# The disintegration of Yugoslavia, 1990–95

## Conceptual understanding

### Key concepts
- Change
- Causation
- Consequence

### Key questions
- What were the consequences of the break-up of Yugoslavia?
- Why did Yugoslavia fall apart?

## A chronology of key events in Kosovo and the Balkans, 1989–98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 December</td>
<td>Albanian leaders declare their independence from Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 July</td>
<td>The Belgrade government dissolves the Kosovo Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Slovenija and Croatia both declare their independence from Yugoslavia; there is war between Serbia and Slovenia (lasting ten days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 June</td>
<td>Bosnia breaks away from Yugoslavia and declares independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>War breaks out in Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 April</td>
<td>US President George Bush warns Milošević that Serb aggression in Kosovo could bring a military response. This is referred to as the 'Christmas warning'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Ibrahim Rugova is elected president of the self-proclaimed republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Ethnic tension and armed unrest escalate in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 November</td>
<td>The Srebrenica massacre takes place in Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993–97</td>
<td>NATO air strikes against Serb positions in Bosnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 July</td>
<td>The Dayton Accords are signed in Dayton, Ohio, USA, ending the Bosnian war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August–September</td>
<td>The Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) is formed and carries out attacks against Serbs in Kosovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Monica Lewinsky scandal hits the US media

Serb forces kill Adem Jashari; large protests held in Pristina

UN Security Council Resolution 1160 condemns Yugoslavia's excessive use of force

The UN Security Council passes Resolution 1199 for ceasefire in Kosovo

1998 January
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October

US diplomat Robert Gelbard
KLA a terrorist group

US Special Envoy Richard Holbrooke travels to Belgrade

Talks are held between Rugova and Milošević

Milošević agrees to allow the Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) into Kosovo

Franjo Tuđman (1922–99)

Tuđman was the first president of the state of Croatia after it broke away from the former Yugoslavia in 1991. He remained its president until his death in 1999. A fervent nationalist, he fought with the partisans during the Second World War and later joined the military to become the youngest general in the Yugoslav army. He later gained a university degree in history and his outspoken manner led him to be expelled from the Communist Party in 1967.

He continued to be a defender of Croatia's record and became even more nationalistic. He was imprisoned for political activities against the government, although it is said that Tito, who was himself half Slovene and half Croat, was sympathetic to him and so his prison sentence was a soft one. Tuđman revered and greatly admired Tito.

He said in 1990:

If Yugoslavia is to exist, it can exist only as an alliance, a confederation of independent states.

In the 1980s, Tuđman formulated the Croatian Nationalist Programme. In 1989, he founded the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ), which won Croatia's first free parliamentary elections the following year.

Tuđman's autocratic style and hardline approach made him unpopular with many outside his country, but he led the country at a crucial time in its history. He has been accused of human rights violations during the early 1990s and in 2008 was indicted for war crimes, even though he had died almost a decade before. Tuđman is credited with creating an independent Croatia, and with helping the country move away from communism and towards greater democracy.

In the next year, both Slovenia and Croatia broke away from the Yugoslav Federation and held their own multi-party elections. In April, Slovenia elected Milan Kučan as its new president and Franjo Tuđman became head of state in Croatia. There is little doubt that the inflammatory nationalist rhetoric and actions of Serbia contributed to the decisions that brought about the breakdown in relations between the Yugoslav states.

Although Slovenia was the state that led the way, it was in Croatia that most of the problems developed. This was partially due to the fact that, ethnically, Slovenia had hardly any Serbs living in its territory. In contrast, in Croatia there existed a significant number who had been living there for generations. The percentage of those who declared themselves Serbs living in Croatia was, according to the census of 1991, almost 12% of the total population, living among an 80% Croat majority.

Apart from the desire to ensure the well-being of Serbs in the whole of Yugoslavia, the relationship that had existed before 1990 between Serbs and Croats was a rocky one. The actions committed by the collaborationist Croatian state and the Ustaša during the Second
World War against the Serbs could not be forgotten. As Milošević preached Serb nationalism in the late 1980s, pressure was put on other Yugoslav republics to allow Serb nationalist rallies, particularly in Croatia, where a large minority lived. Now it appeared as though Croatia wanted to leave the Yugoslav Federation, while many ethnic Serbs living within its borders opposed the secession and wished Croatia to remain a part of Yugoslavia. The answer for many Serbs in Croatia was the creation of a new Serb state within that republic, or to be allowed to join a Greater Serbian state.

