



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The unfinished trial of Slobodan Milošević: Justice lost, history told

Vrkić, N.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Vrki, N. (2015). *The unfinished trial of Slobodan Milošević: Justice lost, history told.*

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

The Unfinished Trial of Slobodan Milošević: Justice Lost, History Told

ACADEMISCH PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor

aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam

op gezag van de Rector Magnificus

prof. dr. D.C. van den Boom

ten overstaan van een door het College voor Promoties ingestelde
commissie, in het openbaar te verdedigen in de Aula der Universiteit

op vrijdag 18 september 2015 te 13.00 uur

door Nevenka Vrkić

geboren te Orahovica, Kroatië

Promotiecommissie:

Promotor: prof. dr. J.Th.M. Houwink ten Cate Universiteit van Amsterdam
Copromotor: prof. dr. N. D. Adler Universiteit van Amsterdam

Overige leden:

prof. dr. M.J. Wintle Universiteit van Amsterdam
prof. dr. L.A. Bialasiewicz Universiteit van Amsterdam
prof. mr. dr. H.G. van der Wilt Universiteit van Amsterdam
prof. dr. M.J. Osiel University of Iowa
prof. dr. R. Detrez Universiteit van Gent

Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes on Language and Translation	ix
Pronunciation Guide.....	xi
Previously published portions of this manuscript.....	xii
List of Acronyms.....	xiv
Maps.....	xvi
Figures.....	xvi
Preface.....	xvii
Introduction.....	1
The Court.....	1
<i>The End of the Mandate</i>	8
<i>The Legitimacy and Legality of the ICTY</i>	10
<i>International Criminal Trials: Political Trials, Show Trials, or Transformative Trials?</i>	11
The Trial	15
<i>Self-Representation</i>	18
<i>Joinder or Severance?</i>	22
Chapter I: Theoretical Framework, Scope of the Research, and Sources	25
The Courtroom Narrative: “Two Truths” about the Conflict	27
<i>History in the Courtroom</i>	29
The Trial Record.....	31
<i>History Outside the Courtroom</i>	34
<i>Scholarly Debate on the Causes and Consequences of the Disintegration of Yugoslavia</i>	35
<i>The Transformative Value of the Evidence</i>	43
What the Trial Record Tells Us about the Leader, the Ideology, and the Plan	45
<i>Who? The Leader</i>	45
<i>What? The Ideology and the Plan</i>	49
<i>How? The Plan Becomes Criminal</i>	52
Chapter II: The Leader	54
The Making of a Leader	55
<i>The Leader Made in Kosovo</i>	60
<i>The Eighth Session: Milošević Seizes Power in Serbia</i>	65
<i>Empowered by a Legacy of Authoritarian Culture</i>	67
Power for the Sake of Power	70
<i>Surviving Mass Protests</i>	70

<i>Defying Political Opponents</i>	72
<i>Keeping It in the Family</i>	75
Chapter III: The Ideology	78
Greater Serbia Ideology and a History of Violence: From Terrorism to Mass Atrocities	79
A History of Expansion of the Serbian State by Force, 1912-1941	81
<i>The Balkan Wars, 1912-1913</i>	81
<i>The First World War, the London Treaty of 1915, and a Greater Serbia</i>	83
<i>The First Yugoslavia or Greater Serbia?</i>	86
<i>The Second World War and the Historical Legacy of Moljević’s “Homogeneous Serbia”</i>	87
The SANU Memorandum and Serbian State Ideology	89
<i>Authors of the Memorandum Appear as Defence Witnesses</i>	91
<i>The Influence of the SANU Memorandum on Post-Communist Serbian State Ideology</i>	94
The Principle of Self-determination as an Element of Milošević’s Greater Serbia Designs.....	98
A Centralised Yugoslavia or a Serb State?.....	101
Chapter IV: Centralisation of Serbia, 1987-1990	104
The Implementation of SANU Memorandum Goals by Mob Rule, 1988-1989	104
Adoption of Amendments to the Serbian Constitution, 1989	107
Milošević’s Major Success: The Centralisation of Serbia.....	110
<i>The Gazimestan Speech: Celebration of a Political Triumph in Kosovo</i>	110
The 1990 Serbian Constitution	113
From the SANU Memorandum to the SPS Party Programme	115
Chapter V: A Failure to Centralise the SFRY, 1990-1991	118
A Failed Attempt by Serbia to Control the SFRY through the League of Communists	118
Serbia’s Obstruction of Federal Reforms, 1989-1990.....	121
Serbia’s Rejection of a Confederation.....	122
The Debate over Responsibility for the Disintegration of the SFRY	125
<i>What Intercepted Telephone Conversations Revealed About Overt and Covert Serb Objectives</i>	127
<i>Violence and the Disintegration of the SFRY</i>	130
The End of Yugoslavia.....	132
<i>The Brioni Declaration</i>	132
<i>The Hague Conference and Milošević’s Rejection of The Carrington Plan</i>	133
Establishing the Nature of Yugoslavia’s Disintegration	138
Chapter VI: The Formation of the Republika Srpska Krajina (RSK) and the Policy of Ethnic Separation in Croatia	142
The Armed Rebellion of Serbs in Croatia in 1990	143

