

**The Marxist**

**Volume: 15, No. 02-03**

**April-September 1999**

**YUGOSLAVIA: AN IMPERIALIST WAR FOR A NEW WORLD  
ORDER**

*(This is an abridged version of the original article written  
before the war on Yugoslavia ended)*

-- **Tania Noctiummes**

-- **Jean Pierre Page**

*"The NATO war is a bandit action"  
Harold Pinter, London, 2 May 1999*

**A War of Aggression**

The imperialist war of aggression is being waged, under the NATO umbrella, against a sovereign State and its peoples under the leadership of the United States and the active participation of France, Britain, Italy, Germany and other NATO partners. The argument of legitimate defence cannot be invoked. Moreover, it was launched without authorization of the United Nations Security Council, without any approval of the national parliaments of these countries, and in violation of the terms of the Treaty governing the Atlantic Alliance. As such, the perpetrators have violated every rule of international law and are guilty not only of a breach of the peace but of war crimes.

The intervention of NATO is unprecedented and creates a new precedent. For the first time, Western Europe has endorsed and actively participated in a unilateral action of war that has upto now been a privileged weapon of the United States. What we are seeing today is not simply an alignment of Western Europe with US against Yugoslavia. Neither does it reflect any inability of Europe to provide itself with the necessary means to carry out its own politics. The war against Yugoslavia reveals a joint will to implement a common 'new strategic concept', elaborated and finalised together by Western Europe and the United States, and ratified at the recent NATO summit in Washington. The war serves to legitimize this new

concept and, for this reason, NATO cannot afford to lose the war.

It is significant that the war is conducted in the name of the 'international community' when in reality it is being waged by a bellicose Euro-American alliance. On what basis does NATO arrogate itself the right to speak on behalf of the international community in a unilateral manner and claim to incarnate 'the law'? After Pax Americana, Lex Americana! One of its main results is the programmed death of the system of international relations built after World War II. In the US view, the present system has become anachronistic and must be replaced by a new world order through a new role for NATO under US domination.

Within a period of only eight months, the United States is guilty of armed aggression, carried out with total impunity, against four sovereign states -- Sudan, Afghanistan, Iraq and Yugoslavia -- without any authorization by the United Nations and in violation of the United Nations Charter. The instrumentalisation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, is its most significant demonstration: yesterday, forced into silence, today pressed into submission to obtain the agreement of the Security Council to legitimize ground intervention in Yugoslavia. The NATO Alliance may have agreed to designate the ground force as a UN force, but it insists that NATO troops must be the core, wielding heavy NATO firepower and working within an exclusively NATO command structure: "UN-wrapped but NATO-filled"! [1] According to sources close to the Secretary-General, he was apparently warned by US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright on 7 May 1999 that any political or military intervention by the United Nations would be "unacceptable", that the international military presence in Yugoslavia would not be a UN force and that "in no case" would it be under the control of the UN. He was also told that the UN "should be satisfied with its own business, ie, humanitarian affairs". [2]

### **A war planned and prepared in advance...Rambouillet and Akrona**

The United States had prepared the aggression against Yugoslavia well in advance. The 'negotiations' undertaken in Rambouillet turned out to be a manoeuvre to deceive the public into giving a stamp of approval for the war.

The US attack against Yugoslavia began more than a decade ago when the World Bank and the IMF set about destroying the multi-ethnic federation with lethal doses of debt, market reforms and imposed poverty. Millions of jobs were destroyed. In 1989 alone, 600,000 workers, almost a quarter of the workforce, was sacked without severance pay. But the most critical reform was the ending of economic support to the six constituent republics and re-colonisation by western capital.

At the same time, 'Milosevic, the reformer' was considered a favourite among senior figures in the US State Department and the KLA were considered to be "no more than terrorists". Richard Holbrooke described President Milosevic as "a man we can do business with, a man who recognises the realities of life in former Yugoslavia". In October 1998, the US drafted a peace plan for Kosovo giving the Kosovans far less autonomy and freedom than they had under the old Yugoslav federation. But this deal included crucially for the Americans a NATO military presence. When Milosevic objected to having NATO troops on his soil, he was swiftly transformed like Saddam Hussein from client to demon.

Frequently it is claimed that the war has provided each party, Serbs and Albanians alike, with the pretext to fuel the worst kind of nationalism. However, one fails to recognise that the situation in the Balkans has a clear origins and responsibilities. Germany followed by the rest of Western Europe hold direct responsibility for fuelling ethnic divisions and rivalry with the objective to destabilise and dismantle former Yugoslavia. Germany directly inspired the break-away of Croatia and Slovenia, since then it new economic colonies. Later, German Chancellor, Gerhard Schroder, was to offer a glimpse of the underlying strategic context of this kind of move when he said, on 19 April 1999, that "the role of Germany in the world has changed....we are advancing to the centre of Europe for the deepening and enlargement of the process of European integration....the transfer of the Reichstag to Berlin clearly shows the extent to which German capital can become the link between East and West as the hinge of European unity."[\[3\]](#)

The 'intransigence' of President Molosevic to agree to the Rambouillet peace accord became the pretext for NATO military intervention in Yugoslavia. In an article appearing in *Le Monde Diplomatique* of May 1999, Paul Marie de la Gorce revealed the 'secret history of the Rambouillet negotiations'.[\[4\]](#) The 'invitation'

extended to the Government of Yugoslavia by the 'Contact Group' (USA, UK, Germany, France, Italy and Russia) took the "form of an ultimatum"; it was "threatened with military reprisals should it refuse to present itself". All the elements of the Accord presented at Rambouillet as 'non-negotiable' were already present in an American text of a 'peace' agreement which was published in February 1999 in the Albanian journal 'Koha Ditore'. The text was elaborated by Roger Hill, assistant to Richard Holbrooke, former US Secretary of State and US mediator in former Yugoslavia, following the latter's visit to Belgrade in summer 1998 to oblige President Milosevic to begin negotiations with the Kosovo Albanian community. The negotiations were delayed as rivalry escalated between the moderate Kosovo Albanian leader Ibrahim Rugova and the extremist Kosovo Liberation Army. Meanwhile, the US began work on its own draft.

What was hidden from the public is that the Yugoslav delegation to Rambouillet had no objection to the political aspects of the Accord but rejected other the military section, as a violation of its national sovereignty and independence. Annex B of the Accord, in effect, provided for the occupation of the entire territory of Yugoslavia by NATO forces. In fact, there were no negotiations at Rambouillet. A compromise proposal for an 'international' presence in Kosovo made by the representative of the Government of Yugoslavia was ignored by the Western members of the Contact Group which, without further ado, acquired the signature of the Kosovo-Albanian representative. The final document was given to the Russian delegation only on the last day of the conference! Since then, France and UK, co-chairs of Rambouillet, have refused to release to the public the section of the document dealing with military aspects.[\[5\]](#)

A closer examination of the military clauses of the Rambouillet Accord will show why the United States and its European allies would have known in advance that such a condition would be unacceptable to any sovereign State, even a NATO member State! The provisions reduce, not only Kosovo, but all of Yugoslavia into a colony of the United States, the dominant NATO power.

Sections 2, 5 and 7 provide for a permanent NATO presence in Kosovo. OSCE would control the functioning of the police and justice. In case of litigation, the two parties would have appeal to NATO and only to NATO.

Sections 6 and 7 stipulate that NATO forces will be immune "under all circumstances and at all times" from the jurisdiction of the Yugoslav Federation "in respect of any civil, administrative, criminal or disciplinary offenses which may be committed by them in the FRY" (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia). Richard Becker, Western Regional Co-Director of the International Action Center, describes this provisions as comprising "the old, hated, colonial concept of 'extraterritoriality', under which the colonisers were immune from being tried by the courts of the colonized country, even if they committed -- as they often did -- rape, murder and mayhem"[\[6\]](#) exempt from all provisions of the Constitution and legislation of the Yugoslav Federation.

Sections 8 and 9 provide NATO forces, their vehicles and equipment with free, unrestricted and unimpeded access throughout Yugoslavia, including its airspace and territorial waters:

Section 8 : "NATO personnel shall enjoy, together with their vehicles, vessels, aircraft, and equipment, free and unrestricted passage and unimpeded access throughout the FRY including associated airspace and territorial waters. This shall include, but not be limited to, the right of bivouac, manoeuvre, billet, and utilisation of any areas or facilities as required for support, training, and operations."

Section 9 : "NATO shall be exempted from duties, taxes, and other charges and inspections and custom regulations including providing inventories or other routine customs documentation, for personnel, vehicles, aircraft, equipment, supplies, and provisions entering, exiting, or transiting the territory of the FRY in support of the operation."

Sections 11 and 15 give NATO the right to use, in all of Yugoslavia and free of cost, the country's transport infrastructure and telecommunications services, including broadcast services;

Section 11: "NATO is granted the use of airports, roads, rails, and ports without payment of fees, duties, dues, tolls, or charges occasioned by mere use."

Section 15: "The parties (Yugoslav and Kosovo governments) shall, upon simple request, grant all telecommunications services, including broadcast services, needed for the Operation, as determined by NATO. This shall include the right to utilise such means and services as required to assure full ability to communicate and the right to use all of the electromagnetic spectrum for this purpose, free of cost."

Section 22 gives NATO the right to modify the country's public infrastructure.

Section 22 : "NATO may, in the conduct of the Operation, have need to make improvements or modifications to certain infrastructure in the FRY, such as roads, bridges, tunnels, buildings and utility systems."

The military provisions of the Accord were in effect an ultimatum to the government of Yugoslavia with a conditional declaration of war, a violation of the Hague Convention. International law forbids the "use of threat of force" which is "an express or implied promise by a Government to resort to force conditional on non-acceptance of certain demands of that government".

