

The Refugees are the Victims of US-NATO led Wars: The Migrants' "Long March" across the Balkans to Western Europe

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, August 29, 2015

[Oriental Review](#) 28 August 2015

Region: [Europe](#), [Middle East & North Africa](#)

Theme: [Crimes against Humanity](#), [Poverty](#)
& [Social Inequality](#)

ORIENTAL REVIEW publishes exclusive English translation of the interview given by Andrew Korybko to the Macedonian TV presenter Slobodan Tomic, the host of "Гласот на Народот" (Vox Populi) show.

They speak about the current migrant crisis in Europe in the context of Mideast destabilization following the "Arab Spring" and why the Balkans and Greece are chosen as a gateway for the masses of miscellaneous refugees to the EU. Much attention is given to the threat of the radical ISIL-linked elements penetrating Europe and the back-stage role of the US in this process.

How do you evaluate the current situation of Mideast refugees transiting through Macedonia and Serbia en route to the EU?

The crisis is totally out of control, and it's direct blowback from the US and its allies' regime change operations in Libya and Syria. Europe gains nothing whatsoever from this and is anxiously trying to mitigate the fallout while giving off the impression of partial compliance with its heavily promoted 'values', but conversely, Europe's pain is the US' gain. Washington is seeing to it that the continent's most prominent countries (France and Germany, in particular) are caught up in a demographic nightmare, a time bomb of sorts that can be strategically activated at will in the event that these states ever decide to pursue policies independent of the US' dictates.

They already had their own preexisting issues before this, but now they're being exacerbated and creating clear tension between identity groups and political parties, opening new avenues for the US to exercise its stereotypical divide-and-rule policies when needed. To put it frankly, the US purposely created the conditions that sparked the refugee crisis, and it's weaponizing the individuals that are fleeing from these theaters to use them as unwitting tools in a larger power play against Europe. In the course of events, the refugees (identified by the US as 'strategic weapons/assets') plow through the Balkans and simultaneously achieve one of Washington's other goals, which is to destabilize Serbia and Macedonia. Everything that's going on is basically the application of chaos theory in a geopolitical context.

Why do they opt for taking this route? Is it coincidental or something consciously chosen?

The US exercises certain degrees of situational influence to 'guide' the refugees along this

route, just as it's capable of corralling ISIL in the direction of its shared strategic objectives in Syria, for example. To accomplish this task, its intelligence agencies exert influence on the covert network of human traffickers facilitating these migrant flows, getting them to believe that the Macedonia-Serbia-Hungary route is the fastest and safest one for their 'clients'. From the viewpoint of the migrants and traffickers, this satisfies the criteria they're looking for – speed and relative safety (as in not getting caught) – while for the US, it accomplishes the destabilization of these two geostrategic countries with little to no cost involved on its part. Everything is taken care of through proxy, and the US only has to create the conditions needed and give the guiding push in order for the chaotic processes it's unleashed to autonomously upset the given order on their own.



Slobodan Tomic

Why is our southern neighbor Greece organizing buses and sending the refugees to our borders? Shouldn't they be sending them back to where they came from?

At first, it appeared as though the Greek government was completely overwhelmed with the crisis and powerless to act in containing it (also purposely being deprived of help from its EU and NATO 'allies' as part of a 'bargaining mechanism' to pressure the Tsipras government into submitting to the debt deal), but now it's clear that some of the Greeks are actively aiding and abetting this process. What really stands out as evidence of this is the Greek government's plan to ship the refugees from Kos island to the northern Greek mainland, thereby putting them within easy reach of the Macedonian border. Why not send them closer to the Albanian or Bulgarian borders, why the Macedonian one? Could it be that certain figures in Greece have a deep-seated vendetta against Macedonia and her people and are seeking to use this crisis to punish the country? Could it also be that these very same government figures might have been given orders by the EU and NATO to do these functions as part of a shadow deal agreed to in exchange for EU bailout funds? No matter what the reason is, it's become evident that some figures in the Greek government are complicit in the weaponization of Mideast refugees against Macedonia.

Why doesn't NATO or anyone else help the refugees? It's clear that these people see Europe as a dreamland, but why is that, anyhow? And why are they going through Orthodox countries on their way to the Schengen Zone, why not through Albania-Bosnia-Croatia-Slovenia? They're part of Europe, after all, but could it be that NATO is looking after its interests in these countries and directing the migrants elsewhere?