The Belgrade Initiative and the Partition of Croatia in 1991	149
<i>The Reorganisation of the JNA, De facto Greater Serbia Borders, and the RAM Plan</i>	153
<i>The Distinction between Greater Serbia and “All Serbs in a Single State”</i>	160
The Creation of the Republika Srpska Krajina.....	164
<i>Formation of the RSK, International Negotiations, and the Serb Strategy of Ethnic Separation</i>	166
Evidence on Milošević’s <i>de jure</i> and <i>de facto</i> Power during the Conflict in Croatia	169
<i>The Presidency of the SFRY</i>	169
<i>The PSFRY Sessions</i>	171
<i>The Rump PSFRY and Evidence on Planning</i>	173
The Kula Camp Video and the Formation of the JSO.....	179
<i>Evidence of a Criminal State of Mind</i>	181
<i>The Impact of the Kula Camp Video in Serbia</i>	185
Chapter VII: The Formation of the Republika Srpska and the Policy of Ethnic Separation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.....	189
Pre-War Plans for Bosnia and Herzegovina	190
<i>Courtroom Reconstruction of The Karađorđevo Meeting and the Agreement to Partition BiH</i>	190
<i>Milošević’s Pre-War Plans to Keep BiH in Yugoslavia</i>	197
<i>The Convention for a Third Yugoslavia: Serbia’s Last Effort to Keep BiH in a Rump Yugoslavia</i>	199
Formation of the RS, Ethnic Separation, and the Commission of Crimes in BiH	201
<i>The Six Strategic Objectives and the War in BiH</i>	204
Milošević’s <i>de facto</i> Power and the State Council for Harmonisation of Positions on State Policy.....	207
The Serb Strategy of Ethnic Separation and International Negotiations for BiH.....	210
<i>The Cutileiro Peace Plan and Ethnic Separation</i>	211
<i>The London Conference, August 1992</i>	213
<i>The Vance-Owen Peace Plan (VOPP) and Ethnic Separation</i>	216
<i>Milošević and the VOPP Negotiations</i>	218
<i>Failure of the VOPP</i>	221
<i>The Owen-Stoltenberg Peace Agreement, 1993</i>	223
<i>The Washington Agreement, 1994</i>	225
<i>The Contact Group Plan, 1994</i>	225
The Srebrenica Genocide: A Precursor for Dayton Peace Negotiations	230
<i>The Republika Srpska and War-related Losses</i>	232
<i>After Srebrenica</i>	235
<i>Obscured Evidence about Srebrenica Crimes</i>	237
<i>The “Swap of Territories” Strategy</i>	239

<i>The Dayton Peace Agreement</i>	242
<i>Srebrenica and the Six Strategic Objectives</i>	243
Evidence on Milošević's <i>de facto</i> and <i>de jure</i> Power during the Conflict in BiH	246
<i>SDC Records as Evidence of Individual and State Responsibility</i>	246
<i>SDC Documents and Protective Measures</i>	247
<i>Lifting the Protection of SDC Records and the Legacy of the Perišić Judgement</i>	251
<i>What Formerly Protected Parts of SDC Records Revealed</i>	251
<i>The SDC and Evidence on VJ Combat Units in BiH</i>	259
<i>The SDC and the Promotions and Retirement of VJ Officers serving in the VRS and SVK</i>	262
<i>The SDC and Call-ups of Conscripts</i>	265
<i>The SDC and Financial Support for the Wars in Croatia and BiH</i>	266
<i>The SDC and FRY Sanctions against the RS, August 1994</i>	269
<i>The SDC and the Fall of the SAOs</i>	271
What the Evidence Revealed about Discord between Milošević and RS Leaders.....	276
Chapter VIII: The Plan for Kosovo – Keeping Kosovo in Serbia by Changing the Ethnic Composition in Favour of Serbs	281
Serbia's Policy of Maintaining the Status Quo in Kosovo	282
<i>Failed Negotiations to Normalise Life in Kosovo, 1996-1998</i>	284
<i>A Failed Strategy to Change Kosovo's Ethnic Composition through Reforms</i>	286
<i>Kosovo after 1995</i>	290
<i>The Defence Narrative on the Proliferation of Violence in Kosovo</i>	292
Internationalisation of the Kosovo Conflict	294
<i>From the Račak Massacre to Negotiations in Rambouillet</i>	298
<i>The Failure of the Rambouillet Negotiations</i>	299
<i>The Defence Narrative on Račak, the Rambouillet Negotiations, and NATO Intervention</i>	305
NATO Intervention and Attempts by Serbia to Change the Ethnic Composition of Kosovo through the Commission of Crimes	306
<i>Altering Kosovo's Ethnic Composition through Mass Expulsions and the Commission of Crimes</i>	310
<i>Awareness of Criminality and Attempts to Hide Evidence</i>	312
Evidence on Milošević's <i>de facto</i> and <i>de jure</i> Responsibility for Crimes in Kosovo	314
<i>SDC Records and Kosovo</i>	314
<i>The Joint Command for Kosovo and Metohija</i>	318
<i>The Production of Documents Contemporaneous to the Kosovo Indictment Period</i>	326
<i>The VJ Commission for Cooperation with the ICTY and Attempts to Obscure Evidence</i>	328
<i>The Boomerang Effect of Defence Evidence: VJ War Diaries and Daily Combat Reports</i>	335

