

# Embracing the US-NATO War Criminals Who Destroyed Our Country: Serbia's Agreements with NATO. A War for US Hegemony in Europe...

By [Milina Jovanović](#)

Global Research, September 04, 2016

Region: [Europe](#)

In-depth Report: [THE BALKANS](#)

*Seventeen years have passed and many people have already forgotten that the U. S. and a number of other NATO countries collectively waged one of the most destructive wars on the European continent since the end of World War II—the modern aerial bombing campaign against the Serbian people. In the tradition of the New World Order, this “intervention” wasn’t called “war.” It was argued by various Western politicians and the corporate media that the bombing campaign was directed against the late Serbian President Milošević and his “propaganda machine.”[i] In fact, the NATO bombs loaded with depleted uranium[iii] were falling on bridges, maternity hospitals, private residences of ordinary people, a moving train, a Serbian TV station, the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade, as well as water plants, schools, electrical power plants, and many other objects that were crucial for the society to function.*

Even in 2016, there are still several ruined buildings in downtown Belgrade. These sites have not been cleaned up nor repaired. Medical doctors are finally speaking up and emphasizing that the skyrocketing rates of cancer and other deadly diseases will only continue to rise because it takes 10-15 years for the accumulated environmental toxicity to also build up in people’s bodies.[iii] In other words, more than *two thousand five hundred* killed[iv] and several thousand wounded people were only *immediate* victims of the NATO’s “humanitarian intervention.” This military action will continue to take its toll affecting multiple generations as time passes. It is worth mentioning that NATO forces also bombed bridges, refugee centers, buses, hospitals and other important objects in Kosovo—then Serbia’s autonomous province—and now self-proclaimed country. Kosovo was the territory that NATO allegedly wanted to protect in 1999. Soon after the military intervention, NATO seized control over the province, making it a de facto U. S. protectorate, even though it was legally a U. N. protectorate[v]. The United States created its largest military base in Europe and took control over Kosovo’s population and its natural resources.[vi]



One would think that under these circumstances, no Serbian government would be allowed to become too friendly with NATO and to de facto accept the loss of Kosovo—a significant part of its territory that is also considered its cultural cradle. The reality has proven otherwise. In spite of significant opposition expressed by a great majority of the Serbian population,[vii] several governments have actually approved NATO’s plans for controlling the Balkan Peninsula and hosted NATO summits and leaders. While the most recent poll conducted in April 2016 revealed that 71.6% of the survey respondents[viii] didn’t want Serbia to join NATO, these governments signed agreements that gave NATO full access to Serbia’s territory and a promise of so-called military partnership. Such uneven partnership that requires Serbia to commit to making immense changes in its socio-economic and political system, while hardly mentioning any NATO obligations, is in the tradition of a post-Orwellian world called “Partnership for Peace.”

In this article I provide a brief background on the impacts of the 1999 NATO bombing campaign that devastated the whole society, followed by a detailed analysis of recent agreements between Serbia and NATO. These recent agreements were also accompanied with a local Serbian law ratifying the 2015 agreement on “logistical support.” In the concluding remarks I include some reflections on future developments that could possibly lead to Serbia’s full membership in the North Atlantic organization.

Background: Effects of the 1999 NATO Aerial Bombardment

In the last report issued by the “Dr. Milan Jovanović Batut” Institute for Public Health, Serbian health professionals provided alarming data for the period ending in 2012. According to this report, in Central Serbia and the northern province of Vojvodina, cancer rates, including leukemia and lymphoma grew 80% following the NATO bombing[ix]. Professor Slobodan Čikarić, who is a medical doctor and the President of the Serbian Cancer Society, emphasized that Serbia had the highest cancer mortality rates in Europe. Even the Kosovo Public Health Institute registered a 57% increase in cancer rates for the years 2013

and 2014. [x]



Earlier reports were equally disturbing. Michel Chossudovsky wrote in the fall of 1999:

Amplly documented, the radioactive fall-out causes cancer potentially affecting millions of people for generations to come. According to a recent scientific report, “the first signs of radiation on children including herpes on the mouth and skin rashes on the back and ankles” have been observed in Yugoslavia since the beginning of the bombings. [xi]

In 2005, it was reported that between 1999 and 2001, 140,000 people were suffering from cancer in Serbia. On average, 25,000 new cases were registered per year. This data was reported by the Serbian Public Health Ministry during a press conference. Some Serbian media and the general public started calling this phenomenon, a “cancer epidemic.” [xii]

A team of scientists from Serbia and the Serbian diaspora organized an international conference in 2001 in Belgrade to inform the international community about the horrible truth about health effects and environmental devastation that followed the NATO bombing. Professor Jasmina Vujić, who teaches at the U. C. Berkley Nuclear Science Department, was one of the primary organizers of this conference. Vujić published an article with Dragoljub Antic in the New Serbian Political Thought (NSPM) in 2015, and provided references to some attempts to decontaminate the environment[xiii].

