



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

February 1, 2008

Kosovo Secessions

By Vojin Joksimovic, www.kosovocompromise.com

Part I: 2006 and 2007 Secessions

Pierre Marti, a Belgian economist, convinced me that the term independence used by the Western governments and the mainstream media should be dropped in favor of secession. He wrote: “Independence is not something that can be merely proclaimed; it is something that can and must only be achieved...The Albanian minority of Serbia may proclaim the secession of Kosovo and Metohija; however, it will not achieve independence at any time in foreseeable future. First, the Albanian minority of Serbia is not a sovereign people: It is an irredentist diaspora of the Republic of Albania, honoring that country’s flag, national day, and a political vision of a greater Albania. Second, it is only because the Albanian minority of Serbia is living in a part of Serbia under foreign occupation that it can dream of separating the occupied province from the country of which it is a part. Third, even if the occupying forces withdraw as soon as secession is proclaimed by these immigrants and recognized by the occupying countries, this territory is simply not viable on its own and will remain dependent on a capital other than Belgrade for its economy, energy, food, defense and education (at the very least) whether this capital will be Tirana, Ankara, Brussels or Washington.” Serbian Prime Minister (PM) Vojislav Kostunica correctly stated that Kosovo would be a “puppet” of the U.S. and NATO.

The aspirations of Albanian separatisms, illustrated well through three Leagues of Prizren, date back to 1878 during the Berlin Congress. In order to accomplish their separatist goal the Albanians have developed the “imperialism of the small” approach, i.e. reliance on a superpower being the Ottoman Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Mussolini’s Italy, Tito’s Communism and now the U.S.-led NATO. These historical aspects are discussed in my book *Kosovo Crisis: A Study in Foreign Policy Mismanagement*. This three part essay focuses primarily on the last two and half years. Part I provides a summary of salient events leading to 2006 and 2007 attempts by the U.S.-led NATO countries to create a second Albania in Europe on 15% of the territory of democratic Serbia and its cradle of national history. Part II provides insights and an analysis following failure of negotiations mediated by the troika: U.S./EU/Russia leading into early 2008 viewed as the decision-making season. Part III attempts to answer a burning question regarding the enigma behind the U.S. policies in the Balkans.

2006 Separatism

The UN, the EU, the Contact Group (U.S., UK, France, Germany and Italy), the U.S., the UK and others were on record declaring that in 2006 a final status decision for Kosovo



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

must be reached. It became obvious that the UN mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) failed to transform Kosovo into a society in which all citizens could live in dignity and security. It was an impossible task since the Albanian culture is clan-based and only a vast cultural shift over a generation or two could have led to a law abiding society. In 2003, a UN police spokesperson said that Kosovo “is not a society affected by organized crime, but a society founded on organized crime.” A good illustration is March 17, 2004 pogrom or Kosovo Kristallnacht. This onslaught was an organized, widespread and targeted campaign. Minority areas were targeted, sending a message that minorities and returnees were not welcome in Kosovo. It was a targeted effort to drive out Kosovo Serbs and other minorities like Roma and to destroy the social fabric of their existence in Kosovo. Not only that multiculturalism died but genocide took place on UNMIK/NATO watch as documented in *Hiding Genocide in Kosovo*, a book by an UNMIK insider, Iseult Henry.

Two individuals, Iain King and Whit Mason who also served with UNMIK, describe in their book *Peace at any Price: How the World Failed Kosovo* why, despite an unprecedented commitment of resources, UNMIK supported by NATO failed. In 2005 a special UN envoy Norwegian Kai Eide submitted a status report to the UNSC in which he said “Interethnic relations remained bad, biggest threat to the future of Kosovo...Little has been achieved to create foundation of a multiethnic society...Property rights are neither respected nor ensured...Illegal construction and occupation of homes is a widespread phenomenon.” More recently the European Commission report stated: “Corruption, weak institutions and violation of human rights are commonplace...The ethnic tensions are still high, while the paramilitary formations are giving their best to resemble and arm themselves.” All in all, a dysfunctional society that is anything but prepared for independence.

The U.S-led international community was unwilling to seriously confront the Albanian thugs. The risk aversion culture prevailed. Who was responsible for this miserable state of affairs? The answer is nobody in New York, Washington or the Western European capitals. So having created a royal mess, the Western powers have been looking for a way out. A stampede to “finish the job” was initiated by the UN Security Council (UNSC) on October 24, 2005 abandoning the centerpiece of the UNMIK program of satisfying eight EU human rights standards before status. Former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari was appointed as the special UN envoy to “mediate” the interethnic conflict. Person with his background was the wrong man for the job from day one. At one point he even suggested to the Belgrade negotiators that “Serbs are guilty as people.” His mediation was a farce. Kosovo is one of the most complex situations comparable to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict as both sides claim the same piece of real estate. Instead Ahtisaari worked diligently to deliver what the Western powers wanted: the roadmap for Kosovo independence to be imposed on Serbia via a new UN resolution to supersede UN Resolution #1244 which calls for sovereignty (sovereignty mentioned three times) and search for a solution (no mention of independence).

The International Crisis Group (ICG) and other Serb-bashers have predicted that the international community will grant independence to the Albanians before the year-end.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Numerous columns in the Western Serb-bashing media predicted the same. Kosovo “independence” became another test of political correctness. Even in Belgrade doom and gloom atmosphere prevailed. Some argued that Kosmet was lost when Tito allowed uncontrolled migration from Albania. Some argued that it was lost when Serbs sold their houses to Albanians. Some argued that it was lost when Milosevic abolished the 1974 Autonomy and rolled it back to the 1963 level and when he ousted Albanian leaders from running the province. Some argued that it was lost when NATO bombed Serbia in 1999. Finally, some argued that it was lost when the post-Milosevic democratic governments failed to secure powerful allies in the West. A big factor was intimidation by the U.S. and lack of courage by the Serbian leaders to confront the only world superpower.

However, on June 28 PM Kostunica announced that Kosmet (Kosovo and Metohija) was an integral part of Serbia and will remain so. On September 30 the Serbian Parliament adopted a new constitution that declared Kosmet to be inalienable part of Serbia. This was a shrewd delaying tactic on behalf of the PM. The U.S.-led stampede was halted. Ahtisaari still planned to come up with a proposal for supervised independence before the year end. The West assumed it needed only to persuade Serbia to acquiesce without a big fight, so all sides had a soft-landing. However, the Russians have compelled Ahtisaari first to deliver the proposal to Belgrade and Pristina before submitting it to the UNSC. The painful process was extended into 2007.

