

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility,
and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

English Edition of *Zeit-Fragen*

The Nato-aggression against Yugoslavia from 1999 was a model of the new wars of conquest”

“Humanitarian interventions” as a pretext for deployment of US-troops

Interview with Živadin Jovanovi, Former Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia,
presently Chairman of the Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals



Živadin Jovanovic (Bild ev)

Current Concerns: Mr. Jovanovic, can you present yourself shortly for our readers and give us some information about yourself and your career?

Živadin Jovanovic: In 1961 I graduated from the Faculty of Law at the University of Belgrade; from 1961 to 1964 I was at the District Administration of New Belgrade [a municipality of Belgrade]; from 1964-2000 I was in the diplomatic service of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia FRY/Federal Republic of Yugoslavia FRY: from 1988-1993 as Ambassador in Luanda, Angola, from 1995-1998 as Assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, and from 1988-2000 as Minister of Foreign Affairs. From 1996-2002 I was Vice Chairman of the Socialist Party of Serbia for Foreign Affairs; 1996 I was Member of Parliament to the Parliament of Serbia and in 2000 to the Federal Parliament of Yugoslavia (2000). Books that I wrote are: “The Bridges” (2002), “Abolishing the State” (2003), “The Kosovo Mirror” (2006).

After leaving the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in November 2000 you joined the

* “Von Nürnberg nach Den Haag”
ISBN 978-86-83965-7-3 [in serbischer Sprache]
“Von der Aggression zur Sezession”
ISBN 978-86-83965-9-7 [in serbischer Sprache]

“In a broader sense it should be noted that NATO aggression marked a strategic change in its nature: it abandoned the defensive and adopted an offensive (aggressive) policy, authorizing itself to intervene any time at any spot on the globe. The UN, especially the UN Security Council, had been disabled; international law and justice disregarded.”

Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals. Now you are the Chairman of this Association. What are your priorities?

The priorities of the Forum are: the promotion of peace, tolerance and cooperation based on equality among individuals, nations, and states. We stand for full respect of the international law, the basic principles of international relations and the role of the United Nations. Use or threats of use of force and military aggressions are not admissible means in solving international problems. We consider that there are no “humanitarian” wars, or interventions. All interventions beginning with the NATO aggression against Serbia (FRY) in 1999 up to now, regardless on their formal, public explanations, have been wars of conquest, some of them for geo-strategic, some for economic benefits. We promote human rights in their entirety, according to the UN-declaration – including social, economic, cultural, health, employment and other human rights.

We try to meet our objectives through various public debates, conferences, round tables, seminars, on national and international levels. The Forum cooperates with associations of similar aims, within Serbia, the region and worldwide.

We have seen some of very interesting books published by Belgrade Forum. How do you manage to maintain your publishing activity?

The Forum has published about 70 books on different national and international issues, from development policy in conditions of crisis, the status of Kosovo and Metohija and the Hague Tribunal to the NATO policy in the Balkans, on the for-

eign policy of Serbia, on International terrorism and on the role of intellectuals. Some of our books have been distributed in many countries in all continents. This is the case, for example, of the book titled “NATO Aggression – the Twilight of the West”. Unfortunately, for the lack of resources, only a few of our books have been published in foreign languages.

Last month only we published three new books – one devoted to the great Serbian philosopher and academician Mihailo Markovic, who was one of the co-founders of the Belgrade Forum, the other titled “From Nuremberg to Hague” and a third “From Aggression to Secession”. * Promotions of our books in various towns in Serbia attract significant attention.

All our activities, including writing and publishing, are entirely based on voluntary work. We never had, nor do we have today, a single person paid for the work done within the Forum. Membership fees and donations, mainly from Serbian diaspora, are chief sources of the Forum’s income.

You have mentioned promotion of peace to be one of your key objectives. But peoples of your region have been victims of wars in the last decade of the 20th century?

True. The peoples of former Yugoslavia have suffered immensely, first, from the civil wars in Bosnia and Croatia (1992-1995), then from the military aggression of NATO (1999), from sanctions and isolation and so on. Great many of them continue to suffer today. Consider, for

"Freedom, Democracy and ..."

continued from page 1

example, the life of close to half a million of refugees and displaced persons living in Serbia only, who are not permitted to return to their homes in Croatia or in Kosovo and Metohija. Consequences are still painful and will continue long in the future. What to say of the consequences of cassette bombs and missiles with depleted uranium used by NATO in 1999 taking daily tolls in human lives today and in centuries to come. History will prove that the peoples of former Yugoslavia have been victims of the concept of the so called New World Order which in fact has been based on the policy of domination and exploitation.

Do you suggest that the foreign factors are responsible for the break-up of Yugoslavia, and not local ones?

Local factors cannot be amnestied; they do bear their responsibility, of course, for not being prepared to compromise. But the prevailing analyses seem to be lacking due attention to the negative role of external factors. Now we have enough proofs that certain European powers already in 1976 and 1977 had plans on how to "rearrange" the territory of SFRY, in other words, how to divide, or fragment it in order to suit their own interests.

After Tito's death, nationalism and separatism in various Yugoslav republics, as well as separatism and terrorism in the Serbian Province of Kosovo and Metohija, had been encouraged, even assisted politically, financially, logistically and propaganda-wise. Later on certain mighty countries have been involved in the civil wars helping one against the other side. Those countries almost openly had been supporting a secession of Slovenia and Croatia, arming Croatia and Bosnia even during the UN arms embargo, encouraging and facilitating the incoming of mercenaries, including Mujahidin. On the other side Serbia and Montenegro had been under isolation, sanctions and stigmatization. They had been treated as the only ones responsible for the civil wars. That was not based on facts, nor helpful in extinguishing the fire.

Results?

In the place of one state, now there are six, economically unsustainable, puppet states, plus a seventh one in the offing, 18 governments¹, six armies, six diplomatic services, etc. Foreign debt, which in 1990 amounted to about 13.5 billion for the whole of the SFRY rose in 2012 to about 200 billion of Euro for the six former Yugoslav republics! Some of them became financially enslaved. Who has benefited from this? Until 1990 there was not

a single foreign military basis in the region. Today, there are a number of foreign, mainly USA, bases, Bondsteel in Kosovo and Metohija being the largest in Europe.² To do what? To benefit whom? Bosnia almost 18 years after the Dayton Accords is not functional; ten years after the Ohrid Accords the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) is not functional and continues to be faced with profound ethnic divisions and tensions. The status of Kosovo and Metohija even 14 years after UN Security Council Resolution 1244 still remains unresolved. Tirana's *Sali Berisha* and Prishtina's *Hashim Thaci* are publically advocating for the establishment of so called Greater Albania. Other burning problems like unemployment ranging from 30 to 70 per cent, poverty, hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons, international organized crime, including trafficking of human organs, drugs, arms and immigrants, make the picture of post Yugoslavia's reality grim and uncertain.

So, who has really benefited from the fragmentation of Yugoslavia?

Mentioning NATO intervention what are your views now, 14 years after?

My views have not changed. This was an illegal, criminal and immoral attack on a sovereign European state. Illegal because it violated all basic principles of international law, including the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and many international conventions. It was undertaken without permission of the UN Security Council. Criminal, because it was directed mainly against civilians, civilian infrastructure, using forbidden armament such as chemical, cassette bombs and missiles with depleted uranium. Immoral, because it was based on false pretensions and on untruths. The leaders of NATO are responsible first of all for killing of close to 4,000 and for wounding about 10,000 of persons, two thirds of whom were civilians. Direct material damages amounted to over 100 billions of US dollars. The NATO aggression solved nothing, but it has provoked many new problems. It was a war of conquest and not a "humanitarian intervention".

Can you be more specific?

I have already mentioned some direct consequences. In a broader sense it should be noted that NATO aggression marked a strategic change in its nature: it abandoned the defensive and adopted an offensive (aggressive) policy, authorizing itself to intervene any time at any spot on the globe. The UN, especially the UN Security Council, had been disabled; international law and justice disregarded.³

This was a long prepared first war on Europe's soil after the Second World War. It was a demonstration of US domination

"It was a demonstration of US domination in Europe, an expansion toward East, a justification of spending on NATO even after the dissolution the Warsaw Pact, a precedent for future interventions (Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya)."

in Europe, an expansion toward East, a justification of spending on NATO even after the dissolution the Warsaw Pact, a precedent for future interventions (Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya).

It was the war imposed and directed by a non-European power with the consequence that it to stay on Europe's soil for a long time.

The Aggression had marked a strategic change in Germany's policy adopted after Second World War. By taking active part in NATO's aggression against Serbia (FRY) Germany deviated from its own constitution and widely opened the door for combat roles away from its territory, and for militarization.

Today we have on European soil more military bases than at the peak of the Cold War. Mushrooming of military bases started after the NATO aggression on Serbia (FRY). How to explain the expansion of democracy all over the Continent and the proliferation of military bases at the same time? I have not heard any convincing explanation. Something seems to be wrong.

"It was the war imposed and directed by a non-European power with the consequence that it to stay on Europe's soil for a long time."

And what is your opinion on the future of Bosnia?