Some media and research institutions informed the public that there had been a media blockade and that many politicians had remained silent about depleted uranium for a long time. Such media outlets recognized that NATO had unleashed a “silent killer, low level nuclear war waged on the Serbian population[xiv]. Their realization that everything

becomes even more serious if depleted uranium enters the waterways and food chain is consistent with the depleted uranium science that examines various effects of depleted uranium[xv]. This kind of examination is included in the basic documents published by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency[xvi]. While there could be disagreements about the lifespan of depleted uranium and there are different opinions about the effectiveness of clean up technologies, it should be also noted that the Serbian government hasn't invested in any consistent cleanup efforts. While some clean-up is mentioned in several sources[xvii], it is most likely that Serbia has not had enough funds, equipment, and trained personnel to invest in a consistent decontamination process.

NATO bombings specifically targeted civilian populations and objects. Michael Parenti documented multiple examples of NATO war crimes and comprehensively analyzed the underlining motives of U. S. and NATO decision makers.

Sometimes, the NATO attackers defended their atrocities by claiming that a civilian target was really a military one, as when NATO mouthpiece Jamie Shea unblushingly announced that the bombing of Surdulica hospital was deliberate because the hospital was really a military barracks. This was a blatant fabrication. [xviii]

Some people still remember the media campaign during the bombing. Those images traumatized the majority of the Serbian population and disturbed many around the world.

We have seen those endlessly repeated snippets of footage of bomb explosions lighting up the night sky over Belgrade. We've even seen pictures of that burned train at the Grdelica gorge where fifty five Serb passengers were blown to bits or burned alive and another sixteen wounded.[xix]

Gregory Elich documented multiple examples of devastation caused by the NATO bombing throughout Serbia. One of the most striking examples was the destruction of Niš—the third largest Serbian city that was shelled with cluster bombs on multiple occasions, including hospitals, private homes and the DIN cigarette factory which was bombed on four occasions. [xx]

According to experts, exposure to depleted uranium is more dangerous for young people whose bodies are developing, as organs and cells that reproduce faster become more sensitive to the effects of radiation. [xxi] Millions of people, animals and plants were exposed to depleted uranium. However, deadly diseases and environmental devastation were not the only effects of NATO's "intervention."

In addition to displacement and ethnic cleansing of Serbs, Roma, dissident Kosovars and others, NATO's occupation of Kosovo and its subsequent secession from Serbia became a reality. There is no secret that human and organ trafficking[xxii], trafficking in narcotics[xxiii], Israeli-like strategies to expand settlements to include the lands previously belonging to Serbian residents, and general desperation of the entire population have become Kosovo's unfortunate reality.[xxiv] Even in June of 1999, right after the NATO war was concluded, it was evident that very little would be improved in Kosovo. On the contrary, the situation became graver over the years.

Under NATO occupation, the rate of killing was about the same as before the bombings, thirty or so a week. The very level of killing that was detected as a human catastrophe and used to justify an eleven-week bombardment, continued after the bombardment. [xxv]



Here is how Diana Johnstone describes additional goals and effects of NATO's war on Serbia:

In addition to "inflicting hardships in the daily lives of more Serbs", bombing the country's infrastructure also was seen as having a long-term political impact by destroying Serbia's economic self-sufficiency. As an anonymous German official explained that the "kind of money that will be needed to rebuild bridges or even dredge the wrecks out of the Danube" was expected to provide "major leverage for Western countries." The destroyed country would have to follow the dictates of the destroyers[xxvi].

The Serbia-NATO agreements analyzed in this article certainly resemble a situation in which the destroyed country has to follow the dictates of the destroyers. Johnstone added that:

In his first wartime interview, NATO's air commander Lieutenant General Michael Short acknowledged that bombing was intended to cause distress among civilians. [xxvii]

In the passage included below Andrej Grubačić emphasized that NATO supervised the ethnic cleansing of Roma and Serbian population in Kosovo.

Before 1999 there was about 120,000 Roma in Kosovo. After the bombing in November of 1999, only 30,000[xxviii]. In March of 2000, former UN special investigator for the former Yugoslavia Jiri Dienstbier reported to the UN Commission on Human Rights that "330,000 Serbs, Roma, Montenegrins, Slavic Muslims, pro-Serb Albanians and Turks had been displaced in Kosovo." [xxix]

Another immediate impact was that the bombing put approximately 500,000 people out of work[xxx]. Over the years Serbia's rates of unemployment have remained among the highest in Europe. [xxxi]

A number of other prominent intellectuals also wrote about the NATO intervention and dismantling of Yugoslavia, providing data and theoretical frameworks to understand original goals and permanent consequences. Noam Chomsky often addressed multiple myths and ironies utilized by politicians and the media. Below is an example provided in one of his articles.

