

Braco Kovačević

# SERBS IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER



**BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ**  
**SERBS IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

**Evropski defendologija centar za naučna, politička,  
ekonomska, socijalna, bezbjednosna, sociološka i  
kriminološka istraživanja**



**Publisher:**

European defendology center for scientific,  
political, economic, social, safety, sociological  
and criminological research, Banja Luka

**For publisher:**

Dr Duško Vejnović

**Reviewers:**

PhD Rade Biočanin  
PhD Dragan Bataveljić

BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ

# **SERBS IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

Banja Luka  
2017.





# CONTENTS

<i>PREFACE</i> .....	7
1. NEW WORLD ORDER.....	11
2. SEMANTHICAL TERROR AND PROPAGANDA.....	27
3. NATO AGRESSION.....	69
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i> .....	107



# PREFACE

Serious political tensions, conflicts and wars often arise in the Balkans. These are most often conflicts that are projected by others towards the peoples of the Balkans, exactly the ones who have the power to exercise their geopolitical interests. In this sense, nobody asks anything the peoples of the Balkans because they do not decide anything. They are just passive observers and extras of historical events; they are - *observers of history*.

In order to achieve their interests, powerful states conduct divisions by the principle *divide et impera*. In the basis of their imperial strategy, there is a manichaeistic mechanism of *prosecution* or *defense*. It is in this sense that someone should be accused of „lacking“ or „breaking“ some of the civilized values, involve the media and through them win over the „public opinion“ and realize a certain geopolitical interest. The policy implemented by powerful Western states, primarily serves the realization of their interests, and today's development of capitalism in the form of neoliberal globalism and the realization of the

neo-liberal new world order, represents the renewal of classical imperial liberalism.

In order to achieve their interests, the powerful capitalist neo-imperial neoliberal states and their economic, political and military alliances make a firm mix of corporate „*elite powers*“, ie. the mix of power between military bureaucracy, corporative big capital, scientific institutions and the *media* which will justify it all, through which they will undermine the internal stability of other countries, infringing their sovereignty and hindering their internal development. And that, however, is not democracy but terrorism, but, as Chomsky points out – „it is terrorism only if it is done to us, when we do much worse things to them, that is not terrorism“.

The politics of double standards has made a whole number of problems in the area of international relations which have ended in antagonized conflicts contributing to the disintegration of many states and regional territories, including the territory of former Yugoslavia, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) and the Balkans.

By achieving their goals through violence, bombing and destruction of economic infrastructure, endangering territorial integrity, and destroying of sovereignty of the state, many

contemporary humanist-oriented US and NATO intellectuals seriously qualify them not only as criminal but as *fascist forces*. In conversation with Richard Nixon, Henry Kissinger said at one time that he should „strike everything“ and bomb in Cambodia „everything that flies and everything that moves“.

War crime, genocide?

No, for them it is neither war crime nor genocide. But if someone else said it, it would be both a war crime and genocide. Double standards - an example known from the preparation for war and from the war in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) and former BiH, as well as in other examples, and as it will be known in the future of warfare.

To achieve their economic, political and military-strategic interests, powerful geopolitical forces develop patterns of manipulative semantic discourse on „spreading democracy“, „protecting human rights“, „the defense of freedom“ and „civilized values“. In this sense, they use powerful *media* for the purpose of building - a *new world order*.



**1.**

**NEW WORLD ORDER**





## The new world order and sovereignty

When George Orwell published his *1984* (1956) many believed that it is a „*negative utopia*“ which differs from a portion of theoreticians of „*positive utopia*“ (to which, in a certain way, belong Platon, Tomaso Campanella, Thomas More, Mably, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Robert Oweni Karl Marx), because it does not bring out a projection of a „better“ but a „worse“ society. It is exactly in this book that Orwell writes about the problem of hypertrophy of the state power, which absolutely negates personalities. And despite the fact that Zamjatin in his book *We* (1920) and Aldous Haxley in *Brew New World* (1932) write about a single state and Orwel about a division of the world into three states, they all actually point out the problem of statism and bureaucratization of the world in which the omnipotence of state institutions is created, in which the infirmity of an individual is realized through various methods of thought control, political irrationalism, „strictly controlled“ knowledge, a monopoly over information, and disabling communication between people.

Judging by what has been happening in the last few decades in the world (with regard to the foundation of the so-called „new world

order“), we get the impression that we are closer to the realization of an absolute, non-totalitarian, and not a classless world, that some theorists of „*positive utopia*“ have dreamed about. Hence, it raises the question: what is meant by the term „*new world order*“?

The mentioned name will, actually, represent the so-called „working name“ of the American globalist, neoliberal neocolonial politics. At the same time, under this imprecise and blurred, and above all, journalistic term, the policy of establishing the dominant power of the member states of the UN Security Council and primarily USA, as well as a group of highly developed Western countries over other countries in the world, will be assumed. This power includes not only the economic but also the political, military and cultural supremacy of these countries, which is achieved through various international organizations whose activities are strictly controlled.

In essence, the so-called „*New World Order*“, implies the establishment of a so-called „*supranational state*“ discussed by banker David Rockefeller, saying: „The modern world will be more perfect and more balanced if we establish a single world government. The supranational authority of world bankers and intellectual elites has the primacy over the right

of the people to self-determination, which is the principle that we have followed through centuries“.

As can be seen from the previous definition, two essential components clearly arise:

- the „*new world order*“ is based on the establishment of a „*world government*“ („*elite power*“) made up of bankers and intellectuals (journalists, intellectuals, politicians, diplomats, corporate elites); By this, achieved is the demand made by Hugo Grotius in the book *De Iure Belli ac Pacis* discussing international law, pointing out that the like-mindedness (eg. today effected by the action of the United Nations Security Council under the influence of the United States) about the essential elements of international policy is the basis and the only hope for the future peace of mankind;
- from the above definition it can be seen that the power of the „*world government*“, ie. „*supranational governments*“, „*meta*“ or „*supra*

*government*“, rises above the level of national governments, or above the level of the *international „right“ of people to self-determination*; in other words, advocates of establishing the "world government" and "the new world order" stand in the standpoint of the so-called *„theory of limited sovereignty“*: the *„world government“* has *transnational, supranational, meta or supra sovereignty* (while civil, national states have limited sovereignty).

Such a „world government“ has different institutions of domination through which it realizes its global economic, political, military, diplomatic, information and culture power, in other words it has different institutions of realization of the concept of global neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism:

- *non-repressive* (media, „non governmental“ and governmental international organizations), and
- *repressive* (NATO, International Monetary Fund, The World Bank, International Court of Justice, etc.).

When it comes to the International Court of Justice, it should be noted that, „in the American public“, there is a complete „legitimate stance that the United States advocates for the establishment of an International Criminal Tribunal under whose jurisdiction can come potential offenders from any part of the world - except from the United States“ (Reljić, 2011: 15-16).

Particularly worth mentioning is also the document titled *The Hard Road to World Order* by author Richard N. Gardner.

In this document Gardner talks about the relationship between the new world order and the „erosion of sovereignty“ in the following way: „If we do not immediately create a world government, if we do not revise the Charter of the OUN and if we do not authorize the International Court of Justice to have the highest authority, there will be no progress. In one word the home of the world order should be lifted from the foundation, not from the roof. More directly said, around the concept of national sovereignty should be created a hoop of partial but permanent erosion, by which will be achieved much more than by the outdated frontal attack technique. It is necessary to extend the scope of the activity of armed forces of OUN to all sectors of global war focal points... in which

such forces will have the task of patrolling international borders and other demarcation lines, with the oversight of free democratic elections in all countries and with the verification of the implementation of the policy of weapons non-involvement“ (Gardner, 1974).

From this definition, it is clear that the author insists on the creation of a „world government“ and a „world court“ that will have absolute authority and whose existence will necessarily call into question national sovereignty, and thus the voluntaristic subject of world power through the so-called „democratic elections“ (or by calling into question so-called „human rights“) will constantly call into question national sovereignty. And although the apologist is also one of the creators of „*the new world order*“, the former President George Bush in his speech in the OUN on October 1, 1990, talked about „the new world order as an era of peace“, it has shown and it is still showing that the foundation of a „new world order“ as an order of force, is also unfolding through war, violation of international law, the limitation of sovereignty of states, the imposition of political, ethnic and religious turmoil and conflict, by interference with the „domestic affairs“ of states, which is precisely calling into question and restricting human rights and freedoms.

Thus, it shows that *state sovereignty* and *international law* are being excluded. „From the idea of sovereignty, it follows that the state is on the one side of every order, namely - above it. For the one who holds it, international law does not exist“, says Hans Magnus Enzensberger. And we would add that, on the other hand looked at, the dominance of international law, especially voluntaristically interpreted by powerful imperial forces, actually questions the existence of individual state sovereignty. Therefore, the idea of sovereignty implies a legal and political existence of a state standing „above“ the legal order and keeping it in fact means not accepting international law as, on the other hand, it means that accepting international law at the same time means to question the idea of sovereignty. This shows that sovereignty and international law are mutually exclusive, and that this is the case, it is enough for example to take United Nations decisions on sanctions against nations and states. Namely, these decisions show not only that the sovereignty of a state is excluded with international law and that the right to self-determination of a nation is not respected, but also that a new type of „sovereignty“ is created that we might call „supranational“, „transnational“, „meta-sovereignty“ or „suprasovereignty“ of a „state“ that could also be



called „supranational“, „transnational“, „meta“, or „supra-state“, which, in the conceptual, formal and contents sense, differs from the classical state.

Advocates of establishing of the „world government“ and „the new world order“ stand in the viewpoint of the so called „*theory of limited sovereignty*“.

It should be noted that the „theory of limited sovereignty“ is not a discovery of the United Nations Security Council and the current military and political establishment of the United States.

This theory inherits its idea from the time of justification of the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia. Soviet theorist Kovalev, after the military intervention of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty in 1968 in Czechoslovakia, points out that there is a general international law (which applies to relations between states with different socio-economic and political systems) and socialist international law (which applies to states with a socialist arrangement). He believes that if the order of a socialist state is endangered, then the „socialist community“ in the interest of the world socialist community has the right to intervene. Leonid Brezhnev, in his time, favored the doctrine of „limited sovereignty“, which refers to the countries of the „Eastern Welter“, as

today are doing the advocates of „limited sovereignty“ extending its significance and importance for the whole world with the aim of preserving the so-called „International stability“.

The famous „theory of limited sovereignty“ is advocated by powerful politicians of the world. Even the president of OUN Boutros-Boutros Ghali stood in the viewpoint of the doctrine of „limited sovereignty“ when he said that the time of „absolute and exclusive sovereignty is over“. Or, „Every state should be the best guarantor of human rights ... But an international action must be triggered when that state demonstrates that it is unworthy of such, when it turns from a protector into someone who is abusing rights“. Further: „The international community must take over this role from states that do not fulfill their obligations... Thereby, in my opinion, the contemporary understanding of sovereignty is not endangered“. Also, a similar view of the „international community“ as a subject of control and assessment of „human rights“ in the countries of the world, has also been made by the former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria, Alois Mockkoji, which also postulated the doctrine of „limited sovereignty“ saying: „In the midst of the New Millennium, the United Nations must be in a position to effectively

control the respect and development of human rights“. Under the excuse of the struggle for „human rights“, this famous „theory of limited sovereignty“ was also advocated by Pope John Paul II, who on the occasion of the events in former Bosnia and Herzegovina advocated the so-called „*Humanitarian intervention*“, ie. the bombing and killing of Serbs: „As all effective means are exhausted, the right to humanitarian intervention comes into force with the aim of disarming the aggressor and restoring respect for the rights of the endangered population“. Further, „the right to humanitarian interference in the domestic affairs of a particular country is stronger than the sovereignty principle of that same state“.

Thus, it follows that elections, referendums and national plebiscites are „free“ and „democratic“ only if they are („at the order of“ world powers who exercise their power through various organizations, commissions, committees, etc.) accepted as „free“ and „democratic“, which in fact means that they are accepted only when they question and contribute to the eroding of national state sovereignty, thereby enabling the strengthening of „supranational“ sovereignty of the master of the „*new world order*“.

## **Excuse: the fight for human rights**

The idea of abandoning sovereignty due to „human rights violations“ is an idea that is being attempted to be achieved through the concept of the „new world order“. This idea can simply be abused with the aim of carrying out economic and political pressures, including military intervention in a country proclaimed as a „violator“ of respect for „human rights“. It is precisely this that shows that the „new world order“ is shaped by a powerful „supranational“ or „meta-state“ that, like a “world policeman“ defines what is „humane“, „democratic“ and „fair“ and what is not, and which peoples and which countries will be internationally „recognized“ and which will not be, who has the „right“ to self-determination and who does not, who can have „sovereignty“ and who can not achieve the political constitution of statehood, who can, etc. In essence, that means that „right does not exist“ but that „only force exists“ that prevents realization of the right to self-determination.