<i>The Semantics of the Evidence: Cleaning up, Sweeping up, Mopping up, or Ethnic Cleansing?</i>	337
<i>Sanitising the Terrain or Hiding the Crimes?</i>	342
The Scorpions Video	346
<i>The Impact of the Scorpions Video inside the Courtroom</i>	347
<i>Collateral Trials for Crimes Committed by the Scorpions in BiH and Kosovo</i>	354
Chapter IX: The Unmaking of the Leader	358
The Path to Self-Destruction	360
A Common Criminal	361
Milošević’s Courtroom Performance	363
The Prisoner	371
Conclusion	377
The Leader	380
The Ideology	382
The Plan: When and Why Violence Occurred	384
<i>The Plan to Centralise Serbia</i>	384
<i>The Plan to Centralise the SFRY</i>	386
<i>The Plan to Carve Out ‘Serb-Designated Territories’ in Croatia</i>	389
<i>The Creation of the Republika Srpska in BiH and the Commission of Mass Atrocities</i>	391
<i>Genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	392
<i>Peace Negotiations and the Strategy of Ethnic Separation</i>	393
<i>Genocide in Srebrenica</i>	395
<i>Evidence of a “Swap of Territories”</i>	395
<i>The Plan to Change the Ethnic Composition of Kosovo</i>	397
The Evidence	399
<i>Evidence on the de facto and de jure Responsibility of a Leader</i>	400
<i>Evidence for the Kosovo Indictment Period</i>	404
<i>The Transformative value of the Trial Evidence</i>	404
<i>Mass Atrocities Trials and the Right to Know</i>	406
Summary	407
Samenvatting	413
Annex I: Witnesses, listed alphabetically by last name	420
Bibliography	427
Audiovisual Materials	427
Books and Reports	427

Book and Report Chapters.....	434
Decisions and Indictments of the ICTY, by name of accused and date	435
Decisions and Indictments of Other Courts.....	436
Documents published by the United Nations	436
Exhibits tendered by the Defence in the Milošević case, by number.....	437
Exhibits tendered by the Prosecution in the Milošević case, by number	438
Exhibits tendered by the Prosecution in the Perišić case, by number	445
Intercepted Telephone Conversations tendered as exhibits in the Milošević case, by number.....	447
Journal Articles.....	450
Magazine and Newspaper Articles	452
Online Articles.....	454

Notes on Language and Translation

This text is based on and frequently includes quotations from transcripts of proceedings, evidence presented in the courtroom, and materials collected as part of the criminal investigation in the Milošević case. These materials and courtroom testimonies originated in various languages, and in variants of languages (for example, in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian or UK/US English), and many have been translated. Non-English primary materials tendered as evidence in court were translated into English and make up the official court record. Yet, many of these first translations went through a later audit process – in which meaning was clarified and syntax corrected – that produced a second revised version. Every attempt has been made to quote these revised translations when possible. But for materials that were not tendered as evidence, a revised version is unlikely to exist, and even revised translations sometimes contain errors. In this text, quotations from translated sources that do not read well in English have for the most part been paraphrased; or, if need be, edited in only the slightest ways to add clarity – using ellipses or brackets – but never to alter meaning.

As a researcher on the Milošević case, the author dealt with primary documents in both local languages (B/C/S) and in English, but where her original research was done with local language materials, the official English translation of those materials is presented in this text. In other words, the author did not translate those materials herself in the process of writing this text. Still, as a native B/C/S speaker fluent in English, the author had the advantage of being able to identify when official English translations were in some way inaccurate. One example of this is in the English transcript of the testimony of Stjepan Mesić. Mesić discussed Franjo Tuđman having compared the shape of Croatia to a *kifla*, the B/C/S word for a crescent-shaped roll that is traditional in Eastern Europe. In the English trial transcript, a slip-up in homophones resulted in this being translated as “oblong role” instead of “oblong roll” – a confusing error. In the courtroom, translations were also sometimes corrected on the spot by participants in the trial. In one such instance, an English translation of a letter written by Milošević was found online and referred to in court by the Prosecutor; it was corrected by the courtroom interpreter who explained the word “rats” was an inaccurate translation for the B/C/S word *hulje*, which means “scoundrel” and has a more sinister connotation. Milošević himself subsequently addressed the court to concur that “scoundrel” was the more appropriate translation.

