

Vane Ivanović

YUGOSLAV DEMOCRACY ON HOLD

First Edition – February 1996

Published by:
“DODIR” d.o.o.
Liburnijska 6
51000 Rijeka
CROATIA

Copyright – by “DODIR” d.o.o.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

EDITORS
Dr.sc. Marko Ivanović
Petar Ladjević

COVER DESIGN
Jelena Trpković

BOOK DESIGN
“ARCODE” Zagreb

PRINTED BY
“TISKARA JARŽA” d.o.o.
Zagreb, CROATIA

UDK: 323 (497.1) “194/199” & 327 (497.1) “194/197”

ISBN 953-96765-0-9

960209012

Vane Ivanović

YUGOSLAV DEMOCRACY ON HOLD

“DODIR”
Rijeka, 1996

This book is dedicated to:

The participants at the Meeting in March 1963, on the Stansted Estate in England, who there signed the Outline of a proposal for a democratic alternative in Yugoslavia. They were - **Božidar Vlajić, Miha Krek, Branko Pešelj, Franjo Sekolec, Ilija Jukić, Dušan V. Popović, Miodrag Djordjević, Vladimir Predavec, France Čretnik, Vane Ivanović and Desimir Tošić.**

In the course of private and public debates that followed some of the Stansted initiators died. Others joined what had become the Executive board.

The signatories of the final text published in February 1982 in London, that became known as the

Democratic Alternative

were: **Branko Pešelj, Franjo Sekolec, Desimir Tošić, Vladimir Predavec, Vane Ivanović, Bogoljub Kočović, Teufik Velagić and Nenad Petrović.**

I wish in particular to record here the prominent role played throughout the two decades by my distinguished friend

DESIMIR TOŠIĆ

Individualist. Democrat.

Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.

FOREWORD

Sjene mrtvih kraljeva u oklopu, u dekoru historijskog romanti~nog sjaja, s mačevima presvučenima baršunom, progovarale su o Slobodi, o Viteštvu, o političkim Idejama "Nezavisnosti i Samostalnosti narodne"...

On a stage of romantic, historic splendour, the ghosts of dead kings in suits or armour, velvet-clad swords in hand, began to speak of Freedom, of Chivalry, of the political Ideas of "national Independence and Autonomy"...

Miroslav Krleža, Essays V

Blood-spattered walls and torn human flesh, endless columns of dedrabbled civilians trudging through wasted landscapes, bloated bodies, both man and beast, rotting by roads or gliding down rivers, hollow faces and empty eyes, broken lives - this has been the backdrop for the drama of nation-state building among the South Slavs in recent years. The picture sear the brain; the terms chill the blood: ethnic cleansing, ethnically pure ...

The world watches: the horror will pass ... surely? It did before, didn't it? And beyond it, a truth will come, won't it? But when thousands upon thousands of bodies are flung into pits, it's the truth that's being buried. When a library rages in flames in Sarajevo, it's the truth, historic truth, that's scattered across the sky. In the lands of South Slavs, with each new Idea, a new truth. Old truths, layer upon layer, fill the pits. History spins down in a vortex of deafening claim and counter-claim; the only common ground she finds as foothold is xenophobic: the Turks are to blame ... Austro-Hungarian oppression ... it's the Americans' fault ...

The reliable chronicler alone can hardly still the vortex. But when the chronicler is shown to be prescient, the chances grow. And when the chronicle is imbued by passionate campaign for tolerance and understanding, they surely grow still more. In Vane Ivanovi} it was the certain knowledge that Yugoslavia could not break apart without violence and bloodshed that fuelled this campaign. It's the world's shame that it paid it insufficient attention.

Gregor Fulton McGregor
London January 1996

THE DEEPFROZEN DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE FOR YUGOSLAVIA

Trough the development of the media of public information and in particular television, most of the Earth's population is able actually to witness events that in the future are bound to be described as historic. Among those that we shall remember are the first steps man made on the moon, several wars, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of communist rule in Eastern Europe.

In the state of Yugoslavia communist rule did not collapse through violence or as a result of massive public demonstrations. The governing machine simply gave up ruling. But, as elsewhere in Eastern Europe, many of the communist leaders in the several component nations simply transformed themselves into vociferous nationalist tribunes and so retained the levers of power.

The paramount such lever was the enormous wealth hitherto controlled by the communist party, stemming from the original confiscation of land and other property and its decades' long control of the economy. A vitally important part of this controlled property - the so called "social" property - were newspapers, magazines and their distribution, book publishing, radio and television.

Thus, nationalism (the most powerful of the forces that toppled communist power) was harnessed by the ex-communist leaders themselves in order to foster the crystallisation of separate nations. By way of controlled media they organised popular approval of extreme nationalist programmes. In the resulting flowering of nationalist euphorias Yugoslavia broke up. The inevitable grabbing of land among independent states and attempts to secure their frontiers by force followed as night follows day.

The violent conflicts and tragedies that followed them have been widely and in detail reported by the world's media, as have the attempts by European and world organisations to restore peace and help those who were suffering.

This book is not another contribution to the sad accounts of the present day. Nor is its purpose to try to enquire and establish why the violent conflicts did erupt.

The publication in 1995/6 of a book on the deep frozen Democratic Alternative to Yugoslavia must at first sight appear to be broadcasting of a lost cause. It is quite true that in present circumstances any kind of union of the South Slav nations, freely conceived and constitutionally brought into reality to exist in conditions of individual and communal liberty of law and order, is at best in a state of narcosis.

Why then tell the story of an unsuccessful attempt to propose a peaceful and democratic way of establishing a modus vivendi tolerable and useful for all the nations of Yugoslavia?

A glimpse of what was desirable and possibly achievable in peace and freedom might nevertheless prove to be of help to the coming generations of South Slav when they, as they must, reconstruct their lives. They might well reconsider the advantages for the South Slavs of mutual harmony in their relations with non-Slav neighbours and the world's great powers over the practice of mutual extermination.