Bosnia and Herzegovina had existed as one of the six republics of SFRY based on constituent equality of three peoples each having a right of veto – Muslims, Serbs and Croats. In that regard, it was considered being "small Yugoslavia". When in 1992 the constitutional principle of consensus was violated in the way that Muslims and Croats declared for secession ignoring the Serbs option to stay within Yugoslavia, civil war erupted. The Dayton peace Accords were a success only because they reaffirmed the principle of equality of the three constituent peoples, the equality of the two entities (Moslem-

"Freedom, Democracy and ..."

continued from page 2

Croat Federation and Republica Srpska) and the principle of consensus.⁴ These basic principles were enshrined in the Constitution which is an integral part of the Accords.

The main source of the current crisis is the ambition of the Moslem leaders in Sarajevo to abolish the principle of consensus and to make a unitary state under their domination. In addition, they would like also to change the division of the territory guaranteed by Dayton Accords according to which the Muslim-Croat Federation controls 51 and Republica Srpska 49 percent of the whole territory. To make the problem more difficult, Muslims for their claims which obviously are contrary to Dayton stipulations, continue to enjoy support from some power centres, primarily from Washington and Berlin. Why they want to further weaken the Republica Srpska and strengthen the Moslems, I would rather not comment. These centres even pressurize Serbia's leaders to discipline the leaders in Banja Luka so that they accept a revision of Dayton and the Constitution contrary to their interests which are internationally guaranteed. Serbia as guarantor of the Dayton Accords, firstly, has no power to impose anything on the leadership of Republica Srpska and, secondly, it is not in Serbia's interest to weaken the Republica Srpska thus provoking internal tensions and a renewed spiral of ethnic tensions and even clashes in their own neighbourhood.

"Serbia, being a small, peace loving country, having neither an imperial history nor imperial ambitions today, in our opinion, should remain a neutral country, something like Switzerland."

I believe that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be left alone to politically find solutions that suite the interests of the three equal constituent peoples and the two equal entities. The Dayton Accords are not perfect. But there could hardly be a better compromise than the Dayton Accords. Brussels claims that a centralization of power in Sarajevo would apparently upgrade efficiency of the state administration. Authors of this view seem to be disregarding that it is the principle of consensus and decentralization which led to re-establishing of peace, the maintaining of integrity and providing the sense of freedom and democracy. Finally, in

"Serbia and the Serbian nation have always through history been part and parcel of Europe, its culture, progress and civilization; this is the same today and, I believe, it will stay so in the future. Nations have deep roots and faces that do not change overnight. In my opinion it would be useful if any prejudicing and one sided views characteristic of the public approaches to Serbia and Serbs in the recent past would be replaced by more balanced and non biased views."

my opinion, the Office of the High Representative after 17 years of being at the same time Law-making, Prosecution and Judiciary has become an anachronism and should be disbanded. Bosnia and Herzegovina is the only member of the UN (even a member of the Security Council), the OSCE and other organizations, where a High Representative enacts laws, removes presidents, prime ministers and ministers!

Serbia, being a small, peace loving country, having neither an imperial history nor imperial ambitions today, in our opinion, should remain a neutral country, something like Switzerland. Concerning human rights, we stand for the concept of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) which demands respect of all human rights including the one to cooperate.

My colleagues of CC once said that Serbia is a thorn in the conscience of the Western world. What is your opinion on this?

What I can say is that the leaders and politicians of certain European countries have been far from neutral, constructive or moral during the Yugoslav and Kosovo crisis. Some of them actively advocated and participated in the NATO aggression which left serious long term problems for the whole of Europe. Together with leaders of the USA, they at least knew about financing, training and arming Albanian terrorists and separatists in Kosovo and Metohija from their states. UN Security Council documents confirm this.⁵ I may not be quite objective, but I am certainly sincere. In my opinion, there is little to be proud of Europe's role toward Serbia and Serbs in the last 20 years. I have been surprised by the measure of distortions, double standards and immoral statements practiced by certain politicians who represent European values and civilization. And it would not be worth talking about it today, if the lessons had been drawn from the past. Unfortunately, new politicians of those countries continue with the same policies and the same dishonest methods toward Serbia.

Governments of leading western countries initiated an outrageous anti-Serbian propaganda campaign based on prejudices, dishonest fabrications and even on ordinary lies. I still remember, for exam-

ple, the invention of the German defense minister *Rudolf Scharping*⁶ of the alleged "Horse shoe plan". The so called "massacre of civilians" in Racak which served as a justification for the start of the military aggression also proved to be false. The report of the findings of the international forensic experts team headed by the Finish doctor *Helen Ranta*, which acted under EU auspices, has never been published. Apparently, it was lost somewhere in Brussels!⁷

What are the lessons of the NATO aggression for you and the world?

The NATO aggression against Serbia (FRY) in 1999 was a model of the new wars of conquest covered by the phrase "humanitarian intervention". Everybody by now should know that this was not "humanitarian intervention" and that there are no "humanitarian wars". That was a war of conquest to take away from Serbia its province of Kosovo and Metohija and to install there USA troops for strategic reasons. This was a precedent which was followed according to my opinion to export the capitalistic social system based on single Washington's doctrine, which is equally unacceptable today as it was unacceptable to export of the socialist system based on Moscow's doctrine in the sixties of the last century. Freedom of choice should be the sovereign right of every country. It is not right to divide peoples as if some have a right granted to them by Good to decide on what is good even for every other nation in the world. History has thought, at least us in Europe, that such ideology would be a source of great danger.

Where is the solution for the Kosovo issue?

The Problems of Kosovo and Metohija are centuries long, deep rooted ones. The Province is the birth place of the Serbian state, its culture, religion and national identity. About 1.300 medieval monasteries and churches, including some UNESCO proclaimed as world heritage, are still found there. Over 150 have been destroyed by vandals and extremists. To say that the basic problems there have been in the field of human rights of Albanians would be a simplification. To solve the es-

"Freedom, Democracy and ..."

continued from page 3

sential problems which I believe are in territorial expansionism of Albanians supported by western countries, primarily by the USA, Germany and Great Britain, all political actors need wisdom, long term view and patience, qualities that seem to be astonishingly in deficit.

I still believe in a compromise solution based on UN Security Council Resolution 1244 of June 10th, 1999. That resolution, like a number of other UN Security Council decisions preceding it, has repeatedly guaranteed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of FRY (succeeded by Serbia) and substantial autonomy for Kosovo and Metohija within FRY (Serbia). In the meantime great many serious mistakes have been committed, first and foremost, by the so called international community, including EU, then by Serbian authorities. Those mistakes generally can be summed up as serious deviation from the UN Security Council Resolution 1244. In March 2008, Albanian leadership in Prishtina, declared the illegal, unilateral secession of the Province from Serbia, proclaiming the so called Republic of Kosovo. While the Province even today remains under UN Security Council mandate, the UN has not reacted. The USA, Germany, Turkey, Great Britain almost immediately recognized this secession. By now, 22 out of 27 EU members⁸ followed the suite. Serbia has not, and I believe, shall not recognize secession of 17 percent of its territory. Most of the UN members, including two, out of five, permanent members of the Security Council, Russia and China, have not.

Last year the dialog has started under the EU auspices between representatives of Belgrade and Prishtina on solving some concrete issues concerning everyday life of citizens. This may be good presumed it does not prejudice the key issue – the status of the Province as envisaged by UN Security Council Resolution 1244. I personally would like to see that the dialog produces the time table for free and safe return to their homes of about 250 000 Serbs and other non-Albanians who live in miserable conditions in various towns of Serbia and Montenegro. Unfortunately, so far, this issue has not come to the agenda, partially because of the lack of interest of Prishtina, partially because of the double standard policy of the West.

There is no viable solution imposed by force or by blackmailing Serbia's government. The so called *deal* sponsored by certain western countries – territory (Kosovo) for membership (of Serbia) in EU and more foreign investments – may seem logic considering Serbia's economy in shambles, but I do not believe it would

work. It would not be fair, not balanced. It would not be acceptable by Serbs knowing their history, culture and pride.

What is the relationship between Serbia and the EU?

The EU is traditionally the most important economic partner of Serbia. Historic, social and cultural links remain strong. Hundreds of thousands of Serbian citizens and their descendants work and live in EU member countries. Serbia is a candidate for membership in EU. This is reflected in applying the method of "carrot and stick", in an endless list of conditions towards Serbia which have not been applied, nor are they applied now to any other candidate country. The EU expects Serbia to "normalize relations with Kosovo". When Belgrade reacts that it will never recognize Kosovo, Brussels' commissars react that this is "not yet on the agenda", that the EU demands "only" the IBM (integrated border management) system on the borders with Kosovo, dissolution of Serbia's institutions in Kosovo, notably in Northern Kosovo, signing of an agreement on good neighbourly relations, exchange of ambassadors, then that Serbia does not obstruct Kosovo's membership in the UN, and alike! Imagine that dimension of hypocrisy. They do not demand a diplomatic note, or any written statement on recognition, but they certainly demand relations equaling those between sovereign states!

I support close cooperation between Serbia and the EU in all fields of mutual interest without any obstacles: free flow of goods, capital, people, information. Having regard that the EU at present does not treat Serbia as sovereign partner, Serbia should adopt a policy of good neighbourly relations with the EU and freeze the present policy defining membership in the EU as the only alternative. It cannot be in the best interest of Serbia to give away more for less. Openness, cooperation without any administrative obstacles and a good neighbourly relation between Serbia and the EU would be quite a reasonable approach for the foreseeable future.