The *modern form of genocide* is reflected exactly in this. Once it manifested itself in the immediate and visible physical destruction of individuals and ethnic groups. Today it is also

manifested in the form of different methods of action, such as: spreading of false propaganda and negative stereotypes, satanizing of a group, introducing various forms of sanctions (economic, political, diplomatic, military, cultural, sports, scientific, medical and others) media pressures and manipulation, by imposing certain standards that lead to unemployment, poverty, falling of standards of living, disease and death of those affected by these measures.

It is quite clear that limited sovereignty is the cruel reality of the contemporary world. The existence of the OUN, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Court of Justice, the European Commission for Human Rights, the World Trade Organization and other „world power“ organizations and institutions that devastate „national sovereignty“ shows that the classical sovereignty of the states is their past, and that there is a certain tension between national state sovereignty and decision-making in the international arena. For example, by implementing a particular economic policy, the International Monetary Fund may approve a loan to a country by conditioning the adoption of measures to reduce general spending, devaluation of the national currency, lowering social assistance allocations, education, science, culture and health. These measures may result in

a fall in wages, social unrest, and a state of emergency. So tension arises between decisions made in the international area and the idea of national sovereignty that is called into question by these decisions. It is called into question by shaping of new international political relations and associations. And member states of the European Union are no longer the center of authority within national boundaries because the community has been given its authority by „voluntary give in“ of the sovereignty of member states. Now this sovereignty is divided which shows that the current concept of indivisible, indefinite and autonomous sovereignty of the country itself - has died. Within the framework of new international relations, military alliances have a special significance that act to diminish the authority and integrity of the national state calling into question its sovereignty. The US domination (through the Security Council of the OUN and NATO pact) has reduced the possibility of independent and sovereign decision-making by national states. The national state power to decide on complex external issues in internal politics is limited. The supranational command structure of NATO shows that in a war situation it always acts within the strategy of the alliance itself, seen, among other things, in the example of the war in the former Yugoslavia and

the bombing of the Serbian forces in BiH in 1995, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FR Yugoslavia) in 1999, and Iraq without the decision of the Security Council. That fact alone shows that the sovereignty of the NATO member states is, in a certain way, limited by the influence of national military bureaucracies that actually constituted a powerful supranational military block. All this in essence shows that the supranational Orwellian military and political power was designed in the form of the so-called „*new world order*“ - totalitarian, in other words neo-totalitarian, given that the concept of „new world order“ still expresses a cowboy political law of force in which politics completely dominates over law.

**2.**

**SEMANTHICAL TERROR  
AND PROPAGANDA**





## The Balkan Syndrome

Historically viewed, intolerance, hostility, conflicts and wars between people and social groups are one of the earliest social phenomena. Human history is Hobbesian, militaristic and belicistic history of conflict and war, which is especially evident in the Balkans.

The *Balkans*! „Inseparable from Europe (for many things) the Balkans are separated“ (Arsović, 2010: 47).

And, not only as a part of Europe, are the Balkans „separated“ from it, but Europe continually, in various ways, is pushing it away. So unintegrated, the Balkans are an area of constant tensions, and because in the Balkan geopolitical territory of „chaos“ almost everyone „from the outside“ have some of their „vital national interests“ and the „vital interests“ of the people living in it are irrelevant.

The Turks have their nostalgic interests, the Austrians also. Germans have the unattainable „*Lebensraum*“ interests, Americans have „national“ ones and so on. Even every little effort, to defend their interests, their freedom and their poor existence on this windward where the „house next to the road“ is located, the great powers immediately perceive as an attack on

these „vital“ interests of theirs. And, they all seem to have greater rights than the people who live here.

The term „*the Balkans*“ is not precisely defined and derives its origin from the Turkish language – „over the Turkish, from the two Persian words meaning `high house` or `mountain`. Since the 18th century, „European travelers have used the name `European Turkey` for a larger part of this area“ (Stojanović, 1995: 8, 9).

Westerners have perceived the Balkans and are still perceiving it as „something else“, „strange“, „wild“, „primitive“, „inculturated“, and „uncivilized“. For them, the Balkans is a - *bogey*.

By perceiving the Balkans as some bogey, the West at the same time also perceives that „a bogey circulates with the culture of the West - the bogey of the Balkans. All forces entered the holy alliance to expel the bogey: politicians and journalists, conservative scientists and radical intellectuals, moralists of all kinds, generations, and forms. Is there any rival group that its opponents have not denigrated as 'the Balkans' or accused of `Balkanization`? Which of the accused did not fight back branding this act as `Balkanism`“? The term *Balkanization* „meant not only crushing large and powerful

political units, but became synonymous with returning to the tribal, backward, primitive, and barbarian“. However, „the Balkans have a powerful ontology that deserves serious and complex study, and that is the ontology of constant and profound change“. Yet, the relationship with the Balkans is still permeated with stereotypes. „The frozen image of the Balkans, determined by general parameters from the time around the First World War, is reproduced almost without any variation over the next several decades and functions as a separate discourse“. And that discourse speaks of „archaicism“, „backwardness“, „unadjusted and unpredictable behavior“, „tribalism“, etc. (Todorova, 1999: 15, 316, 317).

A characteristic of the Balkans is the existence of rigid divisions and hence the existence of constant tensions and conflicts between ethnic groups, cultures and religions, or, as Samuel P. Huntington would say, „*the conflict of civilizations*“.

Even today, the Balkans are „again the place of strategic tensions and warfare for interests of others, warfare between existing powerful political interests far away from Zagreb, Sarajevo and Pristina“ (Engdahl, 2003: 9).

Thus history in the Balkans is constantly repeating itself, but those who live in it do not draw any lessons. Deeply „divided“ and „split“, it is as if the Balkan peoples seem unfit for inter-ethnic cooperation and a mutual life.

Precisely, „the Balkans can be viewed through the prism of great civilization divisions and tearing. The lines of the Eastern and Western Roman Empire were printed on it, a conflict between the Byzantine and German-Roman rulers occurred during the Middle Ages in the Balkans, and the split of the Christian church to Catholicism and Orthodoxy placed the close Slovene peoples into a deep civilization conflict; The clash of Christians and Muslims broke out in this area, whose consequences are still of great political importance today“. Also, in the Balkan area of „constant intensive traffic of the people and the army“, in its „relatively cramped territory there is a large number of different peoples“. Both the „path to the East“ and the „path to the West“ took place „across these territories“, which prevented and threatened integrations and assimilations (Lakićević, 2002: 32-33).

Even today, the Balkans are „crucified“ between traditional and modern, between different, often irreconcilable, ethnic groups, religions, cultures, and civilizational flows that call into question a peaceful coexistence.

The many problems facing the Balkans need to be sought in the past, but also in the present. The Balkans is a densely populated area with over 50 million people; In the Balkans, Orthodoxy, Islam and Catholicism have long existed, often ending in inter-ethnic and inter-religious conflicts; The Balkans were under Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian rule, as well as under the influence of Russia; In the Balkans, the ideologies of communism, fascism and nationalism, the ideologies that have been created in Europe, fought; In the Balkans, nations and states have been formed late, borders have been tailored constantly, wars have been fought against foreign occupiers and all that contributed to economic backwardness (Kurjak, 2000: 142-143).

Because of the existence of different ethnic groups and their cultures and religions, the Balkans became a „barrel of gunpowder“, a significant area of conflict between the interests of large and small military and political forces, and therefore through history it was often an area of leading many wars. The geostrategic position of these areas is very significant and the creators of the new world order and NATO are aware of this. The Serbian people and the state, who did not want to lose sovereignty and independence, were forced into the war, and then bombing, in

order to realize the project of control of this important geostrategic area. Of course, in order to justify such neo-colonial imperialist politics, the media propaganda manipulation and deception of the world public had to be imposed. In accordance with the „strategy“ of manipulative rhetoric and „*semantic terror*“, the war was called a „*humanitarian intervention*“ that „protects human rights“.

## **The Media and Propaganda**

The *new world order* also needs a *new media order*. If until recently the media had a national and state mark and spread widely in their area, the media now overcome these borders by gaining a global mark and a global character. The power of the „mass media“ is, in terms of political shaping of people, very large. „If I had to decide whether we have a government and not having a newspaper, or having a newspaper but not a government, I would not hesitate to opt for the latter“, Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1787, when the American press had only consisted of thirty Short weeklies, which occupied distinctly party interests. What would he just say today when the media became the third industrial

branch in America with thousands of daily and weekly newspapers, specialized magazines and radio stations, publishing houses, television and the *Internet*?

At a Senate session in 1966, Senator William Fulbright said on the occasion of a debate on the relationship between the government and the media: „It is very interesting that so many of our respectable newspapers have turned almost into an agency or an addendum of power; that they do not question or even reassess government policy“. Of course, the media should not question and reassess the „government policy“ as they represent a whole where common national, corporate and personal interests are expressed; The media are nothing more than the addendum of government and the instrument by which government is justified by the production of false information and semantic terror, or the terror of messages.

In the media war of semantic terror production as a terror of the message a *lie* is significant, „but as - the ultimate means, as the `last chance`. The media `spins` extend into four basic levels:

- organization of information (semantics, semiotics, selection, style ...)



- symbolism (open and hidden meanings, graphic processing, photos ...)
- agenda (agenda, focus theme, distraction...)
- massive expansion of incomplete or unproven news `packed` by specialized PR agencies and political lobbies“ (Ilić, 2002: 71).

In media discourse, and particularly in propaganda discourse - *context* is very important.

In fact, „context is often the most important thing in the news. In every event, it can be relatively easy to report in regard to the presentation of naked facts - a speech in which it is said, such a number of people were killed in the explosion of a bomb... What gives us meaning is context... Context is always a choice. The same incident can be given a different meaning if the concept is regulated: ultimately, the perpetrator can become a victim, a peacemaker - a war criminal, an official who tries to tell the truth - a bureaucrat that conceals facts... the context is a network of assumptions, political beliefs and moral attitudes... The reproduction of this context is constantly taking place...” (Reljić, 2011: 138).

In the manipulative process of shaping public opinion, the United States, along with

their allies, uses various means to show that „democracy is not necessarily related to freedom“ (Noam Chomsky), and that „necessary illusions“ are part of the Western culture that imply „mind control“ ie. control of the production of various forms of the „truth“ that suits corporations and political elites. It is not the role of journalists and media to create public opinion, but to instrumentalize it and to be irrevocably bound by the ruling opinion, and those who try are removed by known means. The model of corporate oligopolism implies state control of the media that has reached its highest level in highly developed countries and especially in the United States, where media control is exercised by those who control the state, ie. those who have the power to rule the state and who strive to achieve a global geopolitical system that the United States would dominate and within which the interests of US business would be realized. The vast majority of the world would constitute a „Great Area“ that would be exclusively subordinated to the interests of the American economy and geopolitics: other capitalist states would be allowed to enter the area, but provided that entry does not endanger American interests. Thus, the US would exercise its control at the global level and it would - rule this „new order“.

Media play an enormous role in the everyday cultural, spiritual and political life of a modern American, strongly shaping his consciousness, attitudes, thinking, and behavior. It is apparent that the United States is the first country of informing in the world, which is not accidental, because the role and importance of the media must be linked to the role and importance of American geopolitics and American interests in the world, and they relate to the American projection of construction - of a *new world order*. And, for this to be possible, a semantic story of „exporting democracy“ and protecting „human rights“ is necessary.

As we all know, the media are very powerful means of influence. In multiethnic communities, they can contribute to the spread of ideas of peace, trust and tolerance, but they can also, as propaganda, spread intolerance, stereotypes and hate speech. In the recent war on the global area, as well as in the regional area of the Balkans, the former Yugoslavia and BiH, the media incited hate. They were not neutral in the Balkan conflict, but were one-sided.

Politics through the media propaganda influences *public opinion* in order to win it for the implementation of its ideological, political, economic, military and other activities.

If the war is a continuation of politics by other (military) means, then peace (after the war) is a possible or the actual continuation of the war by other (non-military) means. The military war in Bosnia and Herzegovina ceased, but war continued through other means: propaganda, political, ideological, educational, religious, media, family. The media, before the beginning of the military conflict, during it, and after it, has played and still plays a big propaganda role.

The media are strongly involved in performing a critical relationship towards a certain phenomenon by dealing with the „classification of the world“ in the context of the “discourse of the ruling ideologies“ (Stuart Hall). And, this refers to the constant manicheistic drawing of the line of distinction of: „correct“ from the „defective“, „normal“ from „abnormal“, „correct“ from „improper“, „good“ from „bad“, „moral“ from „immoral“ etc. In „their“ war, ie. the „media war“, differentiation of these dichotomies, the media often cause *moral panic* on actual but also fictitious states and events. There are many examples to justify this claim, and some of them, related to pre-war and war situations in the former Yugoslavia and former Bosnia and Herzegovina will be mentioned.