This edition in the English language might at the same time remind those who act for future. Great powers that paying heed only to the loudest and roughest in the Balkans does not necessarily lead to long term settlements.

It would not be the first time in human history that, after wounding emotional explosions, healing and revival soon followed. The instinct for self preservation must sooner or later alert men and women to its most potent and lasting means - respect and tolerance, among kith and chins and close neighbours. But of course, common sense must also be a factor.

This, the shortest possible story of the unattained Democratic Alternative for the nations and lands of the South Slavs should be viewed as a contribution to this latter, alas up to now a minor, factor - common sense.

At the conference at Yalta in February 1945 communist dominion over Yugoslavia was acknowledged by the Governments of the United States, of Great Britain and of the Soviet Union. Early in 1946, after an election for the constituent assembly (described at the time by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr Clement Attlee, as a one-horse race) communist Yugoslavia achieved recognition.

Among many others I refused to recognise such a state. Realising that as an individual I was quite powerless to influence any of the world's Great Power or, indeed, any of the members of the United Nations, which organisation had accepted communist Yugoslavia as its founder member, I had no alternative but to seek political asylum in Great Britain where I had been a legal resident since 1925 and in whose armed forces I had volunteered to serve during the Second World War. I was accepted as a political exile in Great Britain.

I re-started the family shipping business and benefiting from the civil and political freedom obtaining in Great Britain took part in some peaceful exile political activities. These will be dealt with in this book chronologically.

My principal activity was in connection with a proposal for democratic reform of the communist dominated state of Yugoslavia by peaceful means. It became known as the Democratic Alternative for Yugoslavia. It is now deep frozen and awaits re-consideration by future generations of South Slavs.

In this early article, submitted late in 1949 to several publications in Britain but never published, I defined Titoism in the following words: "Titoism is the successful defiance of Moscow by a communist ruler and not the heresy of independent thinking"

As was seen in this article the West did decide to support the Titois regime on the ground that the survival of Titoist communist Yugoslavia was the only way of preventing the territory of Yugoslavia from falling under Kremlin's control. Moreover the West thought, contrary to my view, that the survival of Tito would have in the long run a decisive effect in fostering theoretical confusion in the communist dominated world.

Peace and the independence of Yugoslavia were indeed preserved until the fall of communism in the Soviet Union itself. But the failure to support any possible shift of power from Titoists to such Yugoslavs as might be able to broaden the basis of power in Yugoslavia. The crisis of Titoism produced the collapse of Yugoslavia in 1991 with no internal forces ready to prevent the nationalist hysteria, principally among Serbs and Croats, turning liberation from communism into the tragedies witnessed by the rest of the world.

THE COMING CRISIS OF TITOISM

Stalin's plan for world wide Communist revolution rested upon the fundamental proposition that non-Russian States, under the control of local Communist parties and using Soviet methods of wielding power, would continue to act in unison with the Kremlin. The plan called for the establishment, along the boundaries of European Russia, of a series of States under the tight-fisted control of Communist leaders chosen by Moscow. In the first place these States would serve as spring-boards for further political and physical expansion towards the West, and in the second place as buffer areas, in case the Soviet Government found itself on the defensive.

Tito and the Communist Party of Yugoslavia have now demonstrated that such thinking is not infallible. Although Yugoslavia is still under a Government on the Soviet Model, dominated by the Communist Party through control of the public and secret Police and Army, she is no longer a member of the Russian group of countries. The problem which confronted Tito and his associates in the consolidation of their power over the people and State of Yugoslavia proved to be very similar to those which have faced all who had previously sought to impose their will over large portions of the Balkans. To maintain their rule, they were soon forced to act in a manner which was convenient to the Yugoslav Communist Party only. Tito was at first unable to adhere to the timetable for socialisation agreed with Moscow and finally unwilling to accept the Kremlin's orders when differences arose.

Hitherto "deviationists" were either in the area of the Kremlin's physical power, in which case they were forced to capitulate, or they were abandoned as discredited, powerless individuals in an unfriendly outside world. But now for the first time, the policy makers in Moscow found recalcitrant Communist in charge of their own pyramid of power. Tito had been given an opportunity to build his own Police and Army and, through his control of such a State machine, his defiance became the defiance not of one Communist or of a clique within the Party, but of a State. Tito's refusal to relinquish to the Russian control of the Police and Army, i.e., the State of Yugoslavia, is the very essence of their quarrel. This is the true meaning of "Titoism".

Titoism is the successful defiance of Moscow by a Communist ruler and not the heresy of independent thinking. Communists, like other human beings, have never succeeded in producing even two individuals who thought exactly alike. Intense quarrels on theoretical issues have, indeed, been a phenomenon noticeable in all phases of the movement's history. Moscow's success so far in establishing herself as the fountainhead of all theory and the ultimate authority on dogma is not because she was always theoretically convincing, but because she was able to impose her doctrines and its interpretation.

To those of us desirous of seeing the world free from the Communist danger, the interest in Titoism must lie in assessing what effect this schism has had on Communist parties in the West, where they are not in power, and what the other Communist dominated States have done to follow the Yugoslav example.

Effect in the West

It is seventeen months now since the quarrel became known to the public in the West and longer since Communist leaders knew of it. Small groups of Italian and French Communist have defied their Parties' bans upon visiting Belgrade and there has been news of the attempt to establish a German National Communist Party in the Western Sector of Berlin. There have also been rumours that Maurice Thorez has been disciplined for "nationalist deviation" for the second time recently by the French Party and that Palmiro Togliatti is under suspicion by the Italian Party.