Translation is a challenging task because languages not only have different vocabularies, but different personalities, cultural influences, and structures. Translating any text, but especially materials that deal with complicated political concepts and contain a number of linguistic subtleties, requires finding the balance point between what are known as ‘faithful’ and ‘idiomatic’ translations. A faithful translation is a literal rendering of a source text, without revisions that accommodate the nuances of the target language. An idiomatic translation is more focused on producing a text that conforms to the syntax and idiomatic character of the target language, so that a reader feels the text was originally written in their language. Sometimes, word-for-word translations simply do not convey meaning because idioms are a common way of communicating within languages but are not universal. Where translations are paraphrased in this text, attention has been paid to honouring the idiomatic meaning of the original.

Finally, this text is written in UK English – for example, “Defence” instead of “Defense” and “analyse” instead of “analyze” – but direct quotations of materials originally written in US English are used verbatim. This text also uses diacritical marks for words or names drawn from B/C/S, which clarifies their pronunciation (see the Pronunciation Guide for what these marks indicate). Because ICTY trial transcripts and some materials from the trial record do not include diacritics, they have been added in this text, even to quoted testimony, for consistency. Also, words that originated in B/C/S and are now widely used in their English transliteration – such as “Chetnik” (in B/C/S, “*Četnik*”) – appear in their English form.

Pronunciation Guide

Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian are closely related but subtly different languages, all variants of a common pluricentric language. Though Bosnian and Croatian use the Latin alphabet, and Serbian uses the Cyrillic alphabet, the languages are sometimes referred to as one and abbreviated as B/C/S. Unlike in English, vowels in B/C/S are pronounced consistently and some consonants are marked with diacriticals to indicate their pronunciation. Diacritical marks are used in this text and so their pronunciation, as well as that of vowels, is indicated below.

a a, as in *bar*

c ts, as in *cats*

č ch, as in *much*

ć ch, as in *chosen* (this sound is softer than č)

dž j, as in *gin*

đ j, as in *jewelry* (this sound is softer than dž)

e a, as in *pen*

i ee, as in *mEEK*

j y, as in *yes*

o o, as in *omen*

r the r is rolled

š sh, as in *push*

u u, as in *rule*

ž zh, as in *vision*

Previously published portions of this manuscript

There are several places in this manuscript where the author has cited her own previously published work; and in one case, a co-authored chapter. As a specialist in the field, she has written frequently on issues related to the ICTY, including in the midst of research for this manuscript. Inevitably, this has led to similarities between the arguments expressed in some of that writing and those expressed in this manuscript. Therefore, the author's previously published works are cited where this text significantly reflects thoughts expressed in those publications.

1) Tromp, Nena. "A Troubled Relationship: The ICTY and Post-Conflict Reconciliation." In *Regional Co-operation and Reconciliation in the Aftermath of the ICTY Verdicts: Continuation or Stalemate?*, edited by Ernst M. Felberbauer and Predrag Jureković. Vienna: Republic of Austria, 2013, 47-67.

Pages 47-48 of the original correspond to page 7-8 of this text (see: Introduction).

2) Tromp, Nena. "War Crimes Tribunals and The International Criminal Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia." In *15 Years of Peace Building in the Western Balkans: Lessons Learnt and Current Challenges*, edited by Ernst M. Felberbauer and Predrag Jureković. Vienna, December 2010, 151-163.

Pages 151-152 of the original correspond to page 3-4 of this text, pages 154-155 to pages 6-7, and pages 156 to page 9 (see: Introduction); pages 156-157 correspond to pages 25-26, page 160 to page 34, page 161 to pages 38-39; and pages 162-163 to pages 29-30 (see: Chapter I).

3) Tromp, Nena. "Understanding the Milošević Case: Legacy of an Unfinished Trial." In *The Genocide Convention: The Legacy of 60 Years*, edited by H.G. van der Wilt, J. Vervliet, G.K. Sluiter and J.Th.M. Houwink ten Cate. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2012, 27-39.

Page 28 of the original is similar to page 49 in this text; page 29 corresponds to information on pages 39,42, and 44; page 30 to pages 43- 44 of the manuscript; page 31 to page 92; and page 32 to pages 26, 28, 40, and 42 (see: Chapter I).

4) Nice, Geoffrey, and Nena Tromp. “Bosnia and Herzegovina.” In *The United Nations Security Council in the Age of Human Rights*, edited by Jared Genser and Bruno Stagno Ugarte, 288-319. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 288-319.

Pages 306-314 and 316 of the original more or less correspond to pages 214, 236-238, and 241-248 of this text (see: Chapter VII).

Page in “Bosnia and Herzegovina”	Corresponding page in this manuscript
306	237
308	233
308 and 312	241
309	244
310-311	240-241
312	237 and 240
313-314	233-234

Note on co-authorship

Geoffrey Nice contributed to the writing of this chapter, authoring pages 288-294 and 317-319.

These pages are not referred to in this text.