We know that Germany and Austria have firmly supported the secession of Croatia and

Slovenia from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and thus contributed to the radicalization of the conflict during the civil war. In order to justify an illegal act from the standpoint of international law, they had to publicly disclose, through an absolutely controlled media, the misinformation and *propaganda stereotypes* about the Serbs.

Satanization and demonization of Serbs culminated in the attitudes and declarations of high-ranking Western civil servants at that time, which had a great impact on the determination of their public opinion and the deepening of the stereotypes on Serbs. Thus satanization and demonization began in a state institution, and then they were transmitted through their state-controlled media to their population.

Behind the attacks on the so-called creation of „Greater Serbia“, „Great Croatia“ was created, and Serbia became smaller. In order to dislodge it and capture a part of it, they will again launch a story about „Great Serbia“, „the Great-Serbian idea“, „occupier“, „aggressor“, „hegemonic“, or „communist Belgrade“, „Oppressive nation“, „Serb chetniks“, „Serb communists“, etc.

Serbs in war, but also in films recorded after the collapse of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, are still stigmatized,

satanized, and presented as „ugly“, „dirty“ and „evil“. The most common stereotype about Serbs that rules in the West is that the Serbs are „the ravenous, the wicked, the disobedient people, with a religion that looks like a heresy“; Serbian „preserved Cyrillic letter is proof of the unauthorized independence“; „Serbs belong to the second civilization, outside the European matrix, under the influence of the Byzantine and European cultures“. In the bourgeois propaganda hysteria, Serbs have been proclaimed as „robbers“, „peasants“, „Byzantines“, „genocidal“, „Nazis“, „enemies of democracy“, „uncivilized Balkan peoples“, „prone to assassinations and murders of rulers“, „blighters“, „megalomaniac and warrior nation“, and what not. This anti-Serb propaganda originated from earlier formed stereotypes, from the Austro-Hungarian period, and carried a strong seal of revanchism aimed at the secession of Croatia and Slovenia and the dissolution of Yugoslavia.

But the war not only fascinated the politicians who found their interests in it. As is well known, the war fascinated many writers of poets, actors, such as: Jinger, Apollinaire, Cocteau, Marinetti. When it comes to relations with the Serbs, not just politicians and media, but intellectuals have also spread the propaganda

hate speech. For Guenter Grass, who also supported NATO's „humanitarian intervention“ on Serbia, „aggressors are primarily Serbs“, and for Habermas „NATO aggression is justified“. Susan Sontag will speak of „fair wars“, and Edgar Morin, Václav Havel, Andre Gliksmann, Henri Levy, and many other intellectuals will accept the aforementioned propaganda story of „Serbian guilt“ and support the bombing of Serbs (Ilić, 2002: 175-178).

The Western satanization of Serbs is the result of their resistance to the breakup of Yugoslavia which they felt as their homeland, as Americans feel their country as their homeland, the French theirs or Germans theirs, and which they would also feel like their homeland even in moments when they are breaking up under the influence of some external factor.

Former United States Foreign Affairs Minister James Baker said „US and NATO are fighting the enemies of civilization and humanity“, which meant that American interests were determined by kindness and a civilizational duty to mankind. In its strange „*ethical theocentrism*“ the West behaves like some kind of *Deus Absconditus*. Westerners think they have a „divine mandate“ to arrange mankind up to their standards and values, and that they are

„entrusted total mankind“ over which they have „*moral supremacy*“ (Simić, 1999: 300).

At one time, Marx emphasized that „every ruling class strives to justify its true power by relying on a universal moral principle“. And it can refer to „divine justice“, or something else, and therefore also to „moral superiority“, as the theoreticians and practitioners of the new world order speak about.

The West has in the name of the so-called „moral obligations“ and „humanitarian reasons“ bombed, killed, demolished and destroyed Serbia and the Serbs. And for the same reason they do it in the world. In essence, these are *cynical wars of „civilization“ against „evil“*, ie. the rich against the poor, regardless of the kind of ideological or political „justification“.

The United States is ready to use force unilaterally (and without Europe and the UN) whenever „national interests“ call for them. And that is what they do, and that's why most of the world sees them as a „renegade superpower“ and „the biggest threat“ to their countries. NATO and the United States do not declare war: of 250 military aggressions that they carried out over sovereign states, they “announced war“ only five times (Milošević, 2010: 190).

The war against Serbia is not just a military conflict, but it is, as Tony Blair said,



„the fight between good and evil“ and that`s why „NATO will not allow the evil to overpower“. Thus Western morality is actually expressed as imperialism and colonialism. „Western type“ imperialism, notes Hannah Arendt, is based on the desire to „colonize, civilize, physically possess, transform and swallow as backwards and subordinate“. At the same time, it shows that determining and defining of some evil as the character of a group, „when such evil is not only imminent to that group, but it is, Huard Zinn claims possible anywhere, meaning to deprive us of responsibility“.

What a media propaganda hysteria this was, we will mention, to illustrate, some opinions.

Helmut Kohl, former German Chancellor, has advocated the destruction of Serbia as „the last oasis of communism“, and his minister of foreign affairs Klaus Kinkel said, „Serbia needs to be laid on its knees“.

So, before and during the war in the former Yugoslavia, in the early 1990s, the children and grandchildren of those fathers and grandparents who went to the First and Second World War, and then after that, to kill the Serbs in their country talked with propaganda stereotypes and hatred. But, they were not the only ones.

US President Bill Clinton said at a time: Serbia is „the heart of the European darkness, a region of bombed mosques, killed men and children, raped girls“, adding – „Serbs will pay this expensive“. „Serbs are to blame for everything!“ They are the „aureole of evil“! Thus almost seventeen years after the bombing of Serbs in the Republic of Srpska, that is what was said by those who bombed them (former US President Bill Clinton, Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, former NATO Commander in Europe Wesley Clark, former ambassador to Croatia Peter Galbraith, a journalist Cristian Amanpur) at the panel discussion of the Foundation Clinton (Press RS, 2011: 2-3).

US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has exaltedly emphasized: „The Serbs will kneel on their knees and pray for mercy“. NATO Commander Europe Wesley Clark said that „Serbia would turn into powder and ash“, Beycher (1991) will turn Serbia into a pariahs (the country of the people of a lower species), and Michael Rose: „NATO is ready to return Serbs to the Stone Age“.

Of course, behind the „double standards“ and „doctrinal language“ there was a real genocide that Noam Chomsky wrote about: „If civilians succeeded in escaping from Fallujah, they were allowed to leave, unless if they were

men. Men who were in the age of military service or close to it were returned. This also happened in Srebrenica in 1995. The only difference is that the United States bombed Iraq and therefore expelled people, instead of putting them into trucks. Women and children were allowed to leave, men would be stopped and sent back. It was envisaged that they would be killed. This is widely called genocide if it is done by Serbs. When we do this, it is called liberation“ (Čomski, 2009a: 104).

When political and military officials of powerful states speak hate speech in this manner, it is clear that behind this „semantic terror“ must stand a propaganda machine that with lies, deformed, and instrumentalized stereotypes, needs to prepare its own and world-wide public opinion to obtain „legitimacy“ for repressive military and the political measures it will take. In such a propaganda spread of lies, Javier Solana will say on the BBC during Yugoslavia`s bombing that no longer can „men between 30 and 60 years of age be seen in Kosovo“ and President Clinton that – „Serbs are terrorizing and raping Albanian children“.

To what level of primitivism and vulgarity extend the lies, propaganda stereotypes and hate speech, we will also convey, also for illustration, the opinion of American diplomat

Richard Harles Albert Holbrooke according to whom Serbs are „criminal buttheads“. For Medeleine Albright Serbs are „disgusting“; French President Jacques Chirac said „The Serbs are a people without law and without faith, a people of robbers and terrorists“. German Chancellor Helmut Kohl will say, „Let Serbs suffocate in their own smell“, US Congressman David Obey: „Serbs are pigs“; Laurent Fabius, President of the National Assembly of France: „Serbs are trash“. The well-known Foreign Affairs Secretary of the United States, Warren Minor Christopher, called the Serbs „an immoral race“, and American senator Joseph Biden called them „baby killers“ (Vuković, 2009).

Thus, the media developed a hate speech and propagated the hatred of the Serbs. Under the pressure of propaganda hate speech, military and political assistance, in Sarajevo on May 27, 1992 in Vase Miskin Street, and on February 5 1994 and August 27 1995 on the Markale Market a mass murder was staged in order to accuse Serbs and to impose economic, cultural, scientific, sports, political and military sanctions by the so-called „International community“. General Rose knew that Markale's grenade came from the Muslim side, but the need for showing the procedure of “twisting of the truth“ did not see the light of day. Although the then UN

Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghali had a report from UN experts which talks about a hoax from the Bosniak side (which he did not put forward at the Security Council session), the world's public opinion was deceived and sanctions imposed. The BiH Army had bombed its own civilians, which was well known by Boutros-Boutros Ghali, who had the information and had an authentic document on „terrain events“ but hid it. Serbs were accused and this was the rigged cause of bombing of Serbs. It could certainly not be said that this was not directed by the United States, as the United States monitored, controlled, and stimulated the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, armed Muslims and Croats („humanitarian aid“, „parachuting operation“) to establish a „balance“ between the parties at war. The US supported Bosnian Muslims to compensate for their sin in aggression against Iraq before the Muslim world's public. Several years later, a similar plot was known as Račak, where on 15 January 1999 Albanians dressed the killed terrorists into civilian clothes, after which William Walker, chair of the OECD Verification Commission, accused the Serbian forces for the massacre. And, after that hoax followed the - the bombing of Serbia (SR Yugoslavia).

American journalists, as well as journalists from other Western imperial countries of the so-called „international community“ reported on the terrible destruction of the Republic of Srpska and the FR Yugoslavia by entertaining themselves and therefore getting the „prestigious awards“ of their commanders. NATO prevents or destroys the activities of independent media. „The media coverage of the war that NATO led in Yugoslavia was the most serious inflammatory journalism of the worst kind“ (Pirker, 2002: 224).

War has always, and the modern one in particular, had the need for an important support tool, that is - *propaganda*. Propaganda represents the process of influencing people and groups in order to create a certain opinion in order to form certain opinions; It is a form of convincing people to gain their opinion for justification of activities of the propaganda subject. Its goal is to undermine the combat morale and to bring division to the enemy, and in that sense uses different methods and techniques of „special war“, and disinformation in particular. „It is important to destroy Carthage“ is the basic motto of a propaganda message, so that Joseph Goebbels's thought is still present: „a lie repeated a thousand times remains a lie, a lie repeated a million times becomes true“. In this sense, the

media wrote About „brutal monsters of the lower kind“, Serbian leaders as „Hitlers“, „Serbian concentration camps“, „Serbian rape system“, „mass rapes on town squares“, etc.

In addition to the media that spreads propaganda stereotypes and hate speech, justifying certain political, diplomatic and military measures of the „international community“, the *propaganda agencies* should also be mentioned. „Malicious war propaganda, Peter Jennings points out, anti-Serb hatred and complete lies swamped the US media. It was funded and implemented through campaigns of agencies and groups involved in human rights protection under the sponsorship of governments, and all that to mobilize the public opinion on the side of Bosnian Muslims and Croats, and against the Serbs“. In the Balkan conflict, the media, Peter Brock wrote, „became a movement, one of the warring sides that did not appear neutral and impartial“ (Milutinović, 2010: 372).

It is well known that the first such agency, specially engaged in propaganda, „like a ministry“, was established in Great Britain during the First World War.

The basic task of such agencies is to „direct the thinking of most of mankind“. Nevertheless, the US was the first in the industry to engage in *public relations* with the aim of

„controlling the public's awareness“ (Čomski, 2009a: 20; Čomski, 2009b: 17).

In the West, and in the United States in particular, there are many propaganda agencies that are, with large financial resources, engaged in crisis and war situations, and whose media manipulations have an impact on channeling the phenomena in the directions that customers and financiers of exact specific services want.

Thus, the company *Hill and Knowlton* is known for inventing an incident with Kuwait babies from the incubator, which has had a strong impact on public opinion and thus accelerated the Gulf War.

That was exactly what happened in the war in BiH and the former Yugoslavia. Firm *Ruder & Fin* engaged both Muslims and Croats (and later Kosovar separatists) that for their separationist goals, against the Serbs, organize political marketing precisely because the war can be affected and the war can be well sold and paid. James Harff, director of this company, was decisive when he said that „our job is not to make information“ but „to speed up the circulation of information that is favorable to us and to direct them to a carefully selected goal“ (Brkić, 1995: 203).

What is this „carefully selected goal“?