Macedonia has been singled out for a couple reasons, but they all go back to the regime change that was plotted against the country and attempted by Zoran Zaev (who was acting on behalf of his American patrons). There is no intrinsic characteristic that makes Macedonia more 'attractive' to traversing migrants than Albania or Bulgaria, for example, and the same north-south transport routes that some analysts say are responsible for this are also present in both of those countries. What's more, why don't the migrants just use mainland Greece as a stepping stone for final boat ride to Italy? The reason the US and its intelligence agencies don't promote these routes is because they specifically have certain strategic objectives that they fulfill by guiding the migrants through Macedonia and Serbia. They scare the traffickers into thinking that they'd be busted if they go through Albania, Bulgaria, or across the Ionian Sea, which is how they manipulate them into overwhelming choosing

the Macedonia-Serbia route. The US is well aware of the destabilization that follows in the wake of tens of thousands of refugees flooding across the borders of these relatively small states, which is why it does everything it can to avoid having this happen to its Albania and Bulgarian allies, but intentionally guides these illegal migrant flows into Macedonia and Serbia.

Why don't the migrants go to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and similar countries in the region? These states share the same religion as most of the migrants and are also among the richest in the world.

Saudi Arabia and Qatar only want migrants that can work menial jobs and be controlled, which is why they instead prefer South Asians from India and Pakistan. Destitute Syrians and Libyans would be a burden to their national budgets, which both absolute monarchies prefer to keep exclusively for the benefit of their actual citizens. Also, the migrants are fleeing sectarian warfare and terrorist groups, and those two countries are the largest state sponsors of terrorism in the world, with their ideologies being directly to blame for the wars in Libya and Syria. It's for these reasons why those refugees don't go to either state, and plus, they know that even in the unlikely event that they decided to do so, they'd be immediately kicked out, jailed, or possibly even killed by the security forces (which is even more likely if they are of a non-Sunni sect).

How can Macedonia possibly deal with this crisis, and who can help it?



Macedonia took a patriotic and pragmatic stand by declaring a state of emergency and temporarily restricting access through its southern border, but this proved unable to stem the overwhelming tide of refugees. When the crowds got violent and the military was forced to respond with tear gas and rubber bullets, Skopje was met with vague EU criticism about 'human rights' and the 'restraint of force', which proved that Brussels isn't sincere in helping Macedonia solve this problem. Thus, the government is heavily pressured into the 'lesser evil' of reluctantly allowing the migrants to traverse its territory in as controlled of a manner as possible as opposed to stopping them at the Greek border. This choice was made because Macedonia is receiving no help whatsoever from its 'partners' in preventing them from crossing, and it doesn't want to be in a position where any use of force against them is manipulated by the international (Western) media into setting off a new round of anti-government agitation.

In an ideal world, the EU and NATO wouldn't have launched the Wars on Libya and Syria that preceded this crisis, but given that they've regretfully occurred and the situation is what it is at the present, if they were Macedonia's true 'partners' and intent on helping it, they'd send more than paltry and insufficient funds. In fact, they'd take an active stance in solving the problem at its continental source, Greece, and properly assisting the government there. Instead none of this is happening, and the EU is only throwing money at the problem to make it look like it's doing something. In reality, it would rather leave the refugees in the Balkans and wall itself off from the region if it ever came to that point. Macedonia, in effect, doesn't have any friends in the EU, NATO, or the Greek government, and this crisis simply proves what many people had already suspected.

Where does Russia stand in all of this, and what role can it play in fighting against ISIL? The reason I ask is because there's a particularly interesting

analysis coming out of the country by academician and historian Jelena Guskova, who warns that a so-called “[Green Transversal](#)” project is almost finished and is waiting for its final phase to be launched at the end of the month. At that point, she says that armed terrorists will attack Macedonia, southern Serbia (the Presevo Valley), and Bosnia. Beforehand, she says that terrorists will try to make a diversion in Serbia to distract the attention of the Serbian population, in order to catch everyone off guard with the follow-up attack. What do you think about this?