Thousands of Communists have probably always feared that Communism can in practice only be achieved at the price of total subservience to Moscow. Tito's experience has only confirmed their worst suspicions, but they prefer Communism even on Stalin's terms to no Communist at all. Whether or not Tito's mortal sin - the survival of the doctrine of the equality of Communist Parties and the independence of Communist State - is an effective force among Western Communists could only be demonstrated after France, Italy or the whole of Germany became Communist States. True, Communism in the West have lost ground, but only among non-Communists. Some loss of sympathy in the ranks of non-Communist Labour could be attributed to the quarrel. The Party had much influence with woolly-minded but articulate Left Wing intellectuals who believed that the Communists were only an ardent coterie of social reformers. The embarrassment they suffered at continuing to be identified with Kremlin's palpable Imperialism was getting more acute daily. Tito's retorts to Moscow's angry accusations have provided them with ample material to rationalise their timely escape from further travel with Stalin. Many other non-Communists have, for a variety of reasons, raised their voices in praise of Tito. Much has been made of these conversions, but one must point out Stalinists still hold the Western Communist Parties well in hand.

Consolidation in the East

In Eastern Europe, Moscow-trained Communist leaders were installed in power by the Red Army after it had wrested national territories from the Germans. The Russians secured satisfactory control of the police and armies more or less as they liked. Although Titoism soon caused some unrest among the new rulers, the purges in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary speedily imposed total obedience to the Kremlin. But the recent appointment of Marshal Rokossovsky, Soviet Russia has shown that she no longer cares how things look as long as complete dominion is maintained. Except, perhaps, for small isolated Albania, there will be no more Titos.

Why, then, is Titoism considered to be so important by informed political opinion in the West in spite of its failure to undermine the present effective strength of Communism? The one important result of Tito's defiance is the removal of the territory of Yugoslavia from Moscow's control. Owing to the geographical position of Yugoslavia, this fact may have tremendous strategic and political consequences for the Kremlin. Yugoslavia is no longer a springboard for further Russian advances to the West. She may have to be written off as buffer. Worse still, Soviet military men may have to view the Yugoslav departure from their orbit as the first operation towards the unhinging of their whole position in Europe.

Titoism Battles for Survival

True, the population of Yugoslavia is whole-heartedly against the Soviet Russians. But this takes nothing away from their hatred of Tito and his brutal and thorough despotism. At the same time, it is difficult to see Moscow abandoning efforts to bring Yugoslavia back into her fold. With such formidable enemies from within and without, can Tito possibly survive?

His sole chance of outliving the approaching crisis lies in his ability to involve the West in a commitment to support his regime as such. He must succeed in diverting attention from his failure to be really effective as a recalcitrant Communist and persuade statesmen in the West that the survival of his rule was the only

way of preventing the territory of Yugoslavia from falling under the Kremlin's control. But as long as dominion over Yugoslavia is exercised by means of a Communist system with a few men at the top of the pyramid of power, there is constant danger that Moscow may gain complete control of the whole country by deposing this small group of leaders through political manoeuvre, economic pressure or assassination. Stalin can capture this centralised political machine and thus the Yugoslav State without the risk of a general war. The reimposition of the Stalinist fiat in Yugoslavia would be a triumph for the Soviet Union worth immeasurably more at this time than the immediate advantage of the establishment of Russian military power on the Mediterranean. Thus it will be difficult to persuade Western statesmen that Tito's shaky position on the top of his pyramid of power is anything but a menace of the greatest degree also to their world-wide interests. They are beginning to realise that to support such an unstable equilibrium is not in any sense a wise investment. They cannot for any length of time give unconditional aid to such risky enterprise. Western policy makers will have to find other guarantees for Yugoslavia's independence.

Tito will thus remain surrounded by enemies and unable to convince the West of his ability to stay in power. In these circumstances, it will become apparent that the more widely power is spread in Yugoslavia, the less effective can drastic action by Moscow be. The West may find that the only way of preventing Titoism from becoming after all a Moscow victory is by encouraging a shift of power from Titoists to such Yugoslavs as would be able to broaden the basis of power in the country.

The test of Western statesmanship will come as Tito's critical days approach. Whilst in power he could, if he becomes desperate, provoke a general war. Can British and American statesmen succeed in preserving peace and the independence of Yugoslavia while their policy changes from mere support of Titoism to helping reliable anti-Soviet forces in the country to manifest themselves and become effective?

In 1957 I edited and published a book in our language in London. It was an attempt to present the case in favour of the preservation of the union of South Slavs notwithstanding the experiences of the Yugoslav state, the first mainly under the dictatorship of King Aleksandar and the second entirely under the communist rule. I give here my foreword to the book the title of which the author chose from my foreword: "Većeslav Vilder has seized the crazed bull of our nationalisms by its horns"

THE BULL BY THE HORNS, by VEĆESLAV VILDER, 1957
FOREWORD BY THE PUBLISHER

This book does not need a foreword to introduce the writer. Većeslav Vilder has been on the political scene for the past half-a-century. For younger readers there are a few words about his political work at the end of the book.

There are three distinctive features of Većeslav Vilder's political life and work which clearly set him apart from ordinary people. Vilder has never been afraid of anyone and everything he has done has been done out of absolute conviction. Having stood out himself as a young man, he never failed in later life to listen to and try to understand those younger than he, and he has always been of cheerful disposition and fresh spirit.

Like Churchill in England, to his opponents he remains, even in old age, the *enfant terrible* of our political life. To his friends his is an eloquent voice, albeit one that cries in the wilderness. To this day he remains true to both these traits. The important thing in this book is that Većeslav Vilder has seized the crazed bull of our nationalisms by its horns, and he has done so with both hands.

Everyone who reads this book will realise the strength of Većeslav Vilder, because he profoundly believes in what he advocates. Here he speaks to a younger generation to whom, with this book, he bequeaths his political testament. There is no doubt that many people will accept his ideas.

If the writer says little about the Slovenes in this book that is merely because he has focused all his talent and thoughts on the most painful part of our tragedy, where the truth first needs heroically to be revealed.

Like families, every nation has its ups and downs. In the generation which is now dying out our people gave birth to a sterile monster. Out of the idealism and reason with which the concept of the Yugoslav nation was created under Austria-Hungary and in old Serbia - a concept with which we could stand proud before the entire civilised world and with which we set an example to many nations whose self-awareness post-dated our own - were born the Siamese twins of Serbian and Croatian nationalism. Through their common circulatory system these twins inherited the same national virtues and faults as their healthy and normal siblings. Their blood travels through their joint veins to their separate heads and brains, and so today their separate voices are the loudest that are heard.