This „carefully selected goal“, says Harff, refers to „the fact that we have won over the Jewish public opinion. This game was very delicate, and from that side, this issue involved a great deal of danger because President Tuđman was so mischievous in his book *Helplessness of Historical Reality*. Because of this text he could have been blamed for anti-Semitism. Nothing was better on the Bosnian side, where President Izetbegovic in his *Islamic Declaration*, published in 1970, advocated too much for a Muslim fundamentalist state (in Bosnia). In addition, the past of Croatia and Bosnia was marked by very realistic and ruthless anti-Semitism. Several tens of thousands of Jews disappeared in Croatian camps. There were many reasons why Jewish intellectuals and organizations were hostile to Croats and Bosnians. Before us, the challenge was to make the situation turn over and we succeeded in this between August 2 and 5, 1992, when *The New York Newsday* published an article on (Serb) camps. We took note of that and invited three large Jewish organizations... We suggested them to print an ad in *The New York Times* and to protest in front of the UN building. This really worked: the engagement of the Jewish organization on the side of Bosnians (Bosnian Muslims) was the super-poker party. Immediately afterwards, we managed to connect

the Serbs with the Nazis in the public opinion. It was a complex issue. Nobody could figure out what this is about in (former) Yugoslavia. Frankly speaking, I can tell you that most Americans wondered in which African country to put Bosnia. With a single blow we managed to offer a simple story, a story about good and bad guys. We knew that we should play the game in that direction. And, we won, by targeting Jewish public opinion, into the right target. This did not happen long before there was a clear change in the press, as emotional expressions such as ethnic cleansing and concentration camps emerged, recalling Nazi Germany and Gas Chambers in Auschwitz. The emotional charge was so powerful that no one could oppose it without being accused of revisionism“ (Kovačević, 1996: 109-111).

Incredible but effective manipulation!  
And - hoax.

The success of the company *Ruder & Fin* could only be achieved because this was wanted by the mighty powers of the West. Namely, „the real player in this deadly game was the US-NATO-EC coalition. Croats, Muslims and Albanians were (and are) only American puppets. They were able to catch Ruder Finn only because it was already planned by the USA". And, therefore, „none of the really good

agencies have accepted to represent Yugoslavia“ (Vlajki, 2002: 221, 222).

In order to achieve success, the company *Ruder & Fin* has made numerous contacts with senators and „media workers“, organized numerous briefings and educations of „leading American journalists and officials“.

Activities were conducted in three areas - Bosnia, Kosovo and Croatia. And with the aim of „supporting the Clinton administration (in elections in November of 1992) to realize a stronger US role in the Balkan crisis“. Director James Harff emphasized that his company is not interested in ethics, but commercialization and money: „We are professionals. We had a job that needed to be done and we did it. We are not paid to moralize“ (Ilić, 2002: 248, 252).

So, ethics is not important, what's important is - business.

The fact that the Serbs were accused beforehand started propaganda about *collective responsibility of the Serbs*. In the war in the former BiH, Serbs from the Republic of Srpska were *a priori* stigmatized and declared „Balkan barbarians“. In propaganda „semantic imperialism“, Serbs are represented as immature children who need - a „guardian“.

The media demonstration about the war in former Bosnia and Herzegovina and the

former Yugoslavia was aimed at „satanizing“ Serbs where Serbs were shown as „barbarians“ and members of other peoples who were with them at war, as „victims“. As the imperial force the United States, transferred such a stereotype of Serbs to their satellites to spread the American imperial understanding of journalism all over the world.

Not only the propaganda agencies, but also the media, and especially the television, are devastating weapons. They not only make and produce wars, but also invent them. And spread stereotypes.

Thus, for example, in 2008 the BBC Editorial Standards Commission criticized the „Tourist Documentary Series of Michall Palin“ on the geographic areas of the former SFRY. The criticism followed because „Serbia is `unfairly accused` for all events in the region“. In a maniheistic „black and white“ propaganda, the culprit is stigmatized and labeled in advance as „bad guys“ are not able to „be fixed“ (Reljić, 2011: 25).

In propaganda, *television* has a really great power.

Television, as Ellul notes, „is destined to become the main means“ of propaganda because „it has a shock-effect of the image, which is far

greater than the sound effect“ (Reljić, 2013: 235).

The propaganda power of television was well seen in the wars that marked the twentieth century.

In the *Desert Storm*, the war in Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq and Syria, it turned out that television and cameras are stronger than airborne missiles and bombing, and that the consequences of their destruction are far worse than can be seen and assumed. By powerfully manipulating the so-called „*world public opinion*“ it turned out that this „opinion“ is essentially „a powerful choir of men directed by American editors“ (Johansen). So, the „so-called West“ can be called as „a set of governments or business boards that are interested in retaining their global corporate privileges by concealing it with the intentions of protecting certain cultural values, as publicists and intellectuals do it in their countries“ (Eriksen, 2002: 104).

So, a maniheistic approach in action, which Cooper will also talk about.

Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair's adviser, Robert Cooper, discloses the Western Conception of Neoliberal imperialism praising it in the following words: „The Western world needs to be accustomed to using two

arshines. We must act between ourselves lawfully within the framework of an open cooperative security system. But when it comes to states outside the postmodern European continent, we need to go back to the harsher methods of the preceding era: force, preventive attacks, trickery, in short, everything that is needed to deal with those who still live in the age of war of everyone against everyone, where chaos is the rule and war is a way of life as in the nineteenth century. We need a new imperialism, acceptable from the standpoint of human rights and cosmopolitan values, an imperialism that aims, like any imperialism, to bring order and organization. Like Rome once, the West will impose on the citizens of the empire some of its laws, give them some money and build some roads“ (Cooper, 2002).

The essence of the strategy of *neoliberal capitalist imperialism* is to accuse someone of a „lack of“ or „violation“ of some of the civilized values, include the media and through them win over „public opinion“ and realizing any imperative political and military measure. The globalization policy implemented by the United States primarily serves to realize its interests, and today's development of capitalism in the form of *neoliberal globalism* is a renewal of classical *imperial liberalism*.

## Democracy or fascism?

But regardless of the accusations against Serbs, sometimes there are views that speak of the truth in the war in the former Yugoslavia and former Bosnia and Herzegovina. Thus, some point out that it is „hard to dispute the *center's* fault (West) for those crimes in the *periphery*“ because Yugoslavia „under a humanitarian excuse, is broken up into to Roman Catholic Croatia and Slovenia, Orthodox Serbia, and multiple Muslim enclaves“. Former French President Mitterand even in 1991 proposed that „The recognition of the republics of the former Yugoslavia be postponed until the rights of minorities are determined at the international level“. Also, he will also say „that the biggest mistake was made a few months later under pressure of the events. To recognize the independence and sovereignty of the new states without getting the assurances that I have demanded, meant exposing to the tragedies that later followed. This is the question that the Community and the United Nations have approached wrongly“. In 1993, controversial Lord David Owen demanded an „air intervention“ not only in Bosnia but in Serbia as well, to later say: „The West carries part of the guilt because of the stupid recognition of rival states created in the breakup“. US Ambassador

Cyrus Vance, who was the UN Special Envoy for Yugoslavia, said afterwards: „Early recognition of the independence of Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina by the EC and USA led to the war that taking place in the territory of Yugoslavia“.

The wars before, and especially today, can not be lead solely by military means. In his bestial propaganda today, the West and the „Americans use two basic weapons: aviation and information, that is, the physical bombing of the enemy and the electronic bombing of the rest of the world“ (Jean Boudrillard).

In order for a drastic military measure to be realized (as, for example, justification of bombing as a so-called „*humanitarian intervention*“), it is necessary that it first prepares media in order to win over public opinion. Given that the world media (*CNN*, *BBC*, *SKY*) under the influence of transnational capital, which is owned by powerful corporative economic-political-diplomatic-military elites („*elites of authorities*“), it is clear that this influence on „domestic“ „World public opinion“ can easily be fabricated and manipulatively achieved.

The war in the former Yugoslavia and BiH showed that „*media makelavelism*“ was expressed to the extent that for their lies by



which they demonized and satanized one side and showed the other as „innocent victims“, journalists and editors received „prestigious“ awards for „peace“ and „humnnence“, even though, by violating professional ethics, human rights and international law, they manipulated the public opinion by encouraging war and hate. Roy Gutman (who wrote reports „from Bosnia“ which were actually written and sent from Zagreb), Penny Marshall, as well as others, with their stories of „Serb concentration camps“ strongly influenced the American, primarily Jewish, public opinion that supported the American militant Politics towards the Balkans.

When in 1999, without a decision by the Security Council, NATO started the war against the FR Yugoslavia, all information coming from „the other side“ was censored. „All the information about the NATO war against Yugoslavia coming to us must first pass the censorship of the alliance“, said Franz Bauer, then editor of *Trend Weekly* and official of the organization *Reporters Without Borders*, an organization that, as they spoke for themselves, fights for freedom of the media in those countries where it does not exist. But, at home, it happened that free spread of information is not possible. „Freedom of information is impossible“, Bauer said, adding that this also applies to Austria,

which often „holds lessons to the whole world“. Like in other parts of the world, so publishers and media editors in Austria have been very disciplined and cooperatively accepted the instructions on the propaganda war. And, worst of all, of these facts are aware both viewers and readers, but they were not too bothered. And that is exactly what shows the whole farce and lies about the story of „independent“ and „free media“ as well as about the „freedom of the media“ in the West. And how far this politics of poltroonship and loyalty to the „Big Brother“ is indicated by the request of *Neue Kronenzeitung* which demanded that photographers and cameramen in Kosovo no longer take pictures and record „every hit tractor“ and „collateral mistakes“ as it helps to promote Serbian propaganda. „A few more of these images and NATO will lose the propaganda war“, the reporter of Austrian Radio Television said at a time when „humanitarian“ air bombers cast deadly and ecologically polluting and contaminated „carpets of bombs“.

Thus, it shows that „we as a society look at the world from the perspective of *moral relativism*. Even those among us who do not approve of lying, they are consciously often unwilling to publicly admit the existence of a clear line between truth and a lie. In addition, we

would say that we increasingly condemn those who lie. In that sense, a sophisticated refrain is worded `that's not my problem`“ (Dej, 2004: 100).

The media in the war in the former Yugoslavia and BiH, and beyond, played a shameful and immoral role by spreading lies and propaganda stereotypes of hatred. If there were no media, and those who used them to make profits, as well as strategic geopolitical interests, they would be no war, migration, dying, disease and suffering. Thanks to them and to the interests of those who manipulated them economically, politically, ideologically and militarily, there would be no general destruction of biological substance, economic and productive infrastructure, a large number of people would not be left out of business and their children almost no chance of being employed and to live like humans in some of the UN's projected *sustainable development*.

### **Semantic terror**

Under the influence of governments, various propaganda agencies and the media, and in ignorance, non-informedness and disinformation,

people in the West, as well as in many other countries, accept false information as true.

Once George Washington emphasized that *fictitious stories* can have a greater effect than true ones. „The Congress will not make any laws... to restrict freedom of speech or press...” - is part of the text of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, a text that has provided the American media with incentives and the right to publish their content without restriction and censorship. Many years later, and in the continuation of the development of US foreign policy on propaganda stereotypes, lies and deceptions, former US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said that it is OK *to lie* if it was in the „state interest“. After the Cuban Crises with missiles in 1962, a US secretary of defense assistant insisted on the right to *organized public lying*, believing the government is entitled to „manage news“ and the right to deny information or spread false news. This is possible because „the persistent repetition of one and the same propaganda messages dulls the possibility of recognizing lies, and most people begin to believe some value attitudes that their government suggests and imposes successfully“ (Malović, Vilović, 2007: 39).

In other words, in their propaganda lies, the media can carry out the so-called *semantic terror*.

In this relationship in which information and media have become directly dependent on military and political power centers, TV becomes a means of *semantic terror* and „*brainwashing*“. In such a constellation of international relations, dominant subjects of global power use the media and therefore television in its realization. In this relationship in which information and media have become directly dependent on military and political power centers, TV becomes a means of semantic terror and „brainwashing“, a means of spreading lies and hoaxes by:

- prepares information and manipulates by giving importance to marginal and less important issues;
- does not allow the development of truth and critical thinking, but is conducting the apology of the subject of power by controlling TV to influence domestic and world „public opinion“;
- abolishes publicity and the autonomy of public opinion by fabricating and manipulating it.

