels, missile cruisers of the Red Banner Black Sea Fleet had been sailing or anchored in the deep harbours of the Adriatic, standing at anchor as a visible sign of support for brotherly Yugoslavia.

It might have seemed that the aforementioned hopes for fraternal Russian assistance to Yugoslavia were little more than dreams. However, life teaches quickly and often introduces its own corrections. By April 1999, the Northern and Pacific Fleets were already conducting large-scale manoeuvres, and the Duma and the President were condemning the open aggression of the United States and NATO, and, at least verbally, were expressing support for the FR of Yugoslavia in its rightful defence of sovereignty and territorial integrity. But these events will be discussed at the end of the book.

American Banditry on the Banks of the Sana
Escalation in Republika Srpska in Bosnia

In the far northwest of Bosnia's Republika Srpska, on the banks of the mountain river Sana and the slopes of Mount Kozara — famous for its heroic resistance against occupiers — lies the picturesque Serbian town of Prijedor. The town was gradually recovering from the turbulent and tragic events that had shaken Yugoslavia between 1991 and 1996, trying to establish some semblance of a normal life within the framework of RS. RS, under the dictates of the American aggressors, had been forcibly included in an artificial union with the Muslim-Croatian Federation, led by former SS officer Alija Izetbegović, now the President of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH). Prijedor went about its daily life, unaware that the NATO summit held in Madrid on July 8-9, 1997 would play a "cruel joke" on the town and make it the centre of Western media attention, albeit predictably distorted. How could the people of Prijedor have imagined anything untoward when the American and European NATO strategists at the summit were eloquent in their assurances of an unwavering commitment to peace and prosperity in the regions under their military control? Naturally, NATO proclaimed it would spare no effort to achieve its lofty goals and dreams. In line with the speeches at the summit, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, American General George Joulwan, departed Madrid on July 9 and, emphasizing the Western international community's commitment to achieving a long-lasting and stable peace, boldly declared: "I urge the authorities of BiH to understand NATO's and the international community's determination to ensure the full implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement." He categorically dismissed any possibility that NATO's Stabilization Force (SFOR) would take any

actions to arrest individuals accused by the West of alleged war crimes. The confident American general explicitly stated: "This is not our responsibility. It is the duty of BiH authorities (under the Dayton Agreement) to bring such individuals to justice." Joulwan emphasized that he "had not received any instructions regarding operations to detain individuals accused of war crimes, as such actions fall under the jurisdiction of the civilian authorities of BiH" (Madrid, *Tanjug*, July 9, 1997).

While Joulwan was expounding on peace to journalists in Madrid, his punitive squads were preparing for yet another act of banditry — this time in the town of Prijedor. Helicopters and armoured personnel carriers were mobilized. According to the Public Security Centre of Prijedor (PSCP), early in the morning on July 10, NATO forces surrounded the house of the sister of Simo Drljača, the head of the PSCP. Simo Drljača had gone there to visit with his 17-year-old son. In a cowardly ambush, he was killed. The attackers took Drljača's body, along with his arrested son and brother-in-law, to an undisclosed location. That same day, the NATO "peacekeepers" stormed Prijedor's city hospital, arrested its director, Dr. Milan Kovačević, and also took him to an undisclosed location.

Immediately, the corrupt Western media sprang into action, issuing all sorts of reports and statements.

The news of the aggressive actions of the SFOR was confirmed in London by the UK Foreign Secretary Robin Cook. He announced that the raid had been conducted with the blessing of NATO's Secretary General and emphasized that British soldiers had shown "exceptional bravery" during the operation.

NATO's Secretary General Javier Solana, in his statement from Brussels, justified the actions of his "peacekeepers,"

claiming that SFOR "peacekeepers" had killed Simo Drljača "in self-defence." He went on to praise their "high professionalism and enlightenment" (?!?).

Another NATO representative, Rauch, declared that the SFOR operation in Prijedor had been carried out under the "direct order" of American General George Joulwan and NATO Secretary General Javier Solana. Interestingly, the representative of the so-called Hague Tribunal for Yugoslavia, K. Sartje, stated: "The name Simo Drljača is not on our list of individuals accused of war crimes."

As for NATO's Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, American General George Joulwan — who, just the day before, on July 9, had claimed he knew nothing about any such operations — suddenly, on July 10, according to reports from London and The Hague, confirmed that his forces had killed Simo Drljača in the Prijedor region and arrested the director of the city hospital, Dr. Milan Kovačević. Joulwan also announced that Kovačević would be handed over to the Hague Tribunal.

And what about America, which so many wealthy elites across the globe admire? U.S. National Security Advisor Samuel Berger reported that President Clinton had approved the American involvement in this operation and that the U.S. had provided transportation (i.e., helicopters and armoured personnel carriers) and logistical support. The U.S. representative in Sarajevo, Ivo Grbo, at a press conference, applauded this "action of international forces," most likely referring primarily to his valiant General Joulwan, the helicopter pilots and the armoured vehicle drivers.

When reading all these statements by the Americans and their European lackeys about what happened in Prijedor, one cannot help but ask: is it not clear to any reasonable person that a crime has been committed? Can Clinton, the leader

of a superpower, not see that this is a crime — a lynching, American-style? Clearly, he simply does not wish to see it. But he could look at this tragedy from another perspective. Could he imagine that, in his own domain, in the beautiful state of Arkansas, a helicopter squad from RS suddenly lands, surrounds the house of the sheriff's sister, and kills the sheriff himself, who was visiting his sister with his 17-year-old son? The daring squad then takes the body, along with the sheriff's son and brother-in-law, and disappears in an unknown direction. And all of this happens after the Serbs had agreed with the people of Arkansas at the international level that all legal norms in the "glorious" state of Arkansas would be enforced by the Arkansans themselves! Clinton would most likely smirk disdainfully — what a ridiculous notion, a tiny RS and the giant United States! But what if, instead of Bosnian Serbs, it were a Chinese or Russian squad? Would the nature of the crime have changed?

It is well known that Americans are often narrow-minded, arrogant and only respect power, so it is hard to imagine them understanding the atrocities they are committing any time soon. The robbery operation in Prijedor, led by the U.S. General Joulwan and NATO Secretary General Solana, was not coincidentally conducted on July 9, during a period of heightened political tension within the leadership of RS. This provocative, bloody NATO "peacekeeper" raid was designed to further inflame the already critical situation within RS leadership, to threaten the disobedient, and, if necessary, to use armed intervention — force, bloodshed and terror — to impose their dictates and install loyal puppets as leaders.

To uncover the true reasons for the sharp escalation in tensions within RS leadership, it is necessary to briefly review the political developments in the region after the Dayton Accords. As previously mentioned, under these agreements, RS

did not gain independence but was forcibly integrated into the artificial construct of Bosnia and Herzegovina, along with the Muslim-Croat Federation. It is also widely known that the leaders of the Serb national resistance to U.S.-German aggression from 1991 to 1995 were President Radovan Karadžić and General Ratko Mladić, whose authority among the people remains unshakable to this day. Under the leadership of Karadžić and Mladić, the Bosnian Serbs achieved significant military victories between 1991 and 1995 against the pro-fascist Catholic and Muslim forces, uniting all regions of compact Orthodox Serb settlement, which accounted for more than 70 per cent of Bosnia and Herzegovina's territory. Only blatant intervention by the U.S.-German aggressors — the true architects of the fratricidal conflict — who continuously sided with the Muslim-Croat separatists, deprived the Bosnian Serbs of the fruits of their efforts to live compactly and independently in their RS.

It is also important to emphasize that Karadžić consistently advocated for a fair and peaceful resolution of disputes and supported the Dayton Accords. However, the hatred of the United States and its NATO allies toward this people's leader in the struggle for freedom — Karadžić — was so intense, and their desire to punish this defiant leader of the Serbs so immense, that one of the main conditions of the U.S. dictate was the removal of Karadžić and Mladić and their handover to the Hague Tribunal, where they would be prosecuted for alleged war crimes.

During those difficult days, among the many allies of Radovan Karadžić in the struggle for the national liberation of Bosnian Serbs was Biljana Plavšić, a biology professor from Sarajevo. While working on Karadžić's team, Plavšić was known not only for her nationalist views but also for her pro-Western leanings even before the tragic events of 1992-

95. When, under relentless pressure from the United States, Germany and NATO, Karadžić was forced in July 1996 to step down from his position as President of Republika Srpska — a position to which he had been elected by an overwhelming majority of the people — the leadership of RS and the governing Democratic Party, with Karadžić's consent, put forward Biljana Plavšić's candidacy for the presidency. They viewed her as an acceptable choice for the West, which was dictating the terms of the peace settlement. The United States, aware of Plavšić's pro-Western inclinations, approved her candidacy. With the support of the government, parliament, the leadership of the ruling Democratic Party of Republika Srpska and Karadžić himself, Plavšić was elected president of RS. In hindsight, it is clear that this was a mistake.

In her new role as president of RS, Plavšić demonstrated herself to be a loyal subordinate to the occupiers and began implementing their main demands, including the removal of individuals from the RS government apparatus who had fought against Western aggression and their pro-fascist proxies during the 1991-95 period.

It is pointless to talk about any significant authority Plavšić may have had while the leaders of the people's struggle for freedom — Karadžić and Ratko Mladić — were still alive. Everyone in Bosnia knew that as president, she represented a compromise between Karadžić and Clinton, a concession made by Karadžić to Clinton in order to achieve the peace that RS so desperately needed at the time. Plavšić lost the last remnants of her already weak authority among the people due to her constant subservience to Western officials and her continuous contacts with New York, London and Berlin. The people's patience was finally exhausted when Plavšić decided to comply with the West's demand to dismiss RS Minister of Internal Affairs Dragan Kijac.

The RS government declared Plavšić's decision to be illegal, while the ruling Democratic Party demanded that she resign from the presidency. On July 1, the RS parliament (the National Assembly of RS) raised the question of removing Plavšić from her presidential position. Feeling the strong military support of the West behind her, Plavšić decided not to comply with the will of the people. She issued a decree dissolving the parliament, dismissing the government and announced her intention to form a new "Government of National Salvation" by July 15.

According to international observers, Plavšić found herself in complete isolation within her own republic. She was not supported by the people, the newly-elected parliament, the government, the army or even the ruling Democratic Party, which had initially put her forward for the presidency.

But she was fully supported by the all-powerful West, led by the superpower, the United States. International news agencies at the time were brimming with "touching" reports about the West's support for Biljana Plavšić. For instance, *Reuters*, reporting from Madrid, stated that: "NATO leaders at the summit are giving full support to Plavšić in resolving the crisis." They also "demand the extradition of Karadžić and Mladić to The Hague."

The representative of the High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Carlos Westendorp, spoke in Sarajevo and declared that representatives of international organizations had sent a letter to Plavšić, in which they said, "they are aware of her decision to dissolve the Republika Srpska Parliament and consider that this decision is of great importance..." Reports from Banja Luka stated that David Bullivant, a representative of the Office of the International Community, announced that Westendorp "welcomes Plavšić's decisions, which are fully consistent with the Dayton Accords." Mean-

while, the spokesperson for SFOR in the southwest sector, Major A. Wilkinson, denied claims by some agencies that SFOR units were guarding Plavšić's residence.

The well-known Madeleine Albright and the already familiar, notoriously irresponsible U.S. General George Joulwan, did not stay on the sidelines either. They believed that if Plavšić were removed from her position, NATO leadership would not stand idly by and would order NATO forces to intervene, reinstate Plavšić in her position and simultaneously arrest the people's leaders, Karadžić and Mladić. They were entirely unconcerned by the fact that such intervention would constitute blatant interference in the internal affairs of RS. But why would that matter to them? International law, after all, is meant to be observed by the weak, not by America!

Alright, it seems clear enough where the Americans stood. But how did Biljana Plavšić herself, a former ardent nationalist and fighter for the independence and freedom of RS, approach all these events in the first decade of July 1997? She was the one who provoked the escalation of tensions with all the leaders — the government, the parliament, the party — through her subservience to the West, her obedient eagerness to follow every NATO directive, and her efforts to remove from office all honest individuals who were willing to implement the provisions of the Dayton Agreement but refused to bow down to the aggressors. By betraying the interests of the Bosnian Serbs, Plavšić found herself in complete isolation, both from the people and from her former allies in the struggle. Aligning herself with the defence of U.S. interests in the Balkans, she hoped that by relying on NATO's military might and its punitive forces, she could destroy her opponents and force the people into submission, serving the occupiers. She had no intention of resolving the issues through negotiations.

In response to the invitation from Serbian President S. Milošević — who, incidentally, had signed the Dayton Agreement on behalf of all Serbs — to come to Belgrade together with the RS representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina, M. Krajišnik, and resolve all the arising issues in a friendly circle through negotiations, B. Plavšić refused, citing fabricated excuses. Apparently, she found it much more enjoyable to travel thousands of kilometres to New York, London and Berlin to negotiate with Western officials than to cross the Drina River and drive a mere 130 kilometres to Belgrade (unless, of course, she is a separatist of the highest order) to resolve pressing issues with her own colleagues.

Regarding the American-NATO raid on the banks of the Sana River and the murder of Simo Drljača in his sister's home, B. Plavšić could only describe NATO's terror as a "tragic event," as an "uncivilized and inhumane act." As if killing a person in their own home without trial or investigation could ever be humane or civilized? Such is the logic of B. Plavšić. And not a word about the need to hold the perpetrators accountable for the raid, the murder and the arrest of children. Considering the sharply negative reaction of the people to NATO's lawlessness and the surge in anti-American sentiment, B. Plavšić, according to a *Tanjug* report from Banja Luka, issued a statement claiming she had sent a letter to the SFOR commander in Bosnia, W. Crouch, asserting that he had not been informed about the upcoming SFOR operation. She also stated that she had been in contact with C. Westendorp and had spoken with Washington — specifically with the special advisor to the U.S. president, R. Montgomery — pointing out to him that the murder of S. Drljača and the arrest of several individuals was an inhumane act.

In contrast to B. Plavšić, the RS representative in the BiH Presidency, M. Krajišnik (whom she accuses of all sins), sharp-

ly condemned SFOR, characterizing its actions in Prijedor as a crime by international forces. In his statement, he demanded that the perpetrators of these crimes be identified as soon as possible, severely punished, and that all necessary measures be taken to prevent such incidents from happening again. Addressing the guarantors of the Dayton Agreement, M. Krajišnik demanded that they rein in NATO's irresponsible commanders and forever abandon the idea of arresting people in their own country using foreign mercenaries to have them tried in another state.

M. Krajišnik also appealed to the outraged people of RS, asking them to refrain from acts of vengeance, as innocent young NATO soldiers, who should not be held responsible for the crimes of their NATO commanders, could suffer harm.

Unlike B. Plavšić, M. Krajišnik travelled to Belgrade to meet with Serbian President S. Milošević, where the political situation in RS and issues related to resolving the leadership crisis in RS were discussed. The negotiations, held on July 9, 1997, were successful. Both sides expressed agreement in their assessment of the events. They emphasized that all arising issues must be resolved exclusively through cooperation based on constitutional principles and that the full implementation of the letter and spirit of the Dayton Accords represents a vital interest for RS. It was highlighted that combatting the shadow economy and all forms of crime should continue to be a primary task in eliminating the grave consequences of the war. M. Krajišnik underscored that all RS leadership operating out of Pale is committed to these goals.

It is sufficient to compare the statements and actions of M. Krajišnik and B. Plavšić to determine who was defending the interests of the Bosnian Serb people and who was serving the interests of the aggressive West.

Bloody terror, murders, the intimidation of ordinary

people with various threats, blackmail involving the withholding of humanitarian aid, economic blockades, and even the use of military force — these tactics were repeatedly deployed by the American-German occupiers (as they are rightfully called by the people) and their allies. All of this was alternated with incredibly brazen rhetoric about the "need for further democratization" of the region. Through the UN and NATO, they, along with Madame Plavšić, announced municipal elections. The election dates were set for September 13-14, 1997, with the announcement of results scheduled for September 19-20 — a "subtle" calculation aimed at influencing voters in Serbia itself, where parliamentary elections were also being held. On the morning of the Serbian elections, some Western stooge like Đinđić was sure to fill voters' ears with talk of the "great victory" of the pro-Western Madame Plavšić, a servant of the West just like themselves.

Terror, threats and the beating of dissenters, as mentioned earlier, were deployed long in advance. Pro-Western media received maximum support. Intrigue, slander and falsification of facts, heavily utilized by Plavšić, were at their peak. NATO's SFOR units — numbering 32,000 troops — were also fully mobilized to carry out the mission. During the elections, newspapers and magazines were filled with photographs: SFOR soldiers standing guard with automatic rifles at polling station doors, checking voters' documents, and in the evening of September 14, hauling bags of ballots for counting. Everything appeared "proper," showcasing these "peacekeeping democrats." A week passed, and when it came time to announce the election results, the European Electoral Commission grudgingly admitted on September 21 that they were "unable to count the votes" and that the announcement of the results would be delayed by a week. Then another week. And so it went, through all of September and into October. The

Western strategists had miscalculated! The people of RS overwhelmingly rejected the pro-Western Plavšić and her appointees in towns and villages. The Western strategists were forced to reconsider their next moves and dial back their pressure. The first indication of a slight shift in the West's approach came with an announcement in early October that Madame Plavšić had been compelled to enter negotiations with M. Krajišnik, the representative of the government, assembly and RS in the Bosnia and Herzegovina confederation, and that she had signed an agreement to resolve the crisis in RS. But even that didn't help. The Bosnian Serb people despised the traitor Plavšić, a close associate of the infamous Albright, so much that in the next elections, despite all the manipulations of the U.S.-installed electoral system in Bosnia, her presidential candidacy in RS ended in a humiliating defeat. The people, by an overwhelming majority, elected N. Poplašen, an ally of Karadžić, as president of RS. Of course, the U.S. could not tolerate President N. Poplašen, who had been elected by an overwhelming majority. And so, in the spring of 1999, the U.S. overseer for Bosnia, Wolfgang Petritsch, stripped the RS president of his powers. That, dear reader, is the essence of American "democracy" in its purest form.

On The Hague Tribunal and What R. Karadžić Thinks of It

Insightful Statements by V. Šešelj, Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia, on the Traitor Plavšić

First, let's address what the so-called "Hague Tribunal" actually represents. The French scientific journal *Dialogue* published an extensive study in December 1996 by Raymond Kent, a professor at the University of California, Berkeley,

on this so-called court. Professor Kent presented numerous facts in his work. The Hague Tribunal was created by the U.S. specifically to unilaterally blame the Serbs for the Yugoslav tragedy and thereby absolve the real perpetrators of the bloody conflict — namely, the U.S. itself. The key figure in creating this "court" was the notorious Madeleine Albright, then the U.S. ambassador to the UN. She initially secured $6 million, later increasing the sum to $40 million, to pay the salaries of judges whom she herself selected. Albright did not bother to hide her anti-Serb and anti-Slavic sentiments. The results quickly followed. After two years of operation, the Hague Tribunal had not convicted a single individual for crimes committed against Serbs. Meanwhile, in 1996 alone, it convicted 46 Serbs. Professor Kent highlighted a glaring fact that Albright and the Western media concealed: as of early 1996, there were over one million Serbian refugees from Western Slavonia, the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Bosnia. Thousands of peaceful Serbian civilians had been killed, and all these atrocities were committed by the regular armies of Croatia, Bosnian Croats and Muslim units armed and trained by the West, primarily by the United States.