In this book the reader will see how this infant survived and grew up. It was delivered with the help of both our own and foreign midwives. This ungainly two-headed body which should have been left to die on its own was fed by many well-intentioned people who viewed each half-person as a suffering brother. Soon this feeding turned into a profession for some and a trade for others, until the two wretches' cries and screams were transmitted and written about by others, many of whom were nothing more than professional Croats and professional Serbs.

Small, closely-knit national units, which also happen to be intermixed and situated in our part of Europe, are bound to have their disagreements constantly exploited (objectively one minute and subjectively the

next) by their own people or by others who are larger and more powerful. This generation teems with examples of how our discord caused suffering to all of us, be it real or imaginary. Austria divided and ruled us; the Croats consider themselves deceived and exploited by Belgrade, which was not of much use to the Serbs either. Objectively speaking, the Croats were in an impossible situation in the first Yugoslavia. The Serbs blame Croat disloyalty for the disaster of 1941 (to which they themselves mightily contributed). It must be said that Serbs later died in thousands as victims of Ustasha violence. As a result of our discord we also suffered more than necessary at the hands of the Germans, Hungarians, Italians and Bulgarians. And now, partly due to our discord, we accuse our Allies of having betrayed us. During the war, our divisiveness helped the communists to abuse our desire for liberation and we fell from one form of slavery into another.

If we compare 19th century Serbs and Croats with the people produced by the present adult generation in different versions of the blue-white-and-red flag, it is no wonder, with such a leadership, that God does not seem to be with the Croats nor is He protecting Serbia.

Fortunately, for all its vital human instincts, this freak of Siamese twins is intrinsically incapable of self-reproduction. The struggle to preserve separate and strident Serbian and Croatian nationalisms and to pass them on to new generations therefore must, in the long run, prove to be sterile.

By their very nature, such forms of nationalism must always primarily be mutually antagonistic. That is why they cannot step onto the European scene ready to adjust to modern European trends, trends which are leading us to the integration of our entire continent and to new concepts of the state. They have to fight and think with obsolete weapons and ideas since they are themselves obsolete. When they talk about the state, both Serbian and Croatian nationalists constantly contradict themselves. One minute they advocate the territorial concept of the state and the next they advocate the ethnic concept. Bosnia-Herzegovina is the *reductio ad absurdum* of this Serbian and Croatian paranoia.

Unfortunately, even ordinary Serbs and Croats, and they account for the large majority of our peasantry, suffer from this madness afflicting our towns. Of course, when this caricature of nationalism and national development held sway insufficient attention was paid to social upheaval and to economic development. As a result, many of our best young people were won over by the communists. Today it is obvious to all of us, and to many of them, that the communist order set us back in almost every field of national life.

We have wasted half a century, trapped in the dead-end of our two nationalisms, beating our heads against the problem of who and what we are, while other European nations confronted a new great problem we have yet to contemplate.

Others have already recognised that nothing or little was resolved when, after gaining the right to national self-determination, the newly determined nation achieves sovereignty in the form of a national state. The separate, sovereign states of Serbia and Croatia would not offer a solution, even if peaceful divorce were feasible. What do the Poles and Hungarians, to mention two homogeneous nations, have as a result of their national sovereignty and of the fact that they are now living in universally recognised states, with Poland even a founding member of the United Nations? It is this very sovereignty of the Polish state that deprives the Poles' friends of the right to take an interest in the circumstances under which Poles today live. One might say that the regime in present-day Poland has been simply forced upon the Poles against their will and that we - friends of personal and religious freedoms - do not "recognise" that regime, but that does not make things one bit easier for the Poles.

We must totally rethink our political ideas. Once we clarify our notion about who and what we are (and it is the purpose of this book to help us do so), we should know what to do with this notion as we have defined it. Moreover, without an entirely clear idea about the areas that no Government, even if genuinely democratic (meaning it reflects the will of the majority) - *must ever tamper with*, we cannot expect national Yugoslav harmony, let alone mutual Serbian and Croatian harmony. Otherwise we shall again become

slaves to our own despots. Surely we have learned this lesson from the example of the present Polish state and present-day Yugoslavia.

What we must know and never forget is that in England and America, for instance, it was not their national self-determination, nor their sovereignty nor their parliamentary democracy that have allowed the Anglo-Saxons to live so long as free people. Individual and religious freedom, the right of "habeas corpus", an independent judiciary, the fundamental rule of law - these are all notions that are for these nations older, much older, than those of nationality, the system of universal suffrage and respect of majority rule. True parliamentary democracy and modern state sovereignty are possible only in an environment where no one can, and the vast majority never even wants to, tamper with these "ancient rights".

It is we the small nations, who in the age of the hydrogen and atom bomb no longer really possess one of the most important attributes for the survival of the state - the ability to secure and defend one's national territory - who should pioneer new ideas. We should demand universal recognition for the right of the United Nations, or the European Union, or even the well-intentioned Great Powers, to intervene in our country if and when a regime wished to deprive us of these "ancient rights". The Great Powers will have no peace until they realise that it is in their own vital and immediate interest, in the absence of anyone else, for them to guarantee these "ancient rights" to every last peasant in the Balkans, whatever state that peasant may live in.

Only when we bury our tragic Siamese twins, and free ourselves of those whose political careers flourished in the soil of our madness, and whose personal abilities would greatly limit their ability to earn a living anywhere other than on the back of their nation, will we, with all our natural talents and hard experience, be able to contribute again to Europe and the world on a par with our 19th century compatriots. Većeslav Vilder gives us a light and a mirror with which first to recognise ourselves and then to lead new generations into a future where we will not have to struggle every few decades to reclaim the basic achievements of civilised life.

The Study centre for Yugoslav Affairs, of which I was one of the founder, published this article in its REVIEW in 1962. I introduced my text in this words:

The phrases 'sitting behind the Maginot Line' and "Maginot Line mentality' have come to denote, since the brutal awakening in the summer of 1940, a fatally dangerous state of mind. Satisfied with the state of its defences and its general outlook, a nation through misinformation or inertia disregard patent facts about activities and intentions of potential enemies and even refuses to recognise them as such.