This „doctrinal language“ and „semantic terror“ represent the „terror“ message, the area of language of concealment, lies and deceit. Here are some of the many examples of designing and shaping political and media semantic terror from the *Desert War*, the *Gulf War*, the war in Yugoslavia, the war in Iraq, Afghanistan, in the Middle East:

- the war is a „wonderful little war“ (through which economic and political interests are realized and own problems are solved);
- „humanitarian intervention“ and „campaign“ = aggression, bombing, and justification of crimes and genocide;
- „humanitarian aid“ = armament;
- „human relocation“ = ethnic cleansing, intent of peaceful expulsion (eg. Serbs from Republic of Srpska Krajina and RS);
- „collateral damage“ = killing of civilians and innocent persons, bombing and destruction of civilian objects by „scattering the carpet of bombs“;
- a part of the powerful states declare themselves „an

international community“ and declare their economic, political, military and media activities and „efforts“ as „the activities and efforts of the international community“;

- bombing and killing is called a „humanitarian intervention“ (whose „right“ is stronger than the „principle of sovereignty of the state“);
- interference in others internal relations and the destruction of national sovereignty is a „defense of national“ and „vital interest“;
- the entry into military alliances and „integration“ is the purchase of freedom;
- humane, democratic and just is what the so-called „international community“ believes that this is and who can have and can exercise the „right to self-determination“;
- countries that have a neutral and independent position in international relations are threatened by being „deprived of assistance“, ie. economic

sanctions; The World Organization is threatened by the deprivation of financial assistance of the developed countries if it votes against measures and decisions of the developed countries (because „cooperativity“ and „alliance“ is endangered);

- „expanding democracy and human rights“ = imperial conquest of states, peoples and their wealth;
- „liberalization of the economy“ = exploitation of foreign natural resources and labor force;
- „fighting against protectionism“ and „spreading of the free market“ = winning the market and introducing protectionism for selling its goods (through „standards“, „brands“ etc);
- „peace process“ = arbitration in conflicts, blackmail and blocking of achievement of peace (Americans are known to block political negotiations whenever they see a political solution is possible, and then they intensify



other activities, including military ones);

- „free nations“ = nations that conquer...

In accordance with the concept of „semantic terror“, the essence of which is a lie, manipulation and deception, many will not speak of *American imperialism*, but of *American leadership* considering the „attraction“ of the *American lifestyle*, *Protestant ethics* (spoken about by Max Weber as an assumption of the emergence of capitalism in the West), the *democracy of technological advantages*. Thus, the American military supremacy will be camouflaged and falsely represented as if it were „voluntary acceptance of American leadership“. By stressing that the US is a „peaceful nation“, Bush developed the doctrine of „preventive warfare“. Exactly such „doctrinal“ speech, „semantic terror“ and lies are the basis of numerous American warfare with many countries since 1945 and aggression on other states and their peoples.

**3.**

**NATO AGRESSION**



## NATO-war against Yugoslavia

In order to lead a war, it must be propagandly justified with some „ethical“ and „humanitarian“ reasons.

The justification of wars for „humanitarian“ and „ethical“ reasons does not represent some exclusivity of our (post) modern era. The concept of „*bellum iustum*“, or „the just war“, leads its origins from biblical times and old imperial pretensions. However, after the *Gulf War*, it again gains its central place in political discussions, and is based on the view that if the state faces aggression that would endanger its territorial integrity or political independence, „it has the *jus ad bellum* (the right to start a war)“. This traditional concept of the „just war“ actually represents the „banalization of the war“ and the celebration of war as an „ethical means“ that „modern political thought and the international community of nation states strongly reject“ (Hardt & Negri, 2003: 24).

Nevertheless, a part of the „international community“, powerful and neo-imperialist oriented, accepts the concept of „*bellum iustum*“, ie. leading wars for „ethical“ and „humanitarian“ reasons.

So once even American President Theodore Roosevelt, speaking of the humanitarian ethical motives of war, pointed out that „of all wars, the most just is the war with savages“ because by this founded is the authority of the „dominant world races“. When they realized that „most just“ war on the Indians, from those “humanitarian motives“ the US went further. They performed, „in the interests of civilization, humanity and freedom“, an intervention in Cuba in 1898. When the American ship *Maine* exploded in Havana Harbor, the Spaniards rejected the accusation and suggested an independent commission to investigate the real causes of the explosion, but „the Americans were not in the mood to miss the chance“ and - the war started. Something similar happened in the case of Račak (Reljić, 2011: 64).

When the goal is chosen, then that message advocated by Niccolò Machiavelli: *finis sancificat media* is valid.

President William McKinley justified American imperialism for ethical reasons: „We took arms only by listening to orders of mankind and for fulfilling high general and moral obligations“. Then followed the conquest of the Philippines that the American president would justify again for ethical and civilizational reasons: „We fulfill higher moral obligations,

which belong to us and for which nobody's consent was needed. We fulfill our duty to them, since God has enlightened us to see our duty, with the consent of our own conscience, with the approval of civilization“ (Chomski, 2000: 100, 101).

Many intellectuals are supporters of „humanitarian interventions“ for „ethical“ reasons.

Václav Havel points out that the war against the FR Yugoslavia „puts human rights above the rights of the state. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was attacked by the alliance without a UN-mandate. This did not happen irresponsibly, as an act of aggression or disrespect of international law. This has happened, on the contrary, from respect for rights, on behalf of the rights that come beyond the right to protect the sovereignty of the state. The alliance acted on the basis of respect for human rights“ (Havel, 1999: 6).

This is what Michael Walzer also believes, who in 1999 advocated for the bombing of Serbia, and who received an Honorary Doctorate of the University of Belgrade on June 17, 2010 (!?).

Walzer points out that „humanitarian interventions“ are in fact „ethically necessary“ always „whenever cruelty and suffering are

brought to the limit, and when it seems that local authorities are not able to end them“ (Volzer, 2008: 42). We will also cite a part of his text *Politics and Morality in Kosovo*, in which he states: „While I am writing this, the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia continues and the Serbian destruction of Kosovar society also continues. Yes, the Serbian hike had to be planned before the bombing began, the logistical movements of forty thousand soldiers are immensely complicated. In some parts of Kosovo, the cruel reality of ethnic cleansing was already visible before a decision was made to hit Serbs by rockets and smart bombs. If we take into account the Serbian file from Bosnia, the mobilization of soldiers on the border with Kosovo, the refugees already on their way, a military intervention seems to me to be completely justified, even mandatory“.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to these, there were other „intellectuals“ who for various, and most often for „ethical reasons“, insisted on the bombing of Serbia.

Thus, for the third time in the twentieth century, Serbia was bombed. Exactly on Easter - the first time on Catholic Easter on April 6, 1941 by the Germans, the second time on Orthodox

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.pecat.co.rs/2010/06/majkl-volcer-ples-sa-vukovima/> (10<sup>th</sup> May 2017).

Easter on April 16, 1944, by „allied aircraft intended to give a decisive blow to the occupation regime“, and the third time in 1999 on Easter holidays. „What do the bombs for Serbia for Easter mean for the third time in this(XX-BC) century? What do the new masters of the world want to achieve by bombing the Serb people on the day of Christ's resurrection? Is this not an attempt to run over a small nation, to deprive it of its faith and hope? Is this not the killing of faith, actually, the beginning of the twilight of Western civilization and the Christian heritage? Does it mean that evil, violence and deception will in the end dominate the world? Are we witnessing the final destruction of the free and democratic spirit of Europe and the world“ (Trkulja, 1999: 71, 72).

The bombing of the Republic of Srpska lasted from August 30 to September 13, 1995, and the bombing of FR Yugoslavia lasted from March 24 to June 10, 1999.

In the bombing of the Republic of Srpska participated 400 combat aircraft, 2 American aircraft carriers, 1 British air carrier. There were 3,200 combat flights conducted and 150 military and civilian strikes were carried out. 10,000 tons of explosives (aircraft bombs, missiles, cassette bombs, laser and TV guided bombs, cannon hits,



13 Tomahawk cruise missiles were dropped (Volaš, Savić: 2014: 82).

Ammunition with depleted uranium was used in the bombing of the Republic of Srpska. Over 10,000 grains with depleted uranium were fired on military positions and civilian targets of Serbs in BiH, out of which over 5,800 of these projectiles only in two locations - Hadzici and Han Pijesak.

The United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Luxembourg, Belgium, Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Turkey, Greece and Canada participated in the NATO aggression on SR Yugoslavia. Countries joined to NATO also helped them: Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, Slovakia. „The countries that directly attacked us were 228 times larger than Serbia, they had 67 times greater population and were 518 times richer (ie. with higher national income). It was, since the Persian invasion of Helad, probably the most unequal armed conflict ever seen in history“ (Antonić, 2014: 204).

NATO began the aggression with 464 aircraft (371 airplanes, 210 of which from the United States), and ended up with 1200 airplanes (850 fighters). There have been 26,289 flights

(according to some even 36,219). Air-earth projectiles, „tomahawk“ missiles, stealth bombers, cassette, „smart“ and conventional bombs were used. It is believed that more than 700,000 missiles and 1,000 cruise missiles were launched and that 37,000 cassette bombs were dropped.

Destroyed were: 7 industrial and commercial facilities, 11 power plants, 38 bridges, 28 radio and TV repeaters, 470 km of roads, 595 km of railways. 19 hospitals, 20 community health centers, 18 kindergartens, 69 primary and secondary schools, 29 monasteries and 35 churches were damaged.

Also, a bombing took place on the territory of a foreign state - the Embassy of China in Belgrade.

Military and civilian targets, as well as protected zones, were bombed: national parks Kopaonik, Tara, Šar mountain, Gazimestan nature reserve, Palić nature park, Miruše, Vršac mountains, Ovčarsko-kablarske canyon, Divčibara, Rudnik and Jastrebac mountains, monasteries Gračanica, Pećka patrijaršija, Žiča, Church of St. Nicholas and St. The Virgin Mary at Kursumlija, the Ethno Village in Sirogojno, the Pančevo Nitrogen, Pančevo Refinery. War damage is estimated at \$100 billion, which is a

huge amount for a small developing country. It was a real - *economic crime*.

In the bombing of FR Yugoslavia, 599 soldiers, 172 police officers, 2,000 civilians were killed and 10,000 people were injured.

By destroying industrial and production capacities, more than 600,000 people were left jobless, and 2.5 million without resources of material existence.

As a result of the bombing of Yugoslavia, 34 Italian soldiers died and 277 were suffering from malignant diseases (Kremenović, 2014: 95).

Do we know how many Serbs die annually from the consequences of the bombing (Republic of Srpska 1995 and FR Yugoslavia 1999) with *depleted uranium*?

Of course, we do not know, but that's surely a big number.

Spanish captain Martin de la Hoz emphasized that the chief commanders of the bombing were American generals. „They are destroying the country, bombarding it with new missiles, battle poisons, surface mines thrown from parachutes, bombs containing uranium, black napalm, sterilizing chemicals, spraying poison on crops, and using any weapon we do not even know anything about. North Americans are committing one of the biggest barbarisms

that can even be imagined against humanity“ (Vlajki, 2002: 218).

It was a *war crime* because the effect of weapons in the bombing was tested on the civilian population.

The war in the former Yugoslavia and former Bosnia and Herzegovina was actually a war against Yugoslavia, a war that was accomplished thanks to nationalist and secessionist forces „from within“. But without the will and the interest of the „international community“ that war would not occur. As it ended the war in a brutal way, it could have prevented the war, but that was not its true geopolitical goal. The real goal was not to care for the „people“ in Bosnia and Herzegovina, or for Kosovo Albanians in FR Yugoslavia, but Serbian opposition to the fulfillment of ultimate neo-liberal social and economic reforms. US State Officer Nelson Strobridge Talbott III stressed that the NATO war against Serbia was not a consequence of „care for Albanians“, but of the fact that „Serbia did not implement the required social and economic reforms“. Serbia represented the „last corner of Europe that did not adhere to neoliberal programs under US administration“ and therefore the goal was that „it must be removed“ (Politika, 2006). In spring of 1999, Serbia was bombed to supposedly

„solve“ the problem of „human rights“ of Albanians in Kosovo, which was then placed (abducted) under the „international community“ protectorate.

The main reason for the warfare against Yugoslavia and its bombing was not „the suffering of Kosovo Albanians“, but „the resistance of Yugoslavia to the wider trends of political and economic reforms“, which are the doctrinal codes of neoliberal Washington program. The war against Yugoslavia represented „direct proclamation of the war to international law“ (Čomski, 2008: 178; Pirker, 2002: 223).

The war against Yugoslavia had some other reasons that are in conflict with the economic and political interests of the *oligarchy of neoliberal capitalism*.

Stating the underlying reasons for the dissolution of Yugoslavia, Igor Kapelnikov writes: „The dissolution of Yugoslavia has been due to the unacceptable attitude of some Western circles that it for decades has been recording great economic development, that it has a great reputation in the third - non-aligned world and is the leading European country in the export of arms and military equipment to developing countries“ (Milutinović, 2005: 255).

Of course, in addition to the external reasons for the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the internal ones should also be mentioned.

One of them relates to the interests of political elites. The dissolution of Yugoslavia was contributed by „Extreme political elites of the republics and provinces that, for the purpose of establishing their ruling position, searched for legitimacy in making of states and provinces, secession from Yugoslavia and the bloody ethnic conflicts, with the impregnated religious component“. The idea of the break up of Yugoslavia was realized by „Communists, Broz's generals and political officials in leading political and state functions“ (Tramošljanin, 2014: 100).