Professor Kent convincingly demonstrated that the Hague Tribunal itself is illegal, as there is no law or international legal basis for its establishment. No court in the world can simultaneously act as investigator, prosecutor and judge, determining the sentence. Their modus operandi is as follows: first, Western media launch a U.S.-orchestrated campaign targeting certain individuals, and then the Hague Tribunal immediately brings charges against these individuals. This is a direct violation of international law and the UN Charter. The Hague Tribunal has adopted two principles that were fundamental to nazi and fascist ideology: the law of the strongest and the slogan "the end justifies the means." From

such a so-called tribunal, one can expect any treachery, but not the defence of truth and justice.

And this "court" seeks to arrest Radovan Karadžić, the legendary leader of the Bosnian Serbs, who embodies the courage and steadfastness of the Serbian people in their struggle for freedom and independence. Karadžić's authority among his people is immense. This is precisely why he was repeatedly elected President of RS by an overwhelming majority of voters. For this, he was despised by the U.S. and the West. Under relentless pressure from the U.S., Germany and NATO, with threats of war looming again, Karadžić was forced to step down as President. Radovan Karadžić now lives with his family — his daughter Sonja and grandson Nebojša — in a spacious house of 120 square metres on the outskirts of the town of Pale, near Sarajevo. The approaches to Karadžić's home are blocked by NATO tanks and units. NATO helicopters circle overhead. The Hague Tribunal is pursuing him as a war criminal. What Albright and the CIA are planning is difficult to predict, which is why this outstanding political figure of the Bosnian Serbs — a fighter, poet and renowned physician — is protected by a loyal guard of comrades and supporters. These are towering two-metre giants — mountain men, lumberjacks and farmers — well-armed and prepared to defend their leader. For this reason, U.S. strategists are forced to think carefully before attempting an assault on Karadžić's home. It is true that they could blow the house to pieces or bomb it into splinters, but the sinister and revealing echoes of such an action would reverberate around the world, leaving an unpleasant lump in the throats of the soft-hearted citizens of America and Europe.

In truth, Radovan Karadžić himself has a somewhat different perspective on all of this. When asked by *Suddeutsche Zeitung* correspondent T. Deichmann, "Since the Hague Tribunal is seeking to arrest you as a war criminal and NATO troops have surrounded your home, will you eventually be arrested?" — Karadžić replied: "I don't think they would actually want to see me in The Hague. They would have more trouble from me than I would from them." When the journalist followed up with, "Why should they fear you?" Karadžić responded, "Because I wouldn't play the role of the accused there. I would be the accuser!"

A few words about Karadžić's former colleague, Biljana Plavšić. Plavšić, who was nominated by Karadžić himself to become the President of RS, later defected to the camp of Albright and Clinton, betraying her people and Karadžić, and served the American occupiers with complete loyalty. To best describe her, it is fitting to let Vojislav Šešelj, leader of one of Serbia's leading parties, speak. Šešelj said the following about Plavšić: "Last year (1996), when Karadžić informed us that he intended to propose Biljana Plavšić as President of RS to appease the West, I opposed the idea and tried to persuade him to change his decision. Karadžić made a mistake here. He insisted that she was an honest person, an extreme nationalist, a loyal comrade and so on. We warned him at the time that he would regret this decision later. And it didn't take long to confirm this. Biljana Plavšić had been a Fulbright scholar in America. I already knew this, but I didn't think that every Fulbright scholar was a U.S. spy. I hoped there were exceptions. However, after everything she has done, I've come to believe that they are all, without exception, U.S. spies. Plavšić received direct instructions and orders on how to destroy RS. She is also surrounded by Serbian spies recruited by the Americans when they studied or worked in the U.S. Plavšić suppresses everything the CIA orders her to suppress. She's deluded if she thinks they'll keep her around for long. She's useful only for dismantling RS. Once she completes her as-

signment, they'll discard her because they know she's unfit for anything else."

Šešelj was right. The very name of the traitor Plavšić evokes nothing but contempt among the people of RS in Bosnia. The CIA and Bosnia's *Gauleiter* Wolfgang Petritsch discarded her as a spent tool, much like a used rag.

How the Pro-Western Journalist Zamyatina Surpassed Karaulov

To conclude this discussion on certain aspects of the U.S. occupation and their primitive attempts to impose their misguided notions of democracy, it is worth examining how events in RS were covered by Russia's pro-Western, opportunistic media. Apparently present in Banja Luka at the time, *ITAR-TASS* journalist T. Zamyatina offered her own take on the events, publishing an article in the *Literary Gazette* on July 9, 1997, titled "Worse — Only Civil War." Considering the events Zamyatina describes, one cannot help but ask — does the journalist truly believe that betraying one's own people, enduring the oppression of occupation, suffering hunger and cold, grovelling before occupiers and betraying comrades in the fight for the freedom and independence of one's nation is somehow better than civil war? This term, "civil war," has long been a favourite scare tactic of Yeltsin's ilk, effectively used during election campaigns to intimidate both Russian and "New Russian" voters.

Essentially, as expected from a pro-Western journalist, Zamyatina defended the aggressive activities of the United States in the heart of the Balkans, seemingly based on the "principled" assumption that what is good for America is also good for the Russian reader.

It is widely known that the creation of the Muslim-Catholic Federation and the forced incorporation of the Orthodox Republika Srpska into it was a brainchild of the Clinton administration. Zamyatina presents this idea as follows: "Republika Srpska, together with the Muslim-Croat Federation, constitutes the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which has become independent..."! What is that supposed to mean? That the Orthodox Republika Srpska has finally gained independence under the rule of the SS member and fundamentalist Izetbegović? Such unimaginable nonsense — or outright dishonesty — is hard to find even in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*.

It is also widely known that the United States, Germany and the rest of the sycophantic West harbour a deep hatred for the national leaders of the Bosnian Serbs, Karadžić and Mladić, and forced them to resign. For the occupiers, it seems, it is mandatory to smear such national leaders with as much black paint as possible, to tarnish their names, to ensure they are tried in their occupation court and to trample them. Incidentally, the occupation court invented by the Americans, officially called the "International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague," is regarded by several leading legal scholars as a political organization and cannot be recognized as a legitimate court, let alone an international one. However, Americans are not particularly scrupulous in such matters — if they need a court, they create one to deal with undesirable elements, with the silent consent of a subdued Europe. And how does the pro-Western Russian journalist Zamyatina describe Karadžić? Here is her portrayal: "The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague accused him of war crimes and demands that the Serbs hand over Karadžić... The Dayton Accords, which allegedly put an end to the Balkan war (?), are like a thorn in Karadžić's side. Constant NATO military patrols force Karadžić to remain in hiding... But the ambitions of the

ex-president do not allow him to stay in the shadows, and in his efforts to continue leading the republic, he relies on the representative of Republika Srpska in the BiH presidency, M. Krajišnik... Krajišnik directs the ruling Serbian Democratic Party, as well as the parliament and the government." Well, there you have it — everything, absolutely everything: the ruling party, the parliament, the government and the people with their national leader are supposedly out of step. Only Plavšić is in step, and with whom? With none other than the United States, because she respects them so much! For Zamyatina, that alone is enough to support Plavšić. And how could it be otherwise? The traitor Plavšić is a close friend of the man-eater Albright, Zamyatina is delighted with Plavšić, and is also her friend. In short, three energetic "friends" were busy doing their dirty work.

The situation in which B. Plavšić found herself is aptly described by Zamyatina: "Having taken the place of the former national leader Radovan Karadžić (Why "former"? Karadžić is still the national leader of the people), B. Plavšić, according to her, from the very beginning felt that supporters of the ex-president wanted to turn her into a puppet in Karadžić's hands... Biljana Plavšić endured her ambiguous position for a year... she constantly met with representatives of the international community... The insubordination of Minister Dragan Kijac to representatives of the international stabilization forces prompted the West to demand Plavšić dismiss him... If we exclude her nominal international support, then B. Plavšić found herself in complete political isolation." It is entirely unclear how B. Plavšić, who worked under Karadžić's leadership during four years of war without being a puppet in his hands, suddenly, after meeting frequently with Western officials, realized that Karadžić supposedly wanted to turn her into a puppet. Isn't it more truthful to say that she became a puppet

in the hands of the West, as her practical actions clearly indicate? Oh, poor B. Plavšić found herself in complete isolation, all alone — if you don't count the immense support of the occupying aggressors from the U.S. and Germany, the primary culprits behind the destruction of Yugoslavia and the ongoing tragic events in RS to this day.

Zamyatina also demonstrates rather peculiar views on the concept of a rule-of-law state. She writes: "But in Republika Srpska, few people still have an understanding of a rule-of-law state, which is why all decisions are made by Krajišnik and Karadžić." So, according to the clearly West-appeasing Zamyatina, the Bosnian Serbs — who endured four years of continuous battles against pro-fascist mercenaries, the neo-Ustaše and fundamentalists, all encouraged, financed and armed by the U.S., Germany and the Emirates — these very Bosnian Serbs, bleeding and fighting an incredibly difficult war without allies, defending their freedom and independence and building their statehood, supposedly had no idea what rule of law and a legal state were? Meanwhile, Zamyatina, Clinton and the other aggressors claim to know! With such legal "experts," humanity won't just fail to advance but will undoubtedly be led into the dead end of highly developed slavery. This is how "honest and truthful" journalism provides a shining example of servile filth, truly embodying either the second-oldest or perhaps even the first-oldest profession.

One could have avoided revisiting the disinformation spread by Zamyatina if not for one particular circumstance. It is well known that a significant portion of reactionary elements in society — bureaucrats, journalists, directors and other members of the "elite" — will, when society begins to lean even slightly toward a progressive course, and if the authorities offer even minimal support to this leftward shift, instinctively begin to adjust themselves. The faintest leftward

tilt prompts these individuals to subtly "blush": the pale turn pink, the pink turn red and the red grow crimson. This phenomenon can also be observed in the so-called transformation of Zamyatina's consciousness. Now, she is not the *ITAR-TASS* correspondent in Banja Luka, Bosnia, but in Belgrade itself. And while in 1998 she openly supported the U.S. and Western policies against Yugoslavia and its president, Milošević, by 1999, after President Yeltsin sharply condemned the U.S. and NATO aggression, Zamyatina, faintly blushing, grudgingly utters the words "U.S. and NATO aggression," while still presenting carefully curated information approved by the U.S. and NATO under the guise of objectivity. One only needs to listen to Zamyatina to easily discern that she has not yet blushed enough to provide truthful information without the admixture of American poison.

The *ITAR-TASS* leadership is perplexing in their decision during the tragic days of 1999 for the Serbian people. Instead of choosing someone else, they sent Zamyatina — a journalist Americanized to the core, who had previously poured streams of lies about the Serbs and their legitimate leaders — as their representative in Belgrade. How can one hope that a temporary, pale-pink cloud will obscure Zamyatina's true nature? After all, the worn-out face of the traitor Plavšić and the sinister contours of Albright still loom behind her. Unfortunately, Zamyatina is not an exception among journalists.

Reflections on 1995

Of course, for Western strategists led by the U.S., it would have been most convenient to install — preferably through "democratic" means — their loyal figures in all the republics resisting the brutalities of Western dictate, just as they succeeded in Croatia (Tuđman), Slovenia (Kučan), Bosnia (Izetbegović) and Macedonia (Gligorov). They would have been delighted to see individuals like the traitor and CIA agent B. Plavšić in Bosnia, or pro-Western opportunists and capitulators like Drašković or Đinđić in Serbia, or Đukanović in Montenegro.

However, in the event of their protégés failing in elections — such as the failures of Drašković, Đinđić and the rest of the fifth column in Serbia — the Western strategists had a backup plan. Through continuous blackmail and threats, they sought to force the ruling Socialist Party of Serbia into making further concessions to the West, up to and including a coerced accession to NATO. Their arsenal of threats and blackmail was vast, ranging from the reinstatement of economic blockades and missile-bombing campaigns to the detachment of historically Serbian lands such as Kosmet, Raška and Vojvodina, as well as the separation of the fraternal republics of Serbia and Montenegro.

Based on an analysis of the events that took place in RS in 1995, one could draw, unfortunately, only one realistic but disheartening conclusion — the U.S. aggression and the realization of their strategic plans in the Balkans would continue. It was already clear that, unless Russia rose from its knees, where the current regime had placed it, the West's rampage through the towns and villages of RS would not cease on its own. It was also not difficult to predict that the U.S. and NATO would soon attempt, by any means necessary, to break and subordinate the FR of Yugoslavia.

Did the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Abandon Its Brothers and Sisters in the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Republika Srpska During the Tragic Days of 1995?

On Serbia's ancient coat of arms, four letters are engraved

— SSSS — reminding every Serb that "Only unity saves the Serbs!" It seemed as if, from the depths of centuries past, a warning from the ancestors echoed into the late 1990s: "Stick together!" And yet, when the aggressors attacked the western Serbian republics in 1995 from both the air and the ground, cruelly tormenting the people, the FR of Yugoslavia did not stand up for its brothers and sisters. Instead, it engaged in endless negotiations with these Clintons, Kohls, Izetbegovićs and Tuđmans, trying to find at least some acceptable terms for reconciliation. At the time, among the hundreds of thousands of Serbian refugees and exhausted fighters in the mountains of Bosnia, Herzegovina and Krajina, a silent question arose: "How could you abandon us to the mercenaries and fascist scum?" Across all Serbian lands, from Timok in the east to Una in the west, there was bewilderment. After all, everyone vividly remembered that in 1991, when the West was tearing apart the SFR of Yugoslavia, the dominant slogan among all nationally conscious Serbs, echoing even from Belgrade, was clear and seemingly realistic: "All Serbs and Montenegrins will remain in one united state. The Republic of Serbian Krajina, Republika Srpska, the Republic of Montenegro and the Republic of Serbia. As for the other Slavic brothers — Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians — join us when it becomes advantageous and convenient for you."

And as the leitmotif of creating and uniting all Serbian republics, the sentiment was clear: "We will not abandon one another!" The idea was appealing, but at the time, it had one significant flaw — it was unrealistic. It was unrealistic for a number of reasons. For the sake of brevity, only some of them can be mentioned here.

First and foremost, nearly forty years of the Americanization of society and Tito's economic policies, as previously discussed, along with the promotion of individualism and

profit-seeking, created fractures in society — not only along national-republican lines but also within individual nations. Cracks appeared between Krajina, Bosnia and Serbia, and it was difficult to expect a strong unity among the youth, without which serious resistance to the aggressor was impossible. Unfortunately, it took four years of boundless and unrestrained banditry by the United States for ordinary Serbian people to free themselves from the delusions and illusions of Americanization and the blind faith in the values of Western "civilization."

It is also important to note that nationalist and semi-fascist elements in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, encouraged and supported by the West, had no intention of returning Serbian territories that had been arbitrarily assigned to their republics under Tito's administrative borders. These forces were willing to spill fraternal blood but not to give anything up. Why would they when the United States was standing behind them?

Moreover, Russia in the years 1991-95 was disoriented by the intoxication of counter-revolutionary ideas and was unable to provide any meaningful assistance to its Serbian brothers. Russia itself was on its knees before the West, and the Russian people needed time to shake off the illusions clouding their vision and to recognize the crimes of the counter-revolution and the true intentions of the United States and the West as a whole.

All of this is understandable. However, during those tumultuous days following the Dayton Agreement at the end of 1995, heated debates erupted among honest Serbs in Belgrade and throughout Yugoslavia on the same question: Did we betray our brothers, or could this tragedy have been avoided?

To arrive at an objective answer to this difficult question, it is first necessary to examine the American strategy for es-

sentially eliminating the Serbian question. The Americans could only resolve this issue at its root by defeating the FR of Yugoslavia. Therefore, various auxiliary plans and measures were developed and implemented.

First and foremost, as readers may recall, since late 1993, the United States took decisive measures to force the FR of Yugoslavia to cease providing economic assistance to its Serbian brothers in Krajina and Bosnia. To twist the arms of the Yugoslav leaders, the Americans used every tool at their disposal — tightening an already inhumane blockade, threatening to bomb Belgrade and other cities, and engaging in all manner of political intrigues, including leveraging Russian influence. When it comes to such matters, the Americans are not known for their scruples, and at that time, they achieved their goal. They managed to twist the arms of the Yugoslav leaders, and the FR of Yugoslavia agreed to the American-imposed blockade of the bridges over the Drina River. Of course, this success allowed the Americans to sow significant discord among the Serbian republics and to portray the FR of Yugoslavia and President Milošević as traitors to the interests of the Serbian people as a whole.

However, there was a primary course of action that the Americans preferred (and, as of 1999, they likely regret not having devoted sufficient resources and effort to its realization). The American strategists and "peacekeepers" had hoped that the FR of Yugoslavia would reject the American ultimatum and refuse to block the Drina in 1994. They also anticipated that in 1995, when America began its military strangulation of the western Serbian republics, Yugoslavia would defend its brothers and sisters with its army. At that point, the "peacekeepers" would unleash the full might of the United States and NATO — all their Phantoms, Mirages, Tornadoes, Tomahawks, the firepower of the *Saratoga*,

Roosevelt and other warships — upon Belgrade, the cities and villages of Yugoslavia, accompanied by the inevitable invasion of NATO forces, Muslim mercenaries, Croatian neo-fascists and U.S. Marines into Komet, the Sandžak, Vojvodina, Montenegro and Central Serbia. With Russia on its knees, this plan could have been fully implemented. Serbia could have been entirely dismembered, with Kosmet, the Sandžak and Vojvodina taken away, reducing it to a small province resembling the former Ottoman "Belgrade Pashaluk," ruled by a Western-compliant dictator — perhaps someone like the pretender Prince Tomislav — or the "leader" of some collaborationist party. With a single blow, the "Serbian question" and the "socialist question" in the Balkans would have been resolved, while simultaneously eliminating Russia's historical, strategic interests and positions in the region.

It is clear to any impartial observer of events in the Balkans that, in 1995, the FR of Yugoslavia could not expect any assistance or sympathy from its neighbours, Italy and Austria. The neighbouring former socialist republics — Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Macedonia — were preoccupied with their counter-revolutionary transformations and, having fallen into dependence on the West, could not be allies to Yugoslavia in its most difficult struggle against Western aggression. As for Albania, there is no need to even mention it. By that time, fully emboldened by the United States, it had already adopted an aggressive stance. Greece, sensing the increasingly aggressive rise of Turkey along its eastern border and fearing the impending danger of the creation of an Islamic republic in the heart of the Balkans, might have wanted to help Yugoslavia. However, it was so tightly bound by its NATO agreements that effective aid from Greece was unlikely.

As seen from the above, in its confrontation with aggression, Yugoslavia was left entirely without allies. Taking into

account the fact that the West possessed an enormous, truly overwhelming — one might even say a hundredfold — advantage in every aspect, one could understand Yugoslavia's inclination at that time to avoid direct confrontations, to seek to buy time through a policy of manoeuvring, finding compromises, making humiliating concessions and engaging in endless negotiations — a policy pursued by Yugoslavia and President Milošević.

These considerations are valid. And yet, one cannot help but picture the starving columns of retreating Serbian refugees — children, mothers, the elderly — defenceless and distraught from the bombings, suffering and cold, with mute questions in their eyes. In such conditions, it is likely impossible to provide an objective answer to this silent question. And yet, this question is not the central issue in the tragic events of 1999.