The sole purpose of the bombing was to demonstrate to Serbia and to the world NATO's capacity to bomb, thus killing nearly 2,000 civilians, destroying much of Serbia's infrastructure, prompting expulsion and flight of around a million Kosovars. The vast crimes took place after the bombing began: they were not a cause but a consequence. It requires considerable audacity, therefore, to take the crimes to provide retrospective justification for the actions that contributed to inciting them. [xxxii]

Tariq Ali said that the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia was a war for U. S. hegemony in Europe. [xxxiii] This is consistent with conclusions that were eloquently articulated by Michael Parenti, Diana Johnstone, Michel Colon, Michel Chossudovsky, Andrej Grubačić, Gregory Elich, Sara Flounders, and others. In Johnstone's words: "As a result of intervention in Yugoslavia it was concluded that "the presence of U. S. conventional and nuclear forces in Europe remains vital for the security of Europe." [xxxiv]

#### NATO's Continuous Dominance and Serbia - NATO Agreements

The U. S. and NATO leaders knew that they couldn't expect complete acceptance by the Serbian population right after they inflicted so much devastation and suffering. Consequently, Serbian authorities had concealed their talks with NATO officials [xxxv] and had to wait until 2005 and 2006 to enter into specific agreements. Serbian President Boris Tadić and Foreign Minister Vuk Drašković signed agreements regarding the use of information and communication systems. Tadić's government paved the road for future governments to give even more access to NATO leaders. Behind closed doors, Serbian politicians have discussed "modernization" of the Serbian military, acquisitions of NATO technology and future support of NATO missions. At the same time, Serbia's parliamentary resolution of 2007, asserting military neutrality still remains in effect. [xxxvi]

On May 25, 2010, the Serbian Ministry of Defense signed an agreement with NATO in Edinburgh, accepting NATO's codification system [xxxvii]. This agreement was ratified by the Serbian Law that confirmed the formation of the Serbian National Codification Bureau. The codification agreement ensured that the Serbian Ministry of Defense accepted standardization of data, rules and procedures, as outlined in the NATO Codification Brochure. This also means that there would be an exchange of commercial and state codes of so called type S, internal Serbian codification and advertisement of such data in the NATO Master Catalogue of References for Logistics. In other words, the NATO Automated Business System will be used as the main source for the official state (and military) documents. It is not explicitly stated, but by using the NATO technology and data systems, Serbia is adjusting to NATO's standards and also making its systems open to the oversight of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD). So this was the first step of opening the door to "collaboration" with NATO. The parties to this agreement—Serbian Ministry of Defense and CNAD—committed to resolving any possible disputes by themselves, without taking them to international courts or third parties. Anyone familiar with dispute resolution principles might wonder how this can work in practice, especially between parties with such power imbalance.

According to the Individual Partnership Action Plan that was signed by Serbia and NATO in December of 2014, this agreement was connected to Serbia's request to join the European Union (E. U.). Even though this plan was supposed to be a military type of "partnership," there were numerous non-military reforms and conditions outlined within it. Serbia committed to specific standards imposed by the E. U. and NATO regarding human rights, the rule of law, global security, terrorism, cybercrimes, restructuring its economy and media, in addition to boosting its military power, and "managing crises."

In the introduction to this agreement it is highlighted that since 2006, when Serbia joined the so-called "Partnership for Peace," this collaboration has been continually advanced and a work group was formed to coordinate all activities. Composition and roles of this work group were not specified in detail. However, it was emphasized that comprehensive social reforms were expected from Serbia. Serbia's previous collaboration in the areas of diplomacy, security, destruction and storage of excess ammunition, and implementation of UN Resolution 1325 (on Women, Peace and Security) was acknowledged.

When it comes to economic reforms, it is expected from Serbia to continue and soon conclude the process of privatization and otherwise reform its economy in order to attract foreign capital. This was not specified in the agreement, but we know from multiple sources that the phrase "attracting foreign capital/investments" means destruction of labor rights, as well as selling natural and human resources for bargain prices[xxxviii]. What was specified includes negotiations about Serbia's membership in the World Trade Organization, and the expectation of Serbia's greater participation in the E.U. and global markets. Serbia is expected to conclude negotiations, join the World Trade Organization and invite foreign investment. Tax reform is a part of this strategy to attract foreign capital by reducing taxes on foreign investments in Serbia. Completion of the privatization process is also a goal outlined in this agreement, implying that Serbia still has important resources that are not privatized. For example, there were recent attempts to privatize Serbian Telecom and remarkable displays of public resistance.

So called liberalization of financial services and domestic markets was also emphasized. At that time, the destiny of the South Stream pipeline was not known and Serbia's possible participation in this project was mentioned, along with a diverse array of other possibilities to ensure "security" of energy resources.