How can we in Germany, Switzerland and other European countries help that your people are better in every way?

The best way to help not Serbia only, but the understanding in Europe and a return to the real values of our civilization, is to always defend the truth, to avert distortion, semi-truths and immorality of all kinds. Serbia and the Serbian nation have always through history been part and parcel of Europe, its culture, progress and civilization; this is the same today and, I believe, it will stay so in the future. Nations have deep roots and faces that do not

change overnight. In my opinion it would be useful if any prejudicing and one sided views characteristic of the public approaches to Serbia and Serbs in the recent past would be replaced by more balanced and non biased views.

We understand that the Belgrade Forum will be hosting an important international conference next March in Belgrade?

The Forum and some other independent, non partisan associations in Serbia are planning an international conference under the title "Aggressions, militarization and world crises", to be held in Belgrade, March 22 and 23rd, 2014. This conference and other accompanying events will mark the 15th anniversary of the beginning of the 1999 NATO-aggression against Serbia (FRY) and pay honour to the victims of the aggression. We plan to invite prominent scholars and intellectuals from European and other countries to address the burning issues of military interventionism, expansion of military budgets, the militarization of political decision making and the world crisis which, in our opinion is not only a financial and economic, but also a crisis of the international world order.

* ISBN 978-86-83965-7-3 [in serbischer Sprache] und ISBN 978-86-83965-9-7 [in serbischer Sprache]

¹ Bosnia and Herzegovina having one central government, two governments of the entities and plus 10 cantons governments in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina

² "The war against Yugoslavia was waged in order to correct the mistake of general Eisenhower made during the Second World War. For strategic reasons it was necessary to station American soldiers there afterwards". Willy Wimmer, letter to Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, dated May 2nd, 2000, Aktualna pitanja spoljne politike (Current Foreign policy issues), Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals, Belgrade, 2007, p. 76-77.

³ "Force should be above the law. Wherever the law stands on the way, it should be removed", Willy Wimmer: Letter to Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder on USA NATO policy, dated May 2nd, 2000. Current issues of Foreign Policy, p. 77, The Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals, Belgrade, 2007.

⁴ At the same time, the Dayton Accords established two entities – Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Muslims and Croats) and Republic of Srpska – placing all essential constitutional rights and responsibilities in their hands.

⁵ THE UN Security Council "decides that all the states...shall prevent armament and training for terrorist activities in this area" (Kosovo and Metohija, note of the author), UN Security Council Resolution No. 1160, of March 31st, 1998. Also, the UN Security Council "demands that all states use all the means in accordance with their internal laws and relevant international laws in order to prevent use of funds collected in their territories, in the way which is contrary to the resolution 1160 (1998)", UN Security Council Resolution 1199, dated September 23rd, 1998.

⁶ German defence minister Rudolf Shaping presented at the press conference held April 7, 1999, an alleged plan of Yugoslav forces to ethnically cleanse Albanians from Kosovo and Metohija, the existence of which was not supported by the German intelligence service and which later proved to be false.

The Nato-Aggression against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999

by Milica Radojkovic-Hänsel

Fourteen years ago, after the negotiation conferences in Rambouillet and Paris between 6th and 23rd February 1999, the global media informed the general public that “the Serbian delegation did not accept the offered agreement and rather qualified it as null and void”, while indicating that allegedly the so-called Contact Group for Yugoslavia stood behind the agreement. This body consisted of four NATO country-members plus Russia, but Russia rejected to endorse the military section (*Annex B*) of the offered agreement – a fact hidden in the media information.

What had actually taken place in Rambouillet and Paris and what did the “Annex B” exactly say? The then US State Secretary, *Madeline Albright* claimed that “the military portion of the agreement was practically the essence of the agreement offered in Rambouillet” which was unacceptable for the delegation from FR Yugoslavia.

Zivadin Jovanovic, the then Yugoslav Minister of Foreign Affairs, said in his interview to *Politika*, the Belgrade daily, of 6th February 2013, that “in Rambouillet no attempt was made to reach accord, nor were there any negotiations or an agreement”. Yugoslav delegation was invited to Rambouillet to participate in the negotiations with the Albanians’ delegation from Kosovo.

It seems true that indeed no negotiations have taken place. This conclusion derives on basis of several statements made by some western officials, including, among others, the then Chairman of the *Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)*, the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs.

The biased writing of western press and the partial claims by the western politicians about “the failure in the negotiations through non-acceptance of the polit-

ical document about broad autonomy for Kosovo” on the part of Yugoslav side was meant to support the preparation of public opinion for the military aggression of the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) that had already been planned for October 1998, but was postponed for obvious reasons until 24th March 1999. The truth is that the Yugoslavian delegation has requested several times, as indicated in its written communications to the negotiation mediators, direct negotiations between the Yugoslav and Kosovo delegations, which is a fact proven by the official documents. *Christopher Hill*, the American representative in the negotiations, claimed in his response to such requests, that the Kosovo delegation “did not want direct negotiations”. “It became clear to all of us then that direct dialogue was not suitable for the Americans and that this was the real reason why the direct contact was not taking place”, *Jovanovic* points out. “It would be quite hard to believe, in case that the Americans had really wanted direct negotiations, that the Kosovo delegation would not accept their request”, he added.

Global media and the then western officials have also intentionally misinterpreted the alleged rejection by Yugoslavia to allow “installation of peace-keeping forces in Kosovo (and Metohija)”. However, the truth is that the Yugoslav delegation did accept the political portions of the Rambouillet draft agreement, but not its “Annex B” with the Points 2, 5 and 7 that proposed and required a military occupation of the entire territory of FR Yugoslavia (i.e. Serbia with 2 autonomous provinces, and Montenegro). Therefore, the global public opinion was an object of manipulated information which told that Serbs were “rejecting arrival of peace-keeping forces in Kosovo (and Metohija)”.

But, what are “peace-keeping forces” really in international practice and law? In international practice they imply the forces under United Nations (UN) Administration (also called “Blue Helmets”), consisting of troops provided by the UN member countries and not by NATO troops.

To understand what exactly caused FR Yugoslavia to reject the military portion of the document offered in Rambouillet, one has to read its provisions: (I) The NATO troops are allowed to freely and without charges to use any and all land, water and air spaces and equipments; (II) Their soldiers will enjoy diplomatic immunity and will not be held responsible for any damage made on the territory of FR Yugoslavia under civil and/or criminal laws; (III)

their soldiers may carry weapons on them even when wearing civil attire; (IV) Their soldiers may at any time take for use the entire electro-magnetic space of FRY, that is, the TV and radio frequencies, police and ambulance frequencies, civil protection and other frequencies, without announcement or any fee or charges whatsoever; (V) Their soldiers may at any time arrest any citizen on the FRY territory, without any warrant or decision of a court or any FRY authority.

Global media, particularly those in the NATO countries, and the then American and European officials, have withheld the truth about the content of the military document by charging the leaders of Serbia and Yugoslav President for “the lack of cooperation in the efforts to find a peaceful solution”. Just like in Rambouillet, “the Paris Conference also was not an event witnessing any serious ‘attempt’ for accord, negotiations or agreement”. American envoy, *Christopher Hill*, only required from the Yugoslav delegation to sign the text he had prepared and served on the table on basis of the ‘take it or leave it’ principle”, says Former Minister *Zivadin Jovanovic*.

In addition to numerous condemnations concerning the draft agreement text offered, that were expressed by renowned global law experts, a special attention is drawn to the evaluation of the document provided in an interview to the *Daily Telegraph* (London) by the former US Secretary of State, *Henry Kissinger* on 27th June 1999. He said, “The Rambouillet draft agreement text, requiring stationing of NATO troops throughout Yugoslavia, was a provocation. It served as a pretext for the launching of a bombing campaign. The Rambouillet document was such that no Serb could accept it. That horrible document should have not been submitted”. These words indicate, among other things, that the 1999 aggression against FR Yugoslavia was in fact presented in the western media as an epilogue reflected through the launching of the new interventionist strategy of NATO led by USA. This strategy was officially inaugurated at NATO meeting in Washington on 25th April 1999, that is, at the time of actual aggression against FRY.

In the aggression against FRY the NATO was changed from a defensive alliance into an aggressive one with the self-proclaimed right to intervene as a military force throughout the world. Fur-

“Freedom, Democracy and ...”

continued from page 5

⁷ Something similar happened with the Report of *Yasushi Akashi* who was a UN Special Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina of May 1992.). Report noted, among others, two important facts: first, that the most of the Yugoslav Army (JNA) was withdrawn and second, that withdrawal of Croatian Army from Bosnia has not occurred. *Akashi*’s report however was not distributed to the members of UN SC until after the most severe sanctions against FR of Yugoslavia were imposed on May 30th, 1992., UN SC resolution 757. (See SG Report S24049, May 30th, 1992, para 6 and para 9).

⁸ Spain, Romania, Slovak Republic, Greece and Cyprus have not recognized.