A full and objective answer to this crucial question can only be provided by the future generations of the coming century, after the winds of history have cleared away the accumulations and layers always left behind by demagogues and enemies of the people.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERIOD OF 1996-1999

The Period of Preparatory Measures and U.S. Attempts to Dismember the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

As is well known, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States became the world's sole superpower. In light of this status, the U.S., much like Hitler once did, sought to establish a "new order" in the world. Naturally, U.S. statesmen understood that it would not be possible to manage such a complex world without loyal subordinates. To this end, they designated three key allies: Germany in Europe, Japan in the Far East and Turkey in the Muslim world. As for South America and Africa, the "masters" probably hope to manage those regions on their own. It is worth noting that all three chosen candidates are non-nuclear powers and, for the foreseeable future, are likely to remain relatively obedient, which makes them suitable as junior partners for now.

One might ask: what does this have to do with Yugoslavia? The answer is simple — it has very direct implications. This concerns the first two junior partners: Germany and Turkey. Germany's sphere of influence was to include Slovenia and Croatia, with guaranteed access to warm seas — namely, the Adriatic. As for the idea of some Slavic-Orthodox enclave with a faint socialist tint, such as the Republic of Serbian Krajina, there could be no question of its existence. It simply had to go! And indeed, it was eliminated — trampled upon in August 1995. Monasteries, churches and Serbian villages were destroyed with bulldozers, flattened, and the land was ploughed over with tractors. Now it's just level fields and silence all around. You can't deny it — it was done "culturally" and "civilized."

The U.S. junior partner in the vast Muslim world is Turkey. Naturally, it is necessary to gradually bring the former Soviet Muslim republics — Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan — under Turkey's influence and control in the East. On the western front, however, according to the "master's" plan, the stronghold of the Muslim confederation should be an Islamic republic in the heart of the Balkans, either as a counterbalance or an ally to a powerful Germany. U.S. strategists understood that the position of this Islamic entity in Bosnia could only be solidified by dismantling the independent Republika Srpska in Bosnia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The first stage of this task was achieved through the Dayton Diktat, which was discussed in detail earlier. However, attention should be drawn to one seemingly secondary aspect of the U.S. demands during the coercion of Serbian leaders at the Dayton military base in 1995. Through their trusted proxy, Alija Izetbegović — a former SS officer and organizer of the infamous Handžar SS Division during the Second World War, and now the leader of the Islamic Republic in Bosnia — the Americans adamantly demanded the handover of not only the small town of Goražde in Eastern Bosnia to the Muslims, but also a wide corridor guaranteed by the Serbs leading to it. The Americans declared: either you hand over Goražde and the corridor to it, or we will resume the bombings and military operations.

Why did this small town on the left bank of the swift Drina River, located just seven kilometres from the border with the FR of Yugoslavia, suddenly become such a critical and decisive factor in determining peace in Bosnia? Why did this once peaceful, patriarchal, Orthodox Serbian town — an intellectual hub for Serbs, home to the first Serbian printing press, where the first Serbian book was published back in 1513

— suddenly, by American dictate, turn into a purely Muslim enclave? Why would the U.S. issue an ultimatum demanding a wide corridor through purely Serbian territory, from Sarajevo all the way to the eastern border, giving rampaging fundamentalists and former SS officers access to Goražde — a corridor that effectively bisects RS into two parts?

This petty, vile American scheming around the town of Goražde in November 1995 was actually the foundation for a far-reaching plan devised by overseas strategists. The goal of this plan is now as clear as day when viewed in the context of American and NATO activities surrounding Kosmet, the well-known southern region of Serbia. Throughout the summer and fall of 1998, the loud-mouthed Madeleine Albright filled the ears of European and American citizens with shrill cries about the need to "save poor Kosovo." (By the way, Albright adopted the Albanian separatist and terrorist term "Kosovo" instead of the historically recognized administrative name, Kosovo and Metohija, abbreviated as Kosmet. If she had even a basic college education, she would know that throughout five centuries of Ottoman rule, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia up to 1941, socialist Yugoslavia and today's Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, it has always been officially referred to as the Kosovo and Metohija region. But what does Albright care about truth when she is focussed solely on serving her interests and those of her allies — the separatists and terrorists in Kosmet?) Hiding behind the American fig leaf of "human rights," Albright's outcry was deliberate. The groundwork had to be laid for the strategic plan initiated back in 1995.

And the plan itself is quite simple. By crossing the 40-metre-wide Drina River near the town of Goražde, one enters the southwestern part of the FR of Yugoslavia — an area known as the Sandžak, which has a mixed Serbian and Muslim population. Both the Americans and the former SS

officer Izetbegović have openly expressed territorial claims to this small province. A little further southeast, just a few dozen kilometres away, lies the southern Serbian region of Kosmet, which borders Muslim-majority Albania. Through the town of Goražde stretch the tentacles of the West, which, as previously discussed, dreams of creating a large Muslim confederation in southeastern Europe under Turkey's supervision and America's aegis. These strategists are unconcerned that implementing their designs will lead to future bloody conflicts. Their aim is to create volatile hotspots, knowing that "peacekeepers" can intervene when necessary. This is the thinking and approach of the Pentagon strategists.

By late 1995, the Americans were already taking their first steps in the Kosovo and Metohija region, deliberately stoking tensions out of thin air. It is well known that during the tragic days of autumn 1995, Yugoslavia took in more than 650,000 Serbian refugees from the RSK and RS. This was a tremendous burden for Yugoslavia. These refugees, having fled their homes with nothing, had to be provided for. In a true Slavic spirit of community, the people welcomed the refugees and distributed them across the republic. A decision was made to resettle some of them in the southern regions, including Kosmet. But that was not to be. Suddenly, a stern command came from across the ocean: "Do not dare resettle even a single refugee in Kosovo and Metohija. We, the Americans, will not allow it." An official announcement quickly followed: U.S. army units stationed in Albania, together with the Albanian army, were conducting exercises along the Yugoslav-Albanian border. By the end of 1995, Bill Clinton and his team were already flexing their military muscles. The joint U.S.-Albanian military air exercises along the same border in the summer of 1998, involving NATO units (and, regrettably, even a Russian army battalion under the command of a German colonel

[?!]), were simply a continuation of the U.S.'s ongoing plans for the Balkans.

Unsuccessful Attempts by the West to Install Their Puppets as Leaders of Yugoslavia in 1996-97

After the dismantling of the SFR of Yugoslavia, the subjugation of Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia, and the elimination of the Republic of Serbian Krajina, the strategic objective of the United States in this region from 1996 onward remained the destruction of the FR of Yugoslavia — the last bastion of resistance against American aggression. To achieve this, the primary goal was to overthrow the progressive forces of the FR of Yugoslavia, led by the Socialist Party and its president, Slobodan Milošević, who remained steadfast in defending the national interests of the people.

In 1996, the American strategists believed that Milošević could be overthrown by securing victories for their puppets in the parliamentary and presidential elections of 1996-97. These strategists seemingly learned nothing from the catastrophic failure of their previous candidate, a certain Milan Panić, a cyclist and American citizen, who suffered a humiliating defeat in the elections of 1991-92. For the elections in 1995-97, the West backed the notorious Vuk Drašković and Zoran Đinđić — leaders of reactionary, collaborationist parties aligned respectively with pro-American and pro-German interests. Despite overwhelming material and political support from the U.S. and Germany, and their blatant interference in Yugoslavia's internal electoral processes, these candidates suffered resounding defeats in all the elections of the recent years. Once again, the Serbian people dealt a sharp slap in the face to the U.S. and Germany, electing representatives of socialist and nationalist orientation to parliament and reaf-

firming their support for President Milošević.

Looking ahead briefly, it is worth noting that Drašković, the leader of the collaborationist Serbian Renewal Movement, after suffering a crushing electoral defeat, attempted to ride the wave of the public's growing anti-American sentiments sparked by the brazen aggression of the U.S. and NATO. Donning the guise of a patriot, Drašković publicly voiced his support for President Milošević. Trusting the sincerity of his patriotic and anti-American declarations, and in an effort to strengthen the unity of Yugoslav society, he was invited to join the government. How this former capitulationist and pro-Western politician, Drašković, ultimately behaved has already been detailed above.

The Radical Party, led by the popular Dr. Vojislav Šešelj, gained strong public support in Serbia during the elections thanks to its principled stance of active resistance to U.S. aggression, making it the second most influential political party in the FR of Yugoslavia. The coalition between the Socialists and the Radicals, based on a shared commitment to defending the national interests of the country, further strengthened the consolidation of Yugoslav society. Dr. Šešelj was appointed Deputy Prime Minister of Serbia. When discussing the consolidation of Yugoslav society, one interesting detail deserves attention. For over 40 years, Yugoslavia underwent various forms of Americanization — both economic and ideological manipulation. The indoctrination was systematic and, for a time, seemed fairly successful. People were fed false but easily digestible ideas about a utopian society of "equal" opportunities, the supposedly humane and idealistic American way of life, the omnipotence of the United States and so on. Naturally, this was portrayed as something to idolize and worship. The author of these lines, who spent decades observing the fruits of Americanization within Yugoslavia itself, noted a

sharp shift in the attitudes of the population in Belgrade and other cities of the FR of Yugoslavia during July-August 1998. In those months, the author could not encounter a single citizen who did not condemn the vile actions of the United States and its Western allies. Over time, confusion about the aggressors' actions (how could America strike like this?) gave way to anger, then rage, and finally hatred for those who brought so much tragedy to their people, spilling rivers of blood, bombing columns of refugees, and leaving hungry, unclothed, shoeless, and exhausted children, mothers and the elderly to suffer. The Americanization that had blinded large sections of Yugoslav society began to fade, and people started to see more clearly that their primary enemies were not the masses of Croats and Bosnian Muslims poisoned by nationalism and fascism but rather the representatives of multinational corporations from the "prosperous West" — Clinton, Kohl, Major, Chirac — who were the chief organizers of the bloody carnage, along with their puppets like Tuđman and Izetbegović. This realization explains why the Western-backed candidates of the aggressors suffered election defeats in 1995-97.

The U.S. Transition to Aggressive Action Against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

By 1998, the United States had learned from its failed attempts to overthrow the government of the FR of Yugoslavia through elections and replace it with its own puppets. They realized that the Yugoslav people could not be subdued through this method. Consequently, they moved on to implementing alternative, sinister plans that had been developed as early as 1995 and even earlier. These plans were more brutal and bloody but, in the strategists' view, also more reliable. The nature of these plans is plain to see — they are crude-

ly obvious, sewn with white threads — and even the direct agents and executors of American designs in Bosnia, Albania, Kosmet and Vojvodina often inadvertently let their intentions slip. These plans consist of the following steps.

First and foremost, the goal is to detach Kosmet, the southern province of the FR of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia. After that, the plan is to sever the Sandžak and then Vojvodina. Ideally, they also seek to separate Montenegro from the FR of Yugoslavia. According to the strategists' designs, Serbia would then be reduced to an insignificant district (similar to the "Belgrade Pashaluk" during the era of Ottoman rule). The Serbian people would cease to exist as a distinct nation, and Slobodan Milošević would fade into obscurity. With this, any potential resistance to American ambitions in this part of the world would be completely eradicated.

The implementation of the first stage of this plan — the detachment of Kosmet — began long ago. As mentioned earlier, even at the end of 1995, the Americans, with their characteristic audacity, were interfering in the internal affairs of the FR of Yugoslavia, including issues concerning Kosmet, rattling their sabres along the Albanian-Yugoslav border. Throughout the spring, summer and autumn of 1998, they loudly proclaimed the need to "protect" Yugoslav citizens of Albanian ethnicity and Islamic faith living in Kosmet, who, they claimed, were being oppressed by so-called "Serbian villains." It has long been known that, since 1991, American and Western European media have unleashed literal torrents of lies and fabrications about Yugoslavia and the Serbs, flipping the truth on its head. But more on this later. The Americans are demanding full political autonomy for Kosmet, with the ultimate goal of transforming it into a constituent republic. Once they identify an appropriate figure from among the

ranks of the separatist terrorists, it would be just a short step from independence to unification with a "Greater Albania." There is no doubt that for Madeleine Albright, legally formalizing these schemes before the international community would be, as the saying goes, "a walk in the park." In October 1998, official Washington began loudly proclaiming to the world its demands for "justice" and "mercy" toward the residents of Kosmet, mobilizing the United Nations, NATO, the European Community and Albania to pursue its own objectives. The Americans disguise their actions to detach Kosmet with ideological and legal sleights of hand and outright lies. By cherry-picking facts, blending them with fabrications and turning everything upside down, they seek to justify their actions. Naturally, this is aimed at further brainwashing their own population and the still-compliant Europeans. It is particularly important to examine these facts and fabrications because Western media, with relentless energy that could be put to better use, continues — and will continue — to hammer these lies into the heads of everyone, including the Russian people.

How Did the Ethnic Composition of Kosmet Evolve?

Madeleine Albright, the U.S. Secretary of State, along with Western media, repeatedly provides the following arguments to justify American interference in the internal affairs of the FR of Yugoslavia.

First of all, she (Albright) declares that almost 90 per cent of the population in Kosmet consists of Yugoslav citizens of Muslim Albanian nationality. If we take this rather questionable figure at face value, a legitimate question arises for anyone not brainwashed by Western media: how did such a demographic imbalance emerge in what has historically been

a Serbian province? Madeleine Albright, despite presumably having graduated from at least a reputable college, and despite her attempts to pontificate on the subject of Kosmet, remains silent on this question. And that's a shame, because as someone of Jewish descent (whose family, fleeing from nazi-occupied Czechoslovakia in 1939, was sheltered and saved by Serbian families in Serbia from Gestapo genocide when she was just a young girl), she is morally obligated to speak out against the blatant and creeping genocide against the Serbian population of Kosmet that has been ongoing for centuries.

As is well known, facts are stubborn things, and the facts in this case tell the following story. First and foremost, it is important to remember that the Albanians only arrived in the Balkans, in the territory of present-day Albania, in the 11th century AD. Their so-called "Illyrian origins" are nothing more than a myth, a narrative that has long been useful to the Western aggressors and remains so today. The Russian scholar Selishchev demonstrated that over 90 per cent of the toponyms in the region are Slavic in origin, inherited by the Albanians as they settled across Albania. Regarding the changes in the ethnic composition of both Albania and Kosmet, those familiar with the accounts of Russian consuls in Albania, such as Yastrebov and Hilferding, know well the brutal terror campaigns by the Ottoman Empire during the second half of the 19th century and the early 20th century, which altered the ethnic makeup in favour of Muslims and Albanians at the expense of the Serbian population. And yet, even in the first decade of the 20th century, Serbian communities predominated in northern Albania, including its central city of Shkodra. This is precisely why, in 1920, Italy proposed ceding northern Albania to Serbia in exchange for the northern Adriatic port of Rijeka.

In fact, Albania as a state was created at the beginning of

the 20th century by Austria-Hungary, which sought to block Serbia's access to the Adriatic Sea. As for Kosmet, until the Second World War, the Serbian population constituted more than 50 per cent of the population in this southern Serbian province. However, after the nazi occupation of Yugoslavia, Kosmet fell under the control of fascist Italy, which annexed the region, along with western Macedonia, to Albania, thereby creating a "Greater Albania" under Mussolini's protectorate. During 1941-44, fascist and nationalist elements of "Greater Albania" carried out a campaign of genocide against the Serbian population in Kosmet. As is well known, rabid nationalism goes hand in hand with ethnic cleansing. A significant portion of the Serbian population was forcibly expelled from Kosmet, and the towns and villages emptied of Serbs were then resettled with people from Albania. It is precisely here that one must look to find the roots of the demographic imbalance in Kosmet's ethnic composition. It might seem that after the victory over fascism and the rise to power of Tito in Yugoslavia, the injustices faced by the Serbian population in Kosmet would have been rectified and the Serbs would have returned to their homes in 1945-46. But that was not the case. Full of self-importance after the victory over fascism, the ambitious Tito was busy pursuing the idea of creating a Balkan Federation under his leadership, which was to include Bulgaria and Albania. To entice the leader of then-Albania, Enver Hoxha, Tito promised to cede Kosmet to Albania, thereby "restoring" a "Greater Albania." As proof of his sincerity and goodwill toward Enver Hoxha, in 1946 Tito prohibited Serbian families who had been expelled from Kosmet from returning to their homeland. This marked the second major blow to the Serbian population in Kosmet.

Unfortunately, the tragedy of the Serbian population in Kosmet does not end there. When Tito broke Yugoslavia

away from the socialist bloc in order to maintain his grip on power, he had to replace the pro-Soviet, mostly Serbian partisan cadres with anti-Soviet ones he could trust. And that's exactly what he did. In Kosmet, these new cadres were made up of Albanian nationalist and pro-fascist elements — former collaborators of the occupiers, officials of the former "Greater Albania," soldiers from the Muslim SS division formed by the Gestapo to fight partisan units, as well as their close and distant relatives. In the new political climate, these individuals continued the gradual expulsion of the Serbian population from Kosmet. It was these same elements who propagated national intolerance and separatism among the Muslim population. The slogan "Kosovo — Republic" was raised with far-reaching goals. This national chauvinism and separatism later became a tool for the intelligence services of the United States and Germany as they dismantled Yugoslavia and its republics from 1990 to 1994.

Who Organized Terrorism in Kosmet?

U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright asserts that Yugoslav citizens of Albanian nationality in Kosmet are an oppressed and helpless people, claiming that they are being killed, raped and terrorized daily by the "villainous" Serbian authorities. She speaks at length and with great detail, but nearly every statement is an outright lie.

Let us examine Albright's claim about the alleged terror inflicted on Yugoslav citizens of Albanian nationality. Yes, terror exists in Kosmet, but it is carried out by separatist elements who have been transformed from political groups into terrorist organizations. These groups sow fear and horror not only among the Serbian population but also terrorize nearly the entire Albanian population of Kosmet. The Yugoslav au-

thorities have thousands of volumes of investigative reports and documents about the atrocities and bandit raids perpetrated by these terrorists. But this does not interest the U.S. Secretary of State, who represents a country that often boasts about its fight against terrorism. Why? Because the terrorist groups of separatists operating in Kosmet are heavily supplied with weapons and resources via the Albanian border, provided by the intelligence services of the United States and Germany. These groups are trained in terrorist tactics and methods of warfare by Western specialists in special camps in Albania and serve the primary goal of the Americans: the secession of Kosmet from Yugoslavia. It is these terrorists — not the Yugoslav authorities, as Albright claims — who force entire villages to abandon their homes, turning their residents into "refugees" supposedly fleeing from the Serbian "oppressors." The Serbian authorities, on the other hand, call upon the terrorized population to return to their villages, guaranteeing peace and security. Meanwhile, the terrorists respond by killing Albanian citizens who refuse to obey them, as well as opening fire on government officials, police patrols and border guards, demanding compliance with their insane orders. At first glance, the terrorists' behaviour may seem incomprehensible, but it soon found its logical explanation. The Yugoslav authorities had closed the once-unrestricted crossings along the Albanian border, which the terrorist gangs had widely used for their operations. In response, clever strategists devised a plan: "You, our terrorist friends, should create large gatherings of people by forcing them out of their villages; we, in turn, will demand from the international community to open a wide corridor on the Yugoslav-Albanian border for humanitarian aid to the starving refugees, under the supervision of the 'esteemed' Albright. Through this 'humanitarian corridor,' we will send you not only food and medical supplies but

also the weapons and reinforcements you need — additional trained terrorist units. After all, the corridor will be guarded by our people, the UNPROFOR police, or perhaps even more experienced specialists." The terrorists carried out their dark mission — they drove out and organized large gatherings of innocent people. And Albright began loudly demanding the establishment of the corridor, calling for NATO's urgent intervention and so on. This is how the Western intelligence services, led by Albright, operate.