By signing this agreement Serbia also accepted the responsibility and commitments to develop its military capabilities in order to make them available for possible participation in multinational operations overseen by the U.N. and E.U. Even though it was mentioned that Serbia could take advantage of the resources provided to all members through the Partnership for Peace, NATO's obligations were not spelled out in the text of the agreement. However, Serbia committed to improve education, training and readiness of its military personnel. Furthermore, it was noted that Serbia was ready to improve its military equipment. Financial plans for this kind of modernization/improvement were not specified.

According to this agreement signed in 2014, Serbia also committed to conduct a media campaign to promote military reforms, including the extent and benefits of its collaboration with NATO within the Partnership for Peace framework. This comprehensive media strategy would include print and digital resources, and support given to academic, NGO, and research centers to organize round tables to promote NATO. The strategy would also encourage Serbian scientists, university professors and research institutions to collaborate with NATO and participate in joint projects. Support provided by NATO public diplomacy

groups (it is not clear from the text of the agreement what these groups are and how they operate), other members of the Partnership for Peace, the taskforce for cooperation with NATO, as well as NATO's Military Office located in Belgrade, was seen as crucial in the implementation of this strategy. It was not clearly defined why all of these resources were needed. However, knowing that less than 12% of Serbia's population approves any kind of collaboration with NATO[xxxix], these clauses are better understood.

The section of this agreement that outlines specific individual actions also includes a timeframe for implementation. For example, continuation and further improvement of political dialogue with NATO was marked as "ongoing;" coordination and corresponding processes of "E.U. integration" as a "continuous process;" improvement of public opinion regarding global security and NATO as being "implemented in 2014," etc. Another important goal outlined in the agreement was Serbia's continued cooperation through the Serbian Mission at NATO. The so-called European integration processes were connected with Serbia joining an agreement for Stabilization and Association with the E. U. Negotiations about E. U. membership were connected with changing laws to correspond to the E. U. legal system, and to build positive relationships with neighbors, including Kosovo. Furthermore, this plan includes preparation and implementation of the National Program for Acceptance of E. U. Values and Traditions. These values and traditions are not listed in the agreement. Serbia committed to supporting various organizations for regional stability, the E. U. Strategic Partnership for the Danube River, and the continuation of negotiations with Priština regarding the Brussels' Agreement, in collaboration with NATO's Kosovo Force (KFOR) in the context of U. N. Security Council Resolution 1244. Collaboration and work with the U. N., Organization for European Security and Cooperation—OEBS (Serbian acronym), and the European Council also became logical parts of this agreement, as Serbia has a long history of cooperation with these organizations.

When it comes to multiculturalism and human rights, Serbia committed to "anti-discriminatory practices," inclusion of Roma, and to improve the social status of other marginalized groups. Serbia also has to reform its legal system according to an already accepted strategy for 2013-2018 and must harmonize its legal standards with international laws and the E. U.'s legal traditions. It is not specified what laws and legal traditions need to be incorporated.

In terms of international obligations and the "global fight against terrorism," Serbia has special responsibilities to respond to the U. N. Security Council Resolution 1373, and to improve its readiness for this fight. By 2015 Serbia also needed to ratify an additional protocol to accompany its agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Training of personnel employed in the business and governmental sectors to improve their skills in the detection, control and prevention of controlled substances is yet another obligation that Serbia accepted by signing this agreement with NATO. Somewhat connected to that is the improved training regarding the transmission of sensitive information and protection of data from cyber-attacks.

Reforms of the military and intelligence agencies are also a demand put on Serbia. While it is stated that the Serbian Parliament has oversight role in this area, it is also emphasized that the members of Parliament needed to be trained in order to make informed decisions.

Military Aspects of the 2014 Agreement with NATO



It is stated in the agreement that, in order to expand its contributions to attaining global security, Serbia has to increase its participation in multinational military actions. Serbia should explore possibilities for participation in E. U. combat operations. This is an aspect of Serbia's obligation to work closely with NATO's Office in Belgrade in order to improve its military technology and defense system. In addition to Partnership for Peace, Serbia will also participate in NATO's Building of Integrity program, particularly adapted for application in Southeast Europe.

Serbia's obligations are numerous and include development of a NATO fund that will be given to the Serbian Ministry of Defense for the purposes of secure storage and demilitarization of excess ammunition. These weapons and ammunition need to be safely stored by using the full capacity of the Technical and Overhaul Center located in Kragujevac. Another important activity is the collaboration with OEBS and UNDP towards expanding capacity for management of conventional ammunition supplies.

Serbia also committed to continue to work on its own defense strategy, develop new military doctrines, create new laws and regulations, and implement the long term strategic plan developed by the Serbian Government in 2011. In order to participate in multinational military operations, Serbia is obligated to develop a national codification system that is compatible with NATO's codification standards. This includes national laws in the area of defense, transportation of military personnel, equipment and weapons. Serbia has to work towards establishing new models of supporting its own troops once they are ready to participate in multinational military operations and also support the host country where these operations occur. In preparation for this kind of readiness, Serbia is obligated to develop new types of military education and training, in accordance with NATO and Boulogne standards. It also has to exchange information with partners about its military. Serbia's military personnel will join trainings and multinational military exercises conducted by its partners. A regional center for the training of Serbian military was supposed to be open by the end of 2015 within the "South NATO Base." It is unclear from this agreement if the base is located in Kosovo or elsewhere.