"The Nato-Aggression against ..."

continued from page 5

thermore, the judgement of the Yugoslav leaders implementing the country's official policy was correct in saying that one of the goals of this particular aggression was establishment of a precedent for military actions across the world without any decision of the UN and by violation of the UN Charter. This judgement was ver-

ified at the conference of NATO member states and membership candidates held in Bratislava in April 2000. The conference was organized just a few months after the aggression against FR Yugoslavia by the State Department and the *American Enterprise Institute* of the Republican Party, and was attended by some very high officials (government representatives and ministers of foreign affairs and defense) of NATO member states and membership

candidates. The main topics at the conference were the Balkans and expansion of NATO. In his written summary of the conference conclusions sent to the Chancellor of Germany, *Gerhard Schroeder*, on 2nd May 2000, *Willy Wimmer*, the then member of German Parliament (Bundestag) and Chairman of the *Parliamentary Assembly of the OESC*, claimed that by

continued on page 7

Mr Gerhard Schroeder, MP

Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany,
Federal Chancellery,
Schlossplatz 1, 10178 Berlin
Berlin, 05-02-2000

Dear Chancellor,

Last weekend, I was in the Slovakian capital of Bratislava, where I had the opportunity to participate in a conference jointly organized by the US State Department and the American Enterprise Institute (the institute of the Republican Party foreign policy) with focus on the themes of the Balkan and NATO enlargement.

The event was attended by high-ranking personalities already reflected in the presence of several prime ministers and foreign and defense ministers from the region. Of the many important issues that could be dealt with under that topic, some deserve particularly to be reported.

1. The organizers requested that the Allies achieve recognition of the independence of the state of Kosovo, according to international law.¹
2. The organizers declared that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was beyond any jurisdiction, in particular beyond the Final Act of Helsinki.²
3. The European legal system is an obstacle to the implementation of NATO plans. The American legal system was more suitable for this, even when being used in Europe.
4. The war against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was conducted to revise a false decision made by General Eisenhower in World War II. Due to strategic reasons, the decision to deploy US soldiers in the region had to be rectified.³
5. The European Allies went along with the war in Yugoslavia in order to overcome de facto the dilemma caused by the April 1999 'New Strategic Concept', which was enacted by the Alliance and the European predisposition of an existing mandate from the UN or the OSCE.
6. Irrespective of the subsequent legalistic European interpretation, where the enlarged task field of NATO in the Yugoslavian war exceeded the contract territory, it was an exceptional case, obviously a precedent which anyone at any time could and would rely on.⁴
7. The goal of the recently pending NATO expansion, is to restore the geographical situation between the Baltic Sea and Anatolia, as it had been at the time of the height of Roman expansion.⁵
8. In order to achieve this, Poland is to be surrounded in the north and south by democratic neighboring states. Romania and Bulgaria are to secure the ground connection to Turkey, Serbia (most likely to ensure a US military presence) was to be permanently excluded from European development.
9. North of Poland, it is important to maintain the complete control of entry from St. Petersburg to the Baltic Sea.⁶
10. In each case, the right of self-determination is given priority over all other provisions or rules of international law.⁷

11. The assessment, according to which NATO, when attacking the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia actually infringed upon international rule and, above all, any relevant provisions of international law, did not evoke contradiction.⁸

After this very candidly run event and in view of participants and organizers, one cannot help but make an assessment of the statements made at this conference.

In the global context and in order to achieve their goals, the American side, deliberately and intendedly wants to lever out the international legal system which was developed as a result of two world wars in the last century. Power shall precede law. Where international law stands in the way, it will be eliminated.

When a similar development happened to the League of Nations, the Second World War was not far off. This type of thinking which considers its own interests as being absolute, can only be called totalitarianism.

*Sincerely,**Willy Wimmer,**Member of Parliament,**Chairman of the CDU district association Lower Rhine,**Vice-President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly*

The following remarks are from Andreas Bracher (see source).

- 1 So far, the Kosovo continues to nominally be a province of Serbia, which in turn is a constituent republic of Yugoslavia. Maintaining this status, had been a prerequisite for the termination of the so-called Kosovo war in June 1999. Officially, maintaining this status is the program of the West until today.
- 2 The Helsinki Final Act, the so-called CSCE Order, had put down the foundations of coexistence of the European states in 1975. These principles included amongst others the inviolability of borders.
- 3 This seems to refer to the Allied invasion of Europe during the Second World War. Churchill et.al. had demanded then that an Allied invasion of the Balkans was to take place. Instead, Eisenhower as Commander in Chief of the Allied forces commanded invasions of Sicily (1943) and France (1944). As a result, there was no Western occupation of the Balkans at the end of the Second World War.
- 4 On the part of NATO, the 1999 Kosovo war was performed without UN mandate. Such a mandate would have complied with the wish of the European governments but not the American government. The latter wants to act preferably self-confidently without international restrictions. Items 5 and 6 apparently meant that with this war a) the European states would have overcome their commitment towards their public regarding such a UN mandate and b) a precedent for future operations without UN mandate was created.
- 5 The Roman Empire never extended to the Baltic Sea. Should Wimmer here have reported the statements correctly, 'Roman' on the one hand, means the Roman Empire, and on the other hand, the Roman church.
- 6 Thus this means to cut away Russia from its Baltic Sea connection and therefore to cut it off from Europe.
- 7 Emphasizing this right of self-determination, the American Wilsonianism, coined after the former president Woodrow Wilson, shows itself once again, according to Rudolf Steiner who was a main opponent of the founding of the threefold movement. Steiner saw this as a program for the "destruction of the coexistence of the European peoples". It allows the destruction of almost all European countries by accentuating "minority problems".
- 8 Apparently, this is about the reactions to a Wimmer draft. The conference participants were apparently aware of these violations against the provisions of international law, yet they did not care.

Source: Reprinted with notes by Andreas Bracher in "What does the Western Balkan policy want?" In *The European* Vol. 6 No.1, Nov. 2001. www.perseus.ch/PDF-Dateien/bracher-wimmer.pdf

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

Ten years already!

Extracts out of the Conference volum “Nato Aggression. The Twilight of the West”

The second segment, titled “MESSAGES AND SALUTARY SPEECHES” contains all messages from various senders as greetings or best wishes for the successful work of the Conference, and as denouncing of the crime of aggression that should never and nowhere happen again, and that should never be forgotten. We have fifteen such messages and greetings. Those came from all over the world, from India, Brazil, Palestine and Belarus, to France and Greece. These have everlasting meaning and weight. Those of us entrusted with preparing and holding the Conference and with compiling this Repertory, owe our deepest gratitude to their senders for the support expressed to our country and our nation for the suffering we had been exposed to, and for their heroic standing up to the incomparably mightier adversary. Each of these messages and greetings is most important and precious. We neither compare nor grade them. Having said that, I will take one of them as an example, not

because it is better or more valued than the other ones, but because it attaches a special symbolism for us and for all freethinking world. This is the message of *Pierre-Henri Bunel*, Major in the French Army, who on the eve of NATO aggression on Serbia shared with a Serbian diplomat his knowledge of certain secret aspects of NATO’s criminal intentions, thus giving immeasurable contribution to decreasing the number of Serbian casualties. For this heroic deed, brave Major Bunel served some time in prison. We can get more insight in the type of his message and the ethics of the author from the title he gave to his message. It reads “MESSAGE TO THE LAND OF HEROES DEFYING THE KILLER BOMBS”. Any further comment to it is unnecessary. Therefore, let us only say thank You, courageous Major, Your deed will serve as a model for future generations, showing how honor, dignity, and struggle for justice can overcome any fear and rationalize any loss.



ISBN 978-86-83965-35-9

“The Nato-Aggression against ...”

continued from page 6

the NATO attack on FRY, according to the admittance by USA, a precedent was established in order to be used whenever necessary. “It is understood that it is all about an excess that can be referred to at any time”, Wimmer explained one of the crucial conclusions. It was actually a retroactive confirmation that the real goal of the Rambouillet talks was not to allow any direct negotiations between the involved parties (Serbs and Albanians) or any political solution, but rather to ensure a pretext for the aggression, as Henry Kissinger indicated quite well (“It was just a pretext to launch the bombing campaign”).

Next, Willy Wimmer points out in his written communication that “the

war against FR Yugoslavia was waged to rectify the wrong decision made by General Dwight Eisenhower in World War Two”. Consequently, for strategic reasons American troops need to be stationed over there, so as to compensate for what was not done in 1945 (Point 4 of his letter). By building the Bondstill Military Base in Kosovo – the largest one in Europe, Americans have practically materialized their position at the Bratislava conference about “their need to station American soldiers in that space, for strategic reasons”. Wimmer’s letter also asserts (under Point 1), “The organizers of this conference have requested that international recognition of the independent state of Kosovo should be accomplished as fast as possible by the countries making the circle of allied states”, whereas “Serbia (the successor

of Yugoslavia) must be permanently excluded from the European development course” (according to Wimmer, probably for the purpose of unhampered military presence of USA in the Balkans). Willy Wimmer also claims, “The assertion that NATO had violated all international rules, and particularly all relevant provisions of international law, during the attack against FR Yugoslavia, has not been contradicted” (Point 11). The text also says that “the American side is aware and prepared, in the global context and to achieve its own goals, to undermine the order of international law”, meaning that international law is considered an obstacle for the planned expansion of NATO. And Wimmer then ends his letter with the following words, “Force has to stand above law”.