After Tudjman’s victory in the 1990 general election, the Croatian parliament changed the status of Serbs in Croatia from residents of a constitutional nation to that of a national minority. Croatian Serbs in the southern town of Knin (a Četnik heartland in 1941–45), under the leadership of local Knin police inspector Milan Martić, formed a separatist body called the SAO Krajina. This organization’s demand was to remain in union with other Serb populations in the Krajina region (see the map) if Croatia decided to secede. In the summer of 1990, SAO Krajina organized resistance to the Croatian authorities with the support of Milošević, who was wary of Tudjman’s nationalistic and separatist stance. The Yugoslav army, dominated by Serbs, was urged by Milošević to defend the rights of Serbs in Croatia. In December 1991, the Croatian Serbs created the Republic of Serbian Krajina. Yugoslavia was in imminent danger of imploding.

The independence of Slovenia and Croatia: War in 1991

Croatia’s War of Independence

As a result both of the victory in the 1990 multi-party parliamentary elections of nationalist groups in Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also of the failure of the politicians to agree to remain in a federated Yugoslavia, Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence in June 1991. Both Tudjman and Milošević had decided that force was going to solve their problems. Meanwhile, in April, fighting had already broken out between the Croatian government and the rebel ethnic Serbs in Krajina, supported by the Serb-controlled Yugoslav People’s Army or JNA. The Croatian War of Independence set the scene for greater conflicts in the coming years in Bosnia and later, at the end of the decade, in Kosovo. It soon became clear that this first war in Croatia was going to be a bloody one, with ethnic hatreds quickly coming to the surface. Civilians were caught up in
the conflicts and brutality was common on both sides. In the early months of the war, the Yugoslav People’s Army deliberately targeted civilian areas in the coastal treasures of Split and Dubrovnik, both UNESCO World Heritage sites.

What happened in episodes such as the siege and bombardment of cultural sites like Dubrovnik and Split appalled many but it was a taste of things to come. After the war, an ex-minister commented:

“All armies in the past did their best and refused to wage war or to target and to bomb the city of Dubrovnik. It was simply impossible for anyone to attack and demolish Dubrovnik. In the 1800s, Dubrovnik was captured by Napoleon, but without a fight. The Russian fleet of Admiral Senyavin came to attack Dubrovnik but they lowered their guns ... there was not a single shell or bullet fired at Dubrovnik. That’s Dubrovnik’s history, and that indicates the level of the human civilisation, the level of respect afforded to Dubrovnik. What we did is the greatest shame that was done in 1991.”

— Nikola Samardžić, 2004

Slovenia’s War of Independence: The Ten-Day War

Slovenia had long regarded itself as Yugoslavia’s most developed state. Slovenia’s borders with Italy, Austria and Hungary; its attractions, which included some of the largest sources of tourist revenue in Yugoslavia, and its open attitude went a long way to accounting for this outlook among the Slovenes. The fighting was a short affair, lasting only ten days before peace was declared. In June 1991, the Slovenian government took control of the republic’s border posts and the international airport in the capital, Ljubljana. After three days and a handful of casualties on both sides, the European community took action and met to propose a cease-fire. Eventually, both sides agreed to this and the conflict was concluded on 7 July. It had cost less than 100 dead on both sides, but the consequences were significant for Yugoslavia. The Slovenes had counted on the international community stepping in to prevent fighting and, in this, they were correct. They also knew that the Milošević’s government was not as concerned about Slovenia’s independence, given the small number of ethnic Serbs in the country; besides, the issue of Croatia was more important to the Serbs.