If you read through the extensive material on this topic published in various Yugoslav newspapers and journals, it becomes clear that the government of the FR of Yugoslavia is doing everything in its power to free peaceful Yugoslav citizens of Albanian nationality from the clutches of the terrorists. Workers have repeatedly been called upon not to abandon their homes, and those who, under the threat of terrorist guns, did leave their homes are encouraged to return and continue living and working peacefully, especially with winter approaching. The authorities of the FR of Yugoslavia have made dozens of offers to representatives of the Albanian population, regardless of their political views — except for terrorist and separatist organizations — to sit at the negotiating table and work together to ensure that life in Kosmet proceeds normally. The authorities of the FR of Yugoslavia have consistently fought only against terrorism, which is instigated and actively supported by Western intelligence services, particularly the CIA.

The reader may find it interesting to hear a firsthand account from a Kosmet resident, which the author heard in early September 1998. While returning to Belgrade after a long trip across Serbia, the author found himself in a train compartment with a woman and her three children. Striking up a conversation, it turned out that she — Jovanka P.

— was a Serbian woman travelling from the city of Prizren, located right on the Albanian border on the slopes of Serbia's highest mountain, Šar Planina. She was travelling with her children to visit her cousin in Banat for some rest. Naturally, given the current situation, I asked her whether she and her family were considering leaving Prizren. Jovanka looked at me sternly and indignantly replied, "What are you saying? We will never leave our beautiful hometown, Prizren." After pausing for a moment, she added, "There's no place in the world as beautiful as this." She reflected for a bit and said, "I understand why you're asking, but no, we will never leave our Prizren!" Then she began to tell her story: "Life is hard for us right now — there's no denying that. I'm a math teacher at the local high school, you know. It used to be a Serbian-Albanian high school, and we were all like one family. Classes were taught in both Serbian and Albanian. The relationship between Serbian and Albanian teachers was normal. But now, everything has changed. The Albanian teachers have stopped communicating with us entirely. We teach Serbian classes on the first floor, where both Serbian and Albanian languages are taught. How could it be otherwise? After all, there are many Serbs and Albanians living in the city. We need to communicate and be friends; it's hard to do that without knowing the language. But on the second floor of the school, there's an Albanian high school. Serbian is banned there. Now everything is separate. They regularly receive their salaries in foreign currency from somewhere. Of course, we know it's not just from 'somewhere' — they're funded by Western agencies and Albania. Meanwhile, we, the professors in the Serbian high school, don't receive our salaries from Serbia for months. But we understand Serbia's current financial difficulties and don't complain. That's how we live now, without talking to each other."

Listening to her story, I couldn't help but interject: "So that's what the Albanians are like."

"No," said Jovanka, "don't think that our Albanian colleagues wouldn't want to communicate with us. That's not true. They are simply terrified to death of the separatist terrorist groups, which keep the entire Albanian population of Prizren in a state of paralysis. You wouldn't believe it, but it's true. They would like to talk to us, but they can't disobey. Disobedience means execution. It's horrifying to say, but it's true, and to our collective horror, this is the reality. I've thought a lot about this," Jovanka continued, "and I firmly believe that the root of the problem is that, from 1990 until recently, no effort was made to address or combat the separatists. They were left unchecked and have now spiralled out of control, organizing terrorist groups with impunity.

"My husband works at the Prizren enterprise *Trudbenik*. Many Albanians used to work there as well. But, as he told me, they were ordered to leave their jobs, and they had no choice but to comply. Despite the managers pleading with them to stay and continue working, it was all in vain. My husband said they refused with sorrow in their eyes, saying, 'Life is more important.' Don't think they are bad people. They are hard-working, just like anyone else. Under different circumstances, everything would be fine. But when the leaders of the terrorist groups killed about a dozen disobedient Albanians, they instilled real fear, and there's nothing that can be done about it for now. These terrorists feel supported from abroad and face no punishment for their murders — they can escape to Albania at any moment. And on top of that, they're receiving large sums of money.

"In the city, everything seems quiet and peaceful on the surface. But whenever the terrorists order a demonstration, people come out and demonstrate. What they're demonstrating for, though, is unclear. They live better than we do here in Prizren, they educate their children as they wish, they do what they want, they don't go to work, but they still hold demonstrations. They all obediently gather in the square, stand there peacefully and then disperse. They fulfilled the order!" Professor Jovanka ended her story with a sigh.

As the train approached the station in Kosjerić, where I had to get off, I wished Jovanka and her children a pleasant stay in Banat, and we parted ways. For some reason, I thought of Madeleine Albright and reflected on how devious and brazen she truly is.

On Yugoslav-Albanian Relations

In every speech this year regarding the FR of Yugoslavia, Madam Albright has ended with threats to bomb Serbian cities. If necessary, she's ready to send in the "pride" of modern America — the U.S. Marines — to "teach those defiant Serbian villains a lesson." Her deputies, like Holbrooke, as well as various European ministers who echo the omnipotent U.S., repeat the same mantra. Bombing cities, defenceless civilians and columns of refugees — the Americans excel at this. They're experts. But when it comes to sending their Marines into hot spots, they still hesitate. Before sending ground troops into Yugoslavia, American officials think long and hard, knowing that this is no Grenada. It's far more prudent to send others — perhaps German soldiers, or Norwegians, to do the shooting. Or better yet, deploy the Albanian army into Serbia. That would be a great success for the U.S. It's no coincidence that the Albanian army has already been involved twice in manoeuvres along the Yugoslav border. Given this possible scenario, it's worth briefly reviewing the history of Albanian-Yugoslav relations, which, unfortunately, have been

strained for decades. As is now well known, these relations have become even more tense. Serious articles and reports in the press have pointed out that the organization of large-scale terrorism and separatist activity in Kosmet is directly linked to former Albanian President Sali Berisha, a well-known U.S. puppet. He worked hand-in-hand with Western intelligence agencies to implement the separation of Kosmet from the FR of Yugoslavia and its annexation to Albania. Berisha took this mission very seriously, as it aligned with his own ambitions to pursue the idea of a "Greater Albania" under his leadership — a cherished dream for any Albanian nationalist, especially one who is also a president. To this end, terrorist training bases were established on Albanian territory. Weapons were supplied and transported into the FR of Yugoslavia. Albania also served as a conduit for funding this entire subversive operation. Whenever terrorists fled from Yugoslav police, they could always find shelter and support in Albania. None of this is a secret, and the Yugoslav side has ample documentation confirming the training of terrorists on Albanian soil.

But here, it would be fitting to recall a minor misstep by the U.S. intelligence services in Albania. Readers may remember that about a year and a half ago, the deceived Albanian people nearly disrupted the carefully thought-out strategic plans of the U.S. with their uprising. And yet, everything had initially gone so well for the Americans. They had secured military bases, deployed their troops and, together with the Albanian army, U.S. Marines flexed their muscles along the Yugoslav border in 1995-96. Albania's economy was under control, and businessmen and bankers flourished with their pyramid schemes. But then, those very schemes collapsed, and the defrauded populace rebelled. In urgent haste, the U.S. was forced to rely on its European allies to suppress the uprising. As a result, the U.S. had to temporarily put its strategic plans on hold.

Progressive forces in Russia — and not only in Russia — welcomed the Albanian people's rebellion which overthrew Berisha. Believing the uprising to be led by progressive forces, and lacking precise information, they hoped it would lead to the expulsion of the Americans from Albania. However, the reality proved to be much harsher. The U.S. intelligence services quickly realized that they could not allow an uprising sparked by economic mismanagement to escalate into a political rebellion against the American occupiers. Swift measures were taken. The wealthy U.S. returned some of the stolen funds to the plundered populace. The despised Berisha was removed from the political stage. And the dying economic rebellion was seemingly taken over by a so-called socialist, Fatos Nano. America sighed with relief and resumed its aggressive plans against Yugoslavia. Now, under the guise of being a socialist, Nano, hand-in-hand with U.S. intelligence, worked towards separating Kosmet from Yugoslavia, hoping that he would be the one to annex Kosmet to Albania and realize the dream of a "Greater Albania" — a cherished aspiration of any Albanian nationalist. Thus, the Albanian army, deceived by false nationalist slogans of creating a "Greater Albania," under the leadership of U.S. puppets like the so-called democrat Berisha and the even greater "socialist" Nano, has been prepared to carry out tasks assigned by the U.S. Alongside U.S. forces, it demonstrates aggression along the Yugoslav border, threatening military action against Yugoslavia if it does not submit to American dictates. For the sake of American interests, this army is prepared to spill both Albanian and Serbian blood. In this way, the American leaders, exploiting deceived peoples, attempt to achieve their strategic goals with other people's hands and blood.

The Position of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1997-98

The Yugoslav leadership, along with President Slobodan Milošević, repeatedly stated — and demonstrated through their actions — that they stood firmly on the principle of resolving any problems through negotiations. Time and again, they invited representatives of the Albanian national minority in Kosmet to sit down and discuss issues. However, the Yugoslav leadership categorically refused to negotiate with terrorist and separatist organizations, as these groups — pushed by Western intelligence services — sought to undermine the sovereignty of the Yugoslav state and continuously threatened the peaceful lives of all Yugoslav citizens. At the same time, the Yugoslav leadership, in response to U.S. and NATO ultimatums, warned the aggressors that any attempts by U.S. or NATO units to enter Yugoslav territory uninvited would be met with the firepower of the Yugoslav People's Army.

Despite the position of the Yugoslav leadership, the aggressors, threatening missile strikes, continued to insist on effectively being granted the right to interfere in Yugoslavia's internal affairs. With the unfortunate assistance of official Russia and its Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov (who supported the so-called "NATO Contact Group"), they managed to push through the deployment of a 2,000-strong army of so-called NATO "monitors" in Kosmet. Public opinion was placated with assurances that these "monitors" would remain unarmed for the time being. One might wonder whether Yeltsin's minister Ivanov ever considered how the Russian people would react to the deployment of American "monitors" on the sovereign territory of Russia — somewhere in the south, for example, in Kuban?

During those tense days in October 1998, when threats of

an attack on Yugoslavia by the U.S. and NATO were incessantly voiced, it is worth noting that the new Russian government, headed by Yevgeny Primakov, declared that the issue of Kosmet was an internal matter of Yugoslavia. The Russian government finally demanded that the U.S. and NATO cease their aggression and threats against the FR of Yugoslavia.

The Russian government adopted a firmer stance, insisting on respect for the sovereignty of not only the FR of Yugoslavia but also any other sovereign state and its right to resolve its internal problems without external interference.

Russia attempted to defend this position in the United Nations Security Council, even threatening to use its veto power, and promised to take appropriate measures if the U.S. and NATO continued to threaten Yugoslavia. An official representative of the Russian Ministry of Defence at the time stated that Yugoslavia would be provided with full military assistance. Unfortunately, all of this turned out to be nothing more than empty promises.

In addition to Russia, other nations also stood against the aggression of the U.S. and NATO. Belarus, the Ukraine, China, Greece, Cuba and North Korea voiced their opposition, which meant that the FR of Yugoslavia, in its struggle for dignity and sovereignty, began to gain reliable allies.

Many states that were once part of Hitler's coalition — including Italy, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary and others — completely disregarded the lessons and consequences of the Second World War and recklessly began to assist the American aggressors by granting the global policeman access to their territories. Germany itself, the instigator of the Second World War, which claimed the lives of 50 million people, was eager to bomb Serbian towns and villages, seemingly intent on repeating its atrocities from 1941-44.

Truly, there are states that learn nothing from history and

stubbornly forget that crimes are always followed, sooner or later, by retribution.

The flagrant violations of international law, the continuous interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign Yugoslav state, and the shameless blackmail and threats by the U.S. and NATO were nothing but rehearsals by the West for its eventual open interference in the internal affairs of Russia, Belarus, the Ukraine and other CIS states. The West's goal remains unchanged: to turn these countries into raw-material appendages for international Western monopolies, into obedient vassal entities submissively integrated into the framework of the global "new order" under U.S. dominance. In those days, it was also evident that the sooner the authorities in Russia fully recognized the looming danger threatening their country, the better it would be for both the peoples of Russia and Yugoslavia.

A New Wave of Bloody Provocations by the U.S. and NATO Against Yugoslavia in 1998-99

Ultimatums and Threats as Methods of "Arm-Twisting"

During the tense autumn days of 1998, when the U.S. and its NATO accomplices issued one brazen ultimatum after another to the Yugoslav government and people — demanding compliance with the American dictate within seven, five or even three days — the diplomatic emissaries of American aggression, the infamous Madeleine Albright and her equally notorious associate in these aggressive undertakings, Richard Holbrooke, once again managed to twist the arms of Yugoslav leaders. On October 13, 1998, under the direct threat of missile and bombing strikes, the Yugoslavs were forced to sign

an agreement with Holbrooke.

The agreement, in addition to general international provisions regarding the rights of national minorities, including those of the Albanian-Muslim minority in Serbia, allowed the Americans to push through demands that were crucial for continuing their aggression. They succeeded in deploying a 2,000-strong force of their so-called "controllers" in the southern Serbian region of Kosovo and Metohija. They secured permission for so-called "aerial monitoring" over Kosmet, which, in reality, meant unrestricted U.S. and NATO air operations in Serbian airspace. What this meant militarily is clear to any honest person. The Americans forced Yugoslav authorities to withdraw police forces from Kosmet that had been protecting the population — both Serbian and Albanian — from the rampant terrorist gangs of separatists. And it didn't stop there. They gained permission for the terrorists to move freely across the entire territory of Kosmet and secured amnesty for all acts of bloody terrorism and atrocities committed by the separatists before October 13, 1998. In this way, the American aggressors, represented by Albright and Holbrooke, achieved a blatant violation of the sovereignty and national independence of the FR of Yugoslavia.

Naturally, the question arises — could the FR of Yugoslavia and its people have said a firm "no" to the American bullies on October 13, 1998, just as the people of Serbia and Montenegro said "no" to Austro-German aggressors on July 24, 1914, March 26-27, 1941 and July 7, 1941? Before answering this question, it is essential to recall that Serbia and Montenegro had allies in 1914 and 1941, such as Russia, France and later the Soviet Union. Unfortunately, on October 13, 1998, the FR of Yugoslavia had no such allies. The leaders of contemporary Russia, Primakov and Yeltsin, offered only verbal and moral support to the FR of Yugoslavia, stating that

the issue of Kosmet was an internal matter for Yugoslavia, that they demanded an end to the aggressive threats from the U.S. and NATO, and that they would defend their position in the UN Security Council, even using their veto power. However, the complete disregard that the U.S., Clinton and Albright showed for such "threats" and pleas was evident from the events in Iraq. To put it bluntly, both Albright and Clinton couldn't have cared less about these well-meaning but toothless statements because neither of them made any mention of tangible, real assistance in the form of modern weaponry to the so-called "brotherly, Orthodox" Yugoslavia, as they liked to say. It's clear to any honest person that if Yugoslavia had possessed robust air defence systems — let me repeat, defensive systems — such as the ones recently showcased to the international community in the Moscow suburb of Zhukovsky, or, even better, S-300 missile systems, all those "Phantoms," "Tornados," B-52s and "Tomahawks" would have been blown out of Yugoslavia's blue skies like a flock of crows. However, the reality of the autumn and winter of 1998 was much bleaker. Therefore, to the previously raised question — could the FR of Yugoslavia have said "no"? — the affirmative answer can only be theoretical. In practical terms, rejecting manoeuvres, endless negotiations and partial concessions would have given the aggressors, under the real conditions of October 1998, the opportunity to unleash a ferocious assault on Serbia. This would have involved hundreds of F-16s and F-17s, hundreds of B-52 missile strikes, and Tomahawks spreading death and massive destruction, followed by the deployment of their mercenary bandits into Kosmet. This, in turn, would have accelerated the secession of this southern Serbian region from the republic — a strategic goal that, as previously mentioned, is central to their plans. Regarding the author's suggestion of military assistance to the

Slavic brothers — help beneficial for Russia and desirable for the FR of Yugoslavia — the author can already hear the outcries of various newly-emerged "patriots" in Russia. These include the pseudo-patriots who have slightly "pinkened" after the catastrophic economic collapse of August 17, 1998, and who have long worn out the public's patience: Svanidze, Kiselyov, Mitkov, Karaulov, Dorenko and their ilk. Their usual cries are: "This is all provocation!," "They're trying to drag us into a conflict!," "We're weak, hungry and the north of the country is dying!," "Our army is in ruins, our industry isn't functioning!," "We have no food, and the West is feeding us!," "We're relying on life-saving loans from international funds, and you want to pit us against these important countries!" and so on. Enough already, gentlemen, pseudo-patriots and freeloaders. The hard-working Soviet people fed you, clothed you and gave you a higher education. You know perfectly well that since the 17th century, Russia has stood guard over the South Slavic Balkan peoples not only because of their kindness and Orthodox blue eyes but because it was defending the geopolitical interests of a great power. You, however, are pseudo-patriots not only because you refuse to firmly point out the culprits behind all the above-mentioned hardships that have befallen the Russian people and bring them to the righteous judgement of the working people. Your pseudo-patriotism reaches its peak in the fact that you are prepared to grovel before the Clintons, Albrights, Kohls and the pack of international financial barons in the hope of securing yet another usurious loan for Russia, necessary only for your personal benefit.

And where did you, gentlemen pseudo-patriots and their cronies, get the idea that the Americans in 1998 were all-powerful? Have you simply failed — or are you too scared — to open your eyes and see how they behave with more

powerful, self-respecting nations? Look at Pakistan and India, who, despite all the prohibitions from the United States and the UN, developed their nuclear arsenals. Whether this is good or bad is another matter. But where was the superpower United States then? Where were its threats, dictates, F-16s and Tomahawks? Where was the "tough" sex-leader President Clinton and his sidekick Albright? They barked and yapped, but that was it. Pakistan and India silently stomped their feet, and the supposedly mighty leaders of the global sheriff tucked their tails, whimpered and crawled under the benches of their ranches to lick their moral wounds — and everything else they lick when they're too scared to bark or have nothing else to do.

So, gentlemen pseudo-patriots, it is evident that you grossly overestimate your true masters due to the poverty of your moral qualities. As the saying goes, to each their own.

The Russian people are a great people, and perhaps Yeltsin or another president of Russia will eventually come to understand that the leader of a powerful state — one that Russia once was and can become again — should not serve as a lackey to American, German or British strategists, the present-day heirs of Hitler's fascism, who are attempting to implement a "new world order." This is the very same order that the mighty Soviet Union prevented Hitler from achieving in Europe. Fortunately, a truly independent and sovereign policy, entirely free from the dictates of American, German or Zionist financial clans and conglomerates is an imperative for Russia's future. The question is truly Shakespearean: to be or not to be! It is clear that puffing out one's chest and adding steel to one's voice won't be enough. What is required is a fundamental pivot, and as the saying goes, to "stand your ground to the death."