Already in 1996, NATO's General Secretary, Javier Solana, declared: "the experience acquired in Bosnia could serve as a model for future NATO operations". Ivo Daalder, Director at the Brookings Institution in Washington, echoed these sentiments: "If NATO is unable to get rid of a paper tiger in the centre of Europe, then what purpose does the Alliance serve? NATO cannot lose its first war in 50 years. Kosovo constitutes a determining moment for NATO."

### **A War Based On Deceit**

The United States and its junior partners have sought to justify their imperialist war in the name of 'democracy', 'human rights', 'moral values'. For the first time, 'universality' of human rights is being used to give pseudo legitimacy for military intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign State, sabotaging existing mechanisms established within the framework of the United Nations and creating a precedent for new interventions to come.

They have accused the Government of Yugoslavia of 'ethnic cleansing' of its Kosovo Albanian population. In reality, however, prior to the bombardment, the civilian population of Kosovo, Albanians and Serbs, were fleeing an armed conflict between the Yugoslav armed forces and the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), which has called for coordinated action with NATO forces. It is only after the beginning of the NATO bombardment that the exodus took on massive proportions.

OSCE monitors and foreign reports in Yugoslavia also exposed the lie about the 'Racak massacre' that was 'discovered' by OSCE KVM Chief, US Ambassador William Walker. It was the lie that would lead to NATO bombardment of the country and provide justification for it on "humanitarian grounds". On 16 January 1999, Walker accused "Yugoslav security forces" of massacring 45 civilians in the village of Racak, an act of which he was "personally convinced" and sent an ultimative demand that investigators from the Hague Tribunal be permitted to come to Kosovo an Metohija within 24 hours. Walker's version was repeated by Albanian reporters personally hand-picked by Walker to accompany him. He had refused to allow representatives of the domestic media to be present. According to the Albanian "eyewitnesses", in the middle of the day, the police raided the village, separated women from men, and subsequently killed the latter. The announcement was made before any investigation could be carried out. The story of the Racak 'massacre' is almost identical to that of the stories about the Sarajevo marketplace of Markale and from Vase Miskine Street, the truth of which was learned only after the Serbs had already been punished for what they did not do.

Soon after Walker's announcement, Yugoslav authorities refuted this version and in a communique, the Foreign Ministry reported that there had been an armed confrontation in the vicinity of Racak on 15 January when KLA fighters attacked Serb police undertaking the arrest of terrorists who had killed a police officer, Svetislav Przic, five days earlier. The KVM of the OSCE was duly informed about the beginning of the arrests and arrived at the scene of fighting.[\[7\]](#)

William Walker's version and that of Albanian 'eyewitnesses' was also refuted by films shot both during and after the fighting in Racak by the American Associated Press and by Renaud Girard,

correspondent in Yugoslavia for the French daily "Le Figaro" on location in Racak. The version was also contradicted by OSCE monitors who were present in Racak.

On 20 and 23 January,[\[8\]](#) Renaud Girard pointed out that the Serb police had nothing to hide since they invited a television crew from the American Associated Press to film their operation to arrest members of the KLA group in Racak, known to be a KLA base, and who had carried out multiple criminal acts of terrorism as per Article 125 of the Criminal Code of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Security forces had also informed the OSCE Mission of the campaign, subsequently confirmed by a British member of the mission, Neal Strechen.[\[9\]](#) Members of the OSCE mission, travelling in two vehicles with American diplomatic plates, were also present.

Le Figaro pointed out that the available facts refute the claims of OSCE and of the Albanian separatists that Serbian security forces massacred 45 civilians. According to various Western dailies, it appears that the bodies may be those of KLA members killed in the fighting with Serb police which were later gathered together by KLA separatists and brought to the gully to stage a massacre.[\[10\]](#)

Inside the OSCE Mission, the conclusion had been reached, on the basis of evidence available, that the 'massacre' was, indeed, staged by the KLA. Officials of the Mission, who had asked to remain anonymous, informed that they had inspected 15 bodies and determined that some of them were moved.[\[11\]](#) According to one monitor, most of the bodies were brought from the surrounding area. Many were KLA fighters killed in an armed combat with Serb forces and "were subsequently dressed in civilian clothes"[\[12\]](#) Willy Wimmer, Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly told the private German television NTV that he rejects with disgust manipulation by television pictures intended to provoke an intervention by NATO in Kosovo and Metohija: "Everything is directed toward provoking a certain reaction so that certain pictures create the desire to immediately issue orders to our soldiers to go into action."[\[13\]](#)

The US Chief of the OSCE KVM and NATO governments went out of their way to prevent the truth of the 'massacre' being known. Walker prevented the investigating judge from carrying out the on-site investigation on 16 January by demanding that she go without



police protection. Having prevented the country's judicial and state authorities from carrying out their duty, Walker himself arrived at the scene on the same day, accompanied by foreign and Albanian journalists, and made the dramatic declaration! Outraged by the arrogance of a US Ambassador behaving like an occupation force, the Yugoslav government accused Walker of intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state: "such an attitude did not come for the first time to the fore in his statement and in his preventing that the investigating judge carry out her duty according to the laws of her own country. He probably forgot that he is not a Governor or a Prosecutor or a judge in Serbia or in the FRY but the representative of the organisation of 54 equal states and the head of the mission whose task is not to rule the territory of a sovereign country but to observe and report accurately."[\[14\]](#)

In addition, the 21 kilo report of a forensic expert team sent by the European Union to investigate the circumstances of death, which was ready at the beginning of March, was not made public. Procedural and other arguments were used, especially by the EU President, German Chancellor Schroder, to prevent the contents being divulged during the Rambouillet meeting.[\[15\]](#) The OSCE, itself, admitted indirectly to this.[\[16\]](#) The head of the team, Finland's Dr. Helena Ranta, was apparently instructed by Bonn not to reveal the contents and to follow directions given by German authorities. However, the contents are known within OSCE circles: that the massacre was substantially manipulated on the Albanian side![\[17\]](#)

The motivation behind Walker's announcement is obvious today: to prepare public opinion for NATO aggression and to create a precedent for what British Prime Minister Blair calls 'the new kind of war'! Immediately after the announcement, German Chancellor Schroder warned that, for the first time since 54 years, German troops could be sent to the Balkans and that the event justified "direct intervention on humanitarian grounds" without a mandate from the UN Security Council.[\[18\]](#) An article in *New York Times* shows that the US Administration knew in advance of the whole scenario of the 'massacre'. A week before, officers at the highest levels had indicated that the Administration was expecting a "decisive moment", a "key event", in order to take further steps.[\[19\]](#)

NATO General Secretary, Javier Solana, himself identified this event as a turning point in the development of the crisis. It was after Walker's announcement of the "Racak massacre" that the

governments of the "Contact Group" summoned the government of Yugoslavia to Rambouillet threatening military reprisals should it refuse to present itself!

The sordid career of William Walker shows that he was chosen to head the OSCE Kosovo Verification mission not for any commitment to human rights but because of his willingness to lie or to keep quiet.<sup>[20]</sup> Almost his entire career in the foreign service was spent in Central and South America, including a highly controversial posting as Deputy Chief of Mission in Honduras in the early 1980s, at the time and place where the Contra rebel force was formed. In 1985 he became the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Central America and in the Reagan and Bush White Houses held responsibility for the operation to overthrow the government of Nicaragua. According to information contained in Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh's lengthy indictment of Eliot Abrams, Walker was responsible for setting up a phony humanitarian operation at an airbase in Ilopango, El Salvador, which was used to funnel guns, ammunition and supplies to the Contra rebels in Nicaragua. Despite being named in the indictment, Walter was named US Ambassador to El Salvador from 1988 to 1992, during the reign of terror by the death squadrons, many of whom were trained in US military academies.

William Walker's career shows that he is not an ordinary State Department employee. After the Chinese Revolution, the State Department enacted the Wriston reform which required the rotation out of their posts every few years to prevent the development of "excessive" sympathies towards the culture of host countries. As a result, most State employees are moved around to posts in different parts of the world. It is, however, well-known among career foreign service diplomats that one of the few exceptions to this rule are CIA agents in the embassies. Until his arrival in Kosovo, Walker spent virtually his entire career in Latin America. In the light of the Racak incident which was used as an excuse for military action in Yugoslavia, one wonders what indeed was Walter's role in Kosovo!

A secret report<sup>[21]</sup> by an Italian monitor, using the pseudonym, 'Ulysse', shows how the United States used the OSCE mission to provide partial and fabricated information for public consumption. The supposedly "neutral and civilian" observer mission was in reality primarily a military mission headed by US Ambassador Walter who travelled in a OSCE vehicle brandishing an American Flag and was

infiltrated with several American agents. According to 'Ulysse', "the military constituted more than 70% of the so-called 'civilian' mission, moving around in uniforms, like NATO soldiers. End November, only 14 Italians remained, of which only two were civilian. To save face." All information activities were immediately placed under "Anglo-American" control, who then transmitted to the observers "carefully 'cleansed' reports". Observers from other countries were excluded: "The Russians were immediately excluded from the intelligence sector of the head office. And we noticed a clear contradiction between the Anglo-American and the Franco-German positions." Moreover, the reports were drafted by "American officers and local Albanian personnel (sic!). Italians, Russians and Dutch were suspected of being pro-Serb for having reported cases of human rights violations by the Albanians and members of KLA."