I fear that Western nations today may be in grave peril by regarding Communist Yugoslavia as a valid line of defence against International Communism standing behind it.

I propose to analyse this self-delusion and discuss the consequences already apparent to all who do not shut their eyes to them.

In an attempt to drive my point home I shall compare Western policy towards Yugoslavia and its achievement with the Soviet Union's policy towards Cuba and its achievements in a tenth of time and with a tenth of the effort.

YUGOSLAVIA - THE NEW MAGINOT LINE

In the hundred years or so since the Industrial Revolution immense efforts have been made and much has been achieved by all of us in learning about the rest of humanity. In recent decades the techniques of information have reached new heights - the telegraph cable, the telephone, radio and television, printing developments and finally Telstar. Obviously the quantity of information grows daily everywhere.

But if the quantity of information is growing, does its quality improve a pace? What is the quality of political information on which public opinion is formed? Is it even reasonable to expect quality to rise with quantity?

In the case of all Communist ruled countries it is improbable that the immense increase in the quantity of new items and of general and specific information should be accompanied by a commensurate improvement of their quality.

Free writers and journalists reporting on Communist countries must trust intuition and draw conclusions from premises rather than know the full facts. What do we know today of debates that go on in the inner circle of the rulers of China? What do we know about what went on behind closed doors during the most recent meeting of Soviet and Yugoslav Communist during President Brezhnev's visit to Belgrade?

It may be true enough that the press and other means of broadcasting information are free in perhaps the majority of countries. But freedom of information does not necessarily bring objectivity or the whole truth. Accurate or fully truthful information requires not only much knowledge of the subject, but also freedom from prejudice and *arriere-pensees*.

What are our prejudices? Religious, class, political, national, historical. Are there any real signs of friction between Chinese and Russian Communist - or is it merely that we should like friction to exist? Do the words of Pandit Nehru merely appear to the most humane and pacifist or are they so in truth - as long as Kashmir or the defence of India are not at issue? Do the policies of Dr Adenauer sometimes seem disagreeable because they are disagreeable, or is it because he is the first German statesman of importance to appear while we still remember Hitler's Germany.

This problem of keeping public opinion in the free world truthfully and reliably informed seems to be beset with difficulties in the case of Yugoslavia since World War II.

* * *

There have been more books on Yugoslavia and its people in the last twenty years than in the preceding hundred. True enough, interest in Yugoslavia has grown, as it has for all countries and peoples hitherto 'little known'.

From the coup d'etat of 27th March 1941, which placed the country on the side of Allies, and up to the present time, Yugoslavia has been in the international spotlight more continually than any other comparable country in Europe or elsewhere. It has fallen to Yugoslavia to play a large role in the political field in the last two decades. This political significance stems from the fact that Western policy has given Yugoslavia a special place in its plans. (I shall discuss the aims and achievements of this policy later in this article. Here I am concerned with the question of information upon which policy is formed).

Western policy towards our country - often described as one of 'calculated risk' began at time of Teheran and Yalta, when it was popularly known as the policy of 'supporting both a Communist and a King'. It regathered momentum, as a result of the events of 1948, when Communist Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform. The Hungarian revolution and, more recently, the acrimonious debate between Soviet and Chinese Communists have given Yugoslavia further significance in the assessments and calculations of the West.

In the light of these events the problems they posed for those who decide Western policy, has the information on Yugoslavia been objective? Has it truly reflected what was happening in the country, to its people and their development, their economy and their aspirations for the future? Or has the information on Yugoslavia, or the larger part of it, been coloured in some degree by the policy already decided upon?

At the time of each reconsideration by the U.S. House and Senate of aid to Yugoslavia - still under unlimited Communist rule - the bright light of dispassionate scrutiny should be thrown not only on the information supplied by free journalist and writers but also on that supplied by Administration officials. The question of objectivity cannot be fairly answered otherwise.

In the course of our scrutiny, we must realise in the first place that the propaganda apparatus of the Yugoslav Government itself has the means to make a tremendous impact. It would not be difficult to show that Communist Yugoslavia possesses relatively the most powerful propaganda and information machine of any country including the richest - the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The sheer number of books published in foreign languages; the number of bulletins, pamphlets and journals in foreign languages, often published abroad; the host writers and political figures invited as guests of the Government, would surprise those who took the trouble to delve into the statistics.

Recent information, available to anyone who seeks it, shows that the Government, apart from the publication of a large number of books in almost all foreign languages of importance, produces regularly two ideological quarterlies, one in French and the other in English. It also produces the *Yugoslav Survey*, a quarterly in English full of documentary reports on developments in Yugoslavia. Further it publishes a monthly information magazine called *Yugoslav Life* in English, French, Russian and Spanish. The Government publishes the monthly review *International Affairs* with articles by foreigners and also a *Magazine Review*. Apart from host of specialist trade, financial and scientific journals, many also in foreign languages, it publishes *Service d'Information* containing some 200 to 250 articles in the course of a year by politicians, economists, scientists, art critics and journalists who discuss various aspects of life in Yugoslavia, as well as speeches and articles by high Yugoslav Government officials. In addition, *Service d'Information* produces throughout the year a series of items giving basic information on various internal problems.¹

¹ 'Petit manuel statistique de la Yougoslavie', 1961, published by The Federal Statistical Institute, Belgrade

Even those with the most cursory acquaintance of present Yugoslavia know that the established order and all dissemination of information are not subject to any control on the part of the citizens. One Party, the Communist, rules; and the Government, the so-called Parliament, and all dissemination of news are exclusively in the hands of Party members. We must not forget that such is not the case even in Communist Poland.

Could anybody at all objectively assert that information coming out of Yugoslavia should not, therefore, be subjected *a priori* to guarded scrutiny or criticism? Does not all this information, by its very volume and persistence, influence to some degree the views and attitudes of foreigners as they are published in the free press of the world? We take no account here of the incalculable indirect effort, engendered in an atmosphere of cordiality and *bonhomie*, which results from the vast number of official or semi-official visits by foreigners - trade union representatives, political figures, scientists and Government officials.