The Forced "Diversionary Strike"

To any objective observer, it is clear that the Americans have no intention of bombing England for its longstanding failure to resolve the centuries-old Northern Ireland issue. They do not threaten Spain with Tomahawk missiles over its Basque problem. Nor do they even hint at bombing Turkey for its genocide of the Kurdish people. For Americans like Clinton, Albright and Holbrooke, if you look at the essence of the issue, they could not care less about the relationships between Serbs, Albanians, Turks, Gypsies and Montenegrins within Kosmet itself. The simple truth that is emerging is that, in this region, the Americans are pursuing their strategic objective: the gradual dismantling of the FR of Yugoslavia through the step-by-step secession of its individual territories. First Kosmet, then Raška (the Sandžak), followed by Vojvodina and Montenegro. For this "sacred" goal, as Albright sees it, there is no shame in funding nationalism and separatism, fostering chauvinism and racism, organizing terrorist gangs and staging unimaginably brutal provocations. There is no hesitation in spilling the blood of other peoples and deploying this arsenal of hatred on an unprecedented scale. This can only be compared to the Gestapo's actions in this region.

Considering the aforementioned, it is worth examining how and in what direction the United States' aggressive actions against the FR of Yugoslavia, the Union Republic of Serbia and its southern region of Kosmet developed after October 13, 1998. It seemed natural to expect an escalation of Western aggression, yet external factors unrelated to Serbia intervened. As often happens in history, hidden forces operating beneath the surface for some time emerge suddenly, compelling the "actors" to perform various twists and manoeuvres to stay afloat. This happened in November and December

1998, when the situation on the "theatrical" government stage of the United States dramatically intensified, with a well-orchestrated display of "democracy" and an intriguing sex scandal plot. The serious threat of impeachment hanging over Clinton, fuelled to a significant degree by opposing financial clans, forced Clinton's circle — and Clinton himself — to organize, at any cost, a powerful diversionary manoeuvre, a high-profile and reckless action at the state level to distract the Senate and public opinion from relatively harmless matters like the "immoral antics" of a "March cat."

Such a diversionary manoeuvre or irresponsible and outrageous act could have been a missile-and-bomb strike, for example, on Serbia. After all, why not? It's practically a war — or, as Albright could easily spin it, almost a threat to the integrity and independence of the United States. And you, Clinton's opposition clan, she proclaims, are causing an uproar and even threatening impeachment over the innocent antics of a healthy man. Albright, unfortunately, seems to have gained little understanding of simple moral truths, even after her conversion to Christianity, including the fact that marital infidelity is immoral in private life, but for the president of a state seeking to teach other nations how to live — or worse, aiming to rule the world — it is utterly unacceptable. Most likely, her inability to grasp this stems not only from her upbringing but also from the influence of the corrupt, gold-obsessed and morally bankrupt American establishment that surrounds her.

Nevertheless, the media continued broadcasting claims to the world that the luminous Clinton's approval ratings had only risen, with almost 76 per cent of the population allegedly supporting him. Albright and her media either fail to understand or refuse to acknowledge that such assertions tarnish the reputation of the entire American people. After all, no

matter how you look at it, the implication is that, like Albright herself, the American people lack even the most basic moral principles — neither in family life nor in public or state affairs. Instead of resigning on December 19, 1998, following the example of newly-elected U.S. Speaker of the House Livingston, who stepped down in protest against Clinton's behaviour, "Madam" Albright continued to orchestrate her dark deeds in the Balkans and the Middle East. Such individuals, as the saying goes, are "like water off a duck's back"!

But Serbia, being part of Europe, could not be easily targeted with missile and bomb strikes without potentially upsetting the European allies of the United States. This was especially sensitive during a time of emerging tensions surrounding the creation of the euro — a potential threat to the dominance of the almighty dollar. Such an attack might have caused significant misunderstandings and, heaven forbid, worsened the already shaky position of Clinton. As a result, the strike on Serbia was postponed as a backup option (just in case!) and, for the time being, the focus shifted to a more distant and vulnerable target — Iraq. Four days of relentless missile and bomb strikes by F-16s, Tornadoes, B-52 bombers and hundreds of Tomahawks devastated numerous regions of Iraq. This diversionary manoeuvre orchestrated by Albright, Clinton and their associates played its intended role, or so they believed. Moral admonishments from Russia and China had no impact on the aggressors, who were drunk on their sense of impunity. On the contrary, they brazenly declared their intention to continue launching devastating missile and bomb strikes against civilian populations, regardless of any decisions or vetoes from the United Nations Security Council. After all, they claimed, the Security Council had no authority over the United States. The American law of "double standards" marched boldly across the Earth.

A Deceptive Lull

The "diversionary manoeuvre" — the bombing of Iraq — not only temporarily distracted American and global public opinion from the immoral "indiscretions" of the U.S. president but also somewhat slowed the implementation of plans to separate Kosmet from Serbia, at least for the time being. The period from October to December 1998 and into January 1999 created an illusion of calm — a deceptive and ominous calm — during which the aggressor meticulously prepared for its next strike and advance, which, given Albright's patterns of behaviour, was not far off. Western "peacekeeper" bandits were quite satisfied with the results of their October 1998 "arm-twisting operation" targeting the Yugoslav leaders. As a result of this operation, they began deploying their "monitors" on Serbian territory, sending various missions and using their air forces to monitor Serbian airspace extensively, mapping the locations of Yugoslav army defensive installations. Most importantly at this stage, the Americans had secured the "legitimate" placement of terrorist and separatist gangs on the territory of Kosmet. These same gangs were granted "amnesty" for all their heinous crimes committed up until October 13, 1998. Under the guise of these "monitors," the terrorists — armed to the teeth — were now able to roam freely through towns and villages in Serbia's southern province, while the Serbian police, who had been protecting both Serbian and Muslim Albanian civilians from terrorist atrocities before October 13, 1998, were now restricted to specific locations dictated by the Americans.

In light of the above, it would likely be helpful for an objective reader to familiarize himself with the actions (if such atrocities can even be called "activities") of not only the terrorists nurtured by the caring hands of Albright and Holbrooke, but also the blatant violations of international law by Albright herself, her State Department and their European lackeys. These violations extended even to the United Nations Security Council resolutions that they themselves authored and signed.

The Results of the "Activities" of Albanian Separatist Terrorist Gangs in Kosovo and Metohija

1. Terrorism

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Živadin Jovanović, sent a memorandum on the situation in Kosovo and Metohija to the United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan on the eve of the new year 1999. The document provides horrifying data on the "activities" of separatist terrorist gangs.

In this southern region of Serbia, between January 1, 1998 and December 26, 1998, terrorist gangs carried out 1,854 attacks, during which 284 people were killed and 556 were injured. There were 1,106 attacks on police facilities and officers, resulting in the deaths of 115 police officers and injuries to 399 others. The terrorists also abducted 14 police officers, of whom 3 were killed, 3 were released and the fate of the remaining 8 remains unknown to this day. There were 748 attacks on civilians, in which the terrorists killed 169 people and injured 157 others. Among those killed were 46 Serbs and Montenegrins, 76 Albanians, 3 Gypsies and 2 Muslims. The bodies of 142 victims remain unidentified due to the extreme mutilation caused by the terrorists. During the same period, the terrorists abducted 290 civilians, including 171 Serbs and Montenegrins, 100 Albanians, 14 Gypsies and 15 Muslim Turks. Among the abductees, 31 were killed, 108 were released, 9 escaped captivity and the fate of 142 individ-

uals remains unknown. Mass graves of civilians executed by the terrorists in the villages of Glodane, Klečka, Volujak and other locations stand as silent witnesses to the atrocities committed by these terrorist gangs. In an attempt to defend their terrorist proteges, Albright and Holbrooke will likely claim, "You are citing outdated data. Since we demonstrated initiative on October 13, 1998, and forced those Serbs to engage in peaceful negotiations with the 'poor' Albanian nationalist separatists, the situation has drastically changed." Yes, the Yugoslav leaders signed the agreement with Holbrooke and have strictly adhered to its terms. But what has come of Albright's "initiative"? Here is what: in the period from October 13, 1998 to December 26, 1998, the terrorist gangs under her protection committed 470 terrorist attacks, including 330 attacks on police officers and 140 attacks on civilians. These attacks resulted in the deaths of 12 police officers and injuries to 38 others, as well as the deaths of 20 civilians (including 9 Serbs, 10 Albanians and 1 Muslim Turk) and injuries to 30 others. On October 23, 1998 alone, the terrorists carried out 19 raids on towns and villages. In the village of Dubrava, on November 9, 1998, the terrorists captured two police officers and subsequently killed them on November 11, 1998. In the village of Prilep, on November 20, 1998, mortar fire killed 3 police officers and injured 3 others. On December 4, 1998, the terrorists raided a hospital in the town of Peć, where two police officers defending it were injured. In Glogovac, on December 11, 1998, the terrorists killed 3 civilians of Albanian nationality. In Podujevo, on December 21, 1998, a terrorist raid resulted in the death of one Ministry of Internal Affairs officer and the severe injury of one woman. The most horrifying crime of this period occurred on December 14, 1998, in the town of Peć, where 6 young men of Serbian and Montenegrin nationality, aged 15 to 20, were killed in a

café, and 3 others were injured. On November 18, 1998, the terrorists in the same town of Peć attacked Albanian citizen Dr. Zejnulahu Nurudin and his four children. Dr. Zejnulahu was killed, and his young daughter was injured. During this same period, the terrorists carried out several attacks on the "Belaćevać" mine, killing 1 worker and injuring 3 others.

Between October 13, 1998, when the Holbrooke dictate came into effect, and December 26, 1998, 34 civilians (7 Serbs and Montenegrins, 20 Albanians, and 7 Turks and Gypsies) and 3 police officers were abducted. Among them, 1 civilian and 2 police officers were killed, 13 people were released from captivity, and the fate of 20 individuals remains unknown. On December 18, 1998, the deputy chairman of the "Kosovo Polje" municipality, Z. Bojanić, was abducted and subsequently murdered. His body was dumped on the Priština-Peć road.

Recently, with the "light hand" of Albright, most terrorist gangs have begun operating under the blasphemous name of the "Kosovo Liberation Army" (KLA). Exploiting the sharp reduction in Serbian security forces in compliance with the U.S. dictate and with direct support from American "monitors," these gangs have intensified their campaign of intimidation and announced plans to escalate terrorist attacks in the spring. They do not conceal their objectives, which, among other things, include the physical elimination of all Albanians loyal to the Serbian and Yugoslav government authorities. Their primary goal is to terrorize, exterminate and expel any non-Albanian population to turn Kosovo and Metohija into an "ethnically pure" territory. Through systematic terrorist pressure, 700 villages out of 1,413 villages in Kosmet have already been "cleansed" of Serbian and Montenegrin residents. In 1998 alone, Serbs and Montenegrins were driven out of 87 more villages.

Even the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, a figure generally subservient to U.S. interests, was compelled to express concern and condemn the Albanian terrorists in his last report dated December 4, 1998.

2. Border Provocations and Arming of Terrorists

From January 1, 1998 to December 20, 1998, 122 provocations involving terrorist incursions from Albanian territory into Yugoslavia were organized, violating the Yugoslav-Albanian border. During just the last two months since the signing of the U.S. diktat — i.e., from October 16, 1998 to December 20, 1998 — 22 gross violations of the border were recorded. Continuous attempts by armed terrorist gangs, ranging in size from 10 to 1,000 individuals, to penetrate deep into Yugoslav territory pose a threat to the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the FR of Yugoslavia. A notable incident occurred on December 14, 1998, when three terrorist groups, numbering several hundred individuals, attempted to break through Yugoslav territory near Mount Paštrik, in the "Likeni" border post area. Yugoslav border guards were forced to return fire, killing 36 terrorists and capturing 9. All the captured terrorists were found to be well-equipped and armed to the teeth with German-made weapons. American "monitors" from the nearby city of Priština and Albanian officials were called to verify the incident. However, the Albanian representatives failed to appear, as they had nothing to say.

Armed violations of Yugoslavia's state border and provocations from Albanian territory significantly increased following the acceptance of conditions dictated by Holbrooke, i.e., after October 13, 1998. The activation of Albanian terrorist separatists was driven by their aim to exploit the withdrawal of Serbian law enforcement forces from this southern Serbian province to infiltrate as many trained terrorist groups as possible, smuggle in the latest weaponry and carry out large-scale provocations. These actions were intended to destabilize the situation in Kosmet, disrupt the process of peaceful conflict resolution, and provide Albright and her associates with a pretext for further intervention, possibly including the demand to deploy their troops on the territory of sovereign Yugoslavia.

Since the adoption of UN Resolution 1160 on March 31, 1998, which banned arms deliveries to Yugoslavia, including to Kosmet, not only has there been an escalation of terrorist activities, but also an intensified flow of arms to the terrorists in Kosmet. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia distributed a special "White Book" on terrorism in Kosmet to all delegations of UN member-states, including to Albright and Holbrooke, providing detailed information on the issue. However, as subsequent events showed, this had no effect.

According to reports from the UN Secretary-General, approximately 650,000 units of firearms were stolen from Albanian military depots during 1996-97, of which 200,000 were illegally smuggled across the Yugoslav-Albanian border into Kosmet. Additionally, most of the current weaponry used by terrorist groups was purchased in other countries, with procurement and transport centres established to supply arms to Albania for subsequent distribution to terrorists. Weapons being purchased and delivered include anti-tank missiles such as "Fagot," "Malyutka," "Igla," anti-aircraft guns, modern firearms like American rapid-fire "Browning" guns, automatic and large-calibre sniper rifles, "Stinger" surface-to-air missiles, satellite communication devices, "Armbrust" German anti-tank rockets, Swiss "SIG-Sauer" rifles (prohibited by international conventions), British mine detectors and more. Most of these weapons are shipped to Albanian ports, transported by truck to terrorist bases in northern Albania near the Yugoslav border and then illegally smuggled into Kosmet.

Since the adoption of the aforementioned UN resolution, Yugoslav border guards and police have confiscated 21,008 firearms from terrorist groups, including 37 recoilless guns, 468 mortars, and 10,869 machine guns, automatic weapons and sniper rifles.

While shielding their primary activities as sponsors and organizers of terrorism in Kosmet, Albright, Holbrooke and their Western allies are compelled to occasionally don the guise of "anti-terrorism fighters" and highlight isolated examples of their supposedly successful efforts. For instance, in late October 1998, the European Community Mission suddenly announced that they had prevented an attempt to deliver arms to KLA terrorists in the Albanian port of Durrës. The shipment, disguised as humanitarian aid from Switzerland, was seized. The *Raboka* ship transporting the "humanitarian" cargo was crewed by a Croatian team, and the organizer was a Swiss humanitarian organization. Incidentally, coverage of the *Raboka* case by Western media inadvertently shed light on how so-called "humanitarian aid" — already familiar to the Russian people — can serve dubious purposes. It is no coincidence that Albright, while threatening missile strikes, insisted on establishing "humanitarian corridors" and allowing unchecked transport of "humanitarian aid" across the Yugoslav-Albanian border.

U.S. Activities in Turning Albania into the Primary Base of Terrorism in Europe

It is no secret that the United States has completely subordinated the current Albanian leadership, which, for the appropriate price, is willing to fulfil any American demand. The Americans have conveniently established their military base there. If necessary, Albanian seaports are at the disposal of

the U.S. Sixth Fleet, while Albanian military airfields can accommodate U.S. Air Force operations. The repeated U.S.-Albanian military exercises along the Yugoslav-Albanian border, aimed at demonstrating force and intimidating the defiant and, therefore, despised Yugoslavs, are widely known. The economy of this small country, especially after the "inconvenient" uprising of Albanian workers two years ago from the perspective of the Americans, is now under the watchful eye of American "specialist economists." The Russian people have learned from their own experience that for these "specialists," the primary goal is to create chaos, disorder and irresponsibility in the economy, thereby enabling interference in internal affairs and, most importantly, directing the country's governance in the desired direction.

From this platform, the American leaders aim to proceed with the implementation of their not yet fully completed strategic plans for the Balkans. Their goal is to sow discord and incite bloody conflict between neighbouring countries — Yugoslavia and Albania — by fuelling nationalist fervour, territorial disputes and the personal ambitions of local leaders. In this, the Americans have so far succeeded. The idea of a "Greater Albania" and the secession of Serbia's southern province, encouraged by the schemer Albright (who essentially says, "Make the demands, and we'll support you"), is being actively exploited by the Albanian leaders to confuse the working masses in Albania and the Albanian national minority in the Republic of Serbia.

As a result of this dirty and shameful activity — unworthy of a great power like the United States — an extremely tense and explosive situation has arisen. The Albanian authorities not only fail to take any action to address the significant violations of the Yugoslav borders or to eliminate the threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the FR of Yugoslav-

ia (actions they are obligated to undertake under international law and UN resolutions), but instead openly encourage and inflame separatism and terrorism on Serbian territories with the aim of creating the notorious "Greater Albania." In northern Albania, special bases and camps have been established and are operational (Bajram Curri, Tropoja, Kruma, Kukës, Peshkopi), where terrorist gangs are trained and armed before being deployed. The training of these terrorists involves officers of the Albanian army, specialists from the Muslim-Catholic Federation of Bosnia, and instructors from the UK and Germany. Data sent to the CIA via the internet reveals that mercenaries from Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Afghanistan, Chechnya, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and other countries are being recruited into the so-called "KLA" and continue to join its ranks.

Recruitment centres for paid mercenaries for the "KLA," as well as organizations collecting substantial funding to finance terrorism, operate in several European countries and the U.S. These activities are conducted under the guise of humanitarian and cultural organizations or Albanian diaspora clubs in Europe and America. The OSCE Mission in Albania confirms the existence of several bases and camps designed for recruiting mercenaries, training them, and receiving and storing weapons. The head of this mission, Dan Everett, in a statement to *Reuters* on December 21, 1998, reported that the terrorists in northern Albania are actively preparing for war at their bases, planning to invade Yugoslav territory in the spring.

A number of foreign diplomats, characterizing the terrorists based along the border with Yugoslavia, believe that they plan to brutally retaliate in the spring not only against the Serbs but also against Yugoslav citizens of Albanian nationality who refuse to join them. The diplomats report that the

"KLA" terrorists are armed with the most modern weaponry and that, for example, the closed nickel mine near Kukës in northern Albania has been turned by the terrorists into one of their weapons storage facilities.

As is well known, Albright, Holbrooke and the rest of the cadre of American and Western representatives are trying to play the familiar roles of "peacekeepers" and zealous fighters against all forms of international terrorism — of course, excluding American terrorism. Therefore, openly assisting and financing pure Albanian terrorism is unseemly for them. This necessary support for maintaining the Albanian terrorists at a "high" level has been shifted to a semi-legal status, as if unnoticed. But like any endeavour in this world, it also has its downside. By transferring the procurement and supply of weapons for their terrorists into a semi-legal, semi-smuggling operation, the U.S. has involuntarily tied it to organized international terrorism. If Albright is somehow unaware of this, she could familiarize herself with the documents, statements and information obtained from terrorists arrested on the territory of Kosovo and Metohija.

The chaos organized by the United States of America in Albania has turned this country into the main hub of organized international crime, banditry and drug mafias in Europe, as well as a perfect springboard for extremist Islamic fundamentalism. This Islamic extremism, exacerbated by the tension created by the Americans within the FR of Yugoslavia, would naturally seek to use it as a launchpad for expansion into Europe. Numerous statements by government representatives from several European countries, reports from Interpol and international agencies indicate that Albanian terrorism is directly linked to the international drug mafia and global organized crime in general (such as human trafficking, money laundering, prostitution, contract killings, etc.).