Modernization of Serbia's military is already in progress, based on this agreement. This kind of modernization includes acquisition of more complex weaponry and military equipment, including drones, ground vehicles, airplanes, communications controls, and information technology. Serbia also has to complete reports on these acquisitions and negotiations with contractors. Serbia's Military-Technological Institute is obligated to conduct research on the possibilities for better international cooperation, modernization of its own defense systems and connections with NATO. To that end Serbia will participate in numerous activities of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD) and coordinate its regulations with European regulations that control export of weapons.

### Information Campaign

When the Serbian government signed the 2014 agreement with NATO's Partnership for Peace, it also accepted an obligation to develop a public information strategy for collaboration with the Partnership for Peace in order to ensure public support. This public support should be displayed for both Serbia's participation in NATO and Serbia's own military force. Serbia is committed to participating in the NATO program called "Science for Peace and Security" and will inform the general public about it. For this purpose, informational events will be organized on a regular basis, and information will be posted on the Serbian Military Defense website. [x] There will be a positive institutional atmosphere

created for Serbia's participation in this program by supporting development of infrastructure and tax-free acquisition of research technology. It is implicitly suggested that it is NATO's obligation to provide tax-free scientific equipment and research technology.

Serbia also accepted the obligation to improve its relationships with other countries in the region. Some of these countries are partners or members of NATO. It is not specified what countries the agreement refers to. By the end of 2015, all documents and plans for emergency situations and crisis management were supposed to be completed and accepted by the Serbian government. Serbia also participated in regional multinational military training in 2014 and 2015, according to this Agreement.

#### Serbia's Agreement with NATO Regarding Logistical Support

Serbia signed another agreement with NATO's Support and Procurement Organization (NSPO) in the area of logistical support. This agreement was completed in Copenhagen in September, 2015. At the beginning of 2016 the Serbian Parliament passed a law that ensures implementation of this agreement.

In the preamble of the Agreement it is emphasized that as a participating member of NATO's Partnership for Peace Serbia expressed interest in services provided by NSPO in order to establish cooperation in the areas of logistics, operations and systems support. It is also noted that Serbia signed an Agreement on the Security of Information and the Code of Conduct with NATO in 2008. In 2015, NATO consented to provide the Republic of Serbia with support services. These services include, but are not restricted to, supplies, maintenance, procurement of good and services, transportation, configuration control and technical assistance. The Government of Serbia will pay for the cost of these services provided by NSPO.

Article 4 of the Agreement also reads: "Under no circumstance shall this Agreement lead to any liabilities for NSPO or NSPA." The Serbian Government waived all claims for injury, death or damages resulting in normal use or operation of materials and services. Shipments are insured by NSPO. In terms of security requirements any exchange of classified information must comply with requirements outlined in NATO's Security Policy. Both parties committed to treat information belonging to the other Party as classified information and avoid disclosure, dissemination or transfer.

NSPO, its assets, income and other property are exempt from all taxes and other duties, customs and quantitative restrictions on imports and exports. NATO Support and Procurement Agency (NSPA) personnel shall be integrated with the personnel of NATO's Military Liaison Office (MLO), located in Belgrade. It is not specified where exactly this Office is located in Belgrade. It would be enlightening to conduct a survey among Belgraders to discover how many of them are aware that this MLO exists. This agreement gives NSPA personnel and their vehicles the right to free passage and access throughout the Republic of Serbia. NSPA personnel is also exempt from taxation by Serbia on salaries received from NSPA, movable property, or any income received outside Serbia. NSPA is allowed to contract directly for acquisition of goods, services and construction within or outside Serbia and such contracts are also exempt from duties taxes or other charges.

This agreement also has a settlement of dispute clause. As was the case with previous agreements, this one also determines that any possible disputes should be settled between the two parties without recourse to any national or international court or tribunal, including

third party mediation. In other words, if Serbia is not satisfied with implementation of any of the provisions of this agreement, it will have to rely on the much more powerful NATO to examine any sources of disagreements. Since the Serbian government accepted all provisions by signing the agreement it would be fair to conclude that those government and military representatives either believed that NATO dispute resolution teams would be truly impartial, or that it was highly unlikely that any disputes would arise in the future.

### Serbia's Future With NATO?

Many questions can be posed about Serbia's collaboration with NATO and future developments in the entire region. While Serbian Prime Minister Vučić and President Nikolić both stated multiple times that Serbia had no plans to become a NATO member, it is reasonable to conclude that the country has, nevertheless, accepted many obligations that are typically expected from NATO countries.