Nations without past have no future, either

by Major Pierre Henri Bunel, France

Ten years ago began NATO aggression against proud and free Serbian nation, a drama that developed assisted by a part of Western public, which was misused and deceived by NATO and its satellites!

Due to my firm decision to stand up to this calamity, I was forced to follow further developments from my cell in a French prison, the events that will historically stigmatize its participants and culprits.

In the run-up to the announced crime of bombing your country, I felt shame and pride at the same time.

I was ashamed because I saw my country voluntarily engage into a huge treason, primarily treason of her own self. Taking part in such a misdeed did not serve the French people right. However, the worst of all was that our administration betrayed the traditional friendship of two nations, built upon the historic heritage.

By bombing Belgrade, just like the Nazis did in WWII, the allies compromised themselves for eternity.

I also felt pride. During my stay in Bosnia and Herzegovina, I began to know the Serbian people. Although the situation for Bosnian Serbs was very difficult, when it came to the demands of the occupation forces, they have always bravely kept their promises, their word, but alas, all was destroyed by the subsequent Dayton dictate.

From my Paris prison, I felt strong friendship with Serbs who suffered strikes because they were determined to defend their life, culture and freedom, their most fundamental rights. I was proud when looking at Serbian patriots in bridges, as brave live targets for the beloved motherland.

In my dungeon, I received a lot of support from Serbs, who lived both in France and Serbia. A post card of a Francophile edition, numbered 188, one that I keep in my study and one that I always take with me to any of my travels, reads: "Serbian and French officers in WWI". The caption

* *Pierre Henry Bunel*, Major in French Army, at the time of NATO Aggression a member of French Military Mission to the Military Committee of NATO in Brussels.

beneath reads: Thank you, Commander Pierre-Henri Bunel! Serbia prays for you this March 1999. It was signed by Professor Branko Vasiljevic.

When my friends Yves Bataille and Mila Aleckovic invited me to Belgrade in 2003, and Director of Gutenberg Galaxy, Mr. Bavrlic, published my book "NATO Crimes", I finally got a chance to see the country of heroes defying the murderous bombs.

I crossed Ibar River going to Kosovska Mitrovica, followed by hostile eyes of the Albanians and protected by the Serbs from the north. I understood how my own Ariege in France is similar to this small part of your Serbian Kosovo land, similar in mountains, highlander way of life, and severe winters. We also had to fight in the past, defending from the conquerors from the north, and our high Montsegur, for us the French of Pyrenees is the same as the Kosovo Field is for you Serbs.

The drama continues with recognitions of an independent Kosovo and Metohija by various Washington satellites. However, France has also suffered Alsace taken away from her during 1940 to 1945, and yet we survived that occupation.

Today, once again France faces a dangerous obstacle. Just like the Serbs, we are left but with hope. The forces that crippled Serbia and France will soon enough trigger rebellion and uprising of our two nations. This is why our and your youth must resist lies of the consumer society.

Nations without past have no future, either. Those who preserve their awareness of who they are and who were those who formed them, may go on and take whatever good is there to be found in modernism. The global developments indicate that our enemies only promote weakness and laziness. However, the future of the world belongs to those who are strong, modest, and uncomplicated. We adults have to show this way to our children. Led by our spiritual leaders, we have to harness all our human strength and take our destiny to our hands.

You, Serbs, have been demonstrating bravery throughout your history, at least ever since the Battle of Kosovo. Today,

you are not alone, even if your brothers in the future joint struggle, for the time being, are suppressed and silent.

Believing in God, in motherland, in roots and tradition, are the sources of our future glory.

Today, on the tenth anniversary of the horrors that befell you and that will soon end, I wish to share with you that I am your friend and that I love you.

*Glory and longevity
to the Serbian peoples!*

*Your friend and brother,
Pierre-Henri Bunel*

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility, and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

Publisher: Zeit-Fragen Cooperative

Editor: Erika Vögeli

Address: Current Concerns,

P.O. Box, CH-8044 Zurich

Phone: +41 (0)44 350 65 50

Fax: +41 (0)44 350 65 51

E-Mail: CurrentConcerns@zeit-fragen.ch

Subscription details:

published regularly electronically as PDF file

Annual subscription rate of
SFr. 40,-, € 30,-, £ 25,-, \$ 40,-

for the following countries:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hongkong, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA

Annual subscription rate of
SFr. 20,-, € 15,-, £ 12,50, \$ 20,-
for all other countries.

Account: Postscheck-Konto: PC 87-644472-4

The editors reserve the right to shorten letters to the editor. Letters to the editor do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of *Current Concerns*.

© 2011. All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

The Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals

Never forget

The final document of the Belgrade International Conference

Held in Belgrade, 23 & 24 March, 2009

The *Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals*, in cooperation with the Club of generals and admirals of Armed Forces of Serbia and other independent associations in Serbia and in coordination with the *World Peace Council (WPC)*, held in Belgrade on March 23rd – 24th, 2009, an International Conference titled “Objectives and consequences of NATO Aggression against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) – 10 Years After”.

The Conference gathered some 700 scientists and experts in the area of international relations and security from Serbia and 45 countries from all continents, except Australia. About 60 participants submitted their papers on various aspects of the aggression and ensuing developments.

Opening ceremony was attended by *Prof Slavica Dukic Dejanovic*, the Speaker in the National Assembly of Serbia, Mr. Petar Skundric, the Energy Minister, as well as by the representatives of the Serbian Orthodox Church, veterans’, youth and other organizations.

Mr. Ivica Dacic, Deputy Prime Minister of the Government and the Minister of Home Affairs addressed the Conference and welcomed foreign guests on behalf of the Government.

The special participants of the Conference were *Ms Socorro Gomes*, the President, and *Mr Thanasis Pafilis*, the Secretary-General, of the World Peace Council.

The Conference was also attended by a number of ambassadors and senior diplomatic representatives accredited in Serbia.

The participants paid their respect to the victims of the 78-day bombardment and placed wreaths at the monuments dedicated to the victims of the aggression.

The debate was held in the spirit of friendship, openness and solidarity of all organizations and individuals struggling for peace, development and prosperity.

The participants of the Belgrade Conference agreed on the following:

NATO Aggression against Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) was an invasion that had been prepared long time in advance, with the following global goals: setting a precedent for military interventions worldwide; bringing American troops to the Balkans and expanding NATO to the East; encircling Russia; changing the International Law Order established after Second World War by imposing the rule that might is right; imposing neoliberal capitalistic

NATO Aggression against Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) was an invasion that had been prepared long time in advance, with the following global goals: setting a precedent for military interventions worldwide; bringing American troops to the Balkans and expanding NATO to the East; encircling Russia; changing the International Law Order established after Second World War by imposing the rule that might is right; imposing neoliberal capitalistic system; weakening Europe and damaging the role of the United Nations. The ultimate goal has been to reinforce the US concept of unipolar world order for the purpose of establishing the control over all the economic, natural, and human resources of the Planet. The extension of NATO in Europe and to other continents proves a will to become the gendarme of the multicorporate capital all over the world.

system; weakening Europe and damaging the role of the United Nations. The ultimate goal has been to reinforce the US concept of unipolar world order for the purpose of establishing the control over all the economic, natural, and human resources of the Planet. The extension of NATO in Europe and to other continents proves a will to become the gendarme of the multicorporate capital all over the world. The aggression was preceded by spreading lies and deceptions, with the special role assigned to the thesis on „avoiding humanitarian catastrophe”, the mock negotiations in Rambouillet, and staged „massacre of civilians” in Racak.

The aggression, coupled with its runup and the aftermath, is evidence of a deep moral and civilization crisis of the ruling Western elites, whereas its blowback effect, ten years on, comes to haunt them as a profound global economic crisis whose end remains beyond the horizon.

The leaders of the NATO countries are responsible for use of armed force without the UN Security Council approval; for the breach of the United Nations Charter, the OSCE Helsinki Final Act, the Paris Charter and international conventions, in what amounts to the crime against the peace and humanity.

They are responsible for more than 3,500 deaths and for more than 10,000 wounded people, two thirds civilians, for the use of inhuman non-authorized weapons such as depleted uranium ammunition and missile warheads as well as cluster bombs.

They are also responsible for human losses and suffering in the meantime as the consequence of the aggression, for the lasting pollution of soil and water, as a conse-

quence of the wide-spread use of depleted uranium missiles and of the deliberate bombing of chemical plants that amounted to chemical warfare. And they are responsible for economic damage costing in excess of 100 billion USD. Serbia is entitled to compensation for war damages.

NATO is responsible for failing to prevent destruction and obliteration of the Serbian monuments of culture in Kosovo and Metohija, which resulted in 150 destroyed Serbian churches and the medieval monasteries, most of which were under the UNESCO protection.

It is necessary to identify responsibility for a sharp increase in prevalence of cancer, for human loss and suffering over past ten years that are the consequences of, and caused by, the radiological and chemical pollution of the soil, waters, food and the environment in general.

Serbia is entitled to claim and be granted the war damages; this right cannot be taken away and nobody has the right to waive it.

The Government of Serbia was invited to determine the accurate number of the civilian victims of the NATO aggression.