Also, the unresolved national question of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, as well as other ethnic groups, necessarily led to the escalation of nationalist pretensions.

The role of religious and ecclesiastical influence on the events that led to the break up of the SFRY, which still apply to the problems faced by ex-Yugoslav states, should be mentioned.

And, as for the so-called „*humanitarian intervention*“, it was justified by emphasizing that it is being implemented with the goal of „preventing and stopping ethnic cleansing“. However, exactly the opposite has happened.

There was an ethnic cleansing since the mass exodus of Serbs happened from Kosovo and Metohija. It is believed that about 250,000 Serbs, Montenegrins and non-Albanians left since the arrival of KFOR in Kosovo and Metohija.

After the bombing, NATO and the US have captured 10.887 square kilometers (12.3%) of territory from Serbia.

Violent separation of Kosovo and Metohija from the territory of Serbia does not only have territorial significance, but also has a geopolitical significance because Serbia's territory, resources and energy potentials are being seized from it. Research shows that in this area Serbia has 60% of its resources, that this territory has huge amounts of coal, as well as minerals, especially bauxite, lead, zinc, nickel, cobalt, cadmium, vanadium and gold. In this area there are also resources of quality water. This shows that the West is robbing „the most important natural resources“ (Petrović-Piroćanac, 2010: 244-245).

At the end of the second millennium, the war against the Republic of Srpska (1995) and FR Yugoslavia (1999) was a „war from a distance“ in which new military technologies were tried, which led to a war from a greater safe distance and reduced risk to its own people. The whole world was shown in 1999 the testing of

the aviation war against Serbia. It was a war that showed that, instead of a direct conflict of armies in the battlefield, the armies today enter into a conflict mediated by computers and television. In addition to the economic, geopolitical and military goals of the NATO aggression on the FRY, mention should also be made of those related to the creation of *nuclear dumps* by throwing missiles that have expired, and conducting experiments to show how the latest NATO weapons are operating. Thus, it is evident that in the wars led by NATO pact mostly suffer the people in whose territories the war is waged and the most profits are gained by the weapons producers and transnational corporations to which the territories of new markets are opened. In its „*experimental war*“, NATO not only practiced a complex multinational military command system, but in the „war from a distance“ tried the weapons of cruise missiles, „smart“ and graphite bombs, depleted uranium, and the territory has served for the „disposal“ of radioactive waste, as well as for experimental monitoring of the „*health card*“ and the medical condition of the population afterwards.

NATO forces have helped terrorists in Kosovo and Macedonia to achieve political equality, and by „capturing Kosmet the *‘little world war’ against Serbs* from Krajina across the



Republic of Srpska to Kosovo, with the simultaneous breaking away of Montenegro was suppose to end“ (Czempiel, 2002: 101).

It was - an *economic war*. Primarily, of the UN Security Council against the FR Yugoslavia for more than three years in the form of sanctions and then NATO bombing of the Republic of Srpska and FR Yugoslavia, in other words destroying their economic potential and bringing the population to poverty. Everything that is significant and which is the basis for the economic, social and environmental development of a country has been bombed and destroyed.

And in Iraq economic sanctions resulted in horrendous *genocide* - more than 47,000 children died from January to August 1991, and afterwards 400,000 died because of lack of food, medicine and medical equipment. In 1993, child mortality was truncated - 92 per a thousand children; Almost 1/3 of babies had a lower weight under the normal at birth. More than 600,000 Iraqis were killed in the war in Iraq until August 2006 (Čomski, 1998: 32-33; Čomski, 2008: 7).

In the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, large forces for „humanitarian reasons“ introduced the sanctions to FR Yugoslavia (in order to not help the Serbs in BiH and to make

FR Yugoslavia enforce sanctions against the Republic of Srpska), which, had as a consequence, among other things, a known tragedy of the „Banja Luka babies“. At the same time, these forces, through the „humanitarian aid“ program, delivered weapons to Bosniaks and Croats.

In the *political sense*, the bombing of Serbia and the war against it represented a strong support to the separatist Albanian movement in Kosovo and Metohija, aimed at *breaking down the territorial integrity of a sovereign state*.

From the *legal aspect*, NATO's intervention against FR Yugoslavia was - *aggression*. The Security Council has not made a decision on bombing, but the decision was made by NATO member states, even though that decision had no basis in international law. „NATO - aggression on FRY was an expression of American hegemony, a policy of force and inhumanity... NATO was conceived as a defense pact and became an aggressive organization, bombing a country that is a sovereign and independent member of the UN, from which it was not threatened. The war against the FRY was aggressive and unconstitutional, it achieved the destruction of FRY, ethnic cleansing of Serbs from Kosovo...“ (Carević, 2003: 417).

From the standpoint of *international law*, the bombing of Republic of Srpska and FR Yugoslavia was „illegal“ and as such, it is well noticed by Chomsky „changed the nature of law“. NATO has shown itself as a „military mafia“ and the bombing of the FR Yugoslavia is, as decisively mentions Chossudovsky - a „*criminal act*“. That is why the future development of mankind really depends on the actual legal control of the actions of powerful military forces. For, with the disappearance of the state's classical jurisdictions and with the intensification of military action by leading countries, it is obvious that not only is there no political consensus, but also that there is a lack of and absence of „global legal control and sanctions“ (Katunarić, 2003: 123).

Observed from the *ethical point* of view, the military intervention was a - *crime*. The increase in the rate of morbidity, malignancy and mortality shows that the bombing of FR Yugoslavia (Serbia), as well as the earlier bombing of Republic of Srpska, was actually - a war crime.

## **Actors and geopolitics of the war**

The US and NATO forces supported the Croatian attack of Serbs in Krajina (which was a UN Protected Zone). With the help of NATO and the United States, the Croatian Army in 1995 carried out crimes of ethnic cleansing and genocide against Serbs precisely in those UN-protected areas. „Storm“ („similar to the name `Desert Storm`“) was simultaneously performed in the joint activities of the Croatian ground Army and NATO aviation. With this operation, „Croatia debuted as the front echelon of NATO in the north-western Balkans“, where „the most horrible `ethnic cleansing` and the genocide of Serbs occurred precisely in UN-protected areas“ (Lubardić, 1996: 109).

Croats and Bosniaks in the former BiH have been given by both the US and NATO not only logistical support but complete assistance and then bombarded Serb positions and strategic infrastructure targets in the Republic of Srpska and Republic of Srpska Krajina. The United States have „caused“ the war in BiH, „Controlled its course and with the help of powerful propaganda machinery, accused FR Yugoslavia for that war“ (Todorović, Vilić, 1997: 291).

On the same day when Croatia attacks Republic of Srpska Krajina (August 8, 1995), NATO aircraft bomb the rocket positions of Republic of Srpska Krajina near Knin, blocking its power distribution network and the informative order.

This „double standards“ policy began before the conflict in the former SFRY, during it and also after the war.

In that war, the United States and NATO broke the embargo on the delivery of weapons brought by the UN. „Practically it will exist since April 1994, but a secret policy of non-imposition was the official American policy in the fall“ (Holbrooke) supported by Great Britain, France and Germany (Hartman, 1991: 171).

The United States has retained NATO's structure as a military lever to exhort discipline and obedience to the world. This alliance, initially formed as a defense alliance of Western countries, has now turned into an aggressive organization subordinated to American goals in building a new, neoliberal world order. The US and NATO represent the coalition of geostrategic conquests and control of the world.

The US and NATO have also supported the attacks of Kosovo Albanians on FR Yugoslavia, which the UN certainly knew well. As the media manipulations at Markale served as

an „argument“ of the justification of the 1995 bombing of the Republic of Srpska, so the media manipulations in the Račak village served as the „argument“ of the justification of the bombing of FR Yugoslavia in 1999.

Thus, NATO got involved in internal conflicts and the bombing of FR Yugoslavia and stole Kosovo and Metohija. UN was supposed to react because NATO did not have the right to bomb Serbia; it was a - *NATO genocide*.

The United States has dictated what the United Nations will do, but they „raise hands off“ UN because they do not „need it“ because it will conduct its policy through NATO and world monetary institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization. The UN is often blocked by governments in the highest body - the Security Council. When they can not achieve their goals and interests through the UN, the great powers (especially those from the NATO Pact) bypass the UN. This shows that such UN - are ineffective and overcome, just as ineffective and therefore overcome was the *Society of Peoples*. The UN has thus called into question the purpose of its existence, and that is why they must be strengthened to create a world order that is truly based on *law* and *justice*, or, as they are now, a

NATO and US puppet - they must disappear from the world stage.

The United States and Britain are achieving political goals by means of violence and NATO is threatening to bomb if the other party does not accept the ultimatums it poses (Ash, 2002: 53).

That was the case with the Republic of Srpska and the FR Yugoslavia.

Due to the call for the *right to self-determination*, the leadership of all Serb countries was imprisoned. The Hague Tribunal is a political instrument of the United States and NATO, as it represents a continuation of the aggression against the Serb people. „NATO is a friend of the Tribunal... NATO countries are among its largest financiers. NATO countries have created this tribunal and funded that tribunal“, decisively pointed out Jamie Shea, NATO spokesperson (Subotić, 2010: 21).

But it should be added that Hague was also funded by Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Malaysia...

Thus, the „new interventionism“ of the United States and NATO is denying *international law* which is, in fact, completely irrelevant to them (Čomski, 2000: 192 etc).

The bombing of the FR Yugoslavia was an act of violation of the UN Charter and international law.

And, what they can not destroy by the IMF, World Bank, and World Trade Organization measures, they are destroying by bombing, in agreement with or without its satellite – the UN.

Not a long time has passed since the emergence of the United Nations and the goal of achieving the noble idea of helping the countries on their path to economic, political and cultural development to converting the UN into an instrument of massive capital.

As a voting machine of massive capital of powerful states of the so-called „international community“, the UN places many countries under a blockade whose sanctions push their people into poverty, hunger, disease and death. This was also the case with the Serbs. The UN imposed genocidal sanctions on them, and then forced FR Yugoslavia to impose sanctions on Serbs in the Republic of Srpska. It was believed that the sanctions would break Serbia in ten days if the embargo for oil was consistently respected. During the war, a „flight ban“ was imposed on Serbian aviation, while the airports in Sarajevo, Tuzla and Čoralići were used for arming Bosniaks (and also via Slovenia and Croatian



port of Ploče). Although the UN Security Council on September 25, 1991 put in place an embargo on weapons for the former Yugoslavia, still however, the “Operation parachute” delivered weapons („Humanitarian Aid“) to Bosniacs in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The United Nations are the satellite of the USA, which is seen in the fact that since the Second World War and under the pressure of the United States, they imposed sanctions in almost 120 cases. Have they, by these drastic measures, been conducting an economic war or spreading free trade?

That is why, because of its great power, the Security Council is being reprimanded that in the role of the prosecutor and the judge, its sanctions endanger the lives of innocent and poor, especially children, because it jeopardizes the supply of the means necessary to maintain their health and life. If neo-liberal ideologists talk about the „golden billion“, ie. that our Planet is overpopulated, and that, in order to “preserve“ resources and „decent life“, it is necessary that the population does not exceed one billion, is this not maltreatment in practice, genocide realized in a perfidious way? And, can we thereby better understand the reasons for planting and causing ethnic and other conflicts, wars and „humanitarian interventions“, economic

sanctions, exploitation, abduction and robbery of natural resources, the reasons for which many illnesses are spreading in poor people, their hunger, diseases and death?

In OUN, „voices of conscience or resistance are silenced by force or mercy, threats or corruption“. After the *League of Nations* „died out“ and „the OUN proved helpless to solve the current world problems“, a „third attempt to establish a global world order“ is on the stage (Kalaić, 1994: 178, 177).

UN and NATO produce and control imperialist wars, above all of the United States and Great Britain.

Many believe that NATO is the „armed arm of the Pentagon“ and of its satellite in the United Kingdom. NATO is colonial, and the United Nations is compromised by the self-will of the NATO pact and no longer represents a place of initiatives, coordination and harmonization of interests that would contribute to the welfare of mankind. „Now the whole world knows that NATO and the United Nations are programming and covering imperialist wars that Washington and some French-German circles want“ (Analís, 1990: 20).

At the beginning of August 1995, NATO airplanes began bombing of Serbian positions at Pale, and Croatian forces occupied the protected

zone of UN - Republic of Srpska Krajina. While hundreds of thousands of Serbs goes into an exodus, the UN is hypocritically „sorry“ about the Croatian process. The culmination of hypocrisy and cynicism is reflected in openly expressing sympathies with Croatian and Muslim, and later Albanian victims, but not with Serb victims.

The old, hypocritical imperial force of Europe imposed Yugoslavia on the Serbs, the Serb-Croat-Bosniak war and then, together with the United States, the United Nations and the „international community“, imposed peace and, through the protectoral „high representatives“ the so-called „international community“, the rules of dramatic stalemate-moves, by which, for the time being, it contributed to the excommunication of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian peoples from the community of „European peoples“.