Official German documents and judgements of German tribunals also reveal the falsity of claims of 'ethnic cleansing' and 'massacres' by the Yugoslav Government. A situation report of the German Foreign Ministry of 18 November 1999 pointed out that there was no evidence to prove the existence of 'massacres' or 'mass graves' claimed by the press: "the repeated press reports of 'massacres' and reports about 'mass graves' contributed to alarming the refugees, but could not as yet be confirmed by international observers."[\[22\]](#)

Unpublished official documents[\[23\]](#) sent to various state tribunals by Germany's Foreign Ministry also state that there is no evidence of 'ethnic cleansing' and no evidence of a 'humanitarian catastrophe' facing the population of Kosovo. According to information provided to the High Court of Lower Saxony, "the measures of the security forces are primarily aimed at combating the KLA, which through terrorist means is fighting for the independence of Kosovo and, according to some of its spokesmen, even for the creation of 'Greater Albania'".[\[24\]](#) Another document of 12 January 1999 sent to the Administrative Court of Trier states: "There is no evidence of political persecution explicitly aimed at the Albanian ethnic group in Kosovo. So far the eastern part of Kosovo is not affected by the armed conflict, civilian life in the cities Pristina, Urosevac, Gjinjilan, etc is relatively normal." The "actions of the security forces (was) not aimed at the Kosovo-Albanians as an ethnically defined group, but against the armed opponents and their actual or suspected supporters."[\[25\]](#)

Various courts in Germany have concluded that there is no state

planned programme of persecution aimed at the Kosovo Albanians as an ethnic group. On 24 February 1999, the High Court of Munster concluded: "There is insufficient evidence to show that there is a secret programme or a silent consensus on the Serbian side to annihilate, expel or to persecute in any other extreme manner as has been projected, the Albanian people.... When the Serbian state power puts into effect its laws and thereby exerts the necessary pressure on those Albanians who depart from or boycott the State, the objective aim of these measures is precisely not a programmed persecution of this ethnic group.... Even should the Serbian State benevolently put up with or even intend that a part of the population, who in such a situation see no future for themselves or seek to escape coercion, evade abroad, this, by no means represents a programme of persecution aimed at the entire Albanian population (in Kosovo) in its majority."[\[26\]](#)

Already on 29 October 1998, the Administrative Tribunal in Bayern, referring to violence in Kosovo since February 1998, had concluded that "now as before, there is no State programme of persecution aimed at the ethnic Albanians as a group. Not even a regional group persecution aimed at all ethnic Albanians in a specific area of Kosovo....The violent actions of the Yugoslav military and police since February 1998 is aimed at separatist activities and is not proof of persecution of the entire ethnic group of Albanians from Kosovo or a part of it. Yugoslav violence and excesses since February 1998 is a matter of selective violent action against the armed underground movement (particularly KLA) and its surroundings in their territory of operations."[\[27\]](#)

That the 'humanitarian catastrophe' witnessed today is beyond doubt one provoked by the NATO bombardment of Yugoslavia is confirmed in recent reports from foreign observers visiting Yugoslavia and foreign correspondents based in the country. On his return from a visit to Kosovo, Paul-Marie de la Gorce, writer and essayist from France, is categorical that the situation in the province and the subsequent exodus of Kosovo Albanians is not the result of what Western leaders call 'ethnic cleansing': "before the launching of the war the situation was bad, characterised by the activities of KLA and by counter-offensives of the province's militia and later Yugoslav forces....there were population movements provoked by the fighting; there were human losses as always happens in such situations, but it was nothing compared to what happened afterwards." He described the reasons for the exodus as "diverse and complex": "First, the fear of reprisals by Yugoslav forces or the

Serbian population. Second, obviously, the bombardment..it is useless to deny it. We know from experience of contemporary war that bombings force populations to flee whatever their political sentiments. The third reason is the existence of zones of combat. Finally, perhaps wherever there is concentration of the Yugoslav army, it does not wish to see at its side an Albanian population, reputedly hostile."[\[28\]](#)

The thesis of `genocide' advanced by NATO leaders is also rejected by Fatmi Seholi, spokesman for Democratic Initiative of Kosovo, a political party of Kosovo Albanians opposed to KLA's fight for independence. In an interview with Paul Watson, correspondent for `Los Angeles Times',[\[29\]](#) Seholi declared: "As an Albanian, I am convinced that the Serbian government and its security forces are not committing any kind of genocide. But in a war, even innocent people die. In every war, there are those who want to profit. Here there is a minority who wanted to rob, but this is not genocide. These are only crimes." Seholi also pointed out that, after the wave of looting, killings and other types of aggression, the Government had taken measures to restore order and that Albanians have begun to return, often under police protection. If more Kosovo Albanians are not publicly questioning the accusations of `crimes against humanity' made against Yugoslav leaders and security forces, it is also for fear of being killed by KLA, as was Seholi's father who was murdered by KLA in January 1997 apparently for having being "too cooperative" with Serbian authorities.

What NATO powers are also seeking to hide is that the KLA is a ruthless clandestine armed group which, since 1996, was equipped and trained by the German secret service as it did the Croatian militia. Shock troops of the military secret service in Berlin (Kommandos Spezialkrafte) provided operational training, arms, transmission material and black uniforms taken from the stocks of former East Germany's Stasi. At the end of 1998, the US entered into contact with KLA and decided to back, ie, instrumentalise, the organisation. Bases were established in northern Albania and western Macedonia. The KLA made itself known on 11 February 1996, when it claimed responsibility for bomb attacks against five Serbian refugee camps in Krajina. Alone in 1997, the KLA carried out 14 attacks in Kosovo and one in Macedonia. All `traitors' were systematically eliminated. On 7 January 1998, the KLA announced that it will carry the war to Macedonia. In other words, it was fighting not only for the independence of Kosovo but for the creation of a `Greater Albania, which would include Albania, Kosovo, one-

third of Montenegro and the western half of Macedonia. In mid-February 1998, it launched its first major offensive and within 5 months 'liberated' some 30% of the territory. In the 'liberated' areas, KLA prohibited all political parties, physically attacked other minorities, Serbs, gypsies and the goran (Macedonian Muslims), and denounced Ibrahim Rugova, his political party and the Kosovan parliament.[\[30\]](#)

Political leaders, NATO and the media have remained significantly silent about the thousands of Kosovo Albanians who have sought refuge in Belgrade with Serbian families. They have also remained silent about the fact that before the bombardment, more Serbs were fleeing Kosovo than Albanians. In the past 20 years, the Albanian population in Kosovo increased from 70 to 90 per cent. Since the war, alongwith Albanians, Serbs are fleeing Kosovo in their thousands.

### **War, the expansion of capitalism by other means**

The global expansion of corporate interests, manifests itself through the phenomenon of 'globalisation' or 'imperialism', the global expression of capitalism pursued domestically. War in its various forms is the military means by which capitalism acquires vast markets, a permanent supply of cheap labour and raw materials, essential to counteract the inexorable decline in its rate of profit.

In a 1967 report that was subsequently published in 1969 with the title "Undesirable Peace" with a preface by J.K. Galbraith, 15 American experts affirmed that war is the sole technique available today for the stability of capitalism: "War fulfils certain essential functions for the stability of our society....although we do not affirm that, for the economy, it is impossible to imagine a substitute for war, no set of techniques aimed at maintaining control over employment, production and consumption has ever been tried that is even distantly comparable to its efficiency. War was, and is, from far, the essential element of stability in modern societies..."

The global crisis of capitalism, now threatening the United States at the very heart of the system, characterised by a wave of frantic corporate mergers, acquisitions and alliances, could be off-set only through an acceleration of its control over the global economy. The

multiplication of US sanctions is also a reflection of a deflationary global economy which, in other words, means that capitalism is undergoing a crisis of overproduction -- a 'global glut'. Only two months ago, *Time Magazine* published on its front page a picture of Rubin, Greenspan and Summers describing them as "the Committee to Save the World". At the same time, meetings of G-7, the World Economic Forum in Davos and the Bretton Woods institutions acknowledged that a great economic crisis was threatening global capitalism. George Soros shocked Congress recently when he said bluntly, "The global capitalist system ...is coming apart at the seams". [31] The US economy is reaching the end of an economic cycle. It is feared that growth will transform itself into a 'hard landing'. Patrick Artus, chief economist at the 'Caisse des Depots' notes: "The next crisis will probably emerge from the financial bubble and indebtedness of the American economy." [32] This end of the cycle manifests itself paradoxically through extravagant figures in Wall Street. The capitalisation of American stocks rose sharply from 60% of GDP in 1993 to 120% in 1998, and Dow Jones continues to increase without any relation to profits to be gained. The US must, therefore, maintain the domination of the dollar. The war management of the end of the American cycle is strongly supported by European Union countries. In 1998, FF 930 billion left Europe mainly to the United States. In exchange, the European Union removed all trade and other barriers to facilitate mergers by global corporations.

Only ten years after Western capitalist powers declared the 'victory of capitalism' following the fall of the Berlin Wall, the totality of capitalist postulates -- markets, mobility, transparency, trade -- is being increasingly challenged the world over. The challenge to all these 'values' imposed under the guise of 'modernity' was sufficiently important that even the influential financial magazine, *Business Week*, could not ignore it when the global crisis, after Asia and Russia, hit Brazil, in the America's 'backyard': "The American model is attacked everywhere. The market is increasingly perceived as the enemy of growth. Nations are withdrawing from it in order to respond to one of the largest ever destruction of wealth." [33]

That this crisis was seen as a serious threat to American 'national interests' by the political and financial couple, fathers of the so-called "American miracle", is reflected in a statement made by one of them, Robert Rubin, former US Treasury Secretary on 3 June 1998: "I am profoundly concerned -- and I can tell you that the President shares these concerns -- about the weakening of public support for

globalisation at a moment when economic interests, national security and geopolitics of the country require the opposite... Never have so many countries faced so many difficulties at the same time."[\[34\]](#)

In the US, the "high-tech" industry is seen as the engine of the 'crisis-free' new economy. With the threat of a crisis looming ahead, NATO could be the aircraft carrier for US economic interests with the more or less reluctant approval of the European Union. Western Europe and Japan are the chief competitors of the Us in global markets. The European Union's vision of global hegemony is seen as a threat by Washington and the military industry, reflected in the warning by Chairman of Lockheed-Martin, Vance Coffman, about the creation of a "Fortress Europe" as Western European defense industry consolidates.[\[35\]](#) In the context, Washington must find bogeymen to frighten these countries into spending billion on, and investing in, America's military industry and its products. This would simultaneously serve the purpose of rendering Western Europes more dependent on US imperialism as well as ensure the transfer of national income through Wall Street to the military-industrial complex.