For Slovenia, the Ten-Day War marked its independence from Yugoslavia, which was officially recognized by the European community in the following year. For the international community, there were more pressing issues. In 1990, Saddam Hussein’s Iraq had invaded Kuwait, bringing about UN intervention in March 1991. The attention of the United States and the world was on Iraq and the gulf war in 1991, along with a sharp rise in oil prices and a slowdown in the world economy. In addition, there had been a coup in the former Soviet Union and Boris Yeltsin had replaced Mikhail Gorbachev. With both Slovenia and Croatia now independent, the stage was set for a much more violent conflict in Bosnia in 1992, the bloodiest of all the battles waged in the break-up of the Yugoslav state. Meanwhile, in Kosovo, the majority Kosovars watched and waited.
Source A

A cartoon by De Angelis showing the break-up of Yugoslavia, published in the Italian newspaper *Il Popolo*.

Source B

A cartoon, “Welcome to Yugoslavia”, also by De Angelis, published in the Italian newspaper *Il Popolo*.

First question, part b – 2 marks for each source

What is the message of each of the cartoons?

First question, part a – 3 marks

In Source A, what is the significance of the two oars Montenegro and Serbia having broken off?
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The repression of the Albanian independence campaign, 1991–95

The secession of both Slovenia and Croatia in 1991 meant the end of Tito’s federation, and worse was still to come in Bosnia. However, for the remaining republics, particularly for the formerly autonomous region of Kosovo, the choice was unpalatable: should they remain with the remnants of the Yugoslav state and strive to make it work or should they go it alone?

Ethnicity in Kosovo and the wars in Yugoslavia

The issue of ethnicity in the conflict in Yugoslavia and Kosovo has been overplayed. In Rwanda, the divide between the Hutu and the Tutsi was accentuated by other factors as well as by recent developments under colonial rule. In the case of Yugoslavia, one of the accusations leveled at Milošević by the War Crimes Tribunal was his overt nationalism and that he tried to create a “Greater Serbia”. This was to comprise a Serb-dominated state, which included the Serb-populated areas of Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo.

However, it is reasonable to say that it is a common misconception about the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s that they were the result of centuries of ethnic conflict. There is little evidence to support such a contention. Ethnic groups had existed side by side for centuries and, with the coming of Ottoman rule in the 14th century, the influence of Islam added a religious element to this ethnic mix. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Serbs and Croats lived together harmoniously in the ethnically mixed region of Dalmatia and many early advocates of a united Yugoslavia came from this region. Among them was the Croat Ante Trumbić. Nevertheless, by the time of the outbreak of the Yugoslav wars in the 1990s, the hostile relations between Serbs and Croats in Dalmatia had broken down. This saw Dalmatian Serbs fighting on the side of the Republic of Serbian Krajina. This supports the claim that ethnic conflict between the different groups in Yugoslavia became conspicuous in the 20th century, starting with the tensions over the establishment of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes after the First World War escalating in the late 1920s following the assassination of the popular Croatian politician Stjepan Radić. It is without doubt that severe ethnic conflict took place during the Second World War when the Croatian Ustaša movement committed genocide against Serbs. In return, the Serbian Chetnik movement...
responded with violence against Croats and Bosniaks. Only Tito, when he came to power, was able to promote a Yugoslav nationalism that held the state together. When Tito died in 1980, the federation he had helped create fell apart and for this Milošević must bear a significant share of the blame, although he is not alone. Tudjman was certainly a key partner in this but it was the promotion of a Serb nationalism that did much to bring about the ethnic hatreds that ensued from the bitter wars that broke up Yugoslavia in the 1990s. Finally, when the Kosovar Albanians began to demand their own state, Serb nationalists were unwilling to grant this ethnic minority any of the freedoms they wanted for themselves. The consequence was bloodshed, the break-up of the federation and a Europe thrown into turmoil because of the exploitation of ethnic divisions.

The events happening in Yugoslavia, the rest of the communist world and in the Middle East overshadowed Kosovo and its campaign for possible independence. The removal of the Albanian Kosovar leaders Jashari and Vlasi, and Kosovo's autonomous status in 1989, was followed by the adoption of special measures to control any dissent in the province to separate from Serbia. In the summer of 1990, as Slovenia and Croatia began to hold multi-party elections, there were further protests in Kosovo. In July, a number of Albanian delegates met in the street outside the assembly building to declare Kosovo an independent republic as "an equal and independent entity within the framework of the Yugoslav federation" (Elsic, 2011: 66). A week later, the Serbian parliament dissolved the Kosovo Assembly and took measures to ban Albanian language media and broadcasts.