Germany and Austria supported the secession of Croatia and Slovenia from Yugoslavia and thus contributed to the radicalization of the conflict during the civil war. In the creation of a „new“ Europe, a decisive role was played by Germany and the United States, the powerful states that contributed to the disintegration of Yugoslavia and the separatism of the former Yugoslav republics. They first supported the secession („independence“) of

Croatia and Slovenia, and then BiH, from Yugoslavia and thus during the Civil War, contributed to the radicalization of the conflict and the „ethnic cleansing“ of Serbs from Republic of Srpska Krajina. France for economic reasons joined Germany and supported the German strategy towards Russia and the East. Italy attacked Yugoslavia in 1941 and in the crisis around the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia it was against Serbia by supporting separatism and the breaking of Yugoslavia.

In the geopolitical area of the Balkans and in a negative relation to the Serbs, a significant role plays - the Vatican, which, in fact, spreads the concept of *Civitas Dei* in the form of „new evangelization“, ie. subjugating the world to papal domination. Under the excuse of the struggle for „human rights“ the famous „theory of limited sovereignty“ was also advocated by the Vatican, that is, Pope John Paul II advocated the so-called „humanitarian intervention“. By limiting the right of the Serbian people to self-determination and the state political constitution that would guarantee this right, the Pope talks about a „humanitarian intervention“, ie. a military intervention whose aim would be to use war, weapons and killing (not just soldiers but also civilians, women and children), to force the Serbs to „conversion“ and

humiliation (Kovačević, 1994; Kovačević, 2004).

In the Balkan geopolitical area, Turkey also had a certain role, alongside a block of Islamic countries whose influence was effectuated across various areas of economic, political, military and religious activity. It uses US interests in the Middle East to, gradually, with their support, intensify their domination in the Balkans. Hence, the support of Muslims in Bosnia, Albanians in Kosovo and Metohija and Albania and Bosniaks in Sandzak.

Although the Serbs from Russia expected great help, it should be noted that Russia was in a very difficult economic, cultural, spiritual and political collapse when things in the Balkans began to develop dramatically in the last decade of the last century. Serbs expected much from it, but these expectations were illusory and unexpected. Russia has itself suffered a strong crisis that has prevented it from having an actual political authority in the international arena. Russia did not veto the adoption of Resolution 757 of May 30, 1992, by which the Security Council imposed sanctions on FR Yugoslavia. Its policy was inconsistent. And, not just that. What was unexpected, and it happened: „It was believed that Russia would help preserve Yugoslavia, because Russia itself is in a similar

situation. However, Russia's behavior was largely unexpected for Serbia and Montenegro, as its attitude was inconsistent, dependent and ignored Russian national interests. Objectively, Russia has assumed the anti-Serbian position since the beginning“ (Guskova, 2011: 7-17; Guskova, 2003: 257-258).

But, what needs to be particularly emphasized, is that Russia must draw a lesson from the Yugoslav crisis and the tragic Serbian experience.

Precisely, the tragic example of Serbia and Yugoslavia allows „to see what threatens Russia in case of the same course of events and nobody today any longer doubts the fact that events are taking place in the same direction“ (Dugin, 2004: 401).

## **The Humanitarian Intervention and Ecology**

Ecologically observed, a war is a way of destroying people, goods and the natural environment. As a complex phenomenon, the war endangers human society, sustainable development and human survival. For example, it is enough to take increased radiation due to the

use of radioactive material, the use of nuclear reactors, atomic probes, production and use of atomic bombs.

It is known that in the twentieth century there were many more victims of war than in the previous four centuries together. And not to mention how many chemical, nuclear, biological, and conventional weapons were used to contaminate the nature and disable the achievement of - *sustainable development*.

The war and the aggression of NATO forces on the Republic of Srpska and FR Yugoslavia at local and regional and international levels are degraded the environmental situation and reduced the quality of life's natural environment and living conditions. In addition to human losses, there are also economic and environmental consequences, which relate to health threats, carcinogenic, teratogenic and mutagenic changes, increased morbidity, malignancy and mortality of the population (Kovačević, 2011).

Among other things (due to sanctions and economic war), the bombing of the Republic of Srpska in 1995 and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1999 had the characteristics of an *ecological war*, but also of the *eco-criminality*, because the bombing caused the endangerment of the biodiversity of the natural environment

primarily in the local but also in the regional and the global level. Ammunition with depleted uranium was used in the bombing. Such ammunition was used for the first time in the *Gulf War (Desert Storm)* and then in the Republic of Srpska, in Haiti, Somalia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

By bombardment, legally observed, the sovereignty of a country was violated and therefore international law was violated, and ecologically observed, natural right to a healthy environment was taken away), for 78 days, large volumes of *depleted uranium*, and an unknown quantity of plutonium and gunpowder were dropped.

In the NATO aggression on the FRY, civilians were killed, military and civilian airports, hospitals, monasteries and churches, embassies, petrochemical plants, warehouses of petroleum products and fuel barrels, heating plants, water supply and filtration systems, car factories, railroad compositions and plants were bombed with the aim of causing the release of toxic chemicals, power plants, postal and telephone offices, radio relay nodes, power stations, raw materials and tangible resources of road, air, rail and river-maritime traffic, viaducts, agricultural complexes, road and railway bridges,



buses and trains, civilian objects and houses were also bombed.

The NATO bombing not only of FR Yugoslavia but also of the Republic of Srpska earlier, caused the emission of a large number of harmful and dangerous substances that seriously jeopardized biodiversity and the environment, and had a major impact on global changes, primarily on the weakening of the ozone layer, the creation of the greenhouse effect, occurrence of acid rain, climate change. Many sites were bombed with depleted uranium, sites known for larger deep water reserves, and four sites were contaminated with depleted uranium: Bujanovac (Bratoselce and Borovac); Vranje (Pljačkovica) and Presevo (Reljan). „The UNEP (UN body for Environment Protection) declared Bor, Kragujevac, Vranje, Pancevo and Novi Sad *environmental black spots in Europe*“ (Bataveljić, 2009: 104).

The rate of *malignancy* after 1999 greatly increased, with particular reference to lung cancer and ovarian and uterine cancer, whose numbers increased drastically, as well as the number of premature babies. The number of malignant tumors also increased. Annually 350 children (almost one child every day) gets cancer. Of course, the long-term consequences for the plant and animal life, ecosystems and

human health will be felt because, due to the shelling of petrochemical, power and industrial plants, toxic chemical compounds have gotten into land, air, water and, of course, food. In the process of circulating of the matter, many of these compounds have already come or will come into the food chain, and not only at the local but also at the regional level.

The war, which was imposed on the former Yugoslavia by the so-called „international community“, has demonstrated the real hypocrisy of the Western diplomacy of „double standards“. What the International Monetary Fund did not topple with its rigid and neoliberal reforms, the aviation toppled and destroyed by bombing. Through the empty story of „spreading democracy“ and „protecting human rights“, the West has in essence retouched and refined its self-portrait of the „savior“ of South Slovenes to continue „work on building“ newly-established „sovereign states“ (Chossudovsky, 2008: 283).

This is Western „democracy“.

And, regardless of political and diplomatic declarations, in essence, the mighty West is not trying to solve problems, but to further radicalize them and destabilize countries. This is also shown in the example of Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the occasion of whose situation

Henry Kissinger in October 1995 stated: „The American aspiration towards a united Bosnian state is a recipe for endless war and continuation of suffering“ (Todorović, Vilić, 1997: 244).

In the twentieth century there were more victims of war than in the previous four centuries together. And just how much chemical, nuclear, biological and conventional weapons were used, which with its contamination has led to the contaminated nature and the disabling of achievement of - sustainable development. It is not sustainable because Serb people are denied not only the right to self-determination but also the right to development and the right to a safe and healthy environment. International legal norms and conventions on prohibition of the use of certain types of weapons, as well as the Convention on the Protection of Nature (the 1974 UN Convention on the Prohibition of Ecocide in Wars) were violated in warfare in our territories. It should also be noted that the use of ammunition with depleted uranium is a crime against humanity, and as such *is sanctioned by international war law* precisely because of the devastating environmental and health consequences.

Killing and destroying of economic infrastructure, manufacturing plants and factories, industrial facilities, roads and bridges,

telecommunications means, hospitals, buildings - is a genocide against people who have been denied the *right to development* proclaimed by the UN. In this case, limited economic sovereignty and economic genocide denied that right to the Serbian people.

In addition to other goals, one of them also referred to the economic downgrade of Serbia and the Serb people so that they could not play any important role in the Balkans, and that is nothing but an economic crime, ie. genocide.

This was the case with the US and NATO aggression against FR Yugoslavia. It was a neoliberal war against states and peoples, but a war in which neoliberals clearly see that those who are weak can not defend themselves and that it is not a risky endeavor for the rich. And that is why for them it is a „humanitarian intervention“ which is proclaimed in advance whose supposed goal is the defense of „human rights“. Powerful neoliberal states and their institutions do not tolerate anyone „getting in their way“. In the case of the bombing of Serbia, Clinton and Blair emphasized that the purpose of the bombing is to not lose credibility and, of course, as Noam Chomsky remembers, to let it be known „who is the boss“. For, „Serbia is opposing the orders of the boss, and no one should be allowed this. Like Iraq, Serbia was without defense, so there was no

risk. You could freely say that you are intervening only for humanitarian reasons“ (Čomski, 2009a: 47).

Bombing and military warfare has ceased, but civil war still continues in the media, politics, „science“, culture. The West is still at war so the the imposed hatred continues to maniheistically divide and separate the „good guys“ from the „bad guys“, „Them“ from „us“, „civilized“ from the „uncivilized“, „the European“ from the “Byzantines“. Hate was, and still is, the *spiritus movens* of the moral and political relationship of the powerful West towards the powerless peoples and nations.

Thus, hostility towards the demonized country continues even after the military intervention. „The `international community`s` media continue with hostile propaganda in relation to the `bad regime` to justify previous destruction and genocide. At the same time, `international aid` is promoted and reconstruction of the country is proposed, but with certain concessions“ (Vlajki, 2002: 210).

The farce and hypocrisy still continue.

\*

\*

\*

\*

Serbs live in the Balkan neuralgic area of conflict between the various interests of peoples, nations, religions, cultures, states, large and small military and political forces. The Balkans are a significant crossroads between the West and the East, and are therefore an interest area of conflicts and wars, from the time of Persia, Byzantium, Turkey, Austro-Hungary, Nazi Germany to today's day in which powerful creators create a „new world order“. To achieve their own interests on the Balkan geopolitical territory of chaos, they used the famous efficient method *divide et impera*. That is exactly what happened in the last war in the former Yugoslavia, where the Balkans once again confirmed itself as the „barrel of gunpowder“ and Serbian territory as a „house in the middle of the road“ and as a „house next to the road“.

In such political, military, economic as well as any other extremely difficult conditions, a torturous Serbian struggle for self-determination as the biological, cultural and

political-state-building survival of Serbs in the Balkans was taking place and is still taking place. Unfortunately, this Darwinian struggle for survival has never ceased, it will go on and it will also depend on the will of the powerful West.

The only option Serbs have left to them is to defend themselves which is difficult in the battle between David and Goliath. However, this is indeed difficult because little by little they are left without a part of their *sovereignty*, economic, political, social, cultural space, personal and collective *identity*. In this denationalization of Serbian media, but also beyond media, the propaganda stereotypes of hatred are gaining a special place. Will the Serbs survive as an ethnic group, or will they become the Native Americans of the new world order, the following decades will reveal...

# **BIBLIOGRAPHY**





- Anališ, D. (1999). *Srpski rukopisi*, Podgorica.
- Antić, S. (2014). „Zašto moramo da zapamtimo?“ u: *Tajna osiromašenog uranijuma: posledice NATO bombardovanja Srbije* (Priredivači Branimir Nešić, Nikola Marinković), Beograd: Catena Mundi.
- Arandjelović, J. (2007). „O pravdi, pravičnosti i `humanitarnim ratovima`, u: *Savremeni politički poredak i ideja pravde*, Zbornik, Banja Luka.
- Arsović, Z. (2010). *What remains after the Hague = Ono što nakon Haga ostaje*, Banja Luka: Art print.
- Ash, G. T. (2002). „Ko je terorista?“ u: *Senka Rima nad Vašingtonom (Pro et contra)*, Beograd: Filip Višnjić.
- Avramov, S. (1997). *Postherojski rat Zapada protiv Jugoslavije*, Veternik: LDI.
- Bataveljić, D. (2009). „Pravni aspekti informisanja javnosti u oblasti eko-bezbednosti u Srbiji“, u: *Bezbednost u postmodernom ambijentu*, knj. IV (Editor Slobodan Nešković), Beograd, 2009.
- Belof, N. (1999). *Jugoslavija – jedan rat koji se mogao izbeći*, Beograd: Plato.