List of Acronyms

BiH	Bosnia and Herzegovina (<i>Bosna i Hercegovina</i>)
DB	FRY/Serbian State Security (<i>Državne bezbednost</i>)
DEPOS	Democratic Movement of Serbia (<i>Demokratski pokret Srbije</i>)
FRY	Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
HDZ	Croatian Democratic Union (<i>Hrvatska demokratska zajednica</i>)
IC	International Community
ICR	ICTY Court Record
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia
JATD	Unit for Anti-terrorist Operations (<i>Jedinica za anti-teroristička dejstva</i>)
JNA	Yugoslav People's Army (<i>Jugoslavenska Narodna Armija</i>)
JSO	Unit for Special Operations (<i>Jedinica za specijalne operacije</i>)
JUL	Yugoslav United Left (<i>Jugoslavenska ujedinjena levica</i>)
KLA	Kosovo Liberation Army
KOS	Military Counterintelligence Service (<i>Kontraobveštajna služba</i>)
MUP	Ministry of Internal Affairs (<i>Ministarstvo Unutrašnjih Poslova</i>)
NATO	North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NIOD	Netherlands Institute for War Documentation
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe
PJP	Special Police Units (<i>Posebne jedinica policije</i>)
PSFRY	Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
RS	Republika Srpska
RSK	Republika Srpska Krajina

SAJ	Special Anti-terrorist Units (<i>Specijalna Antiteroristička Jedinica</i>)
SANU	Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (<i>Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti</i>)
SAO	Serbian Autonomous Region (<i>Srpska autonomna oblast</i>)
SBSW	Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sylvania (<i>Slavonia, Baranja i Zapadni Srem</i>)
SDA	Party of Democratic Action (<i>Stranka demokratske akcije</i>)
SDC	Supreme Defence Council (<i>Vrhovni savet odbrane</i>)
SDS	Serb Democratic Party (<i>Srpska Demokratska Stranka</i>)
SFRY	Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (<i>Socijalistička Federativna Republika Jugoslavija</i>)
SIV	Federal Executive Council (<i>Savezno izvršno veće</i>)
SPOK	Serbian Resistance Movement of Kosovo (<i>Srpski Pokret Otpora Kosovo</i>)
SPS	Socialist Party of Serbia (<i>Socijalistička partija Srbije</i>)
SRS	Serbian Radical Party (<i>Srpska radikalna stranka</i>)
SVK	Serbian Army of Krajina (<i>Srpska Vojska Krajine</i>)
TO	Territorial Defence (<i>Teritorijalna odbrana</i>)
UN	United Nations
UNPROFOR	United Nations Protection Force
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
V-K-K	Virovitica-Karlovac-Karlobag
VOPP	Vance-Owen Peace Plan
VRS	Army of Republika Srpska (<i>Vojska Republike Srpske</i>)

Maps

Map 1: Crime scenes as charged in the three Milošević indictments	16
Map 2: London Treaty Map showing land offered to Serbia in 1905 by the Allied Forces	85
Map 3: Moljević's Map of Greater Serbia.	88
Map 4: The 'Optimal Western Border,' from <i>Epoha</i> , 22 October 1991	151
Map 5: The Vance Peace Plan.....	167
Map 6: <i>Epoha</i> 12, 7 January 1992.....	201
Map 7: Six Strategic Objectives.....	205
Map 8: Serb-controlled Areas as of 30 December 1992	206
Map 9: The Cutileiro Peace Proposal.....	213
Map 10: <i>De facto</i> Serb control under the Vance Plan and the Cutileiro Plan.....	213
Map 11: Vance-Owen Peace Plan	217
Map 12: <i>De facto</i> Serb control under the Vance Plan and the Vance-Owen Plan.....	217
Map 13: Owen-Stoltenberg Peace Plan.....	225
Map 14: <i>De facto</i> Serb control under the Vance Plan and the Owen-Stoltenberg Plan.....	225
Map 15: Contact Group Peace Plan	226
Map 16: <i>De facto</i> Serb control under the Vance Plan and the Contact Group Plan	226
Map 17: Ethnic Distribution in BiH Before (1991) and After (1997) the War.....	233
Map 18: The Dayton Agreement.....	242
Map 19: Expulsion of the Kosovo Albanian population from Orahovac and Mališevo	313
Map 20: Expulsion of the Kosovo Albanian population from Mitrovica	313
Map 21: Distance from Izbica to Batajnica.....	345

Figures

Figure 1: Facsimile of page from Obrad Stevanović's notebook, written in Cyrillic	345
--	-----

Preface

It was early Saturday morning, 11 March 2006. I was just finishing breakfast before leaving to spend yet another weekend in the office, when the telephone rang. On the phone was Geoffrey Nice, the Principal Trial Attorney in charge of the team – of which I was a part – that was prosecuting Slobodan Milošević at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY). Very calmly, he told me: “You won’t need to go into the office today. He’s dead. He died last night. There’s no need to do any work today, or any other day. That’s it. That’s the end of the trial.”