This much must be said about the serious danger of over-simplified and even naive dissemination of doctored news.

But to come to a vastly more important point. There is some evidence that, as an outgrowth of what is the established Western policy - the oft proclaimed policy of taking a political and diplomatic risk on possible developments in Yugoslavia - there has been either consciously or unconsciously a persistent playing down not to say actual obscuring of certain facts and trends in Yugoslavia.

We are not concerned with minor events or with the fact that much that happens in Yugoslavia is simply not newsworthy for readers in the free world. We shall refer to some items, the faulty reporting of which has contributed to simple ignorance in the West of developments in Yugoslavia. But the failure to report other important matters, such as the following, has contributed to the positive luring of Western public opinion into making assessments of the situation in Yugoslavia that are quite erroneous.

(I) Let us begin with the year 1948; for that was a famous year. Most Western journalists and news analysts claim that in June 1948 the Yugoslav Communists refused to knuckle under to the Soviets. When, however, one delves a little more deeply into official (and published) Yugoslav documents, one can see how hard the Yugoslav Communists tried for more than a year to be received back into the Communist fold, then dominated by Stalin, and how they tried to justify their actions and to explain their stand. True, it was brave enough not to obey Stalin in everything, an attitude incidentally also taken by French and Bulgarian Communists. But it should not be forgotten that Yugoslavia is furthest West from the Soviet Union of all Communist countries. Her chances of keeping away from Russian domination were at all times better than those of Poland and Rumania. The present situation of Albania *vis-a-vis* the Soviet Union confirms the advantage of distance.

Yet, among those who influence public opinion in the West, it would be difficult to find many who today believe that Tito tried his hardest to patch up the quarrel and avoid formal expulsion from the Cominform. Indeed Tito's open or concealed enmity to the Soviet Union is taken as a starting point of all assessments.

(II) What proportion of the public in the free world knows or remembers that at the time of the fiercest attacks of Stalin's propaganda on them the Yugoslav Communists were actually organising out their large scale of collectivisation of agriculture?²

At the very time of the first massive American aid, Yugoslav Communists initiated the most radical agricultural policy they themselves ever attempted since seizing power in 1945. The measures adopted were more far reaching than in any Communist country except China. The average citizen in Yugoslavia could not imagine that it was not known in the West that the Western powers, and in particular the United States, were financing and making it possible the forced and bloody collectivisation of agriculture by the Yugoslav Communists. The policy of collectivisation was only abandoned when the resistance of the peasants brought agriculture to a standstill. Western reporters were content to ascribe the disaster of

² 'Collectivisation in Yugoslavia' by Desimir Toshitch, published in the *Journal of Farm Economics*, vol. XII, No 1, 1959

Yugoslav agriculture, as they now do with Chinese agriculture, to successive droughts. In Yugoslavia the droughts, particularly in the Voivodina, the richest agricultural region, were chiefly due to the refusal of peasants to co-operate in large scale irrigation to cope with rainless summers, a most usual occurrence.

(III) Who in the West knows that the present Vice-Premier, Aleksandar Ranković, declared on 3 June 1951 that 47 per cent of all arrests carried out in Yugoslavia during 1949 had been made illegally³ even from the standpoint of the then existing Communist laws?

(IV) Who will recall that the same Mr Ranković invited on 29 December 1951 the 50,000 émigrés from Yugoslavia to return home with the promise of an amnesty?⁴ Yet in March 1962 Mr Ranković submitted a report to the Interior Affairs Committee of the Federal Executive Council (the name for the Cabinet of Ministers) in which he raised the number of émigrés to 150,000.⁵ (Incidentally it amnestied persons who fought on the enemy side in the War almost on the very day that the former Partisan General Milovan Djilas landed in jail for the third time, merely for intending to publish a book.) For the first time, in 1962, the regime admitted that the term 'émigrés' included those who had escaped from Yugoslavia *after* the establishment of Communism in 1945. A writer in the Government daily newspaper⁶ gave as the sole reason for such flights to Western countries 'complexes of fear due to strong propaganda against the new Yugoslavia ... fortune hunting ... unsettled economic ... or family circumstances.'

We saw only the barest mention in the Western press of this illegal emigration which assumed massive proportions after 1948. Yet much praise was lavished on the Communist Government for its magnanimity in decreeing the Amnesty.⁷

(V) The Western press and other news sources passed in silence over another remarkable admission by Yugoslav Government. President Tito himself spoke in April 1959 to the Federal Executive Council.⁸ He said that from 1954 to 1957 2,178,000 persons were 'administratively sentenced' (Communist jargon for sentenced without trial) or arrested, of whom over 1 million were sentenced for 'disturbing the public peace'.

In 1954 Yugoslavia had a little over 17 million inhabitants. This means that in the course of four years one in every four citizens, (excluding minors), had been in prison. The Communists today constantly reiterate that between 1934 and 1939, in the days of the Royal Government, 3,000 Communists were arrested. We have under Communism quite an improvement in the technique of keeping the public peace.

(VI) There is much exaggeration on the subject of cultural freedom in Yugoslavia in the reports of foreign correspondents, They forget that the cultural traditions of the peoples of Yugoslavia have for centuries derived largely from Western nations, not only from neighbouring Italy and Germany, but also from the French and English. It is no achievement of the present regime that these Western cultures should still have a strong influence.

It is rather a reflection of the resilience of the people in the country to the aims of the Communist regime.