While Serbia needs to remain neutral based on its own laws, it is difficult to understand the constitutionality of the Serbia - NATO agreements. Additionally, we can ask ourselves whether various sets of Serbian government and military leaders believed that by collaborating with NATO they had a greater chance to be accepted by the European Union. Perhaps they were also hoping that NATO countries would in return pay for at least some of the damage that resulted from the 1999 bombing campaign. Have they also hoped that NATO would commit to decontaminate certain areas affected by depleted uranium? Or was it all about their own preservation of power and control? Some researchers and political scientists have testified that nothing positive has come forward as a result of Serbia's cooperation with NATO. The Director of The Serbian Center for Geostrategic Studies, Dragana Trifković, expressed her views recently, highlighting that it wasn't in Serbia's best interest to collaborate with NATO, adding that this could even hurt its regional interests.[xli]

Serbia's politicians often repeat that, in accordance with their country's main values, they continue to promote military neutrality by working closely with both NATO and Russia. Yet, many have observed that such "neutrality" remains quite asymmetric. Sergej Belous noted that Serbia had only two military exercises with Russia in 2015, while twenty two were performed with NATO. At the same time, it signed only two military agreements with Russia and twenty four with NATO. For that reason he added that this neutrality is "quite lame." [xlii] Reuters also published an article by Aleksandar Vasović on July 3, 2016 entitled *With Russia as an ally, Serbia edges towards NATO*. The Serbian news agencies Tanjug and B92 reported just recently that Russia expected Serbia's support for its efforts in Aleppo [xliii].

Maria Zakharova, spokesperson of the Russian Foreign Ministry, said that it was a special humiliation to be dragged into NATO after fatal U. S. bombings. [xliv] The president of the Srebrenica Historical Project, Stephen Karganović had a similar idea and wrote about *"Serbia's march into NATO servitude."* He added that even though Serbia has laws on the books that prevent the government from joining any military block and require neutrality, government officials receive marching orders from their Western masters [xlv]. Tanjug reported on June 25, 2016 that Serbia already gave information about its security and military forces to NATO. This would be, indeed, consistent with the provisions of the above analyzed agreements to share data and relevant information. Regardless of different ways to approach this consistent cooperation with NATO, all of the agreements that Serbia signed with NATO can only be interpreted as heavily imbalanced, with one side—the Serbian side—accepting 90% of the obligations. It is often not clear what kinds of benefits stem from

such agreements. In other words, it could be interpreted that Serbia accepted most obligations that stem from NATO membership, but since it is formally not a member, it cannot be given any rights exclusively given to members. At the same time, these deals seem profitable for NATO because they provide a platform for tax-free sale of data collection systems, military technology, and much more. They also provide additional avenues for NATO to be present on the ground in Belgrade and entire country.

The Serbian population doesn't have a favorable opinion about their country's relationship with NATO—the organization that waged a full scale war against them only seventeen years ago. In March of this year, the people's voices were the loudest, demanding a referendum about NATO membership. Some local alternative and foreign media reported that as many as 10,000 people protested in downtown Belgrade on March 24, 2016, the anniversary of the beginning of NATO bombing[xlvi]. In the late 1990s Sara Flounders expected that the angry demonstrations against NATO would spread across the region, but over the years they have remained for the most part relatively small and easy to contain[xlvii]. The Serbian population is still struggling with economic, health, and social devastation, which makes it difficult to uncover concealed information and find time to organize. Additionally, it remains to be seen if the information campaign aimed at improving the image of NATO will become effective in the near future. The upcoming months and years might become critically important for the future of Serbia and the entire region.

#### Notes

[i] The corporate media and politicians often used this phrase throughout the 1990s: before, during and after the NATO war against Serbia. See: Barry Lituchy. *Media Deception and the Yugoslav Civil War*. In: *NATO in the Balkans*. 1998. New York: International Action Center. p. 205; also, *Inside Milosevic's Propaganda Machine*, July 4, 1999 TIME magazine.

<http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,27726,00.html>

[ii] The use of depleted uranium was confirmed by multiple sources including U. S. and NATO officials. See: <http://educate-yourself.org/cn/depleteduraniumlegacyyugoslavia28aug13.shtml>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/15-years-on-looking-back-at-natos-humanitarian-bombing-of-yugoslavia/5375577>

Michele Chossudovsky. 2003. *NATO's War of Aggression Against Yugoslavia*.

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/natos-war-of-aggression-against-yugoslavia-2/5517027>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-u-s-nato-military-intervention-in-kosovo/1666>

Shay Lafontaine. *NATO and the Humanitarian Dismemberment of Yugoslavia*. Counterpunch, May 17, 2016.

<http://www.counterpunch.org/2016/05/17/nato-the-humanitarian-dismemberment-of-yugoslavia/>

Also see: Michael Parenti. 2000. *The Rational Destruction of Yugoslavia*.