- Biočanin, R. Totić, I. Kostić, M. (2010). „Misterija o osiromašenom uranu i NATO projektilima“, u: *Rizici i eko-bezbednost u postodernom ambijentu*, (Ur. Rade Biočanin), “Državni univerzitet u Novom Pazaru”, Novi Pazar, 2010.
- *Bosna i Hercegovina u savremenom geopolitičkom okruženju*. (2011). Zbornik radova (Glavni i odgovorni urednik: Milovan Milutinović), Banja Luka: NUBL.
- Brkić, M. (1995). *Blokirana istina*, Beograd.
- Carević, M. (2003). *Uzroci i posljedice raspada Jugoslavije*, Banja Luka: Pravni fakultet.
- Chossudovsky, M. (2008). *Globalizacija bijede i novi svjetski poredak*, Zagreb: Prometej.
- Cooper, R. (2002). *The Liberal Imperialism*, *The London Observer*, 7.4.
- Czempiel, O-E. (2002). „Globalizacija ne sme biti jednosmerna“, u: *Senka Rima nad Vašingtonom (Pro et contra)*, Beograd; Filip Višnjić.
- Čomski, N. (2009a). *Imperijalne ambicije: razgovori s Noamom Čomskim*, Novi Sad: Rubikon, Beograd: Beoknjiga.

- Čomski, N. (2008). *Intervencije*, Novi Sad: Rubikon.
- Čomski, N. (2009b). *Kontrola medija*, Novi Sad: Rubikon, Beograd: Beoknjiga.
- Čomski, N. (2000). *Novi militaristički humanizam: Lekcije sa Kosova*, Beograd: Plato.
- Čomski, N. (1998). *Svetski poredak: stari i novi*, Beograd.
- Dej, A. L. (2004). *Etika u medijima – primjeri i kontroverze*, Beograd: Media Centar.
- Dekanić, I. (2011). *Geopolitika energije: uloga energije u suvremenom globaliziranom gospodarstvu*, Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Dragišić, Z. (2009). „Suverenitet i humanitarna intervencija“, *Srpska pravna misao*, br. 2.
- Dugin, G. D. (2004). *Osnovi geopolitike*, knj. 1, Zrenjanin: Ekopres.
- Đorđević, R. (1996). *Rugobe i laži američke demokratije*, Beograd.
- Engdahl, F. W. (2003). *Stoljeće rata: anglo-američka naftna politika i novi svjetski poredak*, Zagreb: AGM.
- Eriksen, H. T. (2002). *Paranoja globalizacije (Islam i svijet poslije 11 septembra)*, Sarajevo: Sejtarija.

- Gardner N. R. (1974). „The Hard Road to World Order“, *Foreign Affairs*, Volume 52, Number 3.
- *Geopolitička stvarnost Srba*. (1997). Beograd: Institut za geopolitičke studije.
- Guskova, J. (2003). *Istorija jugoslovenske krize 2. Kriza 1999-2000*, Beograd: IGAM.
- Guskova, J. (2011). „Savremena spoljna politika Rusije na Balkanu – stagnacije i usponi“, *Svarog*, br. 2.
- Hartman, R. (1999). *Časni mešetari (Nemačka spoljna politika i građanski rat u Jugoslaviji)*, Novi Sad: Prometej.
- Havel, V. (1999). “Kosovo and the End of Nation-State,” *New York Review of Books*, 10 June.
- Ilić, V. (2002). *Familija: medijski poredak novoga sveta*, Beograd: Konras.
- Kalaić, R. (1994). *Američko zlo*, Beograd: BIGZ.
- Kaldor, M. (1999). *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge.
- Kasagić, R. (2014). *Prevareni narod*, Banja Luka: KZ Vaso Pelagić.
- Katunarić, V. (2003). *Sporna zajednica (Novije teorije o naciji i nacionalizmu)*,

Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Jesenski i Turk – Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.

- Klein, N. (2008). *Doktrina šoka (uspon kapitalizma katastrofe)*, Zagreb: Grafički Zavod Hrvatske.
- Knežević, M. (1996). *Balkanska pometnja*, Beograd: DP Đuro Salaj.
- Knežević, M. (2009). *Srbija i Rusija: Savremene geoekonomske i geopolitičke dileme*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Kovačević, B. (1996). *Medijski rat i genocid*, Banja Luka: Glas Srpski.
- Kovačević, B. (1994). *Neofašistički svjetski poredak*, Banja Luka: Pravni fakultet.
- Kovačević, B. (1995). *Rat*, Novi Sad: Svetovi.
- Kovačević, B. (2011). *Rat i ekologija: Ekološke posljedice NATO bombardovanja Republike Srpske i SR Jugoslavije*, Banja Luka: Defendologija centar za bezbjednosna, sociološka i kriminološka istraživanja.
- Kovačević, B. (2004). *Zašto je papa dolazio*, Banja Luka: Pravni fakultet – Centar za publikacije.
- Kremenović, M. (2014). *Osiromašeni uranijum tiho ubija građane BiH*, u:

*Tajna osiromašenog uranijuma: posledice NATO bombardovanja Srbije* (Priredivači Branimir Nešić, Nikola Marinković), „Catena Mundi“, Beograd, 2014.

- Kukić, S. (2014). *Zadah kolektivne izdaje*, Sarajevo: Kult B.
- Kurjak, J. (2000). „Dileme oko rešavanja etničkog konflikta na Kosovu“, u: *Problemi srpske politike*, Zbornik (priredio Aleksandar Fatić), Beograd: Centar za menadžment.
- Lakićević, D. D. (2002). *Arhipelag Balkan: politička autoritarnost i ksenofobija u novim balkanskim državama*, Beograd: Institut za evropske studije, Centar za rešavanje sukoba.
- Lazarević, P. (1996). *Bez prava na ćutanje*, Banja Luka: Srpska stranka Krajine i Posavine.
- Liz, M. (1994). *Silovanje Srbije*, Beograd: Narodna knjiga Alfa.
- Lubardić, M. B. (1996). „Geopolitički enciklopedizam `Microsoft`- a, u: *Jagnje Božije i zvijer iz bezdana (Filosofija rata)*, Cetinje: Svetigora.
- Malović, S. Vilović, R. (2007). *Etika novinarstva*, Zagreb: Icej.

- Mićović, V. (2001). *Globalizacija i novi svetski poredak*, Beograd: Čigoja.
- Mihalik, M. (1976). *Moral i rat*, Beograd: VIZ.
- Mikić, Đ. (2011). *Austrougarska ratna politika u Bosni i Hercegovini 1914-1918*, Banja Luka: Nezavisni univerzitet.
- Milošević, Z. (2010). *Politička modernizacija*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Milutinović M. (2003). *Medijske manipulacije u južnoslovenskom sukobu*, Banja Luka, 2003.
- Milutinović, M. (2010). *Rat je počeo rečima (Bosna i Hercegovina devedesetih)*, Banja Luka: NUBL.
- Miljanović, M. ((2009). *Bosna über alles: dijalog raznomišljenika*, beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Mitrović, Lj. (2011). *Geokultura razvoja Balkana i savremena sociologija*, Novi Sad: Prometej; Niš: Filozofski fakultet, Centar za sociološka istraživanja.
- Mitrović, Lj. (2012). *U vrtlogu tranzicije: Srbija u kontekstu globalnih i regionalnih procesa*, Niš: Filozofski fakultet.
- Nakarada, R. (2008). *Raspad Jugoslavije*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik.



- Pantelić, M. (2007). *Uticaj osiromašenog urana (OU) sadržanog u NATO projektilima na zdravlje stanovništva i čovekovu okolinu*, Čačak: Tehnički fakultet.
- Petrović-Piroćanac, Z. (2010). *Geopolitika energije (Bitna razvojna komponenta društva u XXI stoleću)*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije, Centar `Jugoistok`.
- Petrović, V. R. (1990). *Zavera protiv Srba*, Beograd: Književno-izdavačka zadruga `Dositej`.
- Pirker, W. (2002). „Rat bogatih protiv siromašnih“, u: *Senka Rima nad Vašingtonom (Pro et contra)*, Beograd; Filip Višnjić.
- *Politika*. (2006). 7. maj.
- Praštalo Šakić, R. (2001). *Knjiga za bolji život na Balkanu (esej o Balkanu i Balkancima)*, Banja Luka: Narodna i univerzitetska biblioteka Republike Srpske.
- *Press RS*. (20011). 11. februar.
- *Problemi srpske politike*. (2000). Zbornik (priredio Aleksandar Fatić), Beograd: Centar za menadžment.
- *Promena obrazaca mišljenja: sudbina kritičkog mišljenja u razdoblju tranzicije*.

- (2011). Zbornik (Priredio: Miloš Knežević), Beograd: Dom kulture Studentski grad.
- *Razbijanje Jugoslavije.* (2012). Zbornik radova (Priredili: Živojin Đurić, Miloš Kovačević, Milan Jovanović), Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
  - Reljić, S. (2013). *Kriza medija i mediji krize*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
  - Reljić, S. (2011). *Odumiranje slobodnih medija*, Beograd: Službeni glasnik.
  - *Republika Srbija i Republika Srpska – stari i novi politički izazovi.* (2014). Zbornik radova (Priredili: Slobodan Nagradić, Ivona Lađevac, Tijana Kecmanović), Beograd.
  - *Republika Srpska: stanje i perspektive.* (2011). Posebno izdanje (Glavni i odgovorni urednik: Đorđe Vukadinović), 1.
  - Shiva, V. (2006). *Ratovi za vodu: privatizacija, zagađivanje i profit*, Zagreb: D. A. F.
  - Simić, R. D. (1999). *Poredak sveta*, Beograd.
  - *Srbija: politički i institucionalni izazovi.* (2008). Zbornik radova (priredio Momčilo Subotić), Beograd: Institut za političke studije.

- *Srpsko pitanje danas*. (1995). Drugi kongres srpskih intelektualaca (Beograd, 22-23. april 1994), Beograd.
- *Srpsko pitanje na Balkanu*. (2013). Zbornik radova (Priredio: Momčilo Subotić), Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Stepić, M. (2012). *Kosovo i Metohija: postmoderni geopolitički eksperiment*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Stojanović, T. (1995). *Balkanska civilizacija*, Beograd: Centar za geopoetiku.
- Subotić, M. (2008). *Srpsko pitanje danas*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Subotić, M. (2010). *Politička misao srbistike*, Beograd: Institut za političke studije.
- Todorova, M. (1999). *Imaginarni Balkan*, Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Todorović, B. Vilić, D. *Krize: izazivanje i upravljanje krizama*, Beograd: Grafomark.
- Tramošljanin, B. (2014). *Kontinuitet sukoba u drugoj Jugoslaviji*, Banja Luka: Udruženje sociologa.

- Trkulja, J. (1999). *Na rubu propasti: zapisi iz razne 1999*, Beograd: Centar za unapređivanje pravnih studija.
- Vidaković, J. (2003). *Društveni konflikti – Bosna i Hercegovina*, Srpsko Sarajevo: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Vlajki, E. (2006). *Američki teror*, Banja Luka: Besjeda.
- Vlajki, E. (2002). *Demonizacija Srba: Zapadni imperijalizam, njegovi zločini, sluge i medijske laži*, Beograd: Bad Vilbel – NIDDA Verlag.
- Volaš, N. Savić, Z. (2014). „Bombardovanje Republike Srpske“, u: *Tajna osiromašenog uranijuma: posledice NATO bombardovanja Srbije* (Priređivači Branimir Nešić, Nikola Marinković), Beograd: Catena Mundi.
- Volzer, M. (2008). *Politika izbavljenja*, u: *Humanitarne vojne intervencije*, Beograd: Službeni Glasnik.
- Vuković, S. (2009). *Etika Zapadnih medija: antisrpska propaganda devedesetih godina XX veka*, Sremski Karlovci-Noví Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.



**BRACO KOVAČEVIĆ**  
**SERBS IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER**

**Press:**  
MARKOS, Banja Luka

**For printing firm:**  
Igor Jakovljević

**Technical preparation:**  
Danijel Jović

**Circulation:**  
**200**

**Illustration on the cover:**  
Pavle "Paja" Jovanović,  
*Migrations of the Serbs, 1986.*

CIP - Каталогизација у публикацији  
Народна и универзитетска библиотека  
Републике Српске, Бања Лука

327(=163.41)

KOVAČEVIĆ, Braco, 1952-

Serbs in the New World Order / Braco Kovačević. - Banja Luka :  
European defendology center for scientific, political, economic, social,  
safety, sociological and criminological research, 2017 (Banja Luka :  
Markos). - 119 str. ; 18 cm

Tiraž 200. - Bibliografija: str. 107-119.

ISBN 978-99976-22-24-2

COBISS.RS-ID 6616856

ISBN 978-99976-22-24-2



9 789997 622242