President Milosevic's refusal to allow a NATO military presence on Yugoslav territory represented a challenge to US strategy to pursue the process of integrating into NATO, after Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, also Albania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia. For those impoverished countries, £ 22 billion weapons buildup will be required. The beneficiaries will be the world's dominant arms industries of the US and Britain -- the contract for fighter aircraft alone is worth £10 billion. Private sector financing of NATO's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary gala amounted to \$8 million. Corporate chief executives paid \$250,000 to sit on a host committee that included Ameritech, Daimler-Chrysler, Boeing, Ford Motor, General Motors, Honeywell, Lucent Technologies, Motorola, Nextel, SBC communications, TRW and United Technologies.

To Eastern European countries that recently joined NATO, they intend to sell weapons, form networks, elevators, airconditioners, heaters and many other commodities. To the leading NATO war-makers they want to sell cell-phones, two-way radios, military supplies, communication equipments.

War provides the justification for the transfer of public wealth to the



financial and economic elites through the state military establishment, while reducing social spending. Expanding the military system is the preferred device to force the public to subsidise high-technology industry and provide a state-guaranteed market for its production.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the US lost the main justification it gave its people for its huge military budget that served to sustain a substantial portion of the US economy and to maintain the profit levels of the big capitalist corporations. The defence budget had to be reduced and the American people had to be provided with fresh pretexts for maintaining its military arsenals to cope with alleged threats to the security of the United States and the protection of its interests in other parts of the world. Its military and political experts worked out regional strategies and they found regional bogeys in North Korea for East Asia, in Iraq for the Middle East, and of late, in Yugoslavia for Europe. The last mentioned provided the pretext for the resuscitation and strengthening of NATO. Earlier the Gulf War provided the pretext for the production and maintenance of aircraft carriers and sophisticated military aircraft. When India produced a nuclear device even India began to be held out as a potential threat to US security in South Asia. The media and the various groups of academics, journalists and others who serve the economic, political and military interests of the ruling class in the United States, serve to keep the US public continuously mis-informed and so misguided as to the true purposes of the current ruling strata in the US. They do likewise for the rest of the world.

It is this economic context that the US State power, headed by Bill Clinton, has launched its military intervention in Yugoslavia. At the end of 1998, Pentagon announced that the financial crisis in Asia was a "core security concern" for the US. On 20 April 1999, hardly a month into the bombing, the IMF declared that only Europe could offset the inevitable slowdown in the US economy caused by "the adverse external environment".[\[36\]](#) There can be no doubt that the President not only consulted his military strategic advisors, but also his economic strategic before launching the war. There can also be no doubt that Blair, Chirac, Schroder and the rest of the European allies and collaborators of the US state in Europe would themselves have been aware of the economic crisis in which they were called upon to collaborate with the US decision on military intervention. The economic crisis has not been resolved and it will continue to underlie the development of the US war in Europe. Hence, the war against Yugoslavia is a manifestation of a major crisis of capitalism.

Today, the war-mongers are in full cry and the war production industries are being geared for full production which may help to sustain the US military-industrial complex in the first place to stave off the crisis of capitalism that has been threatening. While the war itself creates more business in the short term for the industry, winning the war will ensure the continuous flow of ever greater profits as more countries are brought into the system.

The foreign policy of the United States is intricately linked to the construction of a global system of domination subordinated to the needs of its own economy: "Our interests and our ideals compel us not only to undertake but to direct... We must promote democracy and market economy in the world because it protects our interests and our security, and because it reflects values which are at once American and universal."[\[37\]](#) Hence, American values of markets and democracy are the sole and inseparable values of a universal character. They must therefore be imposed on the rest of the world for their own sake. "What is good for General Motors is good for America", and what is good for America is .....

Once, referring to the world order, Winston Churchill declared that the "defense of democracy and human rights" and "democracy" is successfully achieved once government is in the hands of "the rich men dwelling at peace within their habitations". The political histories of the United States and its allies shows that the concept of democracy promoted by the elites in power -- whether from the right or from the left of the political mainstream -- differs from, and is incompatible with, that aspired to by ordinary working people within these same countries. In capitalist democracies, politics is effectively reduced to interactions among groups of investors who compete for control of the State. Hence, when governments and politicians speak of defending "national security interests", they mean those special interests of one sector only: corporations, financial institutions and other business elites.

The governments that are at war outside are simultaneously fighting another war against their own people inside their countries: dismantling social programmes, public enterprises and services, transferring, through the military system, public funds to advanced industry and to the wealthy sectors generally: aircraft industry and its by-products along with steel and metal generally, electronics,

chemicals, machine tools, automation and robotics and other central components of the industrial economy. Unemployment, under-employment, homelessness, disease, illiteracy is growing rapidly in all these countries.

The US concept of democracy is "closely identified with private, capitalistic enterprise" and 'free markets'. According to Samuel Huntington, "the United States must maintain its international primacy for the benefit of the world because, alone among nations, its national identity is defined by a set of universal political and economic values, namely liberty, democracy, equality, private property, and markets, accordingly the promotion of democracy, human rights and markets are (sic) far more central to American policy than to the policy of any other country."[\[38\]](#)

In line with these 'values', the United States has not hesitated to sue force wherever the interests of its corporate elite have been threatened. The historical record of the US and its Western European allies shows that a solicitous concern for democracy and human rights may go hand in hand with tolerance for large-scale slaughter, or direct participation in it, as in Latin America, Marcos in the Philippines, enthusiastic backing for General Suharto's mass murder in East Timor and Indonesia, Mobutu in Zaire. Yesterday, elected governments were subverted and overthrown in Guatemala, Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Chile, Laos, and large-scale terror organised against democracy and independence in Nicaragua, Cuba and elsewhere![\[39\]](#) The enemies are invariably 'rogue states', 'Communists', 'nationalists', 'fascists', 'fundamentalists', 'psychopaths', etc., but never 'democrats'!

The double-standard of Western capitalist democracies does not allow them to act in favour of 800,000 Kurds who have fled a war with almost 30,000 dead, or in favour of 855,124 children who, according to UNICEF, have died in Iraq between 1991 and 1997 because of the embargo. Today, two-thirds of the world's population is under one form or other of US sanctions.[\[40\]](#) What credibility can then be accorded when 'moral values' and 'humanitarianism' is invoked by the US and its European collaborators to justify the aggression against the peoples of the Balkans: "this campaign is being fought for a set of human values -- to assert that there are some crimes so heinous that the community of nations will act to punish them even when they occur within national borders."[\[41\]](#)

Under the guise of safeguarding Europe against so-called 'ethnic cleansing' in Yugoslavia, NATO is engaged in 'political cleansing' of an intractable ruling regime in Yugoslavia. So far Milosevic remains while the country's economic infrastructure, industrial base and civilian infrastructure is being demolished and its peoples -- irrespective of ethnic origins -- terrorised.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the unification of Germany, the disintegration of the former Soviet Union, and with former socialist countries of Eastern Europe eager to join the Western club, the US strategy for domination had to adapt. The Clinton Doctrine announced in September 1993 by National Security Adviser, Anthony Lake, reflected this shift from 'containment' to 'enlargement' ('roll-back' in the case of Russia), 'consolidation' and 'perfection': "Throughout the Cold War, we contained a global threat to market democracies: now we should seek to enlarge their reach'. A year later, he expanded this concept: the "new world" opening before us "presents immense opportunities" to move forward to "consolidate the victory of democracy and open markets". Salina Khan, writing in *USA Today*, pointed out that many US corporations, particularly defense contractors such as Lockheed Martin Corp have played "an active role....in the move to enlarge NATO beyond its traditional US-Western European axis."

In the view of the Americans, the Eurasian continent which extends upto China and including India, constitutes the pivot of the world. The importance of controlling this region is justified by the fact that "it contains approximately 75% of the world's population ....the greater part of the physical wealth in the form of corporations or raw material deposits. The global GNP of the continent amounts for some 60% of the global total. Three-quarters of the world's known energy resources is concentrated there.... After the US, six of the most prosperous economies and six largest defence budgets are to be found there, including all holders of nuclear weapons... All the political and/or economic rivals of the United States as well. Their cumulative power far surpasses that of the United States. Happily for the latter, the continent is too vast to realise its political unity."[\[42\]](#)

In the words of Zbigniew Brzezinski, Security Adviser to former US President Carter and member of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, "Eurasia remains the chess-board upon which

the struggle for global primacy takes place.... As Eurasia is situated in the centre of the world, whoever controls this continent will control the planet... The appearance of a rival in Eurasia capable of dominating this continent and defying America will put into question its objectives."[\[43\]](#)

This concern is part of US strategic objectives to `roll-back' the influence of Russia, which it intends to continue to isolate. Brzezinski see three reasons for this. First, it is the region that links the Eurasia from East to West. Secondly, Russia and the former Soviet Republics still under its influence contain vast deposits of natural resources. Thirdly, political instability in Russia is such that there could be a threat of nationalists or Communists taking power. Weakening Russia, even a capitalist one, is the condition for the unrivalled pillage of Eurasia. Brzezinski proposes that Russia be dismantled in three parts, European, Asian and Central.[\[44\]](#) Controlling Yugoslavia would also deprive Russia of its principal support in the Balkans as well as important access to the Mediterranean Sea. In 1992, Caspar Weinberger, former US Defence Secretary, wrote "if Moscow succeeds in dominating the Caspian Sea (and its petrol), this victory could be more important than the enlargement of the West was for the Occident". Rolling back Russia is part of strategy of global domination to impose control over a vast `Eurasian' region representing 75% of the world's population and 60% of global production. Controlling this vast region to guarantee US leadership is, according to Brzezinski, to ensure domination of the whole world.