It is incomprehensible how the cunning Albright, with her extensive experience working with mafia cesspools, could fail to grasp — or perhaps she simply believed in the absurdity — that the criminal Albanian mafia, having given her their "besa" (a solemn vow) to serve loyally (of course, for money), would not connect with the higher-ranking and more powerful international mafia, with which they are closely intertwined. Any intelligent person should know from a young age that stolen money might be "laundered," but tarnished honour — never. Truly, it defies understanding!

Apparently, for Albright and her American masters, the concept of honour does not exist at all, or perhaps their value system is akin to that of the mafia.

Do the U.S. and NATO Violate Their Own Resolutions Imposed Through the UN?

The American Double Standard

In accordance with UN Security Council Resolution No. 1160 (1998) of March 31, 1998 (see Paragraph 8), it was decided that all states are obligated "to prevent the sale or supply to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, by their nationals or from their territories, as well as the use of ships or aircraft under their flag, of weapons and military equipment of any kind, including firearms, bladed weapons, ammunition, military vehicles, and also equipment and spare parts for the above-mentioned, as well as to prevent the training of individuals for terrorist activities in Kosovo."

How the United States and its Western allies systematically violated Resolution 1160 was demonstrated above. Of course, much more material on the West's violations of this resolution has been published in the international press, as

well as in statements by numerous diplomatic representatives, international missions and commissions.

United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1199 (1998) of September 23, 1998 (ref. Paragraph 11) "requires states to organize and implement measures, in accordance with their domestic legislation and international law, to prohibit the collection of financial resources on their territories for purposes that are incompatible with Resolution 1160 (1998)." Beyond the materials previously presented on this issue, the following should be added. Citizens of Albanian nationality living and working abroad have been compelled by an international network of terrorist organizations to contribute three per cent of their salaries, earnings from drug trafficking orchestrated by the Albanian drug mafia, prostitution, smuggling and other criminal activities, depositing these funds into special bank accounts. There are approximately 800,000 such citizens abroad. Bank accounts for these contributions to support terrorism exist in the United States, Switzerland, Norway, France, Italy, Belgium, Germany, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Canada. These accounts are publicized in newspapers, magazines and online. Prominent Western newspapers such as *The Times*, *The New York Times*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Focus*, *Der Spiegel* and others have reported specific details about the channels financing terrorists in Kosovo and Metohija. They note that these sources are most often linked to drug distribution, money laundering, organized prostitution, the production of forged documents, passports, visas and other criminal operations. Some of the money is used to purchase weapons, and some is allocated to finance pro-Albanian lobbying efforts and political circles in Western countries, including the United States. A significant portion of the funds ends up in secret private bank accounts of the leaders of Albanian separatism, terror-

ism and nationalism.

Through its Resolution No. 1203 (1998) (Preamble, Paragraph 9, dated October 24, 1998), the United Nations Security Council condemned any support for the terrorists in Kosovo and Metohija by any state, including the provision of weapons and the training of terrorists. The Security Council expressed concern over reports of continued violations of the prohibitions imposed by the Council and stipulated by Resolution 1160 (1998). In the same resolution, the Security Council Secretary was instructed to systematically inform the Council of the results of the implementation of this resolution.

That all of this primarily concerns the United States of America leaves no room for doubt. However, Clinton, Albright, Holbrooke and other proponents of double standards — one for the U.S. and another for the rest of the world — hold a different opinion.

The U.S. Attempt to Legalize the Bloody Activities of the Albanian Terrorists

Despite the firm belief of objective observers and the vast amount of damning evidence proving that the southern Serbian region of Kosmet is plagued by the most blatant form of anti-civilian and anti-state Albanian terrorism, the Americans have embarked on implanting into the consciousness of the global community an audaciously outrageous idea. Supposedly, these are not terrorists, nor are they some kind of "amoral antics" of "our dear little Clinton." No, they are "freedom fighters" — how could we not have realized this sooner instead of passing United Nations resolutions condemning these terrorist gangs?! And despite the fact that the cameras of numerous international television crews and

journalists' photographers capture clear evidence daily of the classic terrorist violence perpetrated by the so-called "KLA," the U.S. has begun the process of legitimizing its previously concealed connections with the KLA terrorists. Of course, this provocative endeavour was initiated through direct contacts and negotiations with the terrorists by well-known instigators of the destruction of Serbian lands dating back to the early 1990s, such as U.S. State Department representatives Holbrooke and Galbraith. There is even a photograph of Holbrooke in a friendly conversation with an Albanian terrorist in the ancient town of Junik in Kosmet. Yet Holbrooke and other U.S. officials are better informed than anyone else about the criminal and terrorist nature of the "KLA," its direct links to international terrorism, drug cartels and organized crime in general. Instead of placing Holbrooke in the defendant's chair — at least in the infamous Hague — for his complicity in terrorism and the innocent blood spilled, he is instead sent to deliver speeches and oversee the "peace process" in Albright's and America's peculiar style of "resolution."

The U.S. ambassador to Macedonia, Christopher Hill, continued the legalization of contacts with the terrorists. As is customary for the allies subordinate to the U.S., following the Americans, representatives of Western countries also began establishing open contacts with the terrorists. Currently, some representatives of the OSCE Mission in Kosmet are also engaging in such activities. Public appearances by representatives of the Albanian terrorists are being organized in the West at major international institutions. For instance, on November 11, 1998, in Brussels, at an event organized by the Subcommittee on Human Rights of the European Parliament and the organization "Press Now," someone named Mahmudi spoke on behalf of the so-called "KLA," delivering an aggressive, extremist and separatist agenda in their "fight for the

independence of Kosovo." At the end of December 1998, E. Bibera, head of the Albanian-language division of *Voice of America*, interviewed a certain J. Krasniqi, a representative of the so-called "KLA." In this interview, Krasniqi declared that the "KLA" rejects a peaceful resolution to the issue of Kosmet and that they would continue the war for Kosmet's independence. Krasniqi also admitted during the interview that 100 individuals abducted by the "KLA" last year had been killed. And what came of this? Absolutely nothing. The Americans continue their efforts to legitimize their support of Albanian terrorism in this southern region of Serbia.

Results of Attempts to Legitimize Albanian Terrorism and the Position of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

Encouraged by the American diplomats, several Albanian nationalist party representatives in Kosmet, including the Democratic League led by I. Rugova, refrained from condemning the extremist agenda of "Greater Albania" and the accompanying terrorism. Moreover, these party leaders increasingly expressed support for the terrorists and representatives of the so-called "KLA." The evolution of their political positions followed a trajectory from initially condemning terrorism as such to denying its existence in Kosmet, then minimizing it and ultimately justifying terrorist acts as outcomes of the "freedom struggle." All of this, regardless of I. Rugova's good intentions, played into the hands of the organizers of terrorist activities, enabling the growth of bandit groups, precisely in line with the strategic plans of the Holbrookes, Galbraiths and the entire Clintonian-European "peacekeeping" cohort.

The governments of the FR of Yugoslavia and the Republic of Serbia, in the spirit of respecting the agreement with

Holbrooke and fostering cooperation, have consistently fulfilled all commitments recorded and signed in the October 16, 1998 agreement between the FR of Yugoslavia and the OSCE. However, the FR of Yugoslavia has warned that any so-called agreements reached by third parties, such as negotiations between Holbrooke or Albright and the terrorists of the so-called "KLA," whose hands are soaked in the blood of innocent Serbs, Montenegrins, Albanians and Muslims in Kosmet, that concern the FR of Yugoslavia, the Republic of Serbia, their territories or their national and state interests will be regarded as hostile acts against the FR of Yugoslavia and as violations of the signed agreement.

As reported in a memorandum published in Belgrade on December 1, 1998, cooperation between the Yugoslav state authorities and the OSCE Monitoring Mission in Kosovo was proceeding successfully. By that time, more than 600 visas had been issued to OSCE representatives. Approximately 820 diplomatic representatives of foreign states were present in Kosmet. The security forces of the Republic of Serbia and units of the Yugoslav Army were deployed in accordance with the agreement. There were no security force operations in the region, except for maintaining public order and protecting civilians from terrorist attacks and provocations.

The situation in Kosmet was characterized by an initial process of stabilization and normalization, which undoubtedly could have been quickly and fully realized if it were not for the escalation of bloody attacks by terrorist groups, including those of the so-called "KLA." This is confirmed by weekly reports from foreign representatives, as well as the report of the Monitoring Mission in Kosovo dated November 16, 1998. The governments of the Republic of Serbia and the FR of Yugoslavia remain committed to the principles of achieving a peaceful resolution in Kosmet, based on equality for all cit-

izens of all nationalities, in line with international norms established by humanity. In this spirit, they continuously call for political dialogue.

For instance, the political resolution of issues in Kosmet was discussed on November 18 in Priština and on November 19 in Belgrade with representatives of the People's Party of Kosovo, the Kosovo Democratic Initiative, representatives of the Turkish national community, the Gorani community, the Muslim community, the Gypsy community, parliamentary parties in Kosmet, as well as representatives of the Socialist Party of Serbia, the Serbian Radical Party and a number of other political organizations. As a result of these negotiations and consultations, an agreement on the political framework for self-governance in Kosmet was drafted and published on November 20, 1998 in Belgrade. This agreement was developed in accordance with the highest international standards and the fundamental acts of the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Council of Europe, the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Paris Charter, the European Convention on Human Rights, the Framework Convention of the Council of Europe on the Rights of National Minorities and others. Yet even this was insufficient for American representatives.

It is worth noting that the Yugoslav leaders proposed to Holbrooke and Albright: "Show us the provisions of the constitution of any country you consider to be the most 'democratic' and 'civilized' by your standards, ensuring human and minority rights, and we will incorporate them verbatim into the Constitutions of Serbia and Yugoslavia, just to end these endless accusations and rhetoric about 'human rights.'" No such proposal was forthcoming. Nor could it have been, as no constitution can support terrorism as a tool

of separatism and the destruction of its own state.

On December 9, 1998, the President of Serbia, Milan Milutinović, held a high-level meeting during which further steps toward achieving political resolution in Kosmet were discussed. Participants in the negotiations included: Muharem Ibraj and Agron Abazi, representatives of the "People's Party of Kosovo"; Fank Jashari from the "Kosovo Democratic Initiative"; Zejnel Abedin Kureishi, a representative of the Turkish national community; Ibro Vajti, a representative of the Gorani community; Raman Idrizi, a representative of the Muslim community; Koka Luan, a representative of the Gypsy community; Ljubiša Stevanović, a representative of Kosmet's parliamentary parties; Dr. V. Kutlešić, a personal representative of President Slobodan Milošević; Zoran Anđelković, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Autonomous Province of Kosmet; G. Gajević, Secretary General of the Socialist Party of Serbia; Dr. Vojislav Šešelj, the leader of the Serbian Radical Party; and representatives of other parties. The meeting reaffirmed the Declaration on the Joint Agreement on the Political Framework for Self-Governance in Kosovo from November 25, 1998, as it reflects the multinational, culturally and religiously diverse character of Kosmet as an integral part of the Republic of Serbia. The Declaration received support from all ethnic and national communities, including some parties representing the Albanian national minority, which collectively account for 600,000-800,000 citizens of all nationalities and faiths (approximately 250,000 Serbs and Montenegrins, 150,000 Muslims, 15,000 Gypsies and over 100,000 Turks, Gorani, Croats, Egyptians and others).

Representatives of all Albanian political parties have always been invited to these meetings on peaceful resolution of issues in Kosmet. Unfortunately, the political parties of Al-

banians living in Kosmet, gathered around the "Democratic League of Kosovo" led by I. Rugova, at that time did not even bother to accept the invitation to participate in continuing the political dialogue, which, incidentally, involves granting broad autonomous rights specifically to Kosovo Albanians — something that has been agreed upon by the entire international community.

Tracking the development of the political situation in Kosmet at the end of 1998 and the beginning of 1999, it is clear that representatives of all the national minorities and communities found a common platform and political framework for the autonomy they needed. The only obstacle to a final agreement is the extreme separatism and terrorism on the part of the Albanian national minority, which is supported, funded and fuelled by the aggressive strategists of the United States. If this external active support did not exist, the issue would have been resolved long ago, as the terrorists themselves would not pose a significant obstacle to a peaceful resolution of the emerging issues. Remove the material and political support of American official circles for Albanian terrorism and separatism in Kosmet, and conditions will immediately be created for resolving problems in a peaceful, democratic way, with respect for the territorial integrity of Serbia and Yugoslavia and ensuring the highest global standards for the rights of national minorities in Kosmet.

Intervention as an Official Tool of the Strategists of the New World Order

Nevertheless, the American-NATO circus around Kosmet in 1999 continues with renewed energy. Realizing that the governments of Yugoslavia and Serbia, together with representatives of all national minorities living in Kosmet, had

developed a joint platform and political framework to resolve the crisis imposed by the West (a framework that leaves no room for terrorism, separatism, or, especially, the deployment of American and NATO military forces on the territory of a sovereign state), Albright, Cook and company have escalated the hysteria. Once again, with the tacit consent of Yeltsin, Primakov and Ivanov, they have resorted to threats of bombings, military aggression, blackmail and their time-tested method of "arm-twisting."

The so-called Contact Group (with five of its six members — representatives of the USA, the UK, France and Italy — being staunch NATO supporters), after meeting in London on January 29, 1999, decided that the authorities of Serbia and the Albanian terrorist separatists must convene on February 6, 1999 at the Rambouillet Castle and reach an agreement within two weeks based on the principles formulated by the Contact Group. Otherwise, NATO would launch devastating missile and bombing strikes and, of course, begin deploying its troops on the territory of the sovereign FR of Yugoslavia. Notably, there were no threats directed at their protégés, the terrorist separatists. In short, it was the familiar brazen American dictate and a blatant violation of the UN Charter.

All this was accompanied by deafening political demagogy about the protection of human rights, the protection of children, mothers and innocent suffering people, and the defence of democracy — a nauseatingly blatant lie amplified by Western media. Naturally, such a flood of rhetoric inevitably led to some slip-ups. The "Contact Group" members, in their speeches and prepared directive documents, could not directly challenge the sovereignty of the Yugoslav state by bluntly stating: "Hand over your southern province of Kosovo, and that's that!" Especially since the sixth member of the group,

the representative of Russia, mindful of the historically pro-Serb sentiment of the Russian people, could not have supported such audacity. Thus, the text included references to respecting the "territorial integrity of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia."

For the Serbs and the FR of Yugoslavia as a whole, this was of fundamental importance. Unexpectedly for Albright and company, they agreed to travel to Rambouillet (though it was unpleasant and humiliating to resolve their internal issues abroad) and adopted, within the realm of possibility, a wise stance. Firmly defending their sovereignty and the inviolability of Serbia's borders, rejecting any attempts by separatists or their backers to undermine the integrity of their state in any form, they guaranteed all national minorities autonomy, which, incidentally, had existed on a broad scale before the separatist terrorism began in Kosmet. The Albanian separatist terrorists, having been incited for many years by the U.S. State Department and intelligence services to wage an uncompromising struggle for the secession of the southern Serbian province from the FR of Yugoslavia, could not come to terms with this latest American intrigue and zigzag. They continued to insist on secession and found themselves cast in the role of supposed opponents of Albright's "peacekeeping" efforts.

Under these circumstances, which arose at Rambouillet Castle, much to the dismay of the USA and the West, several developments occurred. First, immediate NATO missile and bombing strikes against Serbia became impossible. Second, Albright and NATO were forced to take at least a two-week timeout, primarily to pacify the aggrieved Albanian separatist terrorists and to cobble together, even temporarily, a unified government from the disparate factions. They also urgently needed to find new arguments to justify their planned in-

vasion of the independent FR of Yugoslavia. Realizing their miscalculation, Albright and NATO clandestinely pulled out a rather crude and transparent "improvisation." They demanded retroactive approval for deploying a 35,000-strong NATO force (including 4,000 U.S. Marines) in Kosmet, under the laughable pretext of "ensuring the implementation of the agreement." To any objective reader, it is immediately clear that if Albright and NATO had succeeded in implementing this plan, it would have spelled the end of the independence of both Serbia and Yugoslavia. The secession of Kosmet and the creation of a "Greater Muslim Albania" would have been realized within a few short years. It is also evident that this entire Western initiative constitutes a gross violation of the UN Charter. The United States would have been able to congratulate itself on another success in advancing its strategic plans in the Balkans, as well as on completely sidelining Russia from participation in resolving any international issues. Given all this, the leadership of Yugoslavia and Serbia resolutely declared that under no circumstances would they allow the occupation of the southern Serbian province of Kosmet by NATO forces.

A natural question might arise: why were the United States and NATO in such a rush to implement their plan for Kosmet in the first quarter of 1999, seemingly forgetting the simple folk wisdom that cautions haste in serious matters? The reason for this urgency lies in the following:

The pompous celebrations for NATO's 50th anniversary, scheduled for April 1999 in Washington, DC (where the original pact of the imperialist predators is stored), required tangible evidence of the success of today's dictatorial policies of the sole superpower, which crushes any disobedience. With great fanfare, slightly earlier in the U.S. state of Missouri, in the aptly named town of Independence, the eastward expan-

sion of NATO was to be announced, as three new members — Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary — would be admitted. How much this "gifted" membership in the "independent town" on the banks of the Missouri River will cost the working people of these countries will be revealed in time. For now, however, only the counter-revolutionary leaders of those states and NATO officials are celebrating, congratulating each other on a successful deal and rubbing their hands in satisfaction. The pact swelled to 19 members. And that's not all. During the celebrations, NATO's newest strategic concept was approved and officially adopted, allowing its armed forces to intervene militarily — without UN Security Council approval — anywhere in the world. This blatant violation of the UN Charter is being enshrined as the foundation of the new "world order." Intervention becomes its primary legalized instrument of plunder and suppression of the disobedient.

It turns out that the dismantling of the USSR in 1990, the dismantling of the SFR of Yugoslavia in 1991, the destruction of the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Republika Srpska in 1995, today's lawlessness against the FR of Yugoslavia and Serbia in 1998-99, and the missile and bombing strikes on Iraq and Sudan are merely the initial links in a chain of U.S.-NATO intrigues and the first steps toward legalized interventions by the strategists of the "new order," planned on a global scale.

Earlier, mention was made of the so-called "Dayton Agreement." Back in November 1995, the American aggressors Clinton, Albright, Holbrooke and various European diplomats acting as their lackeys twisted the arms of Yugoslav leaders to force them to sign the disgraceful Dayton Agreement. Under this agreement, the destruction of the RSK and RS by the Americans in September-October 1995 was sanctioned. It might be of interest to learn how these American

aggressors and their European allies now evaluate Dayton and the concept of intervention. After all, they seem genuinely determined to grandly enshrine and forcibly impose it on the entire world.

Here is the respectable, for the zombified and semi-zombified alike, American *Time* magazine, which in early 1999 wrote the following in its headline article "Dayton and Kosovo" (referring to the Serbian province of Kosovo and Metohija): "Successful intervention policy is the combination of military power with political muscle." And further: "The Western alliance needs to defend the very idea of intervention... We are now at a watershed in our failed and successful history of intervention... The Dayton Agreement of November 1995 (which destroyed the RSK and RS — P.M.) opened a new era... Dayton was meant to become the future of Western interventions... The real question is the future of this current, new beginning of an era of military interventions led by America!" After such statements about the current and future policies and actions of the United States, there is nothing more to add, except that this is a repetition of Hitlerism on a new turn of history.