In September of the same year, many of the same delegates who had gathered in July to declare Kosovo an independent republic met again, in secret, in the small town of Kačanik in the south of the province to draw up a constitution for the Republic of Kosovo. The most important impact of the Yugoslav wars on the thinking of the Albanian nationalists in Kosovo was that, instead of striving towards remaining part of the Yugoslav Federation, they would seek full independence. A year later, in September 1991, the Albanians held a referendum and declared Kosovo an Independent state, claiming a 99% vote in favour. Despite the repression of Albanian nationalist sentiment in Kosovo, the people of the province were determined to resist. A key part of this political movement was centred on the Democratic League of Kosovo, known by the initials LDK, from its Albanian name Lidhja Demokratike e Kosovës. This was originally founded in 1989 and led by Ibrahim Rugova.

**Ibrahim Rugova (1944–2006)**

Ibrahim Rugova was born at the end of 1944. His father and grandfather were killed by communists only six weeks after his birth. Rugova was brought up in Kosovo, where he attended Priština University before going to Paris for a year to study literature.

In 1988, he was elected the president of the Kosovo Writers Association, which became the focus of the growing Albanian opposition to Serb rule in Kosovo. In 1989, Rugova became the president of the Democratic League of Kosovo (LDK).

Rugova was president of Kosovo between 1992 and 2006. He did not look like a man who might change history. His office was a bungalow behind the football stadium in Priština, where he spent much of his adult life until he died in 2006. He was hailed by some as the “Gandhi of the Balkans”; with his trademark silk scarf, and a cigarette in his hand, he cultivated a bohemian air. A journalist once described him disparagingly as “a kind of loser who sat in a corner drinking too much coffee” (http://www.economist.com/node/5436910). However, this man held the aspirations of almost 2 million Kosovo Albanians and led his tiny country on the road to independence.
The role and significance of Ibrahim Rugova

Rugova was essentially a pacifist as well as an academic, and spent the last 18 years of his life at the centre of Kosovan politics, where he advocated that the province should be a democratic sovereign state, independent of Serbia. Initially, when Rugova became head of the LDK, he believed he could win independence without the use of force. He worked towards developing a parallel system of education, health services and local government for the ethnic Albanian majority in Kosovo when they were denied many of these by the Serbian government in the 1990s. Events overtook both him and his methods, however. Before the Bosnian war broke out in 1992, Rugova had resisted pressure by the Croats to open up a campaign against Serb rule the year before, fearing the possible consequences for his people. Instead, as Bosnia was carved up and thousands died, his low-key, peaceful approach led to Kosovo being totally ignored in the Dayton Accords signed in Ohio in 1995 to bring an end to the Bosnian conflict.

After 1995, Rugova’s role changed, as Milošević and the Serbs turned their focus back towards Kosovo. Rugova had been elected president of the self-proclaimed Republic of Kosovo in 1992 but he was not granted international recognition and, following the signing of the Dayton Accords, for some Albanians at least, more radical measures were needed. They formed the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) in 1996. Rugova’s policy of passive resistance had managed to maintain peace in Kosovo during the wars with Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia during the early 1990s but this came at the cost of increasing frustration among Kosovo’s Albanian population, hence the emergence of the KLA. Despite this more radical stance by some, Rugova was re-elected president in another unofficial vote in 1998. In 1999, Kosovo was attacked by Serbia and defended by NATO. Rugova went on to be elected as president again in 2002 and 2004, a position he held until his death in January 2006. His significance for the people of Kosovo is huge. Throughout the 1990s, he was seen as the moderate, intellectual face of Albanian opposition that stood against Milošević’s Belgrade regime and is, by some, regarded as the “father of the nation”.

The Bosnian war, 1992–95

The face of passive resistance which Rugova presented to the world was at odds with what happened in neighbouring Bosnia in the early years of the decade. The attention of the world was to be drawn to Bosnia and the full horrors of the conflict examined. In Rwanda, the genocide developed and the international community did little of practical use to stop the killing. Lessons learned in Rwanda were to have an impact in Bosnia and for Kosovo, finally leading to intervention in 1999. In Bosnia, the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Russia and countries of the Middle East followed widely differing policies.