It took some time to comprehend what this meant; and before I could make any sense of it, a colleague who was already in the office, and who had just heard the news on television, called me inquiring about what we were to do. That weekend, Prosecution researchers had been set to begin preparing for the cross-examination of Momir Bulatović, who was being called by Milošević as a Defence witness.¹ For the Prosecution, preparation for a witness such as Bulatović was exactly what those of us in the Leadership Research Team (LRT) had been hired to do.² I became a member of the LRT in May 2000 and thereafter worked exclusively on the Milošević case until his death. The LRT and the MAT (Military Analyst Team) were part of the ICTY’s Office of the Prosecutor (OTP), consisting mostly of non-legal experts and researchers hired to provide information and expertise on historical, political, and military topics required by Prosecution trial teams that were made up mostly of police investigators and lawyers.

Bulatović was a dream witness for the Prosecution and we could hardly believe that Milošević was being so reckless as to call him; for Bulatović had knowledge of more or less everything the Prosecution needed to prove in order to establish our case. He had been a trusted associate and protégée of Milošević, in something of a father-son relationship, especially since his ‘election’ as the President of Montenegro at the age of 34. He had been present at many of the most important

¹ The testimony of a witness consists of three parts: testimony ‘in chief,’ ‘cross-examination,’ and ‘re-examination’. Testimony ‘in chief’ is the term used in legal jargon for adducing evidence from a witness in court by the party – the Prosecution or Defense – that calls the witness. It is followed by a ‘cross-examination’ by the opposing party. After the cross-examination of a witness, the party that originally called the witness and conducted the examination ‘in chief’ has an opportunity to re-examine the witness on topics addressed by the opposing party during the cross-examination, for clarification or correction.

² Members of the LRT came from different national backgrounds. All spoke the languages of the former Yugoslavia and most had been academics, with expertise in the Balkans. The author maintained her position as a lecturer in European Studies at the University of Amsterdam throughout her employment at the UN.

high-level meetings that had determined Serbia's role in the three conflicts for which Milošević was indicted and, during cross-examination, could be asked by the Prosecution to confirm the authenticity and accuracy of documentary evidence.

Milošević's defence was to be concluded by the end of April 2006. He died in his prison cell less than two months before the official end of the trial. His death was by no means entirely unexpected; his ill health was well known and his medical condition was not helped by the fact that he had represented himself. He had not only acted as his own advocate in court, but had also read, watched, and listened to every piece of evidence presented against him. He wrote his own opening addresses, prepared cross-examinations of every Prosecution witness, and organised and conducted the Defence case, preparing Defence witnesses before examining them in court himself. These would have been difficult tasks, physically and mentally, even for a healthy person in his or her prime.

But with the trial so abruptly concluded, indeed – as my colleague had asked – what were we to do? How were we to think about, and what were we to learn from, an unfinished trial? We were confronted with how the sudden end of a trial can obscure the truth. It was with that in mind that the end of the trial became the stimulus for some of us to start a new journey of discovery; this time, reviewing the frozen record of the trial outside of a sealed courtroom, where we had breathed stale but exhilarating air filled with the anticipation of what witnesses would, or would not, say. We knew what had been said. We knew what could not be said. Yet, in hundreds of thousands of pages of our own research, and in the court record, we had the makings of history.

The death of Milošević marked more than the end of a man. It was also the end of our chance to reveal more about Milošević and his plan, and to force him to face truths he never expected to confront. In the immediate aftermath of his passing, it seemed these truths would forever be hidden and that Milošević's death was another demonstration – among many – that trials of individuals in international courts leave unreliable records of historical events. But, in the unexpected turn of his death lay an unexpected discovery – that records of such trials may actually be invaluable points of departure to a level of discovery far greater than trial lawyers can ever conjure as they balance tests of proof against the rules of a court and the decisions of judges. After the dust of any trial has settled, perhaps it is the quiet precision of academic

research that future generations should turn to when they seek the truth about what a trial actually brought to light.

I wondered what would happen to all the research, testimony, and documentary and other evidence that had been collected by all parties. After all, I had handled material on a daily basis that uncovered the historical and political context in which mass atrocities had occurred during the wars that accompanied the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Might it disappear into oblivion because the trial did not come to a close? A huge amount of the material already assembled and analysed for use in court seemed destined to remain unexploited.

• • •

As the product of a legal proceeding dealing with individual criminal responsibility, the Milošević trial record contains a comprehensive – possibly the largest existing – collection of materials pointing to the political and criminal responsibility of individuals for the disintegration of Yugoslavia and for the mass atrocities by which it was marked. Although the traditional objectives of criminal law, such as retribution, justice for victims, and deterrence, were not achieved in the Milošević case, the trial produced an extensive archive of testimonies, expert reports, hearing transcripts, and other documentary evidence to be studied by researchers from various fields. Indeed, there is no doubt that the Milošević trial record is a significant historical resource. And any record of a mass atrocities trial – whether finished or unfinished – establishes a chronicle of past events. These records contribute to interpretations of a historical period and the shaping of collective memory in postconflict societies. In this way, mass atrocities trials do not have merely a legal purpose, they also have a pedagogical function to fulfil.