The consequences of the radioactive weaponry and the chemical substances released in chemical facilities deliberately bombed by NATO must not be neglected or forgotten, and even less covered up. A petition was sent to the Government of Serbia to provide an independent expert scientific analysis of any consequences of use of the banned weapons, to endorse a set of measures aimed at preventing the adverse effects thereof in the future, and to

"Never forget"

continued from page 9

make public the findings of such an analysis.

USA/NATO/EU 1999 aggression was the first war on Europe's soil after the Second World War. It was not only a war against an old sovereign European state but primarily a war against Europe. Paradoxically, participated by Europe itself.

It was conducted in the unique alliance between an international state organization (NATO) and the notorious terrorist organization (OVK/UCK). The aggression was an historic mistake of the West which, sooner or later, will be recognized. Consequences of the aggression will extend throughout of 21st century. The West owes to apologize to Serbia for all the victims and pains, if not to face even deeper moral and overall crisis.

The participants to the Conference expressed their high esteem to the Yugoslav and Serbian Army for their patriotism, professionalism and bravery in defending the freedom of their country against the assault of the aggressors.

The aggression has subsequently continued over the past ten years employing other means such as political, economic and propaganda blackmail, by dismantling the Yugoslav (Serbian) Army and abolishment of FR of Yugoslavia.

The culmination of the imperialist anti-Serbian policy was embodied in the illegal and unilateral declaration of independence

of Kosovo and Metohija on 17 February 2008. This was followed by recognition of that criminal NATO/EU creature by their member states, with the exception of Greece, Romania, Spain, Slovakia and Cyprus. The West's foreign policy mismanagement has transformed Kosovo and Metohija, currently led by the terrorist leaders and the drug dealers' networks, into a stepping stone for the Islamist extremism, and thus into the greatest threat to the peace and stability in Europe.

The secession of Kosovo and Metohija and its subsequent recognition by majority of NATO/EU member countries represents a violation of the basic principles of the international relations and the ones approved by UN Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999). As a binding decision, this Resolution remains in force with the right of Serbia to insist on its strict and complete implementation. This particularly refers to the provisions concerning the safety and freedom of movement of the remaining Serbian population still living in barbed wired ghettos, repossession of the illegally occupied private and state property, the right to free and safe return of 220,000 displaced Serbs and other non-Albanians and the right to redeployment of the Serbian Army and Police contingents.

Serbia shall never recognize such blatant violation of its sovereignty, territorial integrity and national dignity. Serbia has the univocal right to defend its sovereignty and integrity by all legitimate means as any other sovereign country.

Ten years after, it became obvious that the direct goal of the aggression was to depose the legitimate President of FR of Yugoslavia Slobodan Milosevic for the purpose of depriving Serbia of 15% of state territory, to hinder the role of Serbia as a political stakeholder in the Balkans, and to place it under control of the West.

The same power centers that took decisive role in breaking apart SFR of Yugoslavia in 1992–1995, went on to launch the military aggression in 1999, and later on in abolishing of FR of Yugoslavia in 2006.

After the illegal secession of Kosovo and Metohija they continue to tacitly incite and support separatist forces in other parts of Serbia.

On the other side, the West has been engaged revising the Dayton-Paris Peace Agreement in order to dissolve the Republic of Srpska introducing step by step unitarian Bosnia and Herzegovina contrary to the said Agreement guaranteed by Serbia.

Ten years after the NATO aggression, the major part of Serbia's economic and natural resources became property of the countries that were the participatory states to aggression, whereas the US and NATO troops were awarded diplomatic status, that is, such privileges that neither the Serbian Army nor the Serbian citizens enjoy in their own country.

Policy of the West led to creation of 7 new puppet states, dismantling Yugoslavia which had existed as multinational, relatively prosperous state, for over 70 years. Its fragmentation left thousands of human victims, strained relations, economy in shambles and still unresolved problem of over 500,000 Serb refugees and displaced persons. Serbian nation was fragmented and instead of the status of constitutive nation, transformed into right-less minority, like in Croatia.

Overall policy of the West during the last 20 years has surfaced as retaliatory toward Serbian nation. Such a policy raises many questions concerning the future of Europe itself, particularly having regard that Serbia has always played constructive role in the new European history. At the end of the XX century Serbia righteously resisted the policy of capitulation and occupation introduced by US led Alliance like any sovereign country would do. Isolation, sanctions, military aggression and finally support to secession were admittedly also intended to prove to the Muslim world, as if the West protects the interest of Muslims in the Balkans.

The Conference participants held that the "International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia" in The Hague, the ICTY, represents a prolonged arm of NATO, the instrument of revenge. Its goal is to protect the aggressors and justify

EU wants to train and equip terrorists in Syria

For months it has been known that a proxy war is raging in Syria between Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the United States, France, Britain and Turkey on the one hand and Syria with Russia's support, Iran and – in a moral sense – also China on the other. As the investigative journalist Thierry Meyssan revealed contrary to the accounts of western media services, already at the beginning of the terrorist acts against the Syrian people, French officers had been involved, 48 of them could be arrested by the Syrian army. Today even the interest-driven media blatantly admit that Turkey, Qatar and Saudi Arabia were supporting terrorists in Syria with weapons, money, mercenaries, military coordination, safety counselors (agents) and also with possible retreat routes to Turkey. Thus, the above-mentioned states are – considered with respect to international law – at war with Syria, although a declaration of war is still lacking which would be necessary with respect to international legitimacy.

But if the EU wants to officially make the illegal intervention of French and British forces their own affair, there is a problem in many respects: on the one hand an intervention against Syria is illegal under international law – the veto of China and Russia prevents an official war option – and on the other, the Brussels functionaries claim a competence for themselves that is reserved for nation states, namely to wage wars. Above all this is dangerous because the European population has virtually no control over the political EU functionaries. It was not without reason that in genuine democracies the armies were placed under parliamentary control and not within the power range of a commission that is difficult to control or a dictator. Thus the situation in Syria is most explosive, considering Syria's representative function and the resulting dangers of conflagration. (eh)

Source: *Vertrauliche Mitteilungen* No. 4021 of 12 March 2013

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

continued on page 11

"Never forget"

continued from page 10

their crimes declaring the victim, the entire Serbian nation, to be the culprit. The Tribunal displayed neither interest nor readiness to review irrefutable evidence on crimes of the leaders of actual perpetrators, Albanian terrorists and NATO.

The participants called for the dissolution of the Hague Tribunal as a political not judicial body existing beyond the law, contrary to the United Nations Charter. There are no grounds to have Serbia, the Serbian nation, and their leadership stand accused for the past civil wars in former Yugoslavia, nor for the consequences of the Albanian separatism and terrorism. The Conference called for initiating an independent inquiry on the causes and circumstances of death of the former President of Serbia and the FR of Yugoslavia, the late *Slobodan Milosevic*, and also of the deaths of all the other Serbs who died under unclear circumstances while detained by the Hague Tribunal.

They expressed their indignation towards the recent penalties of the Hague Tribunal against high Serbian and Yugoslav political, military and police leaders, as retaliatory, stressing that the Tribunal failed to prove the personal responsibilities of any of the sentenced.

The so-called "independent Kosova" is but an extended US "Camp Bondsteel" and a spring board for the ongoing military expansion eastwards.

The aggression against the FR of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) proved that NATO is neither a defensive nor a regional alliance. It is military organization whose role is to impose global dominance of the richest countries led by the USA, over the vast majority of the less developed countries that happen to possess energy resources, or strategic raw materials, or substantial markets and outstanding geo-strategic position. NATO aggressive policy presents a true danger for peace and security in the world. The mushrooming of foreign military bases in the Balkans, Europe and the world, the constant rise in military budgets of the NATO and the EU member states the spiraling armament race must stop. The militarization of the political decision making process is gravely endangering democracy, inhibiting the social development, massively violating human rights, thus paving the way to the totalitarianism and the twilight of civilization.

The participants of the Belgrade Conference appealed to all the forces of peace, law and justice, to unite in the quest to abolish NATO, to dismantle foreign military bases, and to decrease the military spending for the benefit of the poor and oppressed. They have expressed their appreciation and solidarity with all peace movements and as-

The aggression against the FR of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) proved that NATO is neither a defensive nor a regional alliance. It is military organization whose role is to impose global dominance of the richest countries led by the USA, over the vast majority of the less developed countries that happen to possess energy resources, or strategic raw materials, or substantial markets and outstanding geo-strategic position. NATO aggressive policy presents a true danger for peace and security in the world.

sociations which are taking part in various activities aimed at memory to the victims and other consequences of NATO aggression on Yugoslavia in 1999.

The constant rise in military spending leads to further aggravation of the current world crisis. Reduction of USA/NATO/EU and other countries' military spending is the key condition to overcome the world crisis.

NATO crimes must not be forgotten. Therefore it is a moral obligation to initiate the procedure for determining responsibility of the then-leadership of NATO before the competent international and national courts, aiming at establishing concrete individual accountability.

Apart from this, the Conference noted initiatives to activate existing international tribunals for processing those responsible for NATO aggression, as well as to establish the International Human Conscience Tribunal (le Tribunal International de la Conscience Humaine) securing moral satisfaction to the victims of the aggression and to the entire Serbian nation.