Why might this have been the case? According to a census taken in 1991, Bosnia and Herzegovina’s population consisted of 44% Muslims, 31% Serbs, 17% Croats and 5% “other”. The birth rate of the Muslim community was higher than that of the others, so the probability was that Muslims would dominate the state within one or two generations.
As happened in Croatia, the Serb minority objected to any situation that might leave them as a minority in an independent state. When the Bosnian leader Alija Izetbegović declared Bosnia’s independence in April 1992, the leader of the Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadžić, challenged this declaration as representing the “road to Hell” and threatened that, as a result, “the Muslim nation may disappear altogether” (Nation, 2003: 151). The stage was set for the bloodiest conflict of the Yugoslav wars.

The Bosnian war was fought because Serbs and Croats living in Bosnia wanted to annex Bosnian territory for their own states. Milošević and Tudjman met in March 1991 at Tito’s old hunting lodge at Karadjordjevo, in Vojvodina, to work out a deal over the division of Bosnia should war break out. Prior to the outbreak of war in the summer of 1992, Karadžić, with the support of Milošević in Serbia, created a Serb army in Bosnia; when fighting did break out, Bosnian Serbs began a policy of “cleansing” large areas of Bosnia of non-Serbs. The term “ethnic cleansing” came to the fore, a literal translation of the Serbo-Croatian phrase etničko čišćenje, and was widely employed in the 1990s to describe the brutal treatment of civilians in the Yugoslav conflicts.

There were horrific scenes that had not been witnessed in Europe since the Second World War. After the war, the International Court equated these actions with genocide, and some of the perpetrators were charged with crimes against humanity.

### Ethnic cleansing

The use of the term “ethnic cleansing” became common in the 1990s after its use in the media as a result of the images of the Yugoslav conflicts. As a concept, it has generated some controversy. Some critics see little difference between ethnic cleansing and genocide; however, defenders of the term argue that the two can be distinguished by the intent of the perpetrator. One such defender is Raphael Lemkin, who introduced the term “genocide” during the Second World War to describe Nazi policies of systematic murder in reference to the destruction of the Jews in Europe. (For more on this, see the references to genocide in the Rwanda case study.) Lemkin created the word “genocide” by combining the Greek word for race (“geno”) and the Latin word for killing (“cide”).

The principal goal of genocide is the destruction of an ethnic, racial, or religious group; whereas, argue its proponents, the main purpose of ethnic cleansing is to create areas in which the inhabitants are ethnically homogeneous, that is, of the same race. Ethnic cleansing also includes the elimination of all vestiges of those being ‘cleansed’, including their culture, buildings, places of worship and monuments.

Some people argue that ethnic cleansing has taken place earlier in human history in various parts of the world. These include North America, following the arrival of European settlers, and even as far back as the destruction of Jewish monuments by the Egyptians and Assyrians a thousand years or more before Christ.

The war in Bosnia was the bloodiest conflict in Europe since the Second World War. It is estimated that over 100,000 people were killed and over 2 million people displaced. Similar to the events in Rwanda, probably as many as 50,000 women were raped during the war. When examining the crimes committed during the conflict, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) attributed 90% to the Serbs and around 6% to the Croats. The war lasted for over three and a half years, from April 1992 until the ceasefire in December 1995, when peace agreements were negotiated and signed in Dayton, Ohio. These partitioned the former province of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Events that characterized the fighting and brought the struggle to the world’s attention included:
• the massacres which took place in Prijedor in 1992 and Srebrenica in 1995
• the scenes at Omarska detention camp in Northern Bosnia in 1992
• the siege of Sarajevo in 1992, in which over 11,500 people died
• the destruction of the bridge in Mostar by Croatian forces in 1993
• the declaration, in 1995, of UN safe zones for Muslims in Sarajevo, Tuzla, Bihac, Srebrenica, Zepa and Gorazde
• NATO air strikes in 1994 and 1995, and the use of air power in Bosnia in 1995; this was the first time since its creation in 1949 that NATO had used its military strike force against an opponent.