Examining the Milošević trial record for academic purposes, I experienced advantages and disadvantages as an ‘insider’ to the subject of my research. One clear advantage was my familiarity with the trial record – the principal source for this study – in which I was easily able to identify relevant passages and references in transcripts. But, at the same time, I had to be sure to remain true to the academic requirements of objectivity, academic distance, and impartiality. This dilemma, over the appropriate measure of distance or proximity for those writing about mass atrocities, has been described occasionally by scholars like Mark Osiel, who questioned:

How to strike an authorial posture that is scholarly, yet humane; “disinterested,” yet not disengaged? How to represent the victims’ suffering, for instance, in a way that is neither luridly salacious nor unduly solicitous and sycophantic? For the victims turn out to be perpetrators as well. How to render the perpetrators’ self-understanding at once as supremely malevolent yet humanly intelligible? How to depict the zealotry of international prosecutors in both its sincere humanitarianism and its professional self-aggrandizement?³

From my own experience, neither an insider nor an outsider can be preferred as a matter of principle, nor can either be assumed to maintain appropriate detachment more capably. Any author and researcher must engage academic discipline, consisting of critical thought, rigorous scrutiny of sources, and a mind open to new discoveries.

My journey in trying to make sense of the trial record was a difficult one, not least because of the enormous volume of material the trial produced. The trial lasted 467 days, leaving behind 49,191 pages of transcripts. During the trial, over 400 witnesses were called, the Prosecution tendered 5,759 documentary exhibits into evidence amounting to approximately 150,000 pages, and the Defence tendered 2,107 exhibits of some 25,000 pages. Milošević and his lawyers also received approximately one million pages of potentially exculpatory material supplied to them by the Prosecution under the ICTY’s Rule 68.⁴

I sought guidance and insight from scholars who have studied Nazi war planning by scrutinising the records of Nuremberg war crimes trials. The Nuremberg Tribunal produced a very specific historical interpretation of the Nazi plan, ascribing responsibility for the war chiefly to one person and the ruling elite; but, historians realised over time how the evidentiary focus of criminal proceedings in Nuremberg had unwittingly influenced their analysis in favour of what came to be known as the ‘intentionalist’ interpretation of the period, which maintains that the Holocaust resulted from an explicit master plan created by Adolf Hitler himself and implemented from the top down.⁵ Only later was attention directed to the role of minor bureaucrats and

³ Mark Osiel, *Making Sense of Mass Atrocities* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2008), xvii.

⁴ Rule 68 deals with the obligation of the Prosecution to disclose potentially exculpatory and mitigating material to the Defence. See: ICTY, “Rules of Procedure and Evidence,” No. IT/32/Rev.48, 19 November 2012, 65–66.

⁵ The terms “intentionalists” and “functionalists” was coined by Timothy Mason in his 1981 essay “Intention and explanation: A current controversy about the interpretation of National Socialism,” published in G. Hirschfeld and

functionaries at all levels of German society – an approach known as the ‘functionalist’ interpretation and concerned with the complicity of ordinary Germans in the Holocaust, to such an extent in the case of some scholars that they ascribe the adoption of the Final Solution primarily to social and political pressures from the bottom up.⁶

Given that the Milošević trial revolved around his leadership and his ability to articulate and implement his plan, I narrowed my examination of the trial record to the exploration of three major topics – the Leader, the Ideology, and the Plan. I also considered that any criminal investigation and the criminal trial that may follow deal with three elementary questions: *Who?* *What?* and *How?* These questions are revisited by judges when weighing the evidence and writing a judgement and these are also the questions of interest for historians researching a historical period. In the following chapters, these essential questions will be addressed. The question of *Who?* addresses the role of Milošević as the Accused. The question of *What?* addresses the Ideology and the Plan behind the leader. The question of *How?* elicits a search for answers about what led to the violence and mass atrocities that occurred, and at what point in the planning they were sanctioned.



Long before his trial started in 2002, there was an ongoing debate among scholars, journalists, politicians, and diplomats about the extent of Milošević’s historical and political responsibility for the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia; and there has been near consensus among these authors that Milošević personally bore the greatest share of blame for it.⁷ Still, one might argue that the dominant Yugoslav political culture – which relied on strong leadership – had allowed him to develop very extensive *de jure* and *de facto* powers. And so, notwithstanding his personal

L. Kettenacker, eds., *The “Fuehrer State”: Myth and Reality – Studies on Structure and Politics of the Third Reich* (Klett-Cotta:Stuttgart: 1981). Mason criticised authors who focused too much on Hitler in explaining the Holocaust, calling them intentionalist. He called the opposing school functionalists because they saw the Holocaust as consequence of the way the Nazi state functioned. Mason himself proposed, as an alternative, an investigation into a broader perspective of the period with a distinct focus on the economy.

⁶ See: Ruti Teitel, *Transitional Justice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 74; Mark Osiel, *Mass Atrocities, Collective Memory and the Law* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1997), 100; and Daniel Goldgahen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996).

