

# The “New” NATO Strategic Concept.

The Former Yugoslavia was a Dress Rehearsal

By [Živadin Jovanović](#)

Global Research, November 17, 2010

Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals 16  
November 2010

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

On the eve of the NATO Lisbon Summit there is a need to recall that eleven years ago Serbia (FRY) was a testing ground and first victim of a so called new concept of NATO strategy which is to be formally endorsed at the Lisbon meetings.

It is expected that the leaders of NATO member countries will, among other things, “reauthorize themselves” to undertake military actions beyond the area of their own territories, in fact, all over the globe.

What will be necessary on their part is to proclaim that in a certain region, in certain country, that NATO interests are allegedly being jeopardized – economic, energy, trade, routes. NATO will not seek the authorization of the UN Security Council – it will act on its own. It will impose itself above the UN, the OSCE and all other international bodies. Division of burden and tasks with the European Union will be the pillar of the new NATO strategic concept.

This concept was openly tested in Serbia (FRY) in 1999. “NATO has now had **more than a decade of experience in the requirements to do expeditionary operations**” – stated Michele Flournoy recently explaining the background of 21st century NATO strategy to be adopted at the Lisbon Summit. One can suppose that “more than a decade of experience” also includes NATO interventions in the civil wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1995, occupations of Afghanistan in 2001 and of Iraq in 2003.

What have been results of these US-NATO “expeditionary operations”? What are the human losses, what are the losses in terms of instability, insecurity, financial and economic setbacks and lasting poverty, criminalization?

Are the Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq and other regions which have been the fortunate victims of US-NATO “expeditionary operations” more stable, more economically advanced today than before?

Putting aside other regions and other examples, let us recall that during 72 days of continuous military aggression against Serbia, NATO left thousands of dead, about 10.000 wounded, two thirds of whom were civilians. The economy was completely destroyed, the environment polluted by the use of depleted uranium ammunition. Several hundred thousand people were displaced. Even today, some of the buildings in the heart of Belgrade remain in ruins while over 200.000 of Serbs from Kosovo and Metohija cannot return to their homes.

NATO countries supported the unilateral and illegal secession of Kosovo and Metohija from Serbia (2008). In a sense they proceeded to recongise the illegal state strcutures which they themselves created following the 1999 invasion.

In the 1990s many NATO countries had been financing, training and arming terrorist KLA. In return, the KLA was their ground force in the time of aggression. Today NATO is arming, training and financing the illegal armed forces of of illegal Kosovo and Metohija composed of elements of former KLA terrorists. The USA, Britain, Germany and Turkey are leading in this process.

No wonder that Kosovo and Metohija is perceived by many countries as a “NATOstan”, a NATO proxy state, and by others as a narco-state.

In this regard, the US military base “Bondsteel” in Kosovo is the largest American base in Europe. Some 9.000 NATO troops today still occupy Kosovo while the Province continues to be a safeheaven for the narco-mafia, which protects the heroin transit route from Afghanistan to Central and Northern Europe, in partnership with various international organized crime syndicates.

The implication of NATO aggression and unilateral secession of Kosovo and Metohija is instability in the region, growing socio-economic tensions.

At the end of October 2010 “representatives” of Albanians from Serbia, FYROM (Macedonia), Greece and Montenegro gathered in Tirana to formally launch common a project to establish “Natural Albania”. For some reasons they did not say “Greater Albania”. All Albanians in one state is the motto! It should be recalled that before that gathering, high representatives of Albania, including the Prime Minister himself, called for the unification of all Albanians. Former head of OSCE mission to Kosovo (KVM), USA Ambassador William Walker at the beginning of November 2010, made a statement that Albanians from Kosovo have the right to unite with Albania. All in all, there are open claims for redrawing once again the borders in the Balkan.

NATO aggression on Serbia in 1999, NATO strategy in general, led to rise of secession, legitimization of military interventions as well as undermining the role of UN and defying international law.

NATO has not resolved any problem in the Balkans, neither could it do so. Instead, NATO made the Balkans a region of prolonged instability. The same applies to Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq. Is this the role of NATO that Europe and the world want to see in the 21st Century?

The original source of this article is Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals  
Copyright © [Živadin Jovanović](#), Belgrade Forum for a World of Equals, 2010

---

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

[\*\*Become a Member of Global Research\*\*](#)

Articles by: [Živadin 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)