2007 Separatism

Overwhelming pessimism in Serbia was replaced with a cautious not all is lost attitude. Russian President Putin’s blunt warning, at the February 2007 Munich Security Conference that Russia would not agree to any Kosovo settlement that Belgrade opposed, provided a major boost. In Washington and Brussels there was a feeling that Putin was bluffing and essentially no planning took place in case Putin meant it. It was a policy of “eyes wide shut” attitude. The Russian support was not only based on Slavic friendship, although it was a factor, but on own national interests including the economic ones. The Russian Orthodox Church fully supported Serbia. If Kosovo were to become independent how would Russia explain to the leaders of South Ossetia, Abkhazia and Transnistria why the situation in Kosovo is as unique as the West has been advocating.

On March 26, 2007 Ahtisaari submitted his report to the UNSC recommending Kosovo independence supervised by the EU with continued presence of NATO troops on the ground. Needless to say, supervision and independence are concepts, which exclude each other. Ahtisaari went as far as stating that independence for Kosovo is the “only viable option.” This became a mantra amongst clueless Washington and Brussels policy makers. The U.S./UK/France/Germany jumped on the Ahtisaari plan and drafted a UN resolution which would have annulled the UN #1244 and thus detached Kosovo from Serbia. The third draft filed on June 20 proposed the postponement of supervised independence for 120 days, the time given for negotiations to take place with automatic imposition of the Ahtisaari plan if the



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

parties couldn't agree. In Belgrade and Moscow this proposal was dead on arrival. Russia opposed artificial deadlines and automatism and Serbia was not interested in the negotiations with predetermined outcome. The resolution did not come for a vote in the UNSC as Russia declared its intention to veto it. Other nations represented on the UNSC such as China, Indonesia and South Africa believed that the rule of law should be the keystone of the international order which would be grossly violated if Kosovo independence would be established on 15% of the Serbian territory. In addition, Russia's Foreign minister Sergei Lavrov suggested Ahtisaari unfit to mediate further talks based on reports that Albanian mafia bribed him. The German BND, German Intelligence Service, sent the documentation to the UN Secretary General that he took the bribe from the Albanian mafia. The State Department was unable to deny Ahtisaari corruption charges.

In August negotiations were launched with mediation by the Contact Group negotiating troika: U.S./EU/Russia with a deadline for a report to be submitted to the UN Secretary General by

December 10. The mediators Frank Wisner, Wolfgang Ischinger and Alexander Botsan-

Harchenko, representing the U.S., EU and Russia respectively, were tasked with getting the Serbs and Albanians to agree on Kosovo's future status. The troika will now report that the negotiations have failed after the last session at Baden, an Austrian spa town near Vienna, November 26-28. The U.S. and the EU stated that the mediation ends but Russia insists on further negotiations. Serbian PM said: "We would have a duty to agree to resume the talks and establish a new negotiating process....no one should have any doubt that we will annul any unilateral act, and treat unilateral independence as a null, void and non-binding phenomenon...Serbia will not let an inch of its territory be taken away."

German *Suddeutsche Zeitung* wrote: "Wolfgang Ischinger failed...due to the intransigence

of Albanians. They want only one thing: independence...None of the suggestions the Serbs

made during the 120-day negotiations had the slightest chance. Why should the Albanians

settle for autonomy when George W. Bush had already promised them their own state?"

While visiting Albania in June 2007 Bush declared that "sooner rather than later you've got to say enough is enough, Kosovo independent." Bush wants a puppet state with NATO having the ultimate authority. Opening of a Pandora's Box with consequences for Europe and the world are essentially ignored.

Hashim Thaci, former KLA leader with blood on his hands known as "Snake" and Kosovo's next prime minister said: "We can negotiate for 100 years with Serbia but for the independence of Kosovo we can have no compromise." Despite turnout of only 43% in the November 17 elections, Thaci had audacity to proudly proclaim that "the citizens of Kosovo



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

sent the world a message...that Kosovo is ready for independence.” Guardian wrote: “In response, Europe’s warnings against a unilateral declaration of independence finally became audible, with Swedish foreign minister Carl Bildt speculating that: ‘I don’t think they (Kosovo Albanians) want to be independent from the international community.’” Italian PM Romano Prodi urged Albanians to delay their declaration as the EU nations have made progress on reaching common stance. That stance would be irreplaceably destroyed if there were hasty decisions. Even a strong backer of Kosovo independence Albanian PM Sali Berisha went along. Despite all the prior rhetoric, Kosovo Albanians have to comply with wishes of their backers.

Having visited Belgrade and Pristina on December 3, the mediators sent the report to the UN Secretary General on December 7. The document is supposed to be fact-finding with no conclusions and recommendations because the U.S. and Russia have different standpoints. The UNSC meets on December 19. Russia will continue to support a law-based decision if it suits both sides. Russian UN ambassador Churkin stated: “The talks revealed that a solution is possible.” In that light, Russia will be calling for a continuation of negotiations and will be circulating elements for a Security Council statement. If on the hand the U.S./UK, perhaps with support from France, decide to revamp their June resolution, Russia in all likelihood would veto it. There probably would be double veto by China, which has very valid reasons bearing in mind own cases of Taiwan, Tibet and Xinjiang. Compromises, like replacement of the UN civil administration by the EU, are possible. Hence 2007 ends with another stalemate much like 2006 did.

PART II: FAILURE OF NEGOTIATIONS MEDIATED BY TROIKA

Troika Report: Overview and Analysis

The EU/U.S./Russia troika report was submitted to the UN Secretary General ahead of the December 10 schedule. Even I had an access to the report on December 8. The report contains no more than 20 pages. The summary contains only two paragraphs. The first one asserts that the negotiations were conducted within the framework of UN Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) and the “Guiding Principles” of the Contact Group. “The parties discussed a wide range of options, such as full independence, supervised independence, territorial partition, substantial autonomy, confederal arrangements even a status silent agreement to disagree.”

The second paragraph reads: “The Troika was able to facilitate high-level, intense and substantive discussions between Belgrade and Pristina. Nonetheless, the parties were unable



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

to reach an agreement on the final status of Kosovo. Neither party was willing to cede its position on the fundamental question of sovereignty over Kosovo. This is regrettable, as a negotiated settlement is in the best interests of both parties.”

Nine annexes are divided in two parts: A) Background Documents; 1) UN Security Council resolution 1244 (1999); and 2) “Guiding Principles” of the Contact Group (November 2005); B) Troika Documents: 3) UN Secretary-General’s statement on the period of engagement on Kosovo (August 1, 2007); 4) Troika Events; 5) Statement on Kosovo by Contact Group Ministers (September 27, 2007); 6) Vienna Non-paper (August 30, 2007); 7) New York Declaration (September 28, 2007); 8) Troika Assessment of Negotiations: Principal Conclusions; 9) Troika-Communiqué (Baden, November 28, 2007).