The signing of the Dayton Accords in 1995. In the centre (with eyes closed) is Milošević, next to him, Izetbegović, and to his left, Franjo Tudjman, leader of Croatia

TDK guiding questions

1. How can one gauge the extent to which history is told from a particular cultural or national perspective?
2. Is it possible for historical writing to be free from perspective?
3. What distinguishes a better historical account from a worse one?
4. How can historians assess the reliability of sources?

The events of the conflict in Bosnia are probably the most graphic and best known of the Yugoslav wars.

Thinking, communication, research and social skills

Research the events of the conflict in Bosnia. Consider the importance of the media and the role it played in bringing the events to the world’s attention. Then work in pairs or small groups and examine Sources A–F below.

For each source, prepare a presentation lasting 3–5 minutes. Include visuals, maps, political cartoons and other source materials in your presentation. Be sure to address at least one of the TDK guiding questions given above.

Source A

Omarska Camp: The power of images

Look at this famous cover of Time magazine from 1992: http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19922081,00.html or search “Time magazine Must it go on?”

What is your immediate reaction to the scene featured on the cover? What happened there? Consider how emotion plays a part in the selection of images on such a well-known publication in the world’s media.

Source B

The Siege of Sarajevo, 1992–96

The siege of the Bosnian capital Sarajevo took place from April 1992 until February 1996. Lasting over 1,200 days, it is the longest siege in modern European warfare. People grew accustomed to hearing about “Sniper Alley” during the siege. There were bloody scenes as civilians tried to go about their business and were picked off by snipers or killed by artillery and mortar rounds. In the Markale market, the largest single attack in 1994 caused the deaths of 68 civilians. The images are powerful ones. Research what happened there and why. Consider the following images in your research and presentation.
Source C
The Srebrenica massacre, 1995

The events which took place in Srebrenica shocked the world. The massacre was the worst episode of mass murder in Europe since the Second World War and has been called "the single biggest crime of the Bosnian war" (Glenny, 1999: 650). Over 8,000 mostly Muslim men and boys were massacred and it was this single event that did the most to arouse the international community to urge a ceasefire and end the conflict.

Research how the Srebrenica massacre came about and what happened there.

Source D
UN safe zones for Muslims

Investigate one or two of the six so-called safe zones in Sarajevo, Tuzla, Bihać, Srebrenica, Zepa and Gorazde. These represented the only international attempts to protect civilians in these areas. Established as the United Nations Protection Force in Yugoslavia (UNPROFOR), the mission lasted for three years from early 1992 until 1995. Look at how and why these zones were established, the problems they experienced and why they did not provide either a solution to the situation or protection to their inhabitants.

Source E
The destruction of the Mostar bridge

This was considered one of the worst acts of deliberate cultural destruction in the entire war. The old bridge in Mostar, the capital of Herzegovina, was one of the best examples of Islamic architecture in the Balkans. Designed by the renowned architect Sinan, it joined the two sides of the town. In 1993, the Croatians destroyed the bridge.

Go to www.youtube.com/watch?v=CM38-6CFo9k to watch this act of destruction.

Source F
The NATO air strikes over Bosnia, 1994–95

After the Serbs shelled Sarajevo with mortars, killing dozens of civilians in the marketplace, NATO aircraft attacked Serb positions. Operation Deny Flight spanned more than two years of the Bosnian war. Operation Deliberate Force followed this in 1995. Examine what happened in the air strikes, the targets identified and the significance of this campaign for NATO itself. How did it bring about a resolution to the war?
Ethnic distribution at the municipal level in Bosnia and Herzegovina before the war (1991) and after the war (1998).

First question, part b – 2 marks
What is the message of this cartoon?

First question, part b – 2 marks
How accurate do you think this source is regarding Western inaction?
The impact of the Bosnian war on Kosovo and its struggle for independence

The scenes of carnage, death and destruction that came out of the Bosnian war were shocking to much of the world, and to Rugova and the Kosovan people. Rugova’s reputation as the “Gandhi of the Balkans”, however accurate or not, meant that his refusal to back the Croats by raising a rebellion against the Serbs in the early 1990s did prevent ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. In 1992, Rugova said, “We would have no chance of successfully resisting ... We believe it is better to do nothing and stay alive than to be massacred” (Judah, 2008: 71).