A significant declaration by Milentije Popović, the Communist leader, gives the Communist view on cultural freedom. In an address to students of Novi Sad University in April 1962⁹ he said: -

³ Politika, 4 June 1951

⁴ Politika, 30 December 1951

⁵ Borba, 14 March 1962

⁶ Borba, 15 March 1962

⁷ 'European Refugee Problem', a special report by the Zellerbach Commission on the European Refugee Situation, New York, 1959. This report notes that (a) in 1948 alone 12,000 people ran away from Yugoslavia and that in 1957 the number was twice as large, (b) that over 80 per cent of refugees from Yugoslavia were under 25 years old and (c) that international refugees organisations had begun to classify this emigration, the largest after those then escaping from Eastern Germany, as an 'economic emigration' and that some Governments were refusing them the right of asylum and forcibly returning them to Yugoslavia. On this subject there was a sympathetic report published by a British journalist, Mr Robert Kee, 'Refugee World', London, 1969

⁸ Borba, 20 April 1959

⁹ Borba, 30 April and 1/2 May 1962.

The League of Communists cannot permit any philosophy, any literature or any art to question or even to discuss these ethical values (he was referring to the ethical values manifested by the Communist organised Partisan rising in 1941 - Editor's note), Any such philosophy may be as formally and logically composed as it wishes to be; any such literature may be as full of formal aesthetic virtuosity as it can possibly be. We cannot tolerate either. We must destroy them both for the very simple reason that they are in contradiction with our ethical principles and this means that they are more than merely untruthful. Nor can the League of Communists permit that under the guise of some philosophical or artistically creative work attempts be made to rehabilitate those which were defeated during the preparation of our Revolution or by the act of the Revolution itself.

Need we say that these liberal thoughts on the subject of creative work in cultural, philosophical and artistic fields, publicly declared by those who possess the power of life and death in Yugoslavia, were not passed on by any foreigners to the public in the West?

(VII) A little earlier than Mr Milentije Popović, a young literary critic, Mr Dragoslav Grbić, wrote on the subject of artistic freedom¹⁰ 'For a single rhyme, the poet is not only criticised but often prosecuted. There are many examples. What is most horrible is that he has been banished from his artistic group by the very men most called upon to support him, solely because at a given time his vision of the world did not fit in with the world they were experiencing or could imagine'. A month after his article by Grbić, as though in witness of his words, the 27 year old poet Branko Miljković hanged himself.

But his suicide, of course, does not prove anything. More convincing - at least for Western observers - should be the view of President Tito himself. In July 1962 at the Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee of the League of Communist he said:

We certainly do not want to give lessons to writers nor tell them what they must write, but we shall not permit anyone to write nonsense and caricature or deface our socialised life.

A month earlier, when speaking to students of the Superior School for Political Sciences, Tito was much more categorical: 'You must always bear in mind that there exists only one view for our social development and that is the view of the Central Committee of the League of Communist'.¹²

We appreciate that the task of an objective reporter is not easy in dealing with matters to which we have so far draw attention. In a state where the police are all powerful it is difficult to check facts independently. Prison statistics are not available. Not everybody will talk freely to a stranger and all sources of information are in the hands of the Party.

The weight of the reports that have gone out, when set beside significant facts, the knowledge of which has not permeated to the West, demonstrates how it has come about that so much public opinion in the West simply will not believe that Yugoslavia is still in the hands of a devoted, disciplined and powerful Communist team.

But it is odd that in economic matters Western observers should have registered what is perhaps their grossest failure. For in this field facts are observable, trends can be noted and even statistics are plentiful. No conscientious observer should have been surprised by the revelations of the deep and serious economic crisis that were made at the beginning of 1962.

(VIII) Economic crises in Yugoslavia are as old as the Communist regime itself, but the earliest of the manifestly disastrous state today go back to the first days of 1961. This crisis began with the monetary reform whereby the rate of one U.S. dollar was uniformly fixed at 750 dinars. This important change caused an enormous rise in prices in general; it varied from 5 per cent minimum on some items to 85 per cent on others. But wages were increased only by 10 per cent. Moreover, while prices began rising steeply early in 1961, wage levels were not altered till 1962. For a whole year town dwellers had difficulties in making ends meet, more formidable even those in some other Communist countries for instance

¹⁰ Književne novine ('Literary News'), January 1961

¹² Borba, 22 June 1962

Czechoslovakia. In October 1962 there was a further general rise in wheat prices though, as we write, Government officials claim that this should not cause bread prices to go up at all.¹³

(IX) After long discussions on the economic situation among Communist leaders - the public is excluded from taking part in such matters - Party members were told of the reason for the crisis. A fall of production has been recorded in general, and of agricultural produce in particular. The economic plan for 1962 has fallen short by 230 billion Dinars, according to Communist leader Mr Miloš Minić. Of this sum almost 60 per cent was in the agricultural plan. This year, 1962, the plan is expected to fall short by 367 billion Dinars, of which agriculture will account for 200 billion.¹⁴

(X) Western reporters have asserted that in many cases Yugoslav agricultural production was rising, particularly in the so-called socialised farm units as opposed to individual farms. Contrary to this, the leading Communist agricultural expert Tikvicki declared before the Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee in the summer of 1962, 'latterly we have found that productivity has fallen appreciably in socialised farms. This cannot be solely explained away by the incidence of drought ...'¹⁵

(XI) The economic expert Krajerger said in the summer of 1962 that more than 92 per cent of the population of Yugoslavia had a monthly income of less than 40,000 (\$ 53.33 or .. 19).¹⁶

(XII) Western observers have often during the last decade stressed the significance of so-called workers' management. What was the contribution of this scheme to the birth and development of the crisis? In accordance with what Government representatives now say, it is clear that they take the view that it was just this system of workers' management in the field of profit distribution which greatly aggravated the crisis. In a time of rising prices, workers found it natural, since they could not strike, to raise their own wages. Such surplus wage distribution out of works' were often recorded on paper only. The cash payment of these bonuses had to wait interminably for the granting of credits through the machinery provided for firms with cash difficulties. But workers nevertheless went ahead with purchasing consumers goods on credit in expectation of cash distribution.