All in all, there is not much in this report. The report fails to recognize that Serbia has compromised by granting the most far-reaching autonomy to Kosovo Albanians short of outright independence. It is the Albanian intransigence, with the U.S. support, which rendered negotiations all but worthless. Beyond this, a question that comes to mind is whether the whole process was a negotiating farce despite the fact that the troika held 10 major sessions with the Serbian and Albanian delegations? The author sides with the remarks made by the Russian foreign minister Sergei Lavrov when it comes to the allocation of blame for the failure of negotiations. The second place in the blame equation goes definitely to Germany and Ischinger as their representative who allowed the EU to be humiliated in the process. The Serbian delegation performed admirably. The outcome is obviously disheartening to them.

When diplomacy fails, it means war. Given its influence on Kosovo Albanians, the U.S. holds the key for stability in the Balkans. It appears that the U.S. is confident that there will be no destabilization of the Balkans with likely consequences not only in the Balkans, but in Europe and even beyond. Presumably, this confidence comes from wielding decisive NATO military force in Kosovo which allows pursuit of this aggressive policy. Hence, together with its lapdog, the UK and possibly France, it seems to be determined to abandon the UN process as it continues to overemphasize the Albanian case for separatism while at the same time ignores the Serbian and Russian case for adherence to international law. It boils down to a simple equation: Russia backs diplomacy but the U.S. backs force. It amounts to reversal of roles during the Cold War. Srdja Trifkovic has ably coined the new term “Kremlin on the Potomac.” Mike Jackson, the former British Army chief who commanded the KFOR when it entered Kosovo in 1999, feels that the Kosovo situation is “a mess” that threatens to spill over into ethnic violence again.

With the U.S. and Russia at loggerheads the EU is now in pivotal position. At the EU end of the year summit, the EU has asserted its leadership by committing to send its 1,800 person strong civilian mission to replace UNMIK. A period of reflection is now badly needed to figure out exactly the course of action. The author takes a liberty of suggesting what both the EU and Belgrade should do in his best judgment.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Yet Another Negotiating Farce

In his regular Washington Post column Richard Holbrooke, the Democrat's perennial Secretary of State-designate, claims that the American diplomacy working closely with the German troika representative Ischinger has largely succeeded in persuading most of European allies to recognize Kosovo rapidly. He seems to be implying that the 120-day process was nothing more than a farce despite the fact that the troika process was definitely better conducted than the Ahtisaari process which perpetuated the perception of a rigged process stacked against Serbia. It certainly wouldn't be unprecedented. In French chateau near Paris, Rambouillet Conference February/March 1999, the Clinton administration orchestrated sham negotiations. It was a setup for war rather than a Peace Conference. Post-Baden statements made by Albanian leaders corroborate the farce assertion. Kosovo President Fatmir Sejdiu said: "Even the last 120 days of talks were unnecessary." Veton Surroi said: "Kosovo can't remain hostage to procedures. We have fulfilled our obligations. Now it is our partner's turn." Obligations of the Albanian negotiators were simply to run out the clock.

Lavrov Accuses Western Countries

Russia's foreign minister Sergei Lavrov accused Western countries of fueling a drive for independence by neglecting Pristina violations of UN resolutions. "The conniving indifference of our Western partners toward violations [of UN resolution #1244] by Kosovo Albanians and their attempts to avoid proper actions to enforce the full implementation of this resolution, have inspired a psychological drive toward Kosovo independence." Furthermore Lavrov accused the Kosovo leaders of using pure blackmail to justify plans for independence. "Our Western partners are succumbing to this blackmail and are starting to say that if we don't give Kosovo independence, it will cause an outbreak of violence. To threaten us with violence and disorder if we refuse to make certain decisions is a dangerous and slippery path, which may have repercussions far away from Kosovo. If the West recognizes Kosovo as an independent state, Russia will act in accordance with International law."

Ischinger Doomed Negotiations

Ischinger performance doomed the negotiating process. His statement that "we left no stone unturned" was disingenuous. The Albanian position of independence or nothing has gone unchallenged. There was yet another disingenuous statement: "If they get 50% of their demands, it is better than no solution at all." Instead of challenging the Albanian



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

maximalist approach he attempted to trick the Serbs into a 1972 agreement aimed at strengthening neighborly relations between West and East Germany. This was immediately dismissed by both sides. Then he came up with proposal of “neutral status,” that “would normalize relations between Serbia and Kosovo, without containing the word on status.” This approach would de facto recognize Kosovo as an independent state. Needless to say, both proposals were in contravention of the UN Charter and UN #1244. He showed no interest in the Hong Kong or Aland Islands models. His approach boiled down to helping Western independence advocates to say that they had wanted a different development and did everything possible to achieve it, but things are the way they are and it is now time to rapidly recognize the reality: an independent Kosovo. As a result of his tactics, the EU is now saddled with a severe test.

The EU has now to contend with the consequences of a unilateral declaration of independence by failing to distance itself from the U.S.’unequivocal approach. In addition, very few mention that the EU taxpayers would have to foot the bill for another failed state founded on organized crime in which the justice system is loaded with 40,000 incomplete criminal cases and in which corruption-crime investigations are virtually non-existent. According to the Transparency International, an anti-corruption watchdog based in Berlin, Kosovo under the KLA leadership is among the most corrupt regions in the world today, the fourth in the world right after Cameron, Cambodia and Albania. Sixty seven percent of Kosovo residents have stated they have to pay bribes to get services. Does this criminal governance meet any criteria for a legal secession?

Disheartening for Serbian Delegation

The Serbian negotiators have done an excellent job by exhibiting necessary flexibility and creativity. Belgrade was ready to sacrifice everything, or almost everything, in order to keep Kosovo within Serbia. In the last few months, it has been making one concession after another. It presented in detail the Serbian proposal for unprecedented Kosovo autonomy, to be frozen for 20 years, including most competencies and symbols of a sovereign state: access to financial international institutions like the IMF, trade and cultural representative offices abroad, own flag, anthem and national sport teams. Relations with Serbia would be normalized. Benefits of joining the EU would be enjoyed by Kosovo. Serbia would reserve the right to exclusive representation in the UN, OSCE and Council of Europe. Serbia would also “maintain the right to associate with the provinces’ foreign policy, defense, border control and the protection of Serbian heritage.” Serbian proposals using models of functioning autonomies of Hong Kong, Aland Islands and South Tyrol demonstrated initiatives badly lacking on the other side. The Hong Kong model was presumably used to get China even more involved. It has some shortcomings: the Hong Kong Chinese voted for reintegration into China. Aland Islands is, however, an excellent example. It is an archipelago of more than 6,000 islands in the Baltic Sea, about half way between Sweden and Finland. Its population of 27,000 speaks Swedish. In 1917, 96.2% of its residents voted to join Sweden. Their bid was, however, blocked in 1921 by the League of Nations, which decided that they



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

should remain part of Finland. It is an autonomous, demilitarized, monolingual Swedish speaking administrative province of Finland.