In fact, the Bosnian war made the situation for many Albanians more dangerous as Serb nationalism grew unchecked. In addition, the economic deterioration in Serbia as a result of the wars and sanctions was to affect Kosovo. Some Serbians, displaced by war, took up the offer of land in Kosovo, adding to the problems there. All of these difficulties in Yugoslavia provoked a more radical approach by a number of Kosovar Albanians, frustrated at the lack of progress and unhappy with Rugova’s leadership. In 1996, a group calling itself the Kosove Liberation Army (KLA) began a series of attacks on Serbs. The stage was set for an escalation of the situation in Kosovo.

Source skills

Source A

Milošević speaking in Kosovo in 1989.
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Source B
Preface to the website “Dedicated to giving people the chance to read some of the speeches and interviews with Milošević” (translated into English).

No man on Earth has been lied about more than Slobodan Milošević. One of the most popular lies is that he whipped up nationalism among the Serbian people, and through that nationalism he incited the wars that destroyed the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. Milošević’s speeches were never nationalistic, nor did they contain any racism. We have posted the complete and unedited transcripts of Milošević’s speeches and interviews spanning his entire political career. Read his words and judge for yourself whether he was trying to whip up nationalism and incite wars.

http://www.slobodan.org/speeches.html

Source C
Speech Milošević gave at Kosovo Polje (the “Field of Blackbirds”) to a crowd of largely Serb Kosovars on 24–25 April 1987.

Nationalism always means isolation from others, being locked in a closed circle, and that also means stopping growth, because without cooperation and connection with Yugoslavia, and then widening vistas, there is no progress. Every nation and nationality which shuts itself off and isolates itself behaves irresponsibly toward their constituents’ growth. That is why, before anything else, we communists must do all that is required to eliminate the consequences of nationalist and separatist behaviour ...

But our goal is to emerge from a state of hatred, intolerance and mistrust. That all people in Kosovo live well. And that is why, in relation to that goal, I want to tell you colleagues, yes, you need to stay here. This is your land. Your homes are here, your memories ... You need to stay here because of your forefathers and because of your descendants. You would shame your forefathers and disappoint your descendants ... We’ll change it together, we, Serbia and all of Yugoslavia! ... we can at least stop the exodus, we can assure the condition that all people that live on Kosovo be live under equal rights and equal Kosovo economic opportunity else, and then all other opportunists of Yugoslavia is with you. The it’s a problem for Yugoslavia, but Yugoslavia and Kosovo, Yugoslavia doesn’t exist without Kosovo! Yugoslavia will disintegrate without Kosovo!

Yugoslavia and Serbia will never give up Kosovo!

Source D
Excerpts from the speech by Milošević at a rally in Belgrade, 19 November 1988.

Comrades, no meeting as big as this has been held in Belgrade since its liberation. The last time such a great number of people, united by a great idea, gathered in the streets of Belgrade was on 20th October 1944. At that time the people in the streets of Belgrade were celebrating victory in the war. At that time, just as today, members of all Yugoslav peoples and nationalities assembled here in togetherness.

The most important thing that we must resolve at this time is to establish peace and order in Kosovo. There is no more urgent task for Serbia, nor should there be any other more pressing task for all of Yugoslavia, because the solidarity of the Yugoslav peoples and especially of Yugoslav workers have always been their greatest and strongest characteristic ... For this reason, it is difficult to explain why this solidarity has been late in manifesting itself to a greater extent, more quickly, and with a greater love when citizens of our own country have been concerned. The long absence of this solidarity with the boundless suffering of the Serbs and Montenegrins in Kosovo constitutes an incurable wound to their hearts and to the heart of all of Serbia.