It was noted that Serbia has never belonged to any military alliance; over 60 years it has been nonaligned and is the only European country victim of the NATO aggression.

Therefore participants voiced their profound conviction that Serbia should not seek nor accept membership in NATO being an offensive alliance with the role and objectives above UN and contrary to the existing International Law Order. It is believed that Serbia should be developing an open and balanced foreign policy, good neighborly relations and cooperation with all major stakeholders in the international relations, including with nonaligned countries, remaining militarily neutral.

Serbia should host the Nonaligned summit in 2011 celebrating 60th anniversary of the First nonaligned Summit held 1961 in Belgrade and seek return to full membership Status in NAM.

Serbia should affirm her military neutrality by resuming full membership in the NAM. This would contribute to the upgrading of other courses and priorities of Serbia's foreign and interior affairs, and

at the same time it would be a proper response to the support that the non-aligned countries give to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Serbia.

Recalling forthcoming 70th anniversary of the start of WWII, the participants expressed their concerns over the systematic attempts to revise the history of both the First and the Second World War, and unanimously condemned the revival of fascism and Nazism in certain European countries. A warning was sounded that such incidents are anything but accidental and that they seek to invoke conflicts, and therefore all the countries have the duty to stop them.

The Conference condemned the abuse of the struggle against international terrorism for the purpose of the expansion of the self-centered interests of a superpower or of a group of the richest countries. Double standards are not acceptable in combating terrorism.

So called independent Kosovo, Albanian terrorism and organized crime represent the most dangerous source of destabilization of the Balkans and Europe. Stability in the Balkans depend on the respect of universal principles of international relations, first of all, principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity, without exceptions. Renewal of the negotiations on the status of Kosovo and Metohija respecting UN SC Resolution 1244 is the only way to return to peace, stability and progress.

The Conference expressed its solidarity with the Palestinian people who have the right to freedom, independence and own country, just like any other nation in the Middle East has.

The illegal military occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq have no justification whatsoever and therefore should end up. The Conference called on the relevant foreign governments to withdraw their troops and terminate the operations.

Peace, security and development are inseparable. Aggression and the so-called low-intensity wars in any part of the world jeopardize other countries, nations and peoples. Therefore, peace, security

continued on page 12



The bridge of Varvarin. (picture dpa)

On Wednesday, 20th March 2013, the trial concerning the bomb attack on Afghan civilians near Kunduz started in BONN. In the fall of 2009 the German officer Colonel Klein had instructed US warplanes to bomb a crowd of people without any military necessity. During this attack, more than 130 people were killed or injured. Two Bremen lawyers sued the German government and demanded compensation for the victims of the air raid in Afghanistan. This event commemorates the bombard-

ment by NATO warplanes in the illegal war against the Republic of Serbia. In a public holiday in spring 1999, NATO warplanes bombed a bridge, while obviously civilians were crossing it - near the Serbian town Varvarin in two waves of attacks. They sent 10 civilians to death and 17 were injured, some seriously. Until today the victims have not been compensated. Different articles are documenting the events

<http://www.dw.de/popul-deutschland-muss-zahlen/a-16683296>

<http://www.dw.de/prozessauftakt-im-kundus-verfahren/a-16680680>

<http://www.n-tv.de/politik/Wer-haftet-fuer-die-Kundus-Toten-article10321151.html>

<http://www.presseportal.de/pm/47409/2437312/mitteldeutsche-zeitung-afghanistan-anwalt-der-kundus-klaeger-ist-von-sieg-vor-gericht-ueberzeugt>

"Never forget"

continued from page 11

and development may only be achieved through the broadest possible cooperation of the peace movements, intellectual and scientific forces.

The Belgrade Forum's International Conference on occasion of the 10th anniversary of the start of the NATO aggression, makes an important step to that end.

The unipolar world order era is collapsing. The processes of building a multi-polar world order is in progress. The conditions are conducive for democratization of the international relations

on the basis of sovereign equality of all states and of restoring respect for the fundamental principles of the international relations.

The appeal was addressed to the leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement countries to keep on strengthening unity and action capabilities strengthening the role of United Nations and basic principles of international relations.

The process of deepening global economic crisis obliges the Non-Aligned Movement to strengthen unity in order to prevent the richest countries from, once again, passing the burden of the problems onto the underdeveloped world. The time is ripe for unity, ac-

countability and action of all forces of and for peace, development, and equality. The Conference was preceded by the photo and book exhibition as well as by the review of documentary films organized by the Association of former generals and admirals of the Serbian (Yugoslav) Army.

The participants have expressed their appreciation and gratitude to the Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals for the initiative to convene this Conference, for the high level of organization, and hospitality it provided. •

Source: *Nato Aggression. The Twilight of the West.* p. 519-527

The “EU Councils” try to seize direct power

The lust for power of the European Union is unbroken, like a kraken the representatives of the “soviet-style EU dictatorship” grasp for more and more direct power in the individual member states. Now the member states were promised – in a playing down-manner – the support of the EU in case of “exceptional circumstances” inside their countries by means of the meanwhile formulated “solidarity clause” of the Lisbon Treaty. It is about the implementation of the obligation of the EU institutions and the member states to assist each other in “cases of damage”, as set out in Article 222 of the Lisbon Treaty.

In a proposal submitted by the EU Commission and the High Representative for

Foreign and Security Policy for the design of the “solidarity clause” they now talk of an “obligation to assist” in case of “exceptional circumstances”. In the clause the possible “disaster” is defined so widely that even (political) unrest, blockades and sabotage are included. Reasons for mutual aid (or rather controlling interference by EU institutions) can accordingly arise from all situations, that can have “adverse impact on people, the environment or property.” This refers to “serious, unexpected and often dangerous situations requiring timely action” and can “affect or threaten ... societal functions”. It is a deliberately broad definition, which – there the critical voices do largely in agree – is likely to be applied

to all developments that might jeopardize the continued existence and the powers of the current “soviet-style EU dictatorship”.

In early March the first reading of the proposed “solidarity clause” was to take place in the European Parliament. It is feared that the objections of EU parliamentarians are once again confined to narrow limits. The already established European police forces (“Eurogendfor”) at least completed appropriate exercises and currently the “counterinsurgency capability” (!) of the individual EU member states are under evaluation ... (tb)

Source: *Vertrauliche Mitteilungen* No. 4019 of 26 February 2013

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

France in economic decline

In France the economic situation continues to get worse. The Socialist government Hollande is unswervingly following its destruction course, there is not only a lack of convincing plans to “turn the tide”, but also a lack of time to implement them before other financial difficulties will occur. But instead of analyzing their own mistakes and looking for new approaches self-critically, the envious French political functionaries insult Germany as being responsible for the problems of France. The

German resistance against expropriation of savers by inflation and the German refusal of additional tribute payments within the European redistribution system were to blame for the euro being so strong, the revenue being so low in France and the French products of too low quality being not marketable worldwide, they claim. This behavior will hardly help France to overcome the imminent budgetary difficulties. With the demand for inflation and devaluation policy by the ECB (Europe-

an Central Bank) France changes from the stability-oriented side of Germany to the faction of the southern European bankrupt states that are longing for inflation. With these fundamentally different interests a political union will hardly be mouldable, nor will the common currency Euro remain preserved in this form. (eh)

Source: *Confidential Communications* No. 4021 of 12 March 2013

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

Current Concerns

The international journal for independent thought, ethical standards, moral responsibility, and for the promotion and respect of public international law, human rights and humanitarian law

Subscribe to Current Concerns – The journal of an independent cooperative

The cooperative *Zeit-Fragen* is a politically and financially independent organisation. All of its members work on a voluntary and honorary basis. The journal does not accept commercial advertisements of any kind and receives no financial support from business organisations. The journal *Current Concerns* is financed exclusively by its subscribers.

We warmly recommend our model of free and independent press coverage to other journals.

Annual subscription rate of
CHF 40,-; Euro 30,-; USD 40,-; GBP 25,-
for the following countries:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brunei, Canada, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hongkong, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Qatar, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, USA

Annual subscription rate of
CHF 20,-; Euro 15,-; USD 20,-; GBP 12,50
for all other countries.

Please choose one of the following ways of payment:

- send a cheque to *Current Concerns*, P.O. Box, CH-8044 Zurich, or
- send us your credit card details (only *Visa*), or
- pay into one of the following accounts:

CH:	Postcheck-Konto (CHF):	87-644472-4	IBAN CH91 0900 0000 8764 4472 4	BIC POFICHBEXXX
CH:	Postcheck-Konto (Euro):	91-738798-6	IBAN CH83 0900 0000 9173 8798 6	BIC POFICHBEXXX
D:	Volksbank Tübingen, Kto. 67 517 005, BLZ 64190110		IBAN DE12 6419 0110 0067 5170 05	BIC GENODES1TUE
A:	Raiffeisen Landesbank, Kto. 1-05.713.599, BLZ 37000		IBAN AT55 3700 0001 0571 3599	BIC RVVGAT2B

“We want to hold on to the militia army”

A clear vote of the National Council for a strong army

Interview with National Councillor Jakob Büchler, member of the Security Policy Committee

thk. On the last day of the spring session of the federal councils, there were again a number of final votes, among others the National Council's stance on an initiative to abolish the militia army. Having already



*National Councillor
Jakob Büchler
(picture thk)*

rejected the initiative in the winter session with a majority, it again cast a very clear vote against the initiative on Friday. Moreover, the National Council wants to hold on to the mandatory field shooting and rejected a parliamentary initiative intended to abolish the annual army shooting. On Thursday, the National Council had already approved an increase to five billion for the military budget, and thus again opposed the Federal Council.