In connection with the above, a nearly programmatic document of NATO as presented in *Time* magazine, a legitimate question arises for Russian patriotic deputies and national entrepreneurs: You, citizens of Russia, who speak about your desire to help the Serbian brothers if necessary, do you truly intend to limit yourselves to a plaintive appeal to the UN Security Council? It is obvious to any rational patriot that Albright and NATO will block any attempt to condemn intervention in the Security Council. Unfortunately, even speeches at the UN General Assembly, if one can be convened, will also achieve nothing. The historical experience of fighting intervention teaches us that the American-Anglo-Japanese in-

vaders of 1919-20 respected only the power of the Red Army, just as the German invaders of Hitler's regime did in 1941-45. Therefore, the key to solving the externally imposed problem of Kosmet lies, on the one hand, in the hands of known aggressors like Albright, Holbrooke, Gelbard, Clinton and, of course, the secretive CIA, for whom organizing a bloody provocation, shelling and bombing children and the elderly, is as easy as boiling an egg. On the other hand, the key is in the hands of Russian statesmen, who, if they truly want to be considered statesmen, must treat modern invaders exactly as their grandfathers and great-grandfathers dealt with conquerors in 1914, 1920 and 1941. Otherwise, this will once again prove that they, at the very least, have no understanding of the basics of history. Empty rhetoric and trips to NATO bandit offices will not save them from the fair judgement of the people.

As for the Serbs, as history teaches, they will not falter — as long as there is no betrayal.

Before the Thunder Strikes...

There is an old Slavic proverb, wise yet half-tragic and half-humorous, with a touch of irony: "Until the thunder strikes, the man won't cross himself." Considering everything stated above, perhaps the man should not wait until the thunder of Western "peacekeepers'" missiles and bombs strikes the ancient, freedom-loving and Orthodox Serbian-Montenegrin land. After all, their strategic goal is not to resolve some ethnic problems peacefully. Their goal is of global significance: to destroy the Republic of Serbia and the FR of Yugoslavia, to destroy these main — and, incidentally, last — obstacles to the implementation of their purely American strategic objectives in the Balkans. And not only in the Balkans.

Given that the United States has not respected or adhered to resolutions adopted by the UN Security Council, one might think that the time has come for the President of Russia and the State Duma to raise the question of withdrawing their signature from Resolution 1160 and, finally, to supply the Serbian and Montenegrin brothers with modern defensive weaponry.

State officials from the State Duma, if they truly are such, must understand that this is not primarily about saving someone or helping someone — it is about defending Russia's geopolitical interests and security. They must realize that a self-defended, free FR of Yugoslavia, due to its geographic location and with such a resilient people, could significantly assist its Slavic brothers if the day comes when Albright and the NATO company bring their missile and bomb threats and strikes to the vast and beautiful lands of Russia, Belarus and the Ukraine. As is well known, despite all the incantations and warnings from Yeltsin, NATO has already reached the borders of Belarus. Perhaps the statesmen of the State Duma will someday understand that the idea of a stronger union between Russia, Belarus, Yugoslavia and the Ukraine, especially under today's conditions, is not such an unrealistic concept. With goodwill and mutual interest, it would not be so difficult to implement such an idea in one form or another!

All that is needed is a desire, iron will and an understanding of the urgent historical necessity to withstand the fierce onslaught of the proponents of the "new world order."

If we are talking about a hut, an estate or even a village, it may be forgivable, in exceptional cases, for ordinary men to wait until the thunder strikes, hoping they can avoid disaster. But at present, when even a fool can see that terrible storms are rapidly looming over the people, the state and humanity as a whole — it is truly a great sin not to cross oneself in time.

BY WAY OF A CONCLUSION

CONCESSIONS TO AGGRESSORS LEAD TO NOTHING GOOD: A REAL THREAT OF WORLD WAR

For over two months, the American-NATO military forces arrogantly and without resistance bombarded a sovereign state — Yugoslavia — raining down internationally banned cluster bombs and uranium-laced missiles. They dropped graphite bombs across the entire republic, cutting electricity to hospitals and water pumping stations. Bread factories stopped and water systems failed. The American barbarians destroyed everything like the Huns — bridges, schools, industries, churches, hospitals — intentionally seeking to deprive the people of Yugoslavia of bread, water, electricity and fuel to break their resistance to American dictate.

Thousands of innocent women, children and the elderly perished. Streams of refugees fled in all directions — north, east, south and west. All of this was accompanied and continues to be accompanied by relentless howls from the American and Western media, spreading brazen lies and fabrications worldwide, blaming the chaotic, bloody missile-and-bomb destruction orchestrated and carried out by the U.S. on none other than Slobodan Milošević. At the same time, they ignore the fact that in response to the U.S. and NATO ultimatum, the Serbian government held a truly democratic nationwide referendum in the fall of 1998. In this referendum, 98 per cent of the Serbian population firmly said "no" to American and NATO militarization on Serbian soil. Simultaneously, together with representatives of national minorities in Kosmet, the Serbian authorities developed the highest guarantees of autonomy for all national minorities, including

the Albanian residents of Kosmet.

But Clinton, along with the cannibal Albright and the rest of the NATO scum, were not interested in this. As is well known, they simply attacked the sovereign state of the FR of Yugoslavia without declaring war. The U.S. and its NATO accomplices began their military campaign by launching large-scale missile and bomb strikes on the cities and villages across the FR of Yugoslavia — just as Hitler's Luftwaffe had done in the spring of 1941, exactly 58 years earlier. They attacked Yugoslavia simply because the sovereign nation, both then and now, refused to submit to the arrogant dictates of the fascist thugs, whether in 1941 or 1999. Back then, as now, Yugoslavia threatened no one. And that is not all. The U.S. and NATO openly violated the United Nations Charter and even NATO's own founding treaty, showcasing their desire to dictate their terms and impose their order on the entire world.

All known facts and statistical evidence indicate that the U.S., in pursuit of its strategic objectives, will stoop to any means — ranging from missile and bomb strikes on factories, schools, cultural centres and manufacturing plants, to the destruction of bridges and railways — all the way to invasion and occupation of Yugoslav territories, essentially unleashing a large-scale bloody conflict. This has always been the imperialists' tried-and-tested method during every new redistribution of global resources.

Methods of "arm-twisting" under the threat of bombings, the open and brazen support of separatism and terrorism directed against a sovereign state, the transformation of neighbouring countries — in this case, Albania — into a base and staging ground for terrorist bands, turning Albania into not only a centre for terrorism but also a hub for European drug cartels, the American effort to portray terrorists as so-called "freedom fighters," converting Italy into an unsinkable

American aircraft carrier, and the Italian town of Aviano into a hornet's nest from which deadly strikes were launched against the neighbouring peaceful and non-threatening state of Yugoslavia — all of this represents **stages already completed in the activities of the imperialist tycoons led by Clinton.**

Before Russian citizens and the honest global community, a tragic panorama continues to unfold — a bloody massacre at the close of the 20th century carried out by 19 "highly civilized" countries led by the United States against a small, freedom-loving state unwilling to submit to their dictates. Considering the massive wave of lies disseminated by Western media, as well as the shockingly deceitful propaganda of pro-Western Russian media — from *NTV, ORT, RTR,* to *TV-6, TV-Moscow* and various tabloids — aimed at destroying the great historical friendship among the Russian, Serbian and Montenegrin peoples, it is important to concisely outline the core concepts of U.S. geopolitical strategy, which are the primary driving forces behind the ongoing violence in the Balkans.

Firstly, it is clear to any rational person today that the United States is no longer satisfied with the United Nations Charter — its simple principles of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, the inviolability of borders, the necessity of resolving disputes through peaceful means and the right of sovereign states that threaten no one to receive all necessary assistance, including military aid, from other sovereign states in the event of aggression, in order to protect their sovereignty, independence and the freedom to choose their own path of internal development.

The United States has trampled on all these principles and is belatedly trying to concoct theoretical justifications for its lawless behaviour. For example, the American *Time* Maga-

zine, which appeals to the zombified and semi-zombified, openly wrote in early 1999 in its headline article "Dayton and Kosovo" (referring to the Serbian region of Kosovo and Metohija): "Successful intervention policy is the combination of military power with political muscle." And further: "**The Western alliance needs to defend the very idea of intervention... The Dayton Agreement of November 1995** (which destroyed the Republic of Serbian Krajina and Republika Srpska — P.M.) **opened a new era... Dayton was meant to become the future of Western interventions... The real question is the future of this current, new beginning of an era of military interventions led by America!**" After such statements about the current and future policies and actions of the United States, there is nothing more to add, except that this is a repetition of Hitlerism on a new turn of history.

One of the pillars of this new U.S. strategy, a certain Adam Rotfeld, director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute — which, according to the West (and echoed by the pro-Western Russian press), is touted as one of the most influential research centres in the West — boldly, and without fear of contradiction, declares the core principles of American strategy for the coming decades. In doing so, he confidently employs lies, deceit and the full arsenal of a "bandit theoretician."

To keep it brief, let us cite just a few gems from Rotfeld's musings. Speaking from the height of his "powerful" position, he states without offering a shred of evidence: "The main responsibility lies with Slobodan Milošević, who abolished Kosovo's autonomy (not Kosovo, but Kosmet, according to official Yugoslav jurisprudence, which the director of an institute should be ashamed not to know! — P.M.), conducted ethnic cleansing and violated international law." Here, dear reader, is a typical example of a Western bandit "theor-

etician." Every word is a lie, a demonstration of arrogance, ignorance and confidence that no one will bother to fact-check the claims of this much-publicized director of the "most influential research centre." In reality, there was no "abolition" of Kosmet's autonomy, nor could there have been. What took place was merely an adjustment to certain articles of the Kosmet autonomy laws that conflicted with the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia — such as the provision allowing Kosmet deputies a decisive voice on issues concerning Serbia's internal affairs, while Serbian deputies had no voting rights on matters concerning Kosmet, and so forth. As for the accusation of ethnic cleansing, Rotfeld's audacious lie reaches its absolute peak. Anyone living in Serbia and its southern region of Kosmet has known since childhood that ethnic cleansing of the Serbian population in Kosmet has been ongoing since 1941, ever since Kosovo and Metohija were annexed by Mussolini's Italy under Hitler's directive, with the aim of creating a "Greater Albania" under Mussolini's protectorate. In 1945, after the war ended, Tito, for his own political reasons, exacerbated the plight of Serbian refugees from Kosmet by issuing a decree banning the return of Serbian families to their homeland. The Albanian nationalist elements in power seized on this opportunity to continue the ethnic cleansing of the Serbian population — a process that persisted up until 1989. There is a vast body of published material documenting this genocide against the Serbian people. Yet Rotfeld, apparently, has no knowledge of this. To illustrate the methods of the American pseudo-theoreticians, let us consider another example. Not far from Kosmet, about 400 kilometres northwest, lay the Republic of Serbian Krajina. In October 1995, the American vultures, along with the Croatian neo-fascists and nationalist separatists under their guidance, carried out a horrific genocide of the Serbian population within just a

few days, driving more than 600,000 Serbs from their ancestral homes — territory where they had lived as a compact community for over a thousand years. And what did this Rotfeld, the director of what is claimed to be the most influential research centre in the West, have to say about this blatant genocide? Not a word. He, apparently, knows nothing of it. What a pity for the so-called "golden" half-billion of the West, which installs third-rate liars and bandit theoreticians as directors of its most influential institutions.

Expanding on his thoughts about global processes and problems, and how to achieve peace on this sinful earth, Rotfeld said in an interview: "Nowadays, the main threat to international peace and security is internal conflicts (?!? — P.M.). The international community (NATO) cannot turn a blind eye to the mass persecution of innocent people or tolerate genocide (?!?)... **The principle of non-interference in the affairs of independent, sovereign states cannot justify violations of human rights**..." (??? — P.M.).

The pinnacle of theoretical justification for any American aggression against any state, anywhere in the world, lies in Adam Rotfeld's overflowing confidence in military power and unchecked impunity. He theorizes: "New challenges, threats (?) and risks require a new approach and rethinking of certain principles and norms of international law, taking into account the growing responsibility of non-state entities." And here's his final gem: "**non-military elements of stability are becoming increasingly significant** (given that this is about Yugoslavia, Rotfeld likely means the spread of separatism, terrorism and drug trafficking — P.M.), **and NATO is shifting from defending the territories of its members to protecting common interests?!?**"

There you have it, dear reader, the whole truth. NATO can now violate its own charter, which explicitly states that

it may intervene only in the internal affairs of its member states and that it is purely a defensive alliance. According to this poor excuse for a theoretician, Adam Rotfeld, NATO can now bomb whomever it wants, wherever and whenever it wants. From his perch at one of the West's most "influential" research centres on peace, Rotfeld brushes aside the UN Security Council if it refuses to comply with NATO, and he casually dismisses the UN itself, should it — or its Secretary-General — disagree with the U.S.-NATO agenda. All this hubris, lies and threats were published in the Moscow newspaper *Vremya* on April 7, 1999. The editorial board didn't even bother to condemn this blatant disregard for the UN Charter, for which the grandfathers and great-grandfathers of many of its staff likely fought to the death. It is astonishing that the paper gave a platform to this absurdly arrogant yet ignorant Rotfeld, who, in the same interview, has the audacity to lecture the Russian people to stay quiet, mind their own business and not interfere with the U.S. as it carries out its fascist bandit atrocities. He even advises that Russia cosy up to NATO, or else.

Secondly, the bloody carnage in the Balkans, orchestrated by the Americans, is merely a link in the chain of strategic objectives pursued by the United States. Their aim is to create a western Muslim confederation or alliance stretching from Bosnia, through Goražde, the Serbian province of Raška (the Sandžak), Kosmet, Albania, Macedonia, Thrace and Turkey, under the leadership of a U.S.-subservient Turkey and under the aegis of the American superpower. This crescent, encircling Russia from the southwest to the southeast, is of immense strategic importance for the West's plans — led by the U.S. — to initiate the eventual dismemberment of Russia. Naturally, this loose but populous confederation under American direction serves several other purposes. In the centre of

the Balkans lies Muslim Bosnia, a forward base of the Muslim alliance near the increasingly powerful and unrestrained Germany. To the east lies another Muslim outpost positioned against a still-defiant China, and so on.

In 1999, however, we are concerned with the immediate link in U.S. policy. In the context of the Balkans, the FR of Yugoslavia is a thorn in the side of the American strategists. As expected, the U.S. and NATO have decided that this "disobedient" state must be crushed. They aim to accomplish this in 1999-2000, starting with massive bombings and then moving to occupy the southern Serbian region of Kosmet. From there, they can stir up and exaggerate issues such as autonomy for the Sandžak or Vojvodina, or fabricate claims of "oppression" against national minorities. In such subversive activities, the American "actors" have proven themselves quite adept. In addition to these tactics, the Americans have worked tirelessly to ensure that today's Russian leadership — shamefully beholden to the very same U.S. — does not, under any circumstances, provide genuine assistance to fraternal Yugoslavia. They allow posturing, trips to Europe and theatrical displays of activity — sure. They even welcome limited participation in the occupation of Kosmet with a token military contingent. As U.S. General Wesley Clark put it, "We're very pleased!" But when it comes to meaningful assistance to Yugoslavia's defence — such as selling defensive S-300 systems — the Americans draw the line. "Absolutely not!" they say.

Assessing the stance of the official Russian authorities regarding the U.S.-NATO conflict with Yugoslavia in recent months, it is clear that there was a repetition — under new specific circumstances — of the ill-fated policies of the Yeltsin-Kozyrev tandem during the 1991-95 period. Their continuous concessions and acquiescence to aggressors led first

to the disintegration of the SFR of Yugoslavia, followed by the destruction of the Serbian republics and the signing of the disgraceful Dayton Diktat in the U.S. state of Ohio. The new "troika" of Yeltsin-Ivanov-Chernomyrdin, in the context of direct military aggression by the U.S. and NATO and the relentless, inhumane missile and bombing attacks on Yugoslavia's civilian infrastructure, refused even to withdraw their signatures from Resolution 1160 — a resolution they had rushed to sign — prohibiting the provision of arms to Yugoslavia, including to Kosmet. They were fully aware (even Ivanov himself admitted it, and Yeltsin knew it too) that the U.S. was openly supplying arms to the terrorist gangs of Albanian separatists. Nevertheless, the Yeltsin-Ivanov-Chernomyrdin "troika," disregarding the U.S.'s blatant violations of the UN Charter, ignoring the fact that the UN Security Council had neither authorized nor supported the U.S. aggression, and overlooking Article 51 of the UN Charter (which permits assistance, including arms, to a nation under attack), publicly declared that they would not provide the necessary defensive weapons. Instead, they would continue endless and amicable negotiations with the "man-eater" Albright and NATO ministers "until they dropped." And all of this occurred while Serbian children, mothers and the elderly were dying daily and hourly, as U.S.-NATO vultures destroyed hospitals, schools, churches and the country's industry even more ruthlessly than the nazis had. It became evident that the Yeltsin-Ivanov-Chernomyrdin troika had no intention of defending the UN Charter or establishing peace in the Balkans. All of this was done to secure yet another handout from the IMF! Essentially, no matter what they claimed, they were, at the time, supporting the American aggressors in their military atrocities on Yugoslav territory and in their attempts to break the will of the Yugoslav people.

Everything honest and progressive in the world looked to the Russian leadership with hope when it declared its intention to provide defensive weapons to Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, these hopes have so far proven empty.

For the Russian reader, it may be of interest to hear how the Minister Ivanov justified the capitulatory position of the Russian leadership. To begin with, it should be noted that the militant statements made at the end of March 1999 had completely vanished. At a press conference on June 5, 1999, Ivanov stated that the President had set "four main tasks": to achieve the immediate cessation of missile and bombing strikes; to participate in drafting a UN resolution; to analyse the extent and form of Russia's participation in future peacekeeping forces; and to strive for the deployment of international aid to restore Yugoslavia.

And that's it?! For more than 70 days, the vultures of the U.S. and NATO have been ruthlessly bombing an independent and fraternal country. More than 1,500 children, women and elderly people have been killed by the aggressors. The Americans have blatantly ignored over 50 verbal demands from the current Russian leadership to stop the bombings. Yet on June 5, Ivanov and Yeltsin, like parrots, once again repeated, "Please, stop the bombings." By participating in the drafting of the UN resolution alongside the seven main aggressors against Yugoslavia, led by the U.S., Mr. Ivanov managed to turn the aggressors into "peaceful lambs" in a single moment — lambs allegedly only dreaming of peace — while their NATO mercenary thugs were rebranded as "peacekeepers." A 50,000-strong force of such "peacekeepers" was now set to be allowed into Kosmet, the southern Serbian region. Chernomyrdin, of course, played his dark role, "explaining" to Milošević what was what, making it clear there was no way out and that he, Chernomyrdin, was washing his hands

of the matter. Russian readers are well aware of how effectively Chernomyrdin can "explain" even the simplest issues, not to mention more complex ones — especially when his personal friend Al Gore, Clinton's vice president, is involved. This time, just as in Dayton in 1995, the Americans, with Chernomyrdin's help, twisted the arms of the Yugoslav leaders and their parliament. The aggressors, led by the U.S., set it up so that the issue no longer appeared to concern NATO but concerned the United Nations. If the UN resolution was not accepted, Russia would wash its hands of the matter and remain on the sidelines. Cornered by the bandit "peacekeepers," Yugoslavia agreed to the UN resolution, likely believing in the folk wisdom that says, "Even a tuft of wool from a mangy sheep is something." After all, the resolution did state that the UN guaranteed the inviolability of Yugoslavia's borders. However, whether the U.S. and NATO — with their 40,000-strong mercenary corps in Kosmet, not to mention Albright's beloved Albanian terrorists — could be trusted, only time will tell.