<http://www.michaelparenti.org/yugoslavia.html>

and Robert Fisk. 2000. *Amnesty Internations: NATO Deliberately Attacked Civilians in Serbia*.

Independent, June 7, 2000. <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines/060700-02.htm>

[iii] This article was based on the report published by the Serbian News Agency SRNA.  
<http://www.blic.rs/vesti/drustvo/posledice-nato-bombi-srbija-je-prva-u-evropi-po-smrtnosti-od-tumora/1c0wce1>

[iv] NATO casualties are documented by multiple sources and they differ substantially. According to the Serbian officials, they are still confirming the exact civilian deaths, but the numbers that they published in 2013 include 2,500 dead and 12,500 injured civilians along with 631 members of Serbian armed forces in addition to 28 missing.

<http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/number-of-victims-of-nato-bombing-still-unknown>

[v] <https://mondediplo.com/2003/12/09Derens>

[vi] Check out 2 documentaries by Boris Malagurski: *The Weight of Chains and The Weight of Chains* 2. <http://weightofchains.ca/>

[vii] The majority of Serbian population opposes any collaboration with NATO, as well as E. U. membership <http://inserbia.info/today/201604/serbs-want-russia-do-not-want-eu-and-nato-poll/>

[viii] <http://inserbia.info/today/201604/serbs-want-russia-do-not-want-eu-and-nato-poll/>

[ix] This article was based on the report published by the Serbian News Agency SRNA;  
<http://www.blic.rs/vesti/drustvo/posledice-nato-bombi-srbija-je-prva-u-evropi-po-smrtnosti-od-tumora/1c0wce1>

[x] This article was based on the report published by the Serbian News Agency SRNA;  
<http://www.blic.rs/vesti/drustvo/posledice-nato-bombi-srbija-je-prva-u-evropi-po-smrtnosti-od-tumora/1c0wce1>

[xi] Michel Chossudovsky. *NATO's War of Aggression in Yugoslavia: Who are the War Criminals?* Global Research, March 21, 2006. (reprinted the 1999 article) p. 2  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/nato-s-war-of-aggression-in-yugoslavia-who-are-the-war-criminals/2144>

[xii] *Posledice upotrebe municije sa osiromasenim uranijumom: epidemija kanceroznih oboljenja:*  
<http://www.mycity-military.com/Opste-vojne-teme/Posledice-upotrebe-municije-sa-osiromasenim-uranijumom.html>

[xiii] Jasmina Vujić and Dragoljub Antic. March 31, 2015. *Ekološke i zdravstvene posledice NATO bombardovanja 1999, sa akcentom na osiromaseni uranijum.*  
<http://www.nspm.rs/srbija-i-nato/ekoloske-i-zdravstvene-posledice-nato-bombardovanja-1999-s-akcentom-na-osiromaseni-uranijum.html>

[xiv] <http://www.pecat.co.rs/2010/07/tihi-atomski-rat-protiv-srbije/>

[xv] Irving Wesley Hall. *Depleted Uranium for Dummies*. Global Research, April 17, 2006.  
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/depleted-uranium-for-dummies/2269>

[xvi] *Depleted Uranium Technical Brief: EPA 402-R-06-011*. December 2006  
<https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/402-r-06-011.pdf>

[xvii] Example: Jasmina Vujić and Dragoljub Antic. March 31, 2015. *Ekoloske i zdravstvene posledice NATO bombardovanja 1999, sa akcentom na osiromaseni uranijum*.  
<http://www.nspm.rs/srbija-i-nato/ekoloske-i-zdravstvene-posledice-nato-bombardovanja-1999-s-akcentom-na-osiromaseni-uranijum.html>, p.

[xviii] Michael Parenti. 2000. *To Kill a Nation: The Attack on Yugoslavia*. New York: Verso. p. 121

[xix] A. Cockburn and Jeffery St. Clair. 2004. *Imperial Crusades: Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yugoslavia*. New York: Verso. p. 17

[xx] Gregory Elich. 2015. *No War Crimes Here*. Counterpunch, April 22, 2015.  
<http://www.counterpunch.org/2015/04/22/no-war-crimes-here/> and Gregory Elich. 2006. *Strange Liberators: Militarism, Mayhem, and the Pursuit of Profit*. Llumina Press. Pp.

[xxi] Rade Biočanin and Mirsada Badić. The mystery of depleted uranium in NATO projectiles, p. 7  
[www.cqm.rs/2010/pdf/5/22.pdf](http://www.cqm.rs/2010/pdf/5/22.pdf)

[xxii] Organ trafficking in Kosovo:

<http://www.justiceinfo.net/en/tribunals/mixed-tribunals/2509-european-court-in-view-on-kosovo-organ-trafficking.html>

<http://www.balkaninsight.com/en/article/appeal-court-acquitted-two-in-medicus-case-03-03-2016>

Clint Williamson, chief prosecutor of the Special Investigative Task Force (SITF), released a statement last year accusing KLA leaders of murdering a “handful” of people. The report follows the investigation of an earlier Council of Europe inquiry led by Dick Marty, a Swiss politician, in 2010. According to the investigation, senior officials led a “campaign of persecution” toward Serbs, Roma, other minority groups in Kosovo, as well as Albanians who either worked with Serbs or opposed the KLA.