This is a very broad question but I'll attempt to address it as concisely as possible. Russia is of the belief that the US and NATO are to blame for the refugee crisis because they initiated the regime change conflicts in Libya and Syria. Appertaining to Russia's role in fighting ISIL, I wrote a comprehensive piece for [Sputnik](#) about its recent diplomatic efforts in coordinating an inclusive anti-ISIL coalition that I suggest readers refer to if they're interested. About Guskova, she makes an excellent point about American strategy in the Balkans, which is that it seeks to use Islamic extremism as its preferred 'agent of change' in the heart of the region (Macedonia, Serbia, and Bosnia), although I'm unsure of exactly when the US will formally redeploy this mechanism. Macedonia narrowly averted a larger terrorist war when its military raided the Kumanovo hideout and prevented the perpetrators from attacking Skopje and elsewhere, but the threat still remains. Likewise, that very same threat of Albanian-affiliated terrorism is also present in the Presevo Valley, but the point needs to be stressed that the vast majority of Albanians in both countries (especially those in Macedonia) want nothing to do with this scheme, but it's being associated with them and their ethnic group out of American grand strategic motivations. Bosnia is in a similar situation when it comes to Islamic extremism, too, and I wrote about this for [Sputnik](#) in a different article.

Russian academician and historian Jelena Guskova warned that implementation of the “green transversal” has entered the final stage, and that armed attacks might occur in August in Serbia, BiH and Macedonia.

Should this be taken seriously, or is this a type of spin coming out of Russia that intends to damage the region's relations with the US and EU?



Guskova's assessment very closely resembles my own for the region, and both of our forecasts need to be taken with the utmost of seriousness because of the far-reaching consequences involved. Just because we're both based in Russia doesn't mean that we have any conspiratorial reason for our analyses, and they're both based on enough documented facts and strategic reasoning as to withstand close criticism. The most that any naysayer could point to is that the US doesn't have this sort of 'intent' that Guskova and I ascribe to it, but in response to that, I'd ask the reader to recall the US' purposely destructive policies all across the world which refute that suggestion. For the US, the Balkans are a future Islamic terrorist 'playground', thought of as being a 'reserve force' for pressuring Europe when and if the time is right.

Part of the reason for this is geopolitical (the Balkans are the perfect 'backdoor' to the EU) and the other relates to energy (destabilize the Russian-friendly governments of Macedonia and Serbia to sabotage Balkan Stream), but taken together, the US has very real strategic reasons for why it wants to destroy the Balkans if it can't fully control them. Also, working

with Islamic fundamentalists for grand strategic ends isn't anything new for the US, since everyone is well aware of how the US founded Al Qaeda and the Taliban, and a [Judicial Watch](#) document released in May proves that the Defense Intelligence Agency predicted the rise of ISIL and actively encouraged such a scenario. It's not just non-state Islamic extremist actors that the US deals with, but state-organized ones too, such as Saudi Arabia and even Morsi's former Muslim Brotherhood government in Egypt. About the latter, the reader must be reminded that the Muslim Brotherhood is recognized as the terrorist organization that it truly is by the governments of Russia and Syria among others, so accusing the US of siding with terrorists isn't just rhetoric, but a legal reality.

Another thing that she talks about is how terrorists will stage an attack which will claim the lives of many Albanian civilians, who will then be pressured into launching a struggle for “the salvation from tyranny” that they experience in Macedonia, Serbia, and Bosnia. She warns that the strongest possibility for this happening might be in Republica Srpska, and that under the pretext of “regulating the situation”, NATO could stage an intervention.

That's a very realistic scenario, but I'd take it one step further by forecasting that this false flag event won't just target Albanians, but Muslims in general (if it does in fact occur, that is). There were already attempts to politicize the anti-terrorist operation carried out in Kumanovo by trying to make it out as some war of “Slavs/Christians versus Albanians/Muslims”, but thankfully that woefully misguided perspective didn't catch on and was exposed for the lie that it was. But still, it shows that there is a precedent to label all Albanians/Muslims as victims of Slavs/Christians no matter what the context, all with the intent of fomenting a religious ‘counter-struggle’, an actual jihad, against the majority inhabitants in the Balkans (Christian Slavs).

This isn't to either side's advantage, but is really yet another wily manipulation by the US to provoke a region-wide divide-and-conquer identity war. The US' history of involvement in Bosnia and “Kosovo” indicates that it would take the side of Muslims in the short term should any forthcoming conflict arise and it chooses to directly intervene, but this group would just be functioning as the US' ‘convenient fools’, and they'll eventually be betrayed even quicker than the US turned on decades-long ally Mubarak should the US deem it strategically suitable. If they think that being Muslim automatically entitles them to preferential treatment by the US government, then they're obviously not aware of American history in the Mideast, since sooner or later, they too will be betrayed at some point, whether they realize it now or not.

Guskova also studies the “Islamic State's” influence in the Balkans, and according to her, terrorists are infiltrating the region under the cover of being Mideast refugees. What's your take on this?