Despite promises made by the Western capitalist countries to bring prosperity to Eastern Europe and countries of the former Soviet Union, the objective of the imperialist powers -- United States and Germany, in particular -- is to turn this vast region of the world into suppliers of cheap labour force and to exploit its vital raw material for the benefit of transnational capital. Russia's potential resources in raw material alone is estimated at US \$140,000 billion![\[45\]](#) NATO's warning in 1991 to the rising challenge to its economic model was clear: "we will continue to support, with all means available to us, the reforms undertaken in the East and efforts aimed at creating market economies"[\[46\]](#)

The hostility of China and Russia toward NATO intervention in Yugoslavia under US leadership must be seen in this context. The region coveted by the America is of strategic importance for both

these countries. In an unprecedented recent acknowledgement in an official newspaper, China indicated that it will need to import 40% of its oil by 2010, up from less than 20 now.[\[47\]](#) Hence, securing a stable supply of oil and gas will become a central factor in China's foreign policy. The basis of China's energy security strategy is to diversify sources of supply increasingly toward Russia, Central Asia, Iran and the Middle East. The strategic importance for China of the republics of Central Asia, especially Kazakhstan, goes beyond the fact that they are rich in oil. They also border China's Moslem dominated north-west region. Hence, the view among many Chinese officials that NATO aggression against Yugoslavia is aimed at expanding its sphere of affluence: "Where will NATO stop? Will they next intervene in Azerbaijan or may be in Tajikistan on China's border?", as one Chinese official.[\[48\]](#) The People's Liberation Army has also recently called for a review of its military strategy in the light of the war against Yugoslavia. Over time, control over the South China Sea through which oil tankers supplying its ports must pass, would also become crucial for China.

Control over the evolution of a new international order constitutes one of the challenges of the war. Yugoslavia holds a strategic position in the Balkans, a region that is vital for the further expansion of capital. US control over the region will be guaranteed through the imposition of its military bases in the Balkans. The region not only represents a market to be conquered and source of raw material to be pillaged. It also controls key points of access to the Near and Middle-East through its main navigation routes and infrastructure to major oil resources in the region of growing tension for the United States. Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan and Azerbaijan are reported to contain oil and gas reserves equivalent to that of the Gulf region today. Already in 1992, the US Senator, Robert Dole, declared that the frontiers of American concern to control oil and gas resources had advanced from the Gulf region "towards the North and including the Caucasius, Siberia and Kazakhstan!" Access to the Caucasius through the Black Sea is possible through the Danube, where Yugoslavia occupies a strategic position, and/or Kosovo through which a new US sponsored pipeline project is planned.

In the logic of imperialist expansion, Yugoslavia represents an obstacle in the region for the United States and its main allies. Although the Government of Yugoslavia has been open to privatisation of public enterprise, it has remained opposed to a radical change in social property.[\[49\]](#) Quentin Peel points out that "with the one glaring exception", practically all countries of the

former Soviet bloc in Central Europe have either joined or are seeking to join the European Union. Peel continues, "NATO leaders will undoubtedly be obsessed with this exception"[50] presented. The aim of European Union leader Germany's "stability pact" for the Balkans is precisely to bring Yugoslavia within its orbit of control: to create "lasting conditions for democracy, a market economy and regional cooperation" that would tie south-eastern European countries "firmly in the Euro-Atlantic structures".[51] In a similar vein, at its recent summit, NATO announced that it planned to upgrade its security relations with Balkan countries through its partnership for peace programmes.

This must be taken into account in taking a broader approach to geo-strategic concerns for global domination. The eruption of China in the diplomatic process since the attack against its Embassy in Belgrade reflects not only the international character of the war and the stakes involved, but also the place held by China not only as permanent member of the UN Security Council. As cynically stated by Brzezinski, "the fact is that the stakes are infinitely more than simply the future of Kosovo".[52]

Beyond the credibility of NATO's action in Yugoslavia and NATO itself, there is fear about the emergence of a potential danger in the near future: the birth of a large coalition between China and Russia and perhaps Iran, in an anti-hegemonic coalition. "In order to avoid this eventuality, unlikely today, the US must deploy all its geo-strategic abilities along the perimeters of Eurasia or, at least, in the West, East and South". "But a Sino-Japanese axis, even a localized one, would have greater consequences. It could only emerge from a collapse of the US defence system in the Far-East and out of a radical re-orientation of Japanese foreign policy."[53] It is easy to understand why, right in the middle of the war against Yugoslavia, the Diet approved new legislation on military cooperation between US and Japan re-orientating the objectives of the alliance to enlarge the possibility of intervention and logistical support for Japan's military self-defence system and in case of crisis that could affect American `security' in the region!

When President Milosevic refused to permit NATO troops to occupy Yugoslavia, it was clear that the total subordination of the country could be achieved only through the massive destruction of its economic base. Where politics fail to bring a country to its knees, war becomes the necessary means. Seen in its global context,

Yugoslavia is not just a part of the Balkans but a part of Western Europe, i.e., capitalist Europe, which next to the United States, is a principal supporter of global capitalism. In effect, Yugoslavia has been chosen as the pretext for the US military intervention in Europe.

The destruction of the economic base of Yugoslavia would permit the entry of American and Western European capital to `re-build' the country. But that is not all. The war also shows that US capital must, in order to counteract decline in profit rates, gain or re-gain control over the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services. Not surprisingly public enterprises or recently nationalised private enterprises have become targets for NATO bombs, justified by Pentagon spokesman, Kenneth Bacon, because of the "control" by President Milosevic of "the entire economic sector"! Hence, among the targets of NATO are Galenika (the recently nationalised pharmaceutical company owned by US corporation ICN of Pasadena, California), the automobile company Zastava, a cigarette factory and tobacco warehouses in Nis, the C-chain of food stores, the Beopetrol chain of petrol outlets, Technogas and Progres which imports Russian gas, Jugopetrol which refines and distributes petroleum products, Sartid steel plant of Smederevo, etc etc.

The steel industry is a significant example of how the war will enable the US steel industry to counteract declining profit rates by wielding control over global production. The steel industry is facing profound challenges in the global economy. Declining profits with growing global overcapacity and prices plunging in a deflationary spiral have sparked the erection of tariff walls and `anti-dumping measures'. Much of the growing global overcapacity is concentrated in Eastern Europe, then Asia, then Western Europe. In 1998, the US urged the European Union to impose duties on Serbian steel, imports of which increased by 77% in the first six months. Paul Wilhelm, President of US Steel Group, speaking for his industry at a high-level meeting at the White House in November proclaimed, "we are in a crisis", a warning that is being echoed in Europe.

### **A war on American terms**

The American strategy of global expansion and domination requires that it be "inside" not against Europe. Zbignew Brezinski writes: "the central problem for America is to build an Europe founded on



viable relations linked to the United States in order to extend the international system of democratic cooperation upon which will depend the exercise of global hegemony of America.

The 'Washington Consensus' on the subject reflected in a report of the new US Council on Foreign Relations is that: "the United States should draw Europe, over time, much further into a global strategic partnership to help shape the international system in the new era". William Wallace, professor of international relations at the London School of Economics points out that "this is to be a partnership on American terms".<sup>[54]</sup> Hence, in relation to the NATO's war against Yugoslavia, the date and hour, the strategic objectives, the use of airpowers and missiles, were all decided by the US President and his chiefs of staff!<sup>[55]</sup> The 'new strategic concept' adopted the recent NATO Summit allows the US to preserve peace and reinforce security and stability "throughout the Euro-Atlantic region", which includes the 19 alliance members and 28 other countries with whom it has partnership arrangements.

That the 'partnership' whether with Western Europe or Japan will be on American terms, with the latter playing the role of 'junior partner' is evident in measures that the United States continues to take against its economic rivals that seek to cash in on the crisis. Sanctions against European partners aimed at forcing open their markets for genetically modified organisms and dollar-bananas. Threats to the Japanese steel industry to impose tariffs of up to 17,86 to 61,14 per cent of the value of certain products. Even before the decision is taken by the US International Trade Commission, exporters are being obliged to pay the tariff. On the military front the United States has sought to prevent the emergence of an independent Western European military force. A crucial consideration for the US is to ensure that any potential threat is brought first to NATO, giving it a right of "first refusal". The creation in June 1996 of an European group of a multinational military force within NATO in June 1996 ensured that all military decisions taken by Europe is authorised by Washington. Although the Group is under the authority of the Western European Union (WEU), it can only be used with the approval of NATO, ie, only with the approval of Washington. At the recent NATO summit, agreement was reached that the European build up their military unity primarily within NATO and not separately under the EU.

The recognition by Western Europe of US leadership within NATO

applies also in the domain of logistics, infrastructure and in research and development. The share of the defense budget spent by the United States on research and development is almost four times superior to that spent by the EU countries, with the latter spending US \$10 billion and the former US \$36 billion.