U.S. Determines Stability in Balkans

Serbian President Tadic thinks Washington has not managed to understand the complex international situation in the Balkans—just as it did not understand in Iraq. There is more to it. The U.S. policies in the Balkans have been enigmatic as addressed in part III of this essay. However, there is little doubt that the U.S' final position on Kosovo is crucial regarding stability and peace in the Balkans as the Albanians are under full control of the U.S. Simply speaking, adherence to the UN #1244 means stability and bypassing the international law means most likely long-term instability. Thomas Fleiner, a Swiss legal adviser to the Serbian government, firmly maintains: “The text of the resolution is quite clear to any lawyer and it calls for respect of sovereignty and search for a solution for Kosovo only within the essential autonomy framework,” and as such “every decision that would step out of that framework will require consensus of both sides and an amendment to resolution 1244.” The U.S., UK and France had voted together with Russia and China for the UN #1244. Fleiner further asserts that the unilateral declaration would be equal to “the declaration of war and a hostile act against the United Nations.”

U.S. /UK Abandoning UNSC Process?

After the troika report the ball has been kicked into the UN court. Russia said that it will demand that the UNSC annul any unilateral declaration of independence as it would be a violation of UN #1244 and introduced key elements for a draft statement calling for a “continued negotiating process between Pristina and Belgrade in order to reach agreement on Kosovo’s future status.” As expected, the U.S. and UK ambassadors rejected the appeal saying that the negotiating process has been exhausted after a two-year effort failed. British ambassador John Sauer stated: “I don’t believe the Security Council, as far as I can judge, is going to be able to reach agreement on a way forward, in which case other organizations will have to take their responsibilities, namely the European Union and NATO.”

Condoleezza Rice, who has already qualified for a street to be named after her in Pristina, made statements that Russia must accept reality that “Serbia and Kosovo are never going to be one again...if you don’t deal with that reality, you are to sow the seeds of considerable discontent and considerable instability;” plus focus is now on ensuring that Kosovo fulfills its obligations under the Ahtisaari plan—such as protection of minority rights and religious sites—because there isn’t any more point to further negotiation.” These are clear indications that a stalemate has been reached and that the U.S. is abandoning the UN process in favor of using organizations like the EU and NATO to impose Ahtisaari plan on Serbia.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

The real hawk within the Bush administration is of course Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns; a holdover from the Clinton administration schooled in the policy of raping Serbia in order to appease radical Islam in the Balkans. He seems to be beyond redemption. Of course, the White House if they want to could make Burns shut up

in the interest of the U.S. global policies, which shouldn't result in the Cold War II with Russia. He has not been serving his country well and should perhaps consider resigning.

It appears that not much can be expected from the December 19 UNSC meeting with exception of a debate to replace UNMIK with the EU mission. The EU leaders agreed in "principle" to send an EU mission of some 1,800 police and judiciary officials and pledged the EU would play a leading role in Kosovo. Serbia has, however, sent a clear message that the EU mission is not welcome unless a compromise is reached within the UNSC. Not only the EU big four (Germany, France, Italy and Britain) but even the Greek foreign minister Dora Bakoyannis think that the UN # 1244 allows the EU mission to replace UNMIK. Russia should insist on the vote after the debate on further negotiations and let the U.S. or UK or France, or all of them, cast a veto in order to detach Kosovo forcefully from Serbia. UN Secretary General Ki-Moon is due to give his position on Kosovo in January.

EU in Pivotal Position

With the U.S. and Russia at loggerheads, the EU is put into the pivotal position. For the EU, Kosovo independence is a hot potato. If the EU would respect its own system of deciding

by consensus, the 27 EU members are supposed to reach unanimity. One member has power to veto a decision of majority. An example being Cyprus veto for closer defense ties between the EU and Turkey. Cyprus, vehemently opposed to the independence given its own problems with the Turkish-control north of the divided island, seems to be willing to play the veto role. There is a second tier of EU countries which have serious reservations, especially if independence is declared unilaterally, fearing it would encourage separatist movements in their countries and elsewhere: Spain, Slovakia, Rumania and Greece. There is a third tier of countries, like Hungary and the Czech Republic, who would like to see the EU unity which would require much effort and consultations. They also pointed out that the international community should pay as much attention to Serbia as to Kosovo.

EU Summit

Traditional end-of-the-year EU summit took place on December 14. It started at 10 am and ended after lunch. There was a lot of publicity how they are going to forge unity on how to handle Kosovo's bid for independence without inciting new violence. Memories of the 1990s apparently still haunt EU capitals. However, the EU remained divided how to recognize Kosovo's independence thus putting at risk an administrative takeover from the UN, a mission that requires unanimity. The mission was agreed upon in "principle"



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

whatever that means suggesting there was unanimity on that issue. Gordon Brown, the British PM, even said that the “legal basis” had been established and that it would be implemented in February following the next meeting of foreign ministers. The Guardian used the term “the biggest foreign policy gamble,” and suggested “the EU was responding to strong pressure from Washington, which has signaled that it will wait until February before recognizing an independent Kosovo, but no longer.” The mantra that further negotiations have been exhausted prevailed.

On two key issues the EU continued to be divided—on recognizing an independent Kosovo and on accelerated track for Serbia’s negotiations for the EU membership. The Romanian Prime Minister says “there is a broad interest to sustain a common European position. But there is one problem where we have a clear position. We won’t recognize an independent Kosovo because of the impact of the stability of the region.” Apparently this represented a U-turn for the PM because he can’t get backing in the parliament. How many more parliaments will have a say? Instead of unity on independence the summit discussed over lunch a paper drafted by the Contact Group members minus Russia on how the EU could recognize Kosovo after it declares independence. Under the plan the EU big four, i.e. Germany, France, Italy and Britain would recognize Kosovo days after declaration, followed by other EU nations. The U.S. and others would follow suit after that.