Once more, Ms. Guskova is absolutely right. As I told Marija Kotovska during an [interview](#) she did with me for Netpress at the end of July:

“Hungary [stated](#) that at least 90,000 people have illegally entered the country so far this year, and that they expect a total of 300,000 by year's end. Most of them likely came from the southern route, meaning that they passed through Macedonia at some time or another. Taking into account an extremely conservative estimate that 1% of them could be terrorists, then that calculates to nearly 1,000 terrorists so far (and up to 3,000 by the end of the year)

coming into Macedonia for an unspecified amount of time. To put it another way, that's about 100x the number of terrorists that were killed during the Kumanovo attack."

There is no doubt that the refugee crisis is being exploited by terrorist groups as cover for infiltrating the region, and this is being done in full compliance with American foreign policy precepts. The "Islamic State" is basically a 'territorial Al Qaeda' that can be deployed anywhere in Africa-Eurasia that is of strategic benefit to the US, and right now, it looks as though its newest theater will be the Balkans, using sympathetic Albanians (who are but a tiny fraction of their overall population, it needs to be underscored) as their local anchor. The objective is to radicalize the transnational Albanian community particularly in Macedonia and Serbia so as to provoke the larger Christian/Slav vs. Muslim/Albanian war that the US is hoping for. Hopefully both sides realize what the game is and how the US is desperately trying to manipulate them into this dire scenario.

Guskova says that the Americans want to subjugate the Slavic people in the Balkans that they haven't ever subdued, despite the enormous pressure against them and the imposition of certain puppet regimes. She points to Republika Srpska strengthening its position, Macedonia defending its independence, and Serbia refusing to recognize Kosovo. Your thoughts?

It is certainly true that Macedonia, Serbia, and Republika Srpska have yet to be subjugated, despite certain periods of their history where they came close to having this happen, but the US wants to dominate *all* the peoples of the Balkans, including doing so for perpetuity with those it currently controls (Bosniaks, Croats, Albanians). Macedonia, Serbia, and Republika Srpska form a geostrategic network of states that I've termed the "[Central Balkans](#)", in that they form not only the geographic center of this region, but that they also have in common their strong patriotism in resisting outside domination. Furthermore, all three of them practice pragmatic policies with Russia.

It's telling that some of the smallest countries in Europe happen to be the only ones with the courage to refuse the US' pressure in sanctioning Russia, as not only have they refused to do this, but they've even deepened their ties with Moscow during this time via their cooperation on the Balkan Stream gas project. Their symbolic actions signify a rejection of US unipolarity, and accordingly, the US has targeted them for immediate destabilization in response. This is why Macedonia had the earlier Color Revolution and Albanian-affiliated Unconventional War attempts unleashed against it, Serbia is being pulled by the EU and the US, and Republika Srpska has to endure thinly veiled terroristic threats by Sarajevo loyalists. It shouldn't be seen as a coincidence then that all three, but especially Macedonia and Serbia, are now focal points of the refugee crisis.

There's a noticeable increase in the activities of terrorist organizations and Islamists in the Balkans. One can find "Wahhabis" and the "Red Rose" in Serbia and Montenegro, "Tariq" in Macedonia, and Al Qaeda cells in Kosovo and northern Albania, according to Guskova. Can you comment on this?

The creation of terrorist nests such as the ones you mentioned is all part and parcel of the larger grand strategy of unleashing the US' planned Slav/Christian versus Albanian/Muslim regional war. The Muslim population of the Balkans isn't naturally receptive to this rhetoric, hence why the US must brainwash them through the import of radical Islamists under the cover of the refugee crisis. Also, some of the refugees themselves might be more

fundamentalist than the secular Muslims historically native to the Balkans, so if they remain in the region (either out of choice or because they simply can't get into the EU), some of them could work to change local attitudes on this topic.

The psychological operations being waged against the region therefore aren't focused as much on Macedonia, Serbia, and Republika Srpska (although they're definitely targeted, albeit for different [regime change] reasons), but on the Albanians and Bosniaks in a bid to get them to view all regional dynamics through the false and highly secularized prism of a "War on Islam". If the US can brainwash at least 10% of each of these respective Muslim communities into falling for that propaganda (the so-called "[tipping point theory](#)"), then it can have a sizeable enough 'domestic/grassroots' force in each of the three prospective battlefields (Macedonia, Serbia, and Republika Srpska) to initiate this war and be confident that it has the 'staying power' to continue indefinitely and 'autonomously'. It's for this reason why counter-radicalization initiatives on behalf of each government and their local Muslim representatives are instrumental in preempting this dangerous development and need to be immediately implemented if they aren't already.