⁷ Jasna Dragović-Soso “Why did Yugoslavia Disintegrate? An Overview of Contending Explanations,” in *State Collapse in South-Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on Yugoslavia's Disintegration*, eds. Lenard J. Cohen and J. Dragović-Soso (Purdue University Press, Indiana, 2008), 1-39, 14.

mark on Serbia's path to war, the trial record also contains a wealth of material about the ideology to which Milošević tied his political destiny, best described for the purposes of this text as a variant of Serbian state ideology.⁸ Since the 19th century, one expression of this ideology has manifested in aspirations for what is known in historiography as a Greater Serbia – a state that would include all Serbs scattered across the Western Balkans. Over time, a number of publications have been seen as roadmaps for such a state, including the 1941 pamphlet “Homogeneous Serbia,” which proposed that the western border of a Greater Serbia cut through Croatian territory along the line extending between the three Croatian towns of Virovitica, Karlovac and Karlobag. This became known as the V-K-K line, and evidence of its continued significance emerged in the courtroom. Materials contained in the trial record on Serbian state ideology will be explored in this text with particular focus on Milošević's contribution to its development in the 1980s and 1990s, by means of a project he described by its aim: “All Serbs in a Single State.”

Milošević's plan for achieving a state which would encompass all Serbs was a process of attempting to reach five successive goals set between 1987 and 1999, beginning with a successful attempt to centralise Serbia by revoking the autonomy of its two formerly autonomous provinces, Kosovo and Vojvodina. The Serbian Constitution of 1990 reflected those changes, and its revision launched Milošević to new political heights among Serbs. The successful centralisation of Serbia was followed by unsuccessful efforts to centralise the Yugoslav Federation and secure Serb domination through control of the Communist Party and federal institutions of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). Attempts to achieve this second goal instead brought the disintegration of the SFRY, after Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence in 1991.

Milošević's third goal was set in reaction to the failure to preserve a centralised SFRY. The disintegration of the Federation led to efforts to preserve a Rump Yugoslavia that would consist of all former SFRY republics save for Slovenia and parts of Croatia.⁹ This Rump Yugoslavia was

⁸ Some authors use the term “Serbian State Project” to denote the various forms that aspirations for a Serb state have taken since the 19th century. For example, see: Biserko, *Yugoslavia's Implosion*.

⁹ The term ‘rump’ can be applied as an adjective to describe the remainder of any state after the separation of a region or regions. In the local languages of Croatia and BiH, the term *krnja Jugoslavija* was used to refer specifically to the former Yugoslavia less Slovenia and parts of Croatia. The word *krnja* means “truncated” or “made incomplete” but, colloquially, is associated with a “messy break” or a “rough edge.” Here, Rump Yugoslavia

projected to include ‘Serb-designated territories’ in Croatia and, to that end, attempts were made to secure those territories by force as early as mid-1990.¹⁰ These actions led to an escalation of violence and a full-fledged war in Croatia in 1991. In this process, Croatian Serbs proclaimed their own quasi-state entity. The Republika Srpska Krajina (RSK) was envisaged to extend to the Virovitica-Karlovac-Karlobag (V-K-K) line – a boundary that is the very representation of the Greater Serbia ideology articulated in 1941 – and the borders of the RSK were more or less achieved by December 1991.

The failure to achieve a Rump Yugoslavia with the inclusion of BiH led to Milošević’s fourth goal. A referendum on independence held in BiH in February 1992 made it clear that a majority of the population there was in favour of independence. Adjusting to the loss of BiH, the republic of Serbia and Montenegro – which had not given up on Yugoslavia as the name for a common state – constituted the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) in April 1992. The FRY Constitution allowed for other territories to join in. At the same time, Bosnian Serbs, following the example of Croatian Serbs, formed their own quasi-state in BiH: the Republika Srpska (RS). Unlike the formation of the RSK, which was achieved after several months of fighting, the formation of the RS took more than three years to realise and led to mass atrocities against non-Serbs. Eventually, the peace agreement for BiH that was signed by all parties in December 1995 allowed the RS to maintain its territorial autonomy despite the fact that its borders were established by the commission of crimes, including genocide.

The fifth goal Milošević sought to achieve was related to Kosovo. The Kosovo conflict escalated into an armed conflict in 1998, exposing Milošević’s failure to keep Kosovo under Serbian rule even after revoking its autonomy in the 1990 Serbian Constitution. The eruption of violence between the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and Serbian forces in 1997 was used by Serbia to justify a violent campaign against the Kosovo Albanian population that sought to alter the ethnic composition of Kosovo in favour of Serbs. By the end of December 1998, Milošević’s determination to keep Kosovo in Serbia – and on his terms – resulted in a war, causing a humanitarian catastrophe that was eventually brought to an end by NATO military intervention.

is used in English as a proper noun to reflect the specificity of how the term *krnja Jugoslavija* was used in the early 1990s in the former SFRY.

¹⁰ ‘Serb-designated territories’ was the term used by the ICTY Prosecutor to denote the areas in Croatia and BiH that Serb leaders had claimed on ethnic, historical, or geostrategic bases.

NATO's defeat of Serbian forces led to Serbia's loss of Kosovo in June 1999 and, eventually, to the downfall of Milošević in October 2000.