They clashed also over whether to grant Serbia a fast-track membership deal as a means of persuading Serbia to relax its opposition to Kosovo independence. Italy and the Czech Republic argued in favor but the EU executive, the EC Commission, backed up by Netherlands and the Nordic countries, insisted that signing the SAA should be conditional on Serbia’s full cooperation with the Hague Tribunal. According the AP, Sarkozy said the EU “must send a positive signal to Serbia,” but Serbia could only join the bloc “if it satisfies all conditions; if it respects the independence of Kosovo.” To the best of my knowledge this is the first time that Serbia’s membership was linked with Serbia giving up Kosovo. The Slovak PM Robert Fico said that the integration of Serbia into EU cannot be linked with the issue of Kosovo. Dora Bakoyannis expressed strong opposition to any attempt to link Kosovo with Serbia’s EU prospects.

Period of Reflection

In the circumstances, the EU would be wise to follow what Dora Bakoyannis stated. Greece will continue to follow a responsible policy without hurried moves and decisions. “A criterion of our decisions will be the safeguarding of stability and peace and the broader Greek interests in the region. In every case, Serbia’s European course and of the broader region of the western Balkans must proceed with stable, concrete steps.” Furthermore, “there is no good or easy solution for Kosovo and no one has proposed to date. There must be a period of reflection, so that Belgrade and Pristina evaluate new facts.”

Reflecting the notion of period of reflection the EU enlargement chief, Olli Rehn, stated: “Kosovo’s final solution will be postponed to early spring. A solution must be found. The



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

current situation is not sustainable.” EU foreign ministers are due to hold a key meeting in Slovenia on March 28-29. This schedule takes into account timing of the Serbian presidential elections, which will determine whether Boris Tadic, perceived as pro-European liberal reformer, is re-elected. Run-off is scheduled for February 3.

The EU must resist the U.S. pressure for a speedy “solution” of a problem as complex as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict which has been in existence for 50 years. The EU should use this period of reflection to carefully study a Kosovo solution including lessons learned from the dismemberment of Yugoslavia. Otherwise, the EU will lose Serbia as a prospective member,

a country which is deemed by many to be a key country in the Western Balkans. A European Commission representative recently stated that Serbia has a chance to be a leader in the field of economy and that it has greater potential than Croatia. All in all, the EU should behave as an adult rather than as an American dependent. It behaved as an adult, although only partly, in case of Iraq and should fully learn from the Balkan calamities in the 1990s.

Lessons Learned from Yugoslav Tragedy

As the European Security Strategy concluded in 2003, the credibility of the EU’s foreign policy “depends on the consolidation of our achievements” in the Balkans. In order to prevent further losses of credibility, Europe must clearly define the core of its fledgling Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). After its failure to cope with disintegration of

Yugoslavia, the CPSP is once again challenged by the existing Kosovo crisis. The EU (then EC) badly mishandled disintegration of Yugoslavia and even allowed Germany to dismember Yugoslavia by recognizing unilateral declaration of independence by Slovenia and Croatia (incidentally despite U.S. condemnation) using arbitrary internal borders between the Yugoslav republics as international borders. These reckless moves led to bloody civil wars in Croatia and subsequently in Bosnia. The EC’s arbiters ruled that Croatia did not meet standards for recognition. Nonetheless, the German foreign minister said: “Our recognition of Croatia and Slovenia is unconditional.”

The Kosovo case comprises the same two elements that led to the Yugoslav civil wars: unilateral declaration of independence and internal borders. In the case of Kosovo the U.S. plays the reckless role Germany played in dismembering Yugoslavia. What standards for recognition has Kosovo met? As discussed in Part I Kosovo is a dysfunctional society that is anything but ready for independence. Besides, as pointed out by Pierre Marti “the Albanian minority of Serbia is not sovereign people. It is an irredentist diaspora of Republic of Albania.” The Albanian minorities exist in Macedonia, Greece and Montenegro. Should Europe have eventually five Albania’s? By the same logic there should be five Hungary’s as the Hungarians live in Rumania, Slovakia, Serbia and Croatia in addition to Hungary itself.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Historically Kosovo, as Kosovo and Metohija (Kosmet), did not become an entity until 1945, when the Yugoslav communists divided the country into six republics and two autonomous regions. What is now called Kosmet was first called the Autonomous Kosovo and Metohija Region (AKMO in Serbian). The northern boundary was the city limit of Kosovska Mitrovica. In 1959, an administrative decision was made to rearrange internal Serbia's boundaries (not borders) so to attach three southernmost municipalities, Leposavic, Lesak and Socanica of the Central Serbia to become AKMO northernmost municipalities. They included 71 Serbian villages and a single Albanian village. Since 1999, the Serbian government has been setting up parallel institutions and picking up bills for healthcare, education and public administration.

What Should the EU Do

Reintegration of this northern part into Serbia should be recognized by the EU as a very first step in a search for the Kosovo solution in order to avoid a double secession scenario in case the Albanian secession does take place. This would avoid likely violence and ethnic cleansing. The outside borders should be inviolable unless changes are agreed upon by both sides. Discussions over independence must be replaced by discussions over broad autonomy and special relations with the EU. The lure of membership itself is insufficient to make nations ignore the issues of autonomy and self-determination. This is contrary to Ischinger's view that Serbia and Kosovo share the ultimate goal of accession to EU membership. Supporting Kosovo independence while insisting that both have a common European future is contradictory. Kosovo issue has a potential for the EU to assert itself as credible global power.

The Europeans are typically more pragmatic than Americans. This pragmatism will probably compel the EU to reach out to Russia. After all Kosovo is in Europe. Instability there would affect the EU and not the U.S. Xavier Solana, the EU foreign policy supremo, has recently stated that the EU cannot resolve the Kosovo issue without Russia and in addition advocated multilateralism in international relations. Russia is viewed not only as the most important neighbor but as a strategic partner in particular because of the energy dependency. Sarkozy might think that he might reach a satisfactory deal with Russia which wouldn't humiliate Serbia. Germany and Italy might also arrive at the conclusion that showdown with Putin must be avoided leaving Britain and several other American lapdogs in minority.

What Belgrade Should Do

The PM Kostunica has appropriately commented on the EU Summit conclusions "especially abusive and unacceptable" and promised to respond after the UNSC debate on December 19. Seventy five percent of the Serbian population indicated that they would rather forgo EU membership than give up Kosovo. A strong response on both the Serbian and Russian side is needed.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Many editorials speculate that likely Belgrade response to unilateral declaration would include economic measures such as cutting off power supplies, closure of border with Kosovo, travel restrictions, a trade embargo and legal challenges to privatization measures. Kosovo doesn't have much beyond a mafia economy. Hence, they could only hurt the life of ordinary citizens who now live on rationed electricity anyway.