In Bosnia just recently, Islamists came forward making demands that the country remain unitary under the implicit threat that any change in its status could lead to terrorist attacks and other destabilizing actions. Could it be that this is part of the "Green Transversal" project?

This is definitely related to the larger project that we've been discussing and the US' geopolitical bullying of the Central Balkans. Republika Srpska has a constitutional right to reject the nationwide court system that Sarajevo is advocating, as there is nothing contained in the Dayton Accords about the necessity of such an entity. The reason it's being pushed then is to weaken the Republic's sovereignty in preparation of a wider power play against its entire autonomy, hence why President Dodik and his people firmly refuse it and are so impassioned in fighting against it. Now that they've taken their stand, however, the Sarajevo loyalists are initiating a preplanned information war accusing Republika Srpska of 'separatism' and 'violating the Dayton Accords'.

This isn't true in any shape or form, but they're doing this to damage the Republic's reputation and precondition the European and American masses for a coming wave of formal aggression against it. That's actually what the whole point of the UK's Srebrenica UNSC provocation was, which aimed to paint Republika Sprksa as a 'genocide-created' entity that has no right to exist. Russia vetoed the resolution for exactly this reason, but the teachable moment here is that the West showed its hand for what it plans to do in Bosnia. It's waging an asymmetrical war against Republika Srpska that's already in the information stage, with the ultimate goal of taking it to the economic and terrorist phases whenever the decision is made. Unleashing the scourge of Islamic extremism against it (as like what happened during the Zvornik 'test run') is intended to serve as one of the triggers for the wider regional war that the US is plotting.


Some analysts say that the Hungarian border wall will significantly increase the number of Mideast migrants who remain in Serbia and Macedonia and whose real identity can't ever be ascertained. What do you think about this threat?

The wall is Europe's response to the crisis, which as I mentioned at the beginning of the interview, is to seal itself off from the Balkans if the situation becomes uncontrollable. The fact that Hungary is moving forward with such speed in implementing this idea shows how

serious its national government is in tackling this crisis (and how severe it expects it to get in the future), and since it's being accepted by the EU without any significant push back, it can also be seen as representing Brussels' own take on the matter. This is important because it vividly demonstrates how the EU is abandoning Serbia and Macedonia at a critical time when both countries need as much help as they can possibly get, thus revealing that Brussels never had any positive intentions towards either of their prospective memberships. These two countries have always been seen as future markets and nothing else, never having ever been thought of as equal partners, which is why the EU doesn't mind that countless refugees and the terrorists that have infiltrated the region alongside them remain the sole responsibility of the Balkans. The social, economic, political, and security destabilizations associated with them are tremendously impactful in all regards and disturbingly very real, but the EU prefers not to deal with this, and would rather accept the possible collapse of the Central Balkan states than lend an effective and helping hand in assisting with their ordeals.

Most of the refugees are men between the ages of 27-35, 94% of whom are Muslim, and more than half of whom have no family with them and avoid all forms of media exposure. Who's funding these people, or how do they support themselves?

Like I said previously, the vast majority of the refugees are not terrorists, but many of them do have suspicious profiles that rightfully raise red flags. The problem is that there is no way to verify their identity, and thus, no way for states to see if they're on any terrorist watch lists. Even if they aren't, nobody knows the intent of these individuals, and it does seem odd that so many of these men (who in traditional Muslim cultures should already be married with children by this stage of their lives) are flooding into the EU without any family members. Something's not adding up, and it's unlikely that most of them just happen to not conform to their demographic expectations or are violating the social code of their countries by leaving their wives and children behind. It's not known how they received the money to fund their journey, but it could possibly have been through their families' savings and/or selling off their possessions and property. Still, those that are affiliated with terrorism are likely funded by other terrorists, and given the richness of the "Islamic State", it could theoretically be funding thousands of terrorists to infiltrate the EU and the Balkans under the cover of being refugees.

 ***I'd like to thank all of our readers for their interest in my interview. The future I paint is a dark one, but it's not inevitable and it's possible to successfully resist it. The most important thing everyone can do is inform one another of the true nature of the US' plot against the Balkans, and work together to unite in opposing it. All ethnicities and religions need to be aware of the US' mechanisms in dividing them from one another, and once this realization is reached and unity of purpose is achieved, then it's much easier to form a different future and build a better tomorrow for everyone.***

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

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

Articles by: [**Andrew Korybko**](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

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

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