Jakob Büchler, National Councillor and former President of the Security Policy Committee of the National Council, has energetically taken a stand for respectively against the military proposals. After the vote, Current Concerns asked him to assess the current situation.

Current Concerns: What does the vote on Thursday mean for our army?

National Councillor Jakob Büchler: This vote is of great importance because the Council of States delivered a less convincing performance with their stance on the partial replacement of the Tiger. That was a half-hearted decision. They voted by 22 to 20 for advocacy of the proposal. However, the Council of States has not released the brake of debt. They played relatively weakly, which was quite surprising, as the Council of States is usually very clear in these matters. That was a very weak sign.

The clear decision of the National Council to agree to more money and to enable the procurement of the Gripen means strong backing for the follow-up debate in the Security Policy Committee in a two-day meeting after Easter. It is important that we take the Gripen business at hand. The starting position is certainly better after this clear vote. If Parliament says yes with a nearly two-thirds majority, it means to me that the aircraft procure-

ment should be taken at hand and that the army will be provided with enough vehicles and equipment.

Where do we go from here in Parliament? Is that also a vote for the procurement of the Gripen?

First of all, it is a positive sign. Regarding the Gripen business we must first decide in the Committee and later in Parliament. Nevertheless, to me it is a sign that points in the right direction. If one says that the armed forces must be equipped with new aircraft and get new equipment and vehicles, five billion are needed. This sign confirms that we need the money, even if the entire Federal Council has a different view. But in my opinion it is also quite clear that the majority of Parliament wants us to go in the right direction.

Now the business has been passed on to the Council of States?

Yes, it has. The Council of States has also to decide on the National Council motion. I assume, however, that they will also have the courage to approve the five billion; otherwise we would have to ask what role the council of States actually plays. We have to take care of the whole Gripen business.

Why?

Last week several business representatives came to Parliament, who of course are also talking to Saab about so-called offset agreements. These are companies from the Thurgau and from St. Gallen, from eastern Switzerland. For them it is very important to know whether the deal will be closed, so that they in turn can implement the contracts with Saab in Sweden.

Is it likely that the Council of States agrees to the request of the National Council?

Yes, I seriously hope so. The decision not to release the debt brake has been characterized as an operational accident by some members of in the Council of States, which is why I think that we will get a yes from them.

Were there other military motions in this session?

Well, what made me very happy was the vote on the parliamentary initiative repealing the out-of-duty shooting. With a

91 to 61 vote, the National Council decided to hold on to the mandatory federal program. That has been a very clear vote, though some members of my fraction were questioning, namely, whether this obligation is still reasonable. To my delight, I must say that most of them followed my reasoning.

What convinced your party members and probably also the colleagues from other parties?

Our soldiers need to train, and not only in the annual repetition courses, which are postponed by almost one third of the soldiers due to scheduling reasons. There are years in which some soldiers do not fulfill their annual military service and thus also do no practice shooting. However, this is part of the training of our militia. Furthermore, this shooting obligation is also an expression of confidence that we place in our militia. They receive their service weapon and must be familiar with and be able to handle it, otherwise this is useless. The mandatory federal program ensures that the soldier practices at least once a year. A soldier who does not know his weapon is, for me, a poor soldier. I am very glad that we have found a majority.

But we also see the whole situation. There are regular attacks, and I think it is completely unfair to attack in this way after such a clear referendum against the weapons initiative only a few months ago.

The clear vote of the National Council is also a significant commitment to the militia?

For me this has been twice a very clear yes. In the final vote today, we recommended a rejection of the popular initiative for the abolition of compulsory military service with 128 votes to 57, with 4 abstentions. This is a strong sign. We want to hold on to the militia army and not exchange it for a professional army. This is a clear endorsement: a yes to the militia army. The clear vote for the five billion is for me quite clearly a yes to a well-armed militia. After these two votes yesterday and today I'm very happy to go home.

Mr Büchler, thank you for the interview. •

(Translation Current Concerns)

Understanding Iran!

Gotthard Frick, Bottmingen

In the Western media Iran is represented as a dark, hostile country, whereas we, the Swiss, ought to treat its efforts to pursue an independent policy with great understanding and sympathy. During a large part of the 20th Century the country was dominated by Great Britain and the United States. Although neutral during World War II, it was invaded and occupied via a joint military action of Great Britain and the Soviet Union, which was later joined by the US and had to give up its neutrality. President Mossadegh, democratically elected after the war, was overthrown via a coup staged by the Western powers after he had nationalized the oil industry, and the succeeding Shah was a puppet of the US, governing his policy via its embassy in Tehran, as became evident after his fall. According to the reproach expressed vis a vis the author by a then most important antiquity researcher of the country as part of a larger project, the Europeans see Iran merely through the eyes of the ancient Greeks, to whom the Persians were barbarians. But in ancient times, the word did not mean "uncivilized savages", as now, but it only said that they did not speak Greek. Iran has one of the most ancient cul-

tures and in the ancient world it was also among those at the technical forefront. Thus for example it had developed sophisticated cooling systems for homes, and even in the hottest summer the upper class ate ice-cream dishes. Given this past characterized by heteronomy, the present concern of the country to be independent, politically, economically, but also in matters of national defense, is very understandable. Why should Iran allow its nuclear program to be subjected to international monitoring, if on the other hand another country in the region does not have to fear any penalties, and thanks to Western support, is able to evade international controls, keep an arsenal of nuclear weapons and ignore UN resolutions?

The country is accused of wanting to wipe out Israel. But if the available translations from the Farsi-original text are right, this threat is aimed directly at the current regime, in particular the government of Israel with its policy of annexation. The Iranian leadership officially differentiates between positive-valued Judaism and Zionism perceived as negative. The Iranian variant of Shiite Islam (Imamisme) with its martyrdom may appear

quite strange to Europeans, especially when they see, on a holiday, thousands of bare-chested men pass by lashing their own backs bloody. On the other hand the country protects its other ancient religions, the Jews, the Armenian, Assyrian and Chaldean Christians and the followers of Zoroastro, who together have a constitutional right to five seats in parliament, including one for the Jews. These minorities thus have a far disproportionate representation. Just in today's Tehran, there are at least eleven flourishing synagogues, partly connected with Hebrew schools. There are kosher butchers and restaurants, a Jewish cemetery, and the dancing and alcohol prohibition does not apply to the Jewish community on their holidays. With up to 35,000 members (twice as many as Switzerland!) the country still has the only significant Jewish community across the Muslim Middle East. However, it is barred from relations with Israel. It is high time we encountered the country with more sympathy and understanding. •

Sources: *sephardisticstudies.org*, *youtube.com*, *theintelligence.de*

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

Discontent about EU is increasing

After the threat of exiting the EU by England the discontent about the "EU-politburo" in Brussels is growing along a wide front. Now the Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte has also demanded an exit clause in the EU treaties. Because the Maastricht Treaty, which is already constantly broken, intends no exit, this has to be regulated in new treaties.

While the Politburo in Brussels increasingly eliminates the freedom and sovereignty rights of the citizens and member states of Europe, their discontent and their wish to exit from this non-democratic construct is growing. It seems as if the utopia of *Jean Monnet* who intended a European superstate under dictatorial leadership of a Politburo like in the for-

mer Soviet Union had failed. Meanwhile the older alternative proposal by general Charles de Gaulle of a unified, peaceful Europe of sovereign single states is preferred. (eh)

Source: *Vertrauliche Mitteilungen* No. 4019 of 26 February, 2013

(Translation *Current Concerns*)

Medvedev regarding the Cyprus crisis: The EU behaves like "an elephant in a china shop"

Undermining the trust in financial institutions

Russian Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev has attested to the European Union that severe mistakes were made in handling the Cyprus crisis.

"The European Union, the European Commission and the Cypriot Government are now behaving like an elephant in the china shop", said Medvedev during an interview for European media. "All possible mistakes that could have been made under the circumstances have already been made [...], these mistakes have undermined trust in financial institutions."

Cyprus is facing state bankruptcy, and yet, redevelopment measures still must not make the bank system fall, warned Medvedev.

He compared the idea of compulsory contribution for bank savers to the politics of the Soviet government, which has not handled the savings of its own population sensitively. The situation in Cyprus can trigger a wave of local crises, warned the Russian head of government. Talks about the rescue of Cyprus should not only be limited to the EU space, but "be conducted with all interested parties".

Medvedev expressed his opinion against the blockade of the Cypriot banks. If the current operations should remain further frozen, great losses would occur. Then there will be certainly a big number of complaints against Cyprus and other parties involved, warned the Russian head of government. He did not exclude the possibility of Russia quitting the double taxation agreement with Cyprus.

Source: *Ria Novosti of the 3/20/2013*
(Translation *Current Concerns*)