Serbian President Boris Tadic has announced that Serbia will launch an initiative that the UNCS should seek from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) an opinion on whether the possible independence of Kosovo province would be legal or not. It would be up to Serbia to annul the unilateral decision and to launch international legal processes before appropriate institutions. Adviser Fleiner explained that the ICJ can be engaged in two ways - one is for a UN organ to seek an advisory opinion of that Court, and another is that the Court is asked to pass judgment in a conflict. In that event, Serbia would have to recognize the binding authority of the ICJ. Serbia is among the countries that have accepted the Statute of that Court, but not also its binding authority.

Former Serbian negotiator, Leon Kojen suggested that the Serbian Parliament should pass a resolution addressed to the EU pointing out that Serbia cannot sign the SAA unless the EU drops its support for the secession of Kosovo. The message is: Choose between Kosovo and Serbia, as Serbia cannot join an organization which wants to amputate 15% of its territory. This would cause a number of EU countries to reflect even further than what Dora Bakoyannis had in mind. It should convince some EU countries that Serbia means business and it is not going to trade Kosovo for a not so fast-track to the EU membership. The Serbian Parliament might also consider another resolution: to redefine the Kosovo internal boundary back to where it was in 1959.

The Serbian government must be prepared to send troops to protect the Kosovo Serbs and the religious treasures in case of replica of the March 2004 scenario in case KFOR cannot guarantee protection. It might consider even opening the dialogue with Russia to establish a Russian military base in proximity to Kosovo. Presence of the Russian navy in the Mediterranean may not be sufficient. In addition, the Serbian government should explore a number of partition scenarios. Ivor Roberts, former British ambassador to Yugoslavia, has advocated partition as the best answer in the column published by the Independent. The Daily Telegraph editorial as well as Ian Bancroft in the Guardian have also explored partition options. Lastly, the Serbian presidential elections scheduled for January 20 and February 3 must be postponed.

Other Countries

Retired Maj.-Gen. Lewis MacKenzie, commander of the UN Protection Force in Sarajevo in 1992 stated in an interview: "[Canada should] take the side of the sovereignty of nations and say what [Serbia] is offering is generous to the extreme and should be accepted...If, all of a sudden, we honor a minority that, through violence, achieves its



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

independence, [other groups] from northern Ireland, to Hungarians in Romania, and Hungarians in northeast Serbia [might also follow the violent path to sovereignty]."

This is a good piece of advice to be followed by other countries. At his writing Canada seems to be following Mackenzie's advice. By the way, The Serbian Minister for Kosovo and Metohija Slobodan Samardzic has stated that at least 30 countries oppose the Kosovo independence. These countries need to become more vocal. In 2005 there were only a handful of them. Kosovo issue goes beyond Europe to countries such as Iraq, Israel, Indonesia, China, India, South Africa and some other African countries.

A Conclusion

It is difficult to believe that in the 21st century the world's only superpower, with support from big EU four wants to carve up a sovereign country against its will. Serbia has demonstrated that it wants to join the European family of nations and has been developing a democratic future. There are many Kosovo's round the globe for which the U.S. and its NATO allies insist preservation of territorial integrity must be maintained. Nonetheless, they insist that creation of a second Albania in Europe on Serbian territory must take place. Their bulldozers are in high gear and unless smaller EU countries seriously challenge this abuse of power a precedent with far reaching consequences will be created. Russia and Serbia can still turn these bulldozers around depending on the moves they choose to make in early 2008. D day was supposed to be in 2006, then in 2007 and then on December 10. Kosovo PM Ceku, after hearing from Rice that she couldn't imagine Kosovo remaining part of Serbia, wanted to move it even to late November in order to overlap with the Albanian Flag Day. It has now been moved now to February/March and some are even talking about May. For a huge mess that has been unnecessarily created it's going to take a while for a cleanup to take place. Upon a serious scrutiny, the unprecedented autonomy Serbia has offered might look attractive. In 2008 there might be a secession followed by recognition of some Western and Islamic countries but there might not be. Stalemate might continue yet for a while. The outcome of secession is still uncertain. However, what is certain is that a truly independent state will not be created.

Part III: Enigma behind U.S. Kosovo Policy

The U.S. has been a staunch supporter of Kosovo secession from Serbia. In 1999 the U.S. turned NATO into an aggressor attacking a sovereign country fighting none other than Islamist financed terrorism. The U.S./NATO bombed Serbia for 78 days for the "crime" of repelling the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) narco-terrorist insurgency from the Republic of Albania into the ancestral Serbian lands. The aim has been to snatch 15% of the Serbian territory, ethnically cleanse the Serbian population and other minorities, eradicate the Christianity by demolishing the Serbian churches and monasteries and replacing them with mostly Saudi built Wahhabi mosques, unilateral declaration of independence with recognition from the U.S., some EU and



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Islamic countries followed several years later by a referendum to join Albania because citizens of Kosovo and Albania are one nation.

At this writing it appears that the U.S. is willing to ignore the international laws, bypass the UNSC and recognize Kosovo Albanian precedent-setting unilateral declaration of independence by Kosovo Albanian thugs—over vehement Russian objections based on adherence to the UN Charter, the Helsinki Accords and the UN resolution 1244. Allegedly it is now to be proclaimed as the “coordinated independence” by the Kosovo Albanians, the U.S. and most EU countries on February 6 or thereabout after the Serbian presidential elections. Meanwhile, the establishment media is pointing the finger of blame on Serbian and Russian “obstructionism,” as presidential candidate Hillary Clinton parroted, for the problem made in America.

Meanwhile breakaway republics of Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, Transdnistria in Moldova and Nagorny Karabach in Azerbaijan all claim to have more grounds to declare independence than Kosovo Albanians. In Transdnistria they are willing to implement results of September 17, 2006 referendum, whereby the absolute majority supported independence and integration with Russia. Meanwhile, Turkish Cypriots eye Kosovo to end their isolation and get recognition from others than Turkey. Also, meanwhile the Lakota Indians, living in five-state area, have withdrawn from treaties with the U.S. signed more than 150 years ago. Claiming that they are no longer U.S. citizens they delivered a message to the State Department and visited the Bolivian, Chilean, South African and Venezuelan embassies. Professor Raju Thomas wrote in the Guardian : “Serbia’s claim to Kosovo is, to Serbs, far stronger than Russia’s claim to Chechnya, China’s to Xinjiang, India’s to Kashmir (a claim still disputed by Pakistan), and the Philippines” to the island of Mindanao. All of these are provinces with Muslim majority populations that are part of non-Muslim majority states.”