The shared economic and political interests between the United States and its Western European allies manifests itself in the 'New Transatlantic Marketplace' and the related 'Transatlantic Partnership on Political Cooperation', in which agreement extends to even the use of force and unilateral coercive measures wherever their economic interests are threatened. The military machinery to 'defend' these shared interests is NATO. In other words, the Transatlantic Economic Partnership is to the economy what NATO is to the military.

NATO today has transformed itself from a defensive arm of the alliance to an offensive arm. The message is clear. Any challenge to American interests, even neutrality reflected in a refusal to be incorporated within its area of power, as in the case of Yugoslavia, will be met with bombs!

The 'new strategic concept' adopted at the NATO Summit in April 1999 in Washington for the first time enlarges its scope of intervention to include 'crisis management', providing a new justification for its existence and perenniality. In other words, intervention in the internal affairs of a State when a crisis in that country threatens the interests of the United States and its 'junior partners'. As a global power with economic interests to defend all over the world, the US considers that it is directly responsible for maintaining global "stability" which it alone is capable of guaranteeing.<sup>[56]</sup> That the concept is not new but is part of US imperialist strategy is reflected in the joint declaration of 1996 of Clinton and the Prime Minister of Japan, Hashimoto, re-orientating the objectives of the US-Japanese military alliance to enlarge the possibility of intervention in case of crisis that could affect American 'security' in the region! The recent NATO summit only provides 'post facto' legitimisation for the concept put into effect in US aggression in Iraq, Sudan, Afghanistan and Yugoslavia.

## Winners and losers

In *USA Today* of 15 April 1999, Salina Khan wrote, "The US's defence equipment such as the satellite-guided smart bombs has stolen the international spotlight as NATO airforces pound Serbian forces. That could mean increased foreign interest in US military equipment." Stock prices of the large military manufacturers shot up in the first few weeks of the war. Raytheon was up 17%, Boeing 12%, Lockheed Martin 8%. On 16 April 1999, Boeing, only recently in trouble, announced a surprising ninefold rise in first-quarter profits and a further sharp rise in its stock prices! Dassault saw its capitalisation on the stock market jump by Francs 700 million! Raytheon spokesperson, David Shea, said "We are expecting the Kosovo conflict to result in new orders downstream". Out of the extra emergency funds for the war effort, Raytheon will be siphoning off approximately \$420 million. This is why the US Administration continues to insist that military security and international competitiveness of the economy are linked.

Mostly unreported, the bombing of Serbia and Kosovo provides a valuable laboratory for the Anglo-American arms business. More arms contracts have already been approved by the Blair Government than by the Tories, with two-thirds of the arms exports going to regimes with a paling human rights record such as the dictatorship in Jakarta.

The new strategic concept of NATO will allow Washington to impose upon its allies, i.e., to sell its vision of the war baptised "Joint Vision 201". At present, the total defense budget of the EU member states only half that of the US. In electronic information and common system which are increasingly becoming, the dominant weapon, most European countries are considerably behind. This must hence be remedied through the encouragement of mergers, modernisation of equipment and diversification of the weapons system, which will be led by large US corporate groups. They will also be imposed upon new members and future candidates that the NATO Summit decided to rapidly incorporate, ie, all countries of Central Europe, former Soviet Republics and the Balkans with the exception, of course, of Yugoslavia.

"Money must go to those who cooperate, those who combat the

nationalist logic and share a basic philosophy compatible with Europe" affirms Jacques Rupnik.[\[57\]](#) The intangible principle will be 'conditionality'. "It is necessary to be concrete and create joint-ventures everywhere."[\[58\]](#) On the basis of these considerations and these principles, the door is largely open for enterprises, many of which have already been mobilised. This is case of German corporations already on the spot to evaluate the market. The Americans have at their own disposal an efficient arm, the Civilian Military Cooperation (CIMIC). This structure brings together reserve officers and senior executives who have been sent to the field to build action programmes for reconstruction. In fact, they are there to prepare for the arrival of US corporations.

The damage caused by the war to the economies of the countries of the Balkans gives an indication of the profits to be made by these corporations in that region.

NATO targets have not been limited to military machinery of the Yugoslav Government. Targets have included industrial plants, warehouses, airports, electricity and telecommunication facilities, television stations, drinking water facilities, railways, bridges, fertiliser and other chemical factories, oil refineries, fuel depots, schools, hospitals, day care centres, a refugee camp housing several hundred Serb refugees from Croatia, public transport, residential areas in all major cities, villages, thousands of dwellings, government buildings, museums, monasteries and churches.

According to Michel Chossudovsky, thirteen of the country's major hospitals were among hospitals and health-care institutions bombed. More than 150 schools, including pre-primary day care centres, had been damaged or destroyed and more than 800,000 pupils and students were not able to attend schools. Historical and cultural landmarks on the UNESCO Heritage list which have been targeted by NATO included the 14<sup>th</sup> century Gracanica monastery, the 13<sup>th</sup> century Pec Patriarchate, the Rakovica monastery and the Petrovarardin Fortress.[\[59\]](#)

According to the Yugoslav news agency, Tanjug, 500,000 people have lost their jobs. In a total population of ten million, two million are without any source of income to ensure even minimum living conditions. Guy Dinmore reports that most state workers are receiving only half their salaries and payments of pensions are

delayed.[\[60\]](#)

Alarming reports point to imminent threats of starvation in Yugoslavia. FAO and the World Food Programme have raised the alarm that soon the people, again only referring to Kosovo (!) will be starving. The war has devastated agriculture production, destroyed farming equipment and fertiliser factories, rendered useless agricultural machinery without fuel, devastated transport infrastructure leading to the collapse of internal food distribution. The planting of 2,5 million hectares of land has been halted as water, soil and air have become poisoned as more than a hundred highly toxic chemical compounds have been released by the NATO bombings of refineries, fertiliser facilities and other chemical plants. Yugoslavia's New Green Party scientist, Luka Radoja, pointed out that "the NATO bombings is happening just as many crops vital for survival are supposed to be planted: corn, sunflower, soy, sugar beets and vegetables."[\[61\]](#)

The collapse of agricultural production within the country raises the spectre of absolute dependence of the people of Yugoslavia, for a long time to come, on the very criminals blasting them with bombs! Food would soon become a new weapon in the hands of the imperialist powers, prohibited by international law.

On 17 May 1999, the Government of Yugoslavia announced that it had been able to identify the bodies of over 1,300 civilians killed by NATO bombs.[\[62\]](#) The real figures will however be higher. All ethnic groups have suffered civilian casualties. Kosovo Albanians have not been spared. According to the Decany Monastery in Kosovo, a NATO Cruise missile hit the old town of Djakovic, mostly inhabited by Albanians, and several Albanian houses were destroyed. Even vehicles carrying Albanian refugees have not been spared.

Since NATO attacks began against Kosovo, Serbia and Montenegro, some 785,000 refugees are estimated to have fled the country, according to UNHCR. Thousands of others have been displaced within the country itself. Western media have ignored the number of Serbs who have fled Kosovo or other parts of the country being bombed or who have become refugees inside the country.

The extent of damage caused to the health of the population and the

environment by poisonous gas emissions or by radioactive weapons used by NATO cannot even begin to be estimated. People in places like Belgrade have been asked to wear gas masks to protect themselves from poisonous gas emitted by chemical and pharmaceutical industries, refineries and warehouses storing liquid raw material and chemicals, which have been destroyed by NATO. Furthermore, the bombing of drinking water facilities have totally cut off drinking water supplies in Novi Sad and vastly reduced the supply in Belgrade. Many parts of the country are without electricity or heating. Hospitals are reported to be using emergency generators.

In addition, internationally banned weapons such as cruise missiles with depleted uranium (DU) are being used. According to radiobiologist, Dr. Rosalie Bertell, President of the International Institute of Concern for Public Health, "When used in war, the DU bursts into flame...releasing a deadly radioactive aerosol of uranium, unlike anything seen before. It can kill everyone in a tank... This radioactive ceramic can stay deep in the lungs for years, irradiating the tissue with powerful alpha particles within about a 30 micron sphere, causing emphysema and/or fibrosis. The ceramic can also be swallowed and do damage to the gastro-intestinal tract. In time, it penetrates the lung tissue and enters into the blood stream.... It can also initiate cancer or promote cancers which have been initiated by other carcinogens". In southern Iraq, where Americans used the depleted uranium missile, leukemia in children and birth deformities have risen to match the levels after Hiroshima. According to Paul Sullivan, Executive Director of the National Gulf War Resource Center, "In Yugoslavia, it is expected that depleted uranium will be fired in agricultural areas, places where livestock graze and where crops are grown, thereby introducing the spectre of possible contamination of the food chain."[\[63\]](#)

Despite the Blair Government's ban on landmines, the Royal Air Force is using the BL 755 'multi-purpose' cluster bomb which is an air dropped land-mine. Dropped from the air, the BL 755 explodes into dozens of little mines shaped like spiders. Those are scattered over a wide area and kill and maim people who step on them, children especially.

The case of Montenegro, member of the Yugoslav Federation, reveals to some extent the human tragedy triggered by the imperialist powers. Out of a total labour force of 120,000 - 75,000 are unemployed, 30,000 receive wages only episodically, a large majority

of the 80,000 retired have neither social security coverage nor pensions. The average monthly wage is between DM 120 and 150, when the vital minimum is estimated at DM 450. The pressure of 117,000 refugees for a population of 650,000, would equal 14 million refugees for a country like France. Hepatite-C and tuberculosis is rapidly propagating, especially in Podgorica. And the social budget in Montenegro has been exhausted. Today, the market of its principal partner Serbia is closed for upto 90% of its products. Economic production is functioning only at 15-20% of its full capacity. Railway transport has come to a halt. Road transport is at a standstill. Telephones function only rarely. NATO has prohibited activities of shipping companies and fishermen cannot leave the ports of Montenegro. The threat of famine looms ahead for the winter of 1999. Civil war is imminent.