One does not need to be a genius to predict the future course of events. For the foreseeable future, Yugoslavia will face a bloody, gruelling struggle for its freedom, independence and the liberation of its territories from the occupiers. The primary strength of Yugoslavia now lies in the unbreakable unity of its people. The Serbs and Montenegrins have faced down worse aggressors before and emerged victorious. However, it is also clear that **the primary objective of the U.S. strategists and their agents in Yugoslavia in the second half of 1999 will be to destroy this unity of the Serbian and Montenegrin peoples. They will aim to sow discord through all manner of devious intrigues, spreading lies mixed with exaggerated accounts of the mistakes made by Yugoslavia's leadership. They will spare no expense and**

will utilize the "fifth column," which for now lies dormant, to achieve their goals.

The Yeltsin-Ivanov-Chernomyrdin troika, thanks to its short-sighted policies, will likely live to see the day when the U.S.-NATO aggressors establish their missile systems not on the borders of Albania or Macedonia, but on testing grounds near Smolensk, Orsha, Kraslava and Narva — not to mention in Shevardnadze's Georgia, Maskhadov's Chechnya or Aliyev's Azerbaijan. This is not about saving anyone or spilling Russian blood for someone else's cause. Such rhetoric is vile demagogy from those segments of the Russian political class and media who hide their betrayal of Russia's interests behind lies and base-level demagogy.

The Serbs and Montenegrins have never asked the Russian youth to shed their blood for their freedom. They simply remember, as do all working people of Russia, that in the difficult years for the Russian people, when the German aggressors attacked Soviet Russia on June 22, 1941, a massive uprising of the peoples of Serbia, Montenegro, and Bosnia and Herzegovina against the German occupiers began immediately. A gruelling, bloody struggle was launched to support the fighting Soviet Russia. In those days, the Serbs and Montenegrins didn't ask anyone — not the Americans, not the British — whether they could or couldn't come to the aid of their Russian brothers. They simply took up arms as one. It has already been mentioned that in July 1941 alone, more than 80 partisan units in Serbia were fighting, bearing the brunt of attacks from elite German punitive divisions. Here is an example of genuine brotherhood: on June 24, 1941, just two days after the nazis invaded Russia, more than 3,000 rebels gathered in the Nevesinje region alone. And the proud song of the brotherly people rang out from Mount Bjelašnica like a battle cry:

From Bjelašnica, a spirit calls,
summoning Herzegovinians one by one,
Rise, dear brothers,
Russia has gone to war.

The Serbs and Montenegrins, as brothers and allies in the fight against aggression and fascism, only asked the Russian leadership to sell them modern defensive weapons, which they were never given. Meanwhile, the Americans, blatantly violating international agreements, including Resolution 1160, armed their mercenaries to the teeth without even hiding it.

It is clear to any rational person, without further commentary, that if Russia had supplied modern S-300 systems to Yugoslavia in 1997-98, there would have been no bloody American bombings, let alone the U.S.-NATO occupation of the southern Serbian region of Kosmet. The Americans are not such great warriors that they would die for someone else's freedom for nothing. But if it's for big money and at the cost of others' blood, then by all means.

All of this is beyond the understanding of those in power and their ideological lackeys — people like Svanidze, Kiselyov, Mitkov, Karaulov and others of their ilk. They do everything they can to trample on the centuries-old friendship between our peoples. There is no need to be surprised by their servility toward the West, and especially the U.S., nor by their primitiveness, brazenness and amorality when it comes to the great friendship between Slavic and Orthodox peoples. They are simply being paid by their masters for this and for their betrayal.

During these months of unrestrained U.S. aggression against Yugoslavia, something else stands out. Anyone living among the people knows — and sociological surveys confirm — that the vast majority of Russia's working population sharply condemns the American aggression. Anti-American

sentiments have grown due to the arrogance and brazenness of the United States as it seeks to impose its terms on the entire world. And yet, in this situation of widespread anti-American sentiment among the progressive segment of Russian society, within the so-called opposition to the anti-people regime, and among the leaders of patriotic, communist, socialist, social-democratic and agrarian movements and parties, there was neither the will nor the strength to unite into a single anti-American people's front to support the brotherly people of Yugoslavia. This is especially surprising given that there were no significant disagreements regarding the issue of supporting Yugoslavia. There was no need to break lances over fundamental questions of Marxism, social-democracy, entrepreneurship or other such debates. It was evident that the people would support such a national movement, as it was about helping a nation that dared to defend its freedom and independence, stepping onto the path of resistance against imperialist aggression. Was it truly impossible for all the opposition leaders to gather with a single agenda item: the creation of a broad national front of all patriotic forces to support Yugoslavia against aggression? Was it truly impossible to rally the people for mass demonstrations of hundreds of thousands under such a clear issue for the working class, demonstrations that could pressure the regime's leaders to behave differently? It is also surprising that not a single leader of a progressive movement raised the issue of creating a broad national front to unite all patriotic forces in support of Yugoslavia. It is not hard to realize that on the border with Macedonia, an open, fierce battle against international imperialist banditry was taking place — and still is.

Why is it that the progressive leaders in America can organize a 30,000-strong protest in Washington against Clinton and NATO in support of Yugoslavia? Why can progres-

sive forces in Italy unite and bring tens of thousands of their workers to the streets to protest U.S. and NATO aggression? Yet in Moscow, where the people — including primarily the youth — spontaneously and consistently staged daily protests over an extended period, the united progressive forces could not mobilize 300,000 or more workers.

The only explanation for now is a lack of desire among the leaders to unite and lead the masses of working people. And it is this "lack of desire" from the leaders that is both surprising and alarming. Of course, each leader and their progressive movement made statements — whether in the Duma or at their small-scale rallies. But the spontaneous actions of the working people demonstrated that mass protests in support of brotherly Yugoslavia could have been organized with firm demands. Such protests would have struck with the force of a powerful fist, not the weak slap of an outstretched hand.

As a result, instead of an initiative from the progressive forces, the initiative for allegedly "saving" Yugoslavia was seized by the Yeltsin-Ivanov tandem, which sent a Russian battalion to Kosmet — a move that, in the current situation, is welcomed by ordinary people. However, it is also clear that with a powerful, organized demonstration of united progressive forces in Russia and a mass mobilization of the working people in defence of Yugoslavia, it would have been possible, much earlier — at the very beginning of the bandit-like bombings by the U.S. and NATO — to force those in power to provide real assistance to Yugoslavia in the form of defensive weapons, including the powerful S-300 systems. Such assistance would not only have prevented the barbaric missile and bombing strikes, the enormous destruction and devastation carried out by the U.S. and NATO, but it would also have eliminated the very idea of the occupation of the southern Serbian region of Kosmet by the military forces of

the U.S. and NATO. Clearly, this would have marked a victory for the progressive forces over the rampant international imperialist fascism.

Alongside this, organized mass demonstrations by the Russian workers would have forced the "fifth column" of the U.S. and NATO in Russia's corrupt media to curtail their blatant, unrestrained, anti-Russian and essentially anti-state campaign, which is primarily corrupting the youth.

As is well known, history does not tolerate subjunctive moods. Nevertheless, the great thinker and politician Vladimir Ilyich Lenin repeatedly emphasized that progressive movements and political parties, if they truly wish to lead the working masses, must learn from their own mistakes and, drawing the correct conclusions, not repeat them in the future.

It is necessary to stress once again that, at its core, the current events in the Balkans are primarily about the fate of a great Russia. It is a question of soberly evaluating the strategic goals of the aggressor. And if the imperialist masterminds of America, through the intrigues of Albright and her allies, combined with the "goodwill" of Ivanov and Chernomyrdin, succeed in crushing Yugoslavia, the U.S. and NATO will very quickly turn their attention to Russia, should it wish to remain great and defiant.

Perhaps even then, Mr. Ivanov will be whispering somewhere in Belgium with the man-eater Albright, and Chernomyrdin will be travelling around Europe with a satisfied look on his face. But by that time — of this, there is no doubt — other men, having crossed themselves, will take the defence of their Motherland's interests into their calloused hands. Yet how much young, Slavic, honest and Orthodox blood will be spilled because of the greed, lust for power, short-sightedness and outright betrayal of those in power.

The peoples of Yugoslavia fully understand that the so-called "agreement," or rather, the dictate imposed on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia by the "G8," in which, alas, Ivanov and Chernomyrdin played an active role, is in reality just a slight modification of the U.S. and NATO ultimatum. This "agreement" effectively legalizes the occupation of the southern Serbian region of Kosmet by American and NATO mercenaries. The UN serves merely as an instrument of the U.S. and NATO, having not even condemned U.S. aggression and instead becoming part of this criminal conspiracy. The Yeltsin-Ivanov-Chernomyrdin troika deliberately dragged out negotiations for two months, waiting for the U.S. and NATO vultures to destroy Yugoslavia's infrastructure. Then, after the country was left without ammunition, fuel and electricity, and without being provided modern defensive weapons, Chernomyrdin, essentially on behalf of the U.S., NATO and, regrettably, official Russia, presented Yugoslavia with an ultimatum. In reality, stripping away the empty rhetoric, Chernomyrdin and his patrons betrayed not only Yugoslavia but also Russia on June 3, 1999.

Nevertheless, the peoples of Yugoslavia remain deeply confident that their brotherly Russian working-class comrades firmly stand on the side of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in its continued struggle for freedom and independence against the fascist militarism of the U.S. and NATO.

BRIEF INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Predrag Čedomirović Milićević was born on March 22, 1926 in Belgrade. His father, Čedomir Milićević, and mother, Anđelija Milićević-Zrenjanin, were teachers. Predrag Milićević completed elementary school and four grades of gymnasium in the town of Vršac. On September 15, 1939, he joined the underground League of Communist Youth of Yugoslavia and actively participated in its work. In 1940, he became the secretary of a youth cell. He was regularly involved in the work of an underground party printing press located in his parents' home, printing leaflets for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) and assisting in printing the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)*. In the summer of 1940, he attended underground party and youth courses held at a camp on Fruška Gora.

He participated in the preparation for the uprising and in the uprising itself in 1941, as well as in the National Liberation War from 1941 to 1945. Starting in June 1941, he served as a courier for the city, district and regional committees of the CPY and for the leadership of the National Liberation War in South Banat. He was a member of the urban partisan team of the South Banat partisan detachment, participated in sabotage operations, distributed leaflets and was part of a special reconnaissance group of the underground district committee, among other activities. He was arrested twice by the Gestapo (in June 1941 and May 1942), but due to a lack of direct evidence and testimonies, he was released after enduring Gestapo torture.

At the end of September 1944, he joined the units of the 3rd Ukrainian Front of the Red Army advancing from Roma-

nia toward Vršac. On September 30 and October 1-2, 1944, he participated in the battles for the liberation of Vršac. On October 3, 1944, he became part of the newly-formed city committee of the Communist Youth. In November 1944, Predrag Milićević was admitted to the CPY. He worked until the fall of 1945 as the secretary of the city committee of the Communist Youth and as a member of the bureau of the city committee of the CPY. From the fall of 1945 to 1946, he worked as the deputy secretary for ideology in the Communist Youth Committee of South Banat in Pančevo. At the same time, he studied at the 3rd Partisan Gymnasium in Belgrade, graduating with distinction in the summer of 1946.

In the fall of 1946, based on an agreement between the Yugoslav and Soviet governments, Milićević was sent to the USSR to continue his education. In November 1946, he enrolled at the Moscow Aviation Institute named after S. Ordzhonikidze, in the faculty of aircraft engines, completing two years of studies by the summer of 1948. In 1947-48, he served as the secretary of the party organization for Yugoslav students in Moscow. During the summer of 1948, after passing his second-year exams, Milićević returned to Yugoslavia for holiday with his colleagues. In the fall of 1948, he was co-opted into the party committee of the CPY at the University of Belgrade.

Being a direct witness to the mass repressions against students of the University of Belgrade — members of the CPY — solely for their ideological opposition to breaking relations with the Soviet Union, and familiarizing himself with the situation in the country, including the anti-Soviet and anti-socialist actions of the authorities, such as the dismantling of the CPY, Predrag Milićević opposed the above-mentioned anti-socialist policies implemented by Tito.

From late 1948 and throughout 1949, Milićević was a

member of the editorial board of *Nova Borba* in Prague. In January 1950, Milićević, based on a false denunciation and accusations made by then-General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Rudolf Slansky and Secretary of the Central Committee Otto Geminder, was arrested by the Soviet authorities and accused of espionage in favour of Tito, preparation of terrorist and sabotage acts, and planning assassinations of leaders of the international and communist movements under articles 58.1, 58.2, 58.3 and 58.4 of the Criminal Code. After a lengthy and complex investigation and multiple verifications, Milićević was summoned in the fall of 1953 to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow, where all charges and accusations were dropped. The Central Committee of the CPSU directed Milićević to resume his studies at the Moscow Aviation Institute. In 1957, Milićević graduated with honours, defending his diploma at the Faculty of Jet Engines, and was assigned to one of the leading enterprises in the industry of defence, where he worked for 42 years until the summer of 1998.

Milićević progressed from a junior design engineer to lead designer of complex control systems and, in his final years, served as the head of one of the departments at the enterprise.

He actively contributed to the development of various control systems for jet and rocket engines for MiG, Su and Tu aircraft, including the supersonic passenger airliner Tu-144, the "Sotka" and the Soviet space shuttle "Buran." He holds 31 patents related to control systems. In 1962, Milićević joined the CPSU, and alongside his industrial work, he served for over 20 years as Deputy Secretary of the Party Committee of the CPSU at his enterprise until the counter-revolutionary coup of 1990. He was one of the authors of the *Serbo-Russian Polytechnical Dictionary* (1967). For his participation in the

war against nazi Germany and for his contributions to the industry of defence, he received state awards.

Throughout these years, Milićević maintained a constant focus on the events in his homeland, Yugoslavia, systematically visiting the country and studying the complex processes of Yugoslav reality. In 1983, his memoir *My Comrades* was published in Moscow, dedicated to the heroic struggle of the Yugoslav peoples, led by the communists and youth league members, against the nazi aggressors. In 1996, his book *Hitler, Churchill, Clinton, Kohl and Yugoslavia* was published, defending Yugoslavia, which was subjected to blatant aggression by the U.S. and NATO. Additionally, Milićević authored numerous articles published in newspapers and journals across Russia and the CIS, analysing the causes of Yugoslavia's collapse and the West's aggression, led by the U.S., against it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aškotović, M. et al., *In the Concentration Camps of Northern Norway*, Serbian Literary Association, Belgrade, 1979.

Božić, M. et al., *History of Yugoslavia*, Prosveta Publishing, Belgrade, 1972.

Božić, M. et al., *Overview of the History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia*, Textbook Publishing of the People's Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, 1963.

Bondarenko, V., *The Collapse of the Intelligentsia*, Palea Publishing, Moscow, 1995.

Ćorović, V., *History of the Serbian People*, Glas Srpski Publishing, Banja Luka, 1997.

Dedijer, V., *Diary 1941-1945*, Yugoslav State Publishing, Belgrade, 1945.

Dedijer, V., *New Additions to the Biography of J. Tito,* Vol. 2, Liburnia Publishing, Rijeka-Zagreb, 1981.

Dedijer, V., *New Additions to the Biography of J. Tito,* Vol. 3, Rad Publishing, Belgrade, 1984.

Đorđević, M., *Political History of Serbia*, Prosveta Publishing, Belgrade, 1956.

Đurić, M., *Formation of the Multinational State of Yugoslavia (1918-1921)*, Moscow State University Publishing, Moscow, 1970.

Girenko, Y., *Stalin-Tito*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1991.

Glushkova, T., *Unjust Judgement Against One's Own People*, Baikal Publishing, Moscow, 1997.

Hoffman, B., *Night Before Morning*, Znanje Publishing, Zagreb, 1982.

Kaivenda, P., *Germans in Yugoslavia 1918-1945*, ISI Publishing, Belgrade, 1990.

Kodrić, M., *The Robbed Island*, Scientific Book Publishing, Belgrade, 1990.

Kržavac, S., *The Cominform — What It Is*, Svoboda Publish-

ing, Belgrade, 1976.
Lenin, V.I., *Collected Works, Vol. 26-27, 5th Edition*, State Political Literature Publishing, Moscow, 1962.
Maksimov, S. et al., *Inevitable Retribution*, Voenizdat, Moscow, 1987.
Marić, M., *Children of Communism*, Mladost Publishing, Belgrade, 1987.
Milićević, P., *Hitler, Churchill, Clinton, Kohl and Yugoslavia*, Palea Publishing, Moscow, 1996.
Milićević, P., *My Comrades*, Molodaya Gvardiya Publishing, Moscow, 1983.
Mićunović, V., *Moscow Years*, Liber Publishing, Zagreb, 1977.
Mladenović, M., *Guarding the Supreme Commander*, Narodna Armija Publishing, Belgrade, 1971.
Popović, M., *Beat the Gang*, Albatros Publishing, Belgrade, 1988.
Risović, V., *Development of Capitalism in Yugoslavia*, Moscow State University Publishing, 1972.
Semenov, V.S. et al., *History of Diplomacy*, State Political Literature Publishing, Moscow, 1959-1965.
Shkarenko, L.K., *The Agony of White Emigration*, Mysl Publishing, Moscow, 1981.
Simić, D. and Trifunović, B., *The Women's Concentration Camp on Goli Otok*, ABC Product Publishing, Belgrade, 1990.
Stalin, J.V., *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,* Vol. 16, Writer Publishing, Moscow, 1997.
Stalin, J.V., *Questions of Leninism*, OGIZ Publishing, Moscow, 1947.
Stalin, J.V. and Molotov, V.M., *Letters to Comrades Tito, Kardelj and Ranković*, Borba Newspaper, Belgrade, 1948.
Stojanović, L., *The Life and Work of V.S. Karadžić*, Makarije Publishing, Belgrade-Zemun, 1994.

Vujačić, R., *Women of Serbia in the National Liberation War*, NOLIT Publishing, Belgrade, 1975.
West, R., *J. Tito*, Rusich Publishing, Smolensk, 1997.
Wiener, N., *Cybernetics or Control in the Animal and the Machine*, Soviet Radio Publishing, Moscow, 1968.
Zhukov et al., *World History,* Vol. 3-10, State Political Literature Publishing, Moscow, 1956.

On the Battlefields and Execution Sites, Vol. 1-2, Prosvetni Pregled Publishing, Belgrade, 1985.
On the Events in Czechoslovakia, Press Group of Soviet Journalists, Moscow, 1968.
Participants and Witnesses, Vol. 1-3, Teachers' Society Publishing, Belgrade, 1974.
Proleter: Collected Works of the Underground Communist Party of Yugoslavia, 1929-1942, Foreign Labour Movement Publishing, Belgrade, 1968.

Proof