Russian Patriarch Alexy II expressing profound concern that Kosovo independence can lead to new tragedies stated: “Today, the Kosovan future is resolved by people who have never been to Kosovo, who do not know how sacred this land is for the Serbian people. Think of one Kosovan field, soaked with the blood of our sisters and brethren.”

The U.S. Balkans policies have been mind-boggling and enigma to many. The Bush administration is getting ready to leap into unknown again. Lack of foresight is viewed as a leading cause of its Iraq debacle. What motivates the U.S. and its allies is less than transparent and defies common-sense. A citizen of the 21st century world expects the Western leaders to offer genuine moral judgments, sound logic and thorough assessment of possible consequences of their decisions. However, expectations have not been met. Here is an attempt to figure it out using the thoughts of James Jatras, Srdja Trifkovic, and John Bolton in addition to my own.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

An Explanation

Srdja Trifkovic, foreign affairs editor of *Chronicles* and *Byronica*, attempted to explain the mystery of the U.S. policy in the Balkans in an article published by *Sloboda-Liberty* on September 25, 2007. For irrationality of the U.S. policy Trifkovic offered four elements. The text below represent an amalgam using some Trifkovic's thoughts supplemented by my own while retaining Trifkovic's four element framework.

- 1. The power of money and lobbying in Washington:** Albanian lobby has been well funded and well placed for decades. The Serbian lobby is small in comparison. As a product of money and lobbying, combined with media reinforcement, much false information has been accepted as unquestionable facts. I would like to add that the Washington foreign affairs elitist community is with some minor exceptions totally ignorant about the Balkans with no knowledge of history. For most of them the history started in 1989 when the U.S. started paying attention to Kosovo. In this truncated version of history, the Serbs were branded as bad guys and the Albanians as innocent victims. Having bought into this gross simplification they do not want to know about even what happened after June 10, 1999 when genocide and ethnic cleansing over the Serbian population took place as documented by Iseult Henry in *Hiding Genocide in Kosovo: A Crime against God and Humanity*.
- 2. Inertia:** In politics no one ever admits he is wrong about anything. It is unthinkable that any responsible political actor will go back to suggest we might have misunderstood, or even falsified the facts, or that our actions were misguided. Statements that Kosovo is "the last piece of unfinished business in the Balkans" mean that its solution must reflect the anti-Serb formula applied in the past, because to do otherwise would call into doubt previous actions.
- 3. Hegemony:** In the post Cold War world notion prevailed that the U.S. is the only superpower and as such its role has been characterized as "benevolent global hegemony." Jatras sums up the overall tendency in American global policy with one word: hegemony. The concept has particular application to Europe through NATO. No security decision can be taken without the U.S. approval, and preferably sponsorship as exemplified with the military interventions in Bosnia and Kosovo. The concept doesn't stop in Europe but covers in particular so called Broader Middle East, which includes the Caucasus and Central Asia. The Balkans is seen as much part as it is of Europe. "In wider applications, it means that the opinion of any other power, or the any possible combination of powers, may not outweigh that of the United States on any point in the globe."

In order to enforce this global hegemony, Prof. Chalmers Johnson in his book *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic*, lists 737 American military bases in foreign countries. Furthermore he said if there were an honest count the number would probably top 1,000. Camp Bondsteel built in 1999 in



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Kosovo is the biggest built after the ones built during the Vietnam War. The Roman Empire at its heights in 117 AD required 37 major bases to police its realm from Britannia to Egypt, from Hispania to Armenia. Therefore, entirely peripheral Kosovo has so far managed to restart the Cold War as Moscow cannot be allowed to “win” despite the fact Russia is upholding international legality standards and the U.S. wants to violate the backbones of the international law. This despite a distinct possibility that it would set a precedent for secessionist movements worldwide; to reverse the imperative in the War on Terror and the War on Drugs. These types of victories have often devastating consequences. Some discovered this in Iraq but some never learn.

Ron Suskind, a columnist who had been investigating the Bush 43 White House wrote in *The New York Times* about a conversation he had with a presidential adviser in 2002. “The aide said that guys like me were ‘in what we call the reality-based community,’ which he defined as people ‘who believe that solutions emerge from your judicious study of discernible reality.’” The aide continued to say: “That’s not the way the world really works anymore. We’re an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality, and while you’re studying that reality—judiciously, as you will—we’ll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that’s how things will sort out. We’re history actors...and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.” This was an eye opener to me as it explains many acts of both the Clinton and Bush-43 administrations.

4. **Islamophilia:** During the Cold War, for containment of the Soviet Union, the U.S. relied on Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. Furthermore, in Washington Islamism was considered as antidote to nationalism, socialism and godless communism in the Islamic world. Economically, it was viewed compatible with global capitalism---oil and petrodollars are indispensable. Also, it was derived in part from the U.S. support for the Afghan mujahideen in a proxy war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in the 1980ies. The Gulf war in 1991 created an image that the U.S. was hostile to Islam. A need to counter that image arose which led in part to support of the Bosnian Muslims in the civil/religious war in Bosnia, 1992-1995. In 1992, Lawrence Eagleburger then Acting Secretary of State characterized the U.S. government’s pro-Muslim position in Bosnia as a counter to the Muslim World’s perception of an anti-Muslim position regarding Iraq. In 1996, two New Republic editorial staff writers Jacob Heilbrunn and Michael Lind argued that the American commitment to the Islamic connection is so strong that the U.S. design is to make the Islamic world part of a new American empire and that the American support of Bosnian Muslims is part of the implementation of this plan.

President Clinton operated on the basis that Islamist terrorism should be viewed as cost of doing business. Hence, the American life is just the cost of



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

doing business! Clinton boasted that he used military power to protect poor Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo. He has allowed former KLA leaders and the Albanian narco-mafia to control the Kosovo society. The Islamists invariably view Kosovo as jihad.

Even in the aftermath of 9/11 the pro-Islamist favoritism continued. President Bush considers Islam as a religion of peace and tolerance and meets frequently with Islamic leaders. One needs to recall a photograph of Bush's visit in June 2007 to the Washington's Islamic Center, during which he repeated his call for a Palestinian state, touted U.S. support for Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo, characterized jihadists as betrayers of faith, stated his intention to appoint a special envoy to the Organization of Islamic Conference, and expressed Americans' collective "appreciation for a faith that has enriched civilization for centuries." American ambassador to Belgrade Cameron Munter hosted a Ramadan dinner in Novi Pazar and read out a message from President Bush and said that the U.S. wanted to build stronger bridges with the Muslim community. This despite the fact that the Serbian authorities arrested 15 members of a Wahhabi terror group charged for planning terror attacks on various locations in Belgrade including bombing the American embassy.