Border kidnappings mentioned here:

<https://news.vice.com/article/kosovo-rejects-special-court-to-prosecute-organ-harvesting-and-other-alleged-war-crimes>

[xxiii] Kosovo heroin trafficking: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2000/mar/13/balkans>

[xxiv] *Economic Desperation Forces Kosovars to Flee*. Financial Times, March 26, 2015.  
<https://www.ft.com/content/4a5b7426-d2cf-11e4-a792-00144feab7de>

[xxv] Parenti, *Ibid*, p. 163

[xxvi] Diana Johnstone. 2002. *Fools Crusade. Yugoslavia, NATO and Western Delusions*. NY: Monthly Review. P. 250

[xxvii] *Ibid*, p. 249

[xxviii] Andrej Grubačić. 2010. *Don't Mourn, Balkanize!* Oakland: PM Press. P. p. 146

[xxix] *Ibid*, p. 155

[xxx] *Ibid*, p. 38

[xxxi] <http://www.tradingeconomics.com/serbia/unemployment-rate>

[xxxii] Noam Chomsky. 2001. *A Review of NATO's War over Kosovo*. Z Magazine, April-May, 2001 and Chomsky.info

[xxxiii] Gray Carter. 2014. *Why did NATO bomb Serbia?* There Must be Justice, May 30, 2014, p. 1

[xxxiv] Johnstone, *Ibid.*, p. 266

[xxxv] Serbian authorities conceal agreements with NATO, Pravda.Ru, February 26, 2016, p. 2;  
<http://www.pravdareport.com/news/world/europe/24-02-2016/133627-serbia-0/>

[xxxvi] *Ibid*, p. 1; Resolution of the National Assembly on the protection of sovereignty, territorial integrity and constitutional order of the Republic of Serbia:  
[http://www.parlament.gov.rs/Seventh\\_Sitting\\_of\\_the\\_Second\\_Regular\\_Session\\_of\\_the\\_National\\_Assembly\\_of\\_the\\_Republic\\_of\\_Serbia\\_in\\_2007.6537.537.html](http://www.parlament.gov.rs/Seventh_Sitting_of_the_Second_Regular_Session_of_the_National_Assembly_of_the_Republic_of_Serbia_in_2007.6537.537.html)

[xxxvii] I received copies of all Serbia - NATO agreements analyzed in this article from a Serbian friend. I am not sure how easy or difficult it would be for "ordinary Serbian residents" to obtain any of these copies.

[xxxviii] Check out 2 documentaries by Boris Malagurski: *The Weight of Chains and The Weight of Chains 2*. <http://weightofchains.ca/> in these two documentaries Malagurski interviewed numerous experts who provided data on the destruction of the Serbian economy and impacts on the working people and compared the case of Yugoslavia with examples from other countries.

[xxxix] <http://inserbia.info/today/201604/serbs-want-russia-do-not-want-eu-and-nato-poll/>

[xli] However, at earlier this year, the public support for any collaboration with NATO stayed as low as 11%. <http://inserbia.info/today/201604/serbs-want-russia-do-not-want-eu-and-nato-poll/>

[xlii] *Srbija nema nikakvog interesa da saradjuje sa NATO.*

<http://www.pravda.rs/2016/07/15/srbija-nema-nikakvog-interesa-da-saradjuje-sa-nato/>

[xliii] *Serbia's Asymmetric Neutrality: Teetering Between NATO and Russia.* Nyatider.nu

<https://www.nyatider.nu/serbias-asymmetric-neutrality-teetering-between-nato-and-russia/>

[xliv] Tanjug & B92, August 8, 2016.

[http://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2016&mm=08&dd=09&nav\\_category=78&nav\\_id=1163953](http://www.b92.net/info/vesti/index.php?yyyy=2016&mm=08&dd=09&nav_category=78&nav_id=1163953)

[xlv] Rt.com news article about Serbia being dragged into NATO, February 22, 2016.

<https://www.rt.com/news/333218-serbia-joining-nato-humiliating/>>

[xlvi] Stephen Karganović. *Serbia's march into NATO servitude.* The Saker, July 11, 2016.

<http://thesaker.is/serbias-march-into-nato-servitude/>

[xlvii] *Serbia's Asymmetric Neutrality,* Nyatider.nu.

<https://www.nyatider.nu/serbias-asymmetric-neutrality-teetering-between-nato-and-russia/>

[xlviii] Sara Flounders. 1998. *NATO in the Balkans.* New York: International Action Center. p. 9

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Milina Jovanović](#), Global Research, 2016

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Milina Jovanović](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those



who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)