We shall win the battle for Kosovo regardless of the obstacles facing us inside and outside the country ... Nobody should be surprised that all Serbia rose up last summer because of Kosovo. Kosovo is the very centre of its history, its culture, and its memory. All people have a love which burns in their hearts.
forever. For a Serb that love is Kosovo. That is why Kosovo will remain in Serbia. That will not be at the expense of Albanians. I can tell the Albanians if Kosovo that nobody has ever found it difficult to live in Serbia because he is not Serbian. Serbia has always been open to everybody to the homeless, to the poor and the rich alike, to the happy and the desperate, to those who were only passing through and to those who wanted to stay.

All Albanians in Kosovo who trust other people and who respect the other people living in Kosovo and Serbia are in their own country. I ask them now to rally against the evil and hatred of their own chauvinists, because they bring evil not only to Serbs and Montenegrins, but also to their own Albanian people. They embarrass their people in front of the entire world, shame it before its children, and offend its dignity. For the sake of all this, I call on the Albanians throughout Kosovo and say to them that Albanian mothers and fathers should tend to peaceful dreams, calm schooling, and carefree games of Serb and Montenegrin girls and boys instead of militia and army units. Terror and hatred run riot in Kosovo today, and Kosovo is in our country of Yugoslavia.

Comrades, the day after tomorrow, a conference of the Serbian LC will open here. This conference is devoted to reforms. The reform which we need to carry out concerns great social changes which should take place as soon as possible. The most important changes should take place in the field of economy. These changes should raise the standard of living of all of society and every individual. As far as the political system is concerned, the changes should establish unity in Serbia as a republic, and its equality with other republics in Yugoslavia. The reforms should improve and remedy everything that is of importance to people’s lives: prices, medical care, education, and the information system. ... This is a great programme and we shall achieve it if we remain resolute and united as we have been in the last few months and here today. Today, when Yugoslavia is experiencing difficulties, we should all raise our voice together, rouse our hearts, use our brains and unite our forces in order to preserve our country.

Yugoslavia was created through a great struggle and will defend itself through a great struggle. Long live all comrades gathered here at the meeting for brotherhood and unity, for Yugoslavia, and for better days!

Source E
Excerpts from the speech by Milošević at Gazimestan, Kosovo, 28 June 1989 (the 600th anniversary of the Battle of the Blackbirds between Serbian and Ottoman forces).

At the time when this famous historical battle was fought in Kosovo, the people were looking at the stars, expecting aid from them. Now, six centuries later, they are looking at the stars again, waiting to conquer them. On the first occasion, they could allow themselves to be disunited and to have hatred and treason because they lived in smaller, weakly interlinked worlds. Now, as people on this planet, they cannot conquer even their own planet if they are not united, let alone other planets, unless they live in mutual harmony and solidarity.

Therefore, words devoted to unity, solidarity, and cooperation among people have no greater significance anywhere on the soil of our motherland than they have here in the field of Kosovo, which is a symbol of disunity and treason. In the memory of the Serbian people, this disunity was decisive in causing the loss of the battle and in bringing about the fate which Serbia suffered for a full six centuries. Even if it were not so, from a historical point of view, it remains certain that the people regarded disunity as its greatest disaster. Therefore it is the obligation of the people to remove disunity, so that they may protect themselves from defeats, failures, and stagnation in the future.

Six centuries later, now, we are being again engaged in battles and are facing battles. They are not armed battles, although such things cannot be excluded yet ... Our chief battle now concerns implementing the
First question, part a – 3 marks
According to Milošević in Source A, the main reasons why "Terror and Kosovo today", and to what does he attribute problems in Kosovo?

First question, part b – 2 marks
What is the message of Source A?

First question, part c – 3 marks
Source B states that "Milošević’s speeches were never nationalistic, nor did they contain any racism". Through an examination of Source C, how far is this claim accurate regarding both nationalism and racism?

Second question – 4 marks
With reference to its origin, purpose and content, assess the values and limitations of Source C for someone looking at ethnic issues in the former Yugoslavia.

Third question – 6 marks
Compare and contrast Sources C, D and E with regard to what support each has for the proposal that keeping the Yugoslav Federation together was a key aim of Milošević in these speeches.

Fourth question – 9 marks
Using the sources and your own knowledge, how far can it be said that Kosovo lies at the heart of an understanding of its importance to Serbia as a nation?
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