Western sources estimate the destruction of property at more than US \$100 billion. On 25 April 1999, NATO officials evaluated the cost of reconstruction of bridged, routes and buildings bombed in Serbia at DM 13 billion (6,64 billion Euros). In mid-May, the Yugoslav government estimated damages in Belgrade alone at US \$10 billion. [\[64\]](#) According to the Vienna Institute for the International Economy, should the war end today, the recession will rise to 20% in 1999. [\[65\]](#)

After one and a half months of bombing, the repercussions on economic activity in the Balkans are already considerable. If the loss in GNP is 27% for Serbia and Montenegro, it will be 20% for Bosnia-Herzegovina, 9% for Albania, 8% for Macedonia, 4% for Bulgaria and 3,3% for Rumania. [\[66\]](#)

Neighbouring countries and peoples have not been spared the 'punishment'. Imperialist aggression has also created a 'humanitarian catastrophe' in countries neighbouring Yugoslavia. Economic dislocation, political destabilisation and social disruption is part of a strategy for which a heavy cost must be paid by the peoples of the Balkans. The consequences are not simply an indirect by-product of the war against Yugoslavia. Destruction and dislocation is an intended objective of imperialist strategy to enable a permanent occupation of the region as a guarantee for the expansion of Western capital into 'Euro-Asia', a region that extends up to China and Japan and which first of all implies control over the Mediterranean Sea, the Near and the Middle East and their vast wealth of natural resources, raw material and cheap labour for a capitalist system facing near-collapse.

The neighbouring countries are confronted with the disruption of trade flows and flight of investment capital. The already fragile economies of the Balkans are at risk of breakdown, one after another, under the shock of the war in Yugoslavia.

With their economies in a state of near-collapse, most countries are turning to the IMF and the World Bank for new loans; the accompanying conditionalities will bring the peoples of these countries to their knees. The human and environmental catastrophe awaiting the peoples of the Balkans cannot as yet be estimated. Yugoslavia's New Green Party scientist, Luka Radoja, warned that "the entire Balkan ecosystem" is in danger as a result of the bombings by NATO of refineries, fertiliser facilities and other chemical plants in Yugoslavia.

With regard to the costs of the war and the aftermath, the only recent reference available to experts is the Gulf War. That war cost US \$61 billion for the Americans, but they were reimbursed US \$54 billion by countries of the Gulf, Japan and Germany. According to Gavin Davis, economist at Goldman Sachs, on this basis, a ground operation of six months would cost around US \$80 billion.[\[67\]](#) Three-quarters of the bill, around Francs 360 billion, will be paid by the EU. Obviously that cost will increase budget deficits and consumer morale will be affected as it happened with the Gulf War.

The war will have a major impact on the economies of NATO member countries. The average cost of the war is estimated on 20 April 1999 by Merrill Lynch at US \$200 million a day. But these figures underestimate the real cost of the war, that is the cost of establishing a protectorate in Kosovo. According to Mr. Schmieding, economist at Merrill Lynch, "the real risk is in fact a degradation of consumer confidence in Europe anxious about the duration of the war, the reaction of Russia and eventually Western losses on the ground." Should consumer confidence and internal demand decline in Europe before a revival of exports, then growth in the Euro Zone could, instead of rising upto 2.5%, decline upto 1% by the end of 1999: "the risk is worth considering."

According to the IMF and the World Bank, the prejudice to Yugoslavia's neighbours would be approximately US \$1,6 billion should the war continue until the end of the year, and US \$800



million if it stops in a few weeks. This has led Michel Camdessus, Director General of IMF, to launch the idea of a 'Marshall Plan' to finance Yugoslavia's neighbours. The European Union has already released Francs 1,6 billion (250 million Euros). Although no figures exist at present for the costs of the plan, the *Times of London* estimates it at 22 billion Euros.

The US Congress has just approved a substantial US \$112 billion increase in its defence budget for the next five years, the largest since the beginning of the 1980s. President Clinton has received an additional US \$6 billion to cover military operations for the rest of this fiscal year. As at 19 April 1999, France was spending an extra Francs 250 to 300 million per month for its war effort, covering only expenditure for some 6,000 personnel placed at NATO's disposal, several warships and over 50 aircraft. The figures do not include costs related to maintenance of material, replacement of used munition, humanitarian operations and France's contribution to NATO's expenditure.

Varying estimates from military and other sources to cover the war costs against Yugoslavia between now and 30 September range between US \$4 and 8 billion. The cost of the F-117 lost over Yugoslavia was estimated at US \$70 million! Its European NATO allies spent US \$10 billion of their defence budget on research and development compared with US \$36 billion in the US. All this at the expense of public services, social programmes and employment.

Peace will cost more than the war. As of now, one question is posed. Who will finance the 'Marshall Plan' for the Balkans? What Western experts call "the building project of the century" is expected to last ten years and cost approximately US \$30 billion. Thirty-three countries are concerned and seven institutions, from the World Bank to the EBRD, all meeting in the so-called Balkan Committee since April 1999. The new President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, has proposed a first annual plan of aid amounting to Francs 34 billion to be financed from the EU budget. However, parameters such as the duration of the war and the extent of damage cannot be controlled. As stated simply by the Bulgarian President, Peter Stojanov: "It is necessary to get the Balkans out of the Balkans in order to integrate it into the dynamic of Europe".[\[68\]](#)

The European Central Bank and Brussels Commission have imposed

budgetary disciplines on European Union members. On 16 April 1999, the European Central Bank issued a sharp warning that governments in the Euro-zone are close to breaching the budget deficit limit and priority should now be given to making structural reforms, particularly to remove "structural rigidities" in the labour market! For instance, Germany's budget deficit for 1999 is DM 4,7 billion, that is, just below the ceiling.

At the same time, the value of the Euro has declined. The reasons include withdrawal of American and Asian investors from a Europe at war to safer markets, fear that economic consequences of the war will result in a crisis in consumer confidence, and fear for the budgetary consequences of European member States. The behaviour of financial markets will further reduce the margin of manoeuvre to raise the necessary finances for the Plan.

All the remaining options available to the European Union will imply that the costs of the war will have to be borne by the working people and marginalised social groups: increasing interest rates for loans or decreasing the discount rate, increasing the tax burden on the general public, diverting public funds from social expenditure or reducing labour costs; or doing all three simultaneously. Already on 8 April 1999, the European Central Bank reduced its discount rate by half a point. France meanwhile raised the 10 year interest rates for State loans by from 3.90% to 3.99%. The costs of these measures will be borne by working people as the money available for economic activity declines.

In any event, in the capitalist West, whether Europe or North America, the working people will be called upon to bear the costs of a war waged on behalf of corporate power! The call for 'sacred national unity' in the countries participating in the aggression is aimed at suppressing any opposition to the war and frightening the domestic enemy (the general population) sufficiently so that they would agree to bear the costs of programmes to which they are opposed. The war will serve to obtain consensus on the dismantling of social programmes, public enterprises and services.

The war has created an unprecedented 'humanitarian market' for transnational corporations as working people buy thousands of tonnes of food and consumer products from supermarkets to send to the refugees from Kosovo. Aid in whatever form -- individual,

government or NGO -- is eventually paid out of the pockets of ordinary working people. With rising unemployment, declining real incomes and growing impoverisation in the Western capitalist countries, transnational capital, the war is the ideal device to extract profits from the working people -- of course, all in the name of 'democratic' values!

The IMF and the World Bank, using public funds, have been mobilised to win over Yugoslavia's neighbours in support of the war effort. A US \$450 million deal has been struck by IMF with Romania, paving the way for a US \$250 million World Bank loan and US \$150-200 million loans from Western banks. The World Bank has opened a line of credit of up to Francs 600 million for Albania and Macedonia. The Paris Club has already decided on a moratorium on the debt owed by Albania and Macedonia.[\[69\]](#) However, Albania has estimated the loans it will need to maintain its economy at US \$820 million. Bulgaria will ask for US \$300 million in extra balance of payments support. But, Serbia and Montenegro are excluded from international aid because...they don't belong to the Bretton Woods institutions. Along with their larger involvement in the Balkans with the EU, the role of these institutions in seeking to neutralise Russia has been significant. Suspended in August 1998 after the Russian debt moratorium, the IMF and the World Bank have decided to resume their loans to Moscow. The Agreement of Principle will enable the release of US \$7.5 billion fresh liquidity from private creditors, the IMF and the World Bank and open the way for rescheduling of Russia's foreign debt by the Paris Club. This will increase the total amount of financial aid to Russia to US \$23 to 24 billion.

### **Oppose NATO's War**

On 23 April 1999, NATO celebrated its 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary in Washington with the objective of receiving endorsement for its new strategic concept. On this occasion, the organisation was determined to claim victory. According to Zbignew Brezenski, "it is not unreasonable to affirm that the failure of NATO will simultaneously mean an end to the credibility of the Alliance and weaken global American leadership. The consequences will be devastating for the stability of the planet."

Brent Scowcroft, former national security adviser for George Bush,

pointed out that NATO's very survival is at stake. Warning that failure in Kosovo could result in "tensions that could lead even to a rupture" among allies, Scowcroft argued in favour of sending ground forces to Yugoslavia. Ivo Daalder, Director of Brookings Institute in Washington, added that the failure of NATO to bend President Milosevic would question its capacity to fight against "global threats such as nuclear proliferation, international terrorism or the interruption of energy supplies". What is stake in Yugoslavia is also whether "the United States and its allies have the will to shape the world in conformance without interests and our principles?"<sup>[70]</sup> All objectives that the Clinton Administration intends to assume!