The U.S. is fixated on the notion that victory in the misnamed "war on terror" could only be achieved by getting the Islamic world on our side. A part of that strategy is to make peace with radical Islam including the Muslim Brotherhood. Their radical background is presented in my *The Revenge of the Prophet* book as a longstanding pattern in the U.S. foreign policies. This orientation can be summarized as follows: "in local conflicts, promote Islamic interests; ally ourselves with jihad as long as it is directed against someone else. The underlying logic is: if we—the United States, the West—support Islamic interests, the result will be a moderate Islam that will perhaps threaten others but not us; if we don't, those interests will be championed by "extremists" (or at least by extremists we have co-opted and redefined as moderates)." The U.S. intelligence officers are currently meeting not only with the Muslim Brotherhood representatives but also with even more radical members of the Deobandi sect in Pakistan.

The U.S. State Department has been using the PR, rather than a policy change, in promoting this utopian policy of "If we just explained our policies in a manner they could hear, and then they would understand." In that PR drive it helps to tell the Muslims that the U.S. supports independence for Kosovo like it supported the KLA. Anticipating a diplomatic dividend for pleasing the Muslim world, the House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Tom Lantos called upon "jihadists of all color and hue" to see Kosovo as "yet another example that the U.S. leads the way for the creation of a predominantly Muslim country in the very heart of Europe." Senator Biden, a former presidential candidate and another Serb basher, said: "Pristina is one of rare



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Muslim cities in the world where the U.S. is not only respected but loved...The people of Kosovo—already the most pro-American in the Islamic world—will provide much needed example of a successful U.S.-Muslim partnership.”

Walid Phares, writing in the *American Thinker*, points out those statements of the American congressmen were not only legally unfounded but dangerous. “There is no basis in modern international law for forming states to satisfy a religious bloc of states. This strange logic, instead of weakening the Jihadist view of the world, would further strengthen Al Qaeda and its ilk. The United States is not the Byzantine Empire, nor is the Organization of the Islamic Conference a Caliphate, and they should not behave as if they were. The International Salafists want the world to respond to theologically-motivated world power dynamics instead of the present set of international conventions. Washington has no right to trade favors with oil powers on the basis of satisfying ideological ambitions here and there...Will the U.S. please the Wahhabis by forcing India to relinquish Kashmir, Phillipines to let go of Mindanao, Russia to cut Chechnya loose, Cyprus to abandon its Turkish north and last but not least to slice out half of the Galilee to its own Muslim minority.”

On the opposite side of the spectrum is Daniel Serwer, VP for Peace and Stability Operations at the U.S. Institute for Peace, reminding the American officials who are “fond of pointing out that the U.S. has repeatedly intervened to protect the Muslims from war and dictatorship” that their claim would be devalued “if the so far successful international interventions in Bosnia or Kosovo end in tragedy.” To him the tragedy would be if the U.S. and the EU do not ensure that Serbia is blocked from making trouble, Kosovo becomes independent, and Bosnia stays united. His column in the Pakistani *Daily Times* was referred to me as the one written by an “empire servant.”

Hence, Islamophilia is a huge factor in the U.S.’ Balkan policies, perhaps the dominant one with hegemony being close second. However, it disregards that the Muslims have brought no praise but instead have simply augmented the list of Muslim grievances headed by Iraq and Palestine but including also Chechnya, Kashmir, Philippines, etc. How can the Muslims forget that anywhere up to one million Iraqi civilians have died as a result of the American aggression releasing sectarian violence in Iraq? A survey released by *WorldPublic-Opinion.org* suggests that the struggle for Muslim hearts and minds may already be lost. Overwhelming majorities in Egypt, Morocco, Pakistan and Indonesia say they believe that the U.S. seeks to “weaken and divide the Islamic world” and to achieve political and military domination to control Middle East resources.” Most think that Al Qaeda defends the dignity of Muslims by standing up to the U.S. and most share Al Qaeda’s goal of evicting the U.S. military from the Mideast.



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

Jatras' Thoughts

American Council for Kosovo Director James George Jatras on November the 20th following the "election" victory of the "Democratic Party of Kosovo," under the leadership of Hashim Thaci, said:

“Take everything you think you know about the stated U.S. policy of combating jihad terrorism, organized crime rackets, trafficking in persons (i.e., sex slavery), the global drug trade, peddling weapons and explosives to terrorist groups, and so on. Now stand everything you think you know on its head - and picture the U.S. supporting all of these activities, not combating them. As incredible as it sounds, that describes in a nutshell American policy in Kosovo, which seeks to separate the province from Serbia

and create a new terrorist and criminal statelet in Europe.”

It is also irrational that most EU countries support the Kosovo Albanian extremism, separatism, irredentism and fundamentalism—everything that authentic Europe allegedly is supposed to stand against. The EU leaders refuse to admit that the white apartheid practiced by the Kosovo Albanians as well as their anti-Christian persecution is de facto anti-European and anti-Christian.

Bolton's Interview

John Bolton, former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, was interviewed by Branko Mikasinovich of Voice of America.

“Historically, it is very difficult to identify a new threat, as the case with Nazism in Europe, and it took us a long time to spot the international danger of Communism. I am not sure whether radical Islam would reach such a level of threat, but the threat is real as we have witnessed during the terrorist attacks on the US in 2001, attacks in Madrid and London, then in Asia, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon and the Palestinian-occupied territories. We need to pay more attention to that threat and we shouldn't take any steps which would further increase it, especially in Europe.” This author asserts that Islamism or jihadism is a global movement and represents a real threat to the Western civilization, just as fascism and communism did. In this context the U.S. Balkans policies based on Islamophilia border with criminal negligence.

“I think that the State Department has had an anti-Serbian policy for more than 15 years. When Yugoslavia was falling apart and Milosevic conducted his policy, there was some logic to our opposition to such a policy. Unfortunately, this biased policy has continued, even though there's no logical explanation for it. While Serbia is trying to establish an effective and functional democracy regarding human rights and other issues, the anti-Serbian policy has continued, especially with regard to Kosovo, where a decision in favor of its independence could only create other concerns, and such a



KOSOVO

COMPROMISE 2007

Your daily-updated analyses, charts and solution plug-ins for the Kosovo crisis.

decision can could impact on the democracy in progress in Serbia, and the possibility that the Security Council would step beyond its authority, which would be very unfortunate.”