For a long time, the US Administration has been seriously envisaging the Constitution of 'pure ethnic entities' to solve the problem of the Balkans. The project is not totally foreign to the idea of a new federation of the Balkans which could extend to a re-designing of the frontier. The Dayton Accord for Bosnia has been described as containing the premises of such a project: "A Muslim Bosnia under US tutelage, a Serbian enclave under NATO military control, the creation of a 'Great Albania' under US tutelage, which would leave the North of Kosovo with its mineral resources to the Serbs and the South to an Albanian entity."<sup>[71]</sup> But what will be the consequences, when in Macedonia a quarter of the population is Albanian? What will happen in Greece where the nationalists consider Macedonia as their own? What will happen in Bulgaria where the authorities claim that a third of the Macedonian population is ethnically Bulgarian? Hence, the realisation of the US project for the Balkans will inevitably require a massive and permanent presence of NATO forces in the region. It also requires that the present Government of President Milosevic and Milosevic himself must go. This was confirmed by Madeleine Albright on NBC: "I consider that this is more and more the real question and is something we are concentrating on."

The imperialist war against Yugoslavia is the military manifestation of the logic of capitalism, the expansion of which has become more than ever urgent today with an imminent threat at home of the financial crisis that hit South-East Asia, Latin America and Russia. With the development of the crisis, the dominant system is increasingly forced to intervene in order to control and to orient national policies in strategic areas: economic, financial, monetary, trade. This is the mission now imparted on the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation,

which in its forthcoming Millennium Round will focus on this new mission.

The war against Yugoslavia is the first war waged by the 'new global Robocop' for so-called 'universal values' on behalf of the 'international community'. As such, it poses a challenge not only to the peoples of Europe, on whose soil it is being fought; it also poses a challenge to all peoples of the world, in whose name it is being waged. The challenge posed is whether humanity should live under conditions dictated by imperialist powers or whether it should mobilise and join forces in order to resist the logic of a global order designed to meet the needs of corporate interests and to build a society that can harness the world's productive forces to meet social needs.

\*Tania Noctiummes is an Economist attached to the United Nations.

\*\* Jean Pierre Page is a trade unionist and member until 1999 of the Executive Committee of CGT. He is also member of the Executive Council of Espace Marx, Chief Editor of 'Syndicalisme et societe' and member of the Editorial Committee of 'Recherches Internationales'.

---

[1] Rupert Cornwell, "Diplomacy staggers out of the rubble", *The Independent on Sunday*, 9.5.99.

[2] "Washington veut confiner l'ONU dans un role strictement humanitaire," *Le Monde*, 10.5.99

[3] Arnaud Leparmentier, "Gerhard Schroder assure que 'le role de l'Allemagne dans la monde a change", *Le Monde*, 21.4.99

[4] de la Gorce, Paul-Marie, "Histoire secrete des negociations de Rambouillet", in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, May, 1999.

[5] The existence of the military section of the Rambouillet Accord was first revealed by the German daily, Tageszeitung, on 6 April 1999, two weeks after NATO aggression. The full text, which was extracted from NATO's electronic server, appeared in the daily's website. Since then, the document is said to have 'mysteriously' disappeared from NATO's server! In France, which co-presided Rambouillet with the British, the Foreign Ministry under pressure from parliamentarians to release the text responded first that the text was not available in French, and later that "in virtue of a position of principle adopted with the British, we have decided not to

publish the text. Since it was not signed by one of the two parties, we cannot in effect consider it to be final" (L'Humanite, 30 April-2 May, 1999)

[6] Becker, Richard, "A Declaration of War disguised as a peace agreement", International Action Center, <http://www.iacenter.org>

[7] *Yugoslav Daily Survey*, No. 2004, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Belgrade, 16 January 1999

[8] *Le Figaro*, 20 and 23 January 1999

[9] "Bodies of those killed at Racak were moved", *Guardian*, 22 January 1999

[10] "Kosovo: obscure areas of a massacre, *Figaro*, 20.1.99; "Les morts de Racak ont-ils vraiment ete massacres froidement?" *Le Monde*, 21.1.99; "Neuf questions sur les mort de Racak", *Liberation*, 21.1.99; "Die Krieg um die 40 Toten von Racak im Kosovo Massaker oder `nur' die opfer eines Tages?" *Die Welt*, 21-22.1.99; *Guardian*, 22.1.1999; *Los Angeles Times*

[11] *Guardian*, 22.1.1999

[12] Roland Heine and Thomas Gutz, `OSZE-Vertreter widerlegen Walker', *Berliner Zeitung*, 13 March 1999

[13] NTV contact programme "Schlagzeilen"

[14] *Yugoslav Daily Survey*, No. 2005, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Belgrade, 17 January 1999

[15] Ronald Heine, "Fragwürdiger Umgang mit einer Tragodie", *Berliner Zeitung*, 12 March 1999; Claudius Technau, `der brisante Bericht der Pathologin', *Berliner Zeitung*, 16 March 1999; Genaues will man nicht wissen", *Junge Welt*, 18 March 1999, Nr. 65

[16] "Ob es ein Massaker war, will keiner mehr wissen", *Welt*, 8 March 1999

[17] Claudius Technau, `der brisante Bericht der Pathologin', *Berliner Zeitung*, 16 March 1999

[18] Otto Kohler, `Mass Murder Inc.', *Konkret*, 3/99

[19] *New York Times*, 19 January 1999

[20] William Walker's background described by Gary Wilson the New Yorker `Workers World newspaper of 28 January 1999 and various other newspaper reports.

[21] Cited in Michel Collon, `A secret Italian report reveals : OSCE observers prepared NATO bombardment', 3 May 1999.

[22] Z.: 514-516. 80/3 YUG, p.18

- [23] All quotations cited below from these documents are taken from a Press Release of 22 April 1999 issued by the German Section of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
- [24] Az: 514-616. 80/32 Yug
- [25] Az: 514-516. 80/32 426
- [26] Az: 14 A 3840/94.A, S. 44 f
- [27] Az: 22 BA 94.34252, p.9
- [28] "Les deux camps OTAN et Yougoslavie, dans l'impasse", *L'Humanite*, 18 May 1999
- [29] Los Angeles Times, 17 May 1999
- [30] The information on KLA is taken from Christophe Chiclet, 'Aux origines de l'Armee de liberation du Kosovo', *Le Monde Diplomatique*, May 1999
- [31] George Soros, *USA Today*, 16.9.98
- [32] "Les Apaches de Wall Street", *L'Humanite*, 6.4.99
- [33] "Time to Act", *Business Week*, 14.9.98
- [34] *International Herald Tribune*, 7.9.98
- [35] Gerald Horne, "US imperialism besieged on all fronts", in *Political Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 12, December 1998
- [36] *Financial Times*, 21.4.99
- [37] Anthony Lake in *Remarks*, 21 September 1993, Washington, D.C.
- [38] Friedman, *New York Times Week in Review*, 2.6.92. Huntington, *International Security*, Vol. 17, April 1993.
- [39] Noam Chomsky, *Powers and Prospects*, Pluto Press, London, 1996
- [40] William Wallace, "Meeting of minds", *Financial Times*, 15.4.99
- [41] Philip Stephens, "Staying power", *Financial Times*, 14.5.99
- [42] Zbigniew Bazezinski, *The Grand Chess Board*, Harper Collin Publishers, 1997
- [43] Ibid
- [44] Ibid
- [45] Michel Collon, *Solidaire*, 13.4.99
- [46] *NATO Review*, June 1991, cited in Michel Collon, *ibid.*
- [47] James Kynge, "Beijing anxious to ensure oil supplies are more

secure", *Financial Times*, 6.5.99

[48] James Kynge, "Walking a tightrope", *Financial Times*, 10.5.99

[49] Catherine Samary, "Sursis precare pour M. Milosevic", *Geopolitique du chaos, Maniere de voir 33*, *Le monde diplomatique*, February 1997

[50] Quentin Peel, *Financial Times*, 22.4.99

[51] Peter Norman, "EU aims to take heat off ethnic cauldron," *Financial Times*, 16.4.99

[52] Z. Brzezinski, "Guerre totale contre Milosevic", *Le Monde*, 17.4.99

[53] Ibid

[54] William Wallace, "Meeting of minds", *Financial Times*, 15.4.99

[55] Michael Klare, "Washington veut pouvoir vaincre sur tous les fronts," *Le Monde Diplomatique*, May 1999

[56] Michael Klare, op.cit.

[57] *L'Expansion*, op.cit.

[58] Ibid

[59] Information provided during a press conference held in Ottawa, Canada, on 11 April 1999.

[60] Guy Dinmore, 'Serbs draw on all their experience of hard times', *Financial Times*, 20 April 1999

[61] Mitchel Cohen, "Ecological Catastrophe Hits Yugoslavia", Green Party of New York.

[62] France 2, 17 May 1999

[63] Cited by Prof. Chossudovsky during a press conference held in Ottawa, Canada, on 11 April 1999

[64] Borba, 17 May 1999

[65] *L'Expansion*, No. 597, 12-26 May 1999

[66] *L'Expansion*, op.cit

[67] Ibid

[68] *Le monde*, 3.5.99

[69] *L'Expansion*, op.cit

[70] Robert Kagan and William Kriston, cited in "Grand Strategy: Round and Round on American Interests", *The New York Times*, 24.4.99



[\[71\]](#) Michel Muller, "Derriere l'operation militaire, que projette l'OTAN," L'Humanite, 8.4.99