It is now clear that the present crisis brought about a critical reappraisal of the very concept of workers' management. Vice-Premier Kardelj firmly declared on 28 May 1962:

*We must not flinch from stronger administrative measures to bring order where it becomes necessary, so that a healthy and progressive socialist conception may take solid root in our social life and be protected from deformities... We embarked on this new system (The Act on the Distribution of Incomes 1961 - Editor's note) with a large dose of illusions that workers' committees and the Communes might by themselves be able to carry out the intentions of the new system of distribution without control or any organised help on the part of the governing Socialist institutions... There cannot be any self-management by workers or freedom without a corresponding overall socialised control over the fact that everyone may live within the framework of his set rights and not at the expense of others, There cannot be workers' management without centralisation and satisfactory control of those functions that have to be centralised.*¹⁷

Two months later, in July 1962, President Tito declared to the Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee: 'Factories cannot have uncontrolled power over the distribution of their assets or income, since this brings about frustration and deviation'¹⁸

Nobody should be confused by the apparent contradictions between these quoted passages and the much publicised system of workers' self-management. Communists have their own vocabulary and their own logic. Where for others there are evident contradictions, for them there may be none. They themselves have never considered that 'democratic centralism' may in any way be contradictory to

¹³ Politika, 10 April 1962. - Borba, 5 October 1962.

¹⁴ Borba, 24 July 1962.

¹⁵ Borba, 24 July 1962.

¹⁶ Borba, 27 July 1962.

¹⁷ Borba, 29 May 1962.

¹⁸ Borba, 24 July 1962

'economic decentralisation' . Indeed, it is Western observers who have publicised this 'economic decentralisation' much more than the Yugoslav Government itself.

At this same Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee in July 1962, President Tito revealed the stark truth behind these complicated contradictions of Communist terminology when he declared, 'I must say that administrative decentralisation and workers' self-management are one thing, and overall economic welfare is another. In the overall economic view there cannot be decentralisation in any country and so ours also must be one unit when economic welfare is in question.

On 7 April 1962 a new law¹⁹ was promulgated establishing Commissions at all levels, from the several federal Republics comprising Yugoslavia down to individual factories and enterprises, for the purpose of deciding the amount of net incomes for distribution in all enterprises in the country and the manner of distribution. The members of such Commissions are not appointed by the enterprises themselves or by their workers' committees, but by the Government authorities, the Government established trade unions, and the Government appointed councils of producers; that is, by men not themselves engaged in creating the income to be distributed.

The character of these Commissions and the instructions to their members in the actual text of the Law put a formal end to workers' management in Yugoslavia on 7 April 1962. The above quoted words by Vice-Premier Kardelj and President Tito were thus uttered in explanation of a *fait accompli*, after the Law has been passed.

Thus, almost totally unrecorded in the West, one more cherished illusion of well intentioned Western observers and one more propaganda item broadcast by the not so well intentioned has gone down the river.

(XII) What is the position of the Yugoslav economy? The amount of aid rendered by the West to Yugoslavia and her present huge deficit in the balance of payments are, or should be, publicly known facts.

Let us set out the position briefly. Pre-war Yugoslavia received in 23 years from 1918 to 1941 \$100 million in loans²⁰ , and no aid at all in the form of non-repayable gifts.

Present-day Communist Yugoslavia has received economic and military aid to the amount of about 3 billion dollars in 14 years, not counting U.N.R.A. aid. And what are the results of this aid in figures? A trading deficit in the balance of payments of 1 billion dollars. Industrial production rose 4 per cent instead of planned 12 per cent in 1961. Agricultural harvest figures were 19 per cent lower in 1962 than in 1961.²¹

Putting aside the trade deficit and the monumental agricultural failure, let us see how the latent sources of Yugoslavia have fared under the Communist Government.

In the consumption per person of various sources of energy, the overall figure for Yugoslavia from 1955 to 1958 rose more slowly than in Greece, Spain, Bulgaria or Eastern Germany!²² In steel consumption Yugoslavia is behind Rumania and Bulgaria, not to mention Czechoslovakia or Austria.²³

The percentage increase of industrial production from 1950 to 1958 was smaller in Yugoslavia than in Greece. In the use of artificial fertilisers Yugoslavia only just beats Portugal and Greece. In the use of

¹⁹ Borba, 9 July 1962, 'The law establishing commissions for the implementations of regulations on the distribution of net income of economic organisations and institutions'

²⁰ Les Informations Politiques et Sociales, 19 July 1962, Paris

²¹ Borba, 17 July 1962.

²² 'United Nations Statistical Yearbook', 1959, p.307.

²³ Ibidem, p. 313.

tractors per arable acre of land Yugoslavia is far behind Eire; in cement behind Greece, Portugal and Spain; in coke less than half of Spanish consumption, and in paper behind Greece, Spain and Bulgaria.²⁴

We have not invoked, of course, comparison with the more developed European countries; but these few figures may suffice to make the reader ponder where the 3 billion dollars on no-returnable aid have gone.

* * *

We have no illusions that this sad account of the real state of affairs in Yugoslavia will move many hearts. Nor is that our purpose.

The position has been well enough spotlighted here to show that public opinion on Yugoslavia has been quite inadequate and often influenced by Communist propaganda. Much of the information that did permeate to the West did not tally with the premises upon which Western policy was conceived. In conformity with the "maginot" state of mind, it seems to have been disregarded.

Members of Congress in the U.S. and parliamentarians in Western Europe must form such judgements as they can influence policy largely on the sort of information we have been questioning here.

Unless the Western Governments themselves rely entirely on secret information, they are also bound to be influenced by what turns out to be at best only some of the truth some of the time.

Had Western policy towards Yugoslavia been carefully formed, frequently reappraisal, and above all largely successful, these revelations would not be revelations and our words would have little point.

It would not be necessary then for us to prove beyond any reasonable doubt that the Government of Yugoslavia is not only as firmly Communist as it ever was, but that it is almost incredibly incompetent by any standards including its own.

It is not for us to question how the present Western policy came to be framed nor exactly how and at which times it should be reappraised, but we can assess its achievements.

We can briefly state the main elements and purposes of this policy as we understand it and test it by its result. The policy concerns our country and involves us and our future. As free democrats we claim the moral right and owe a patriotic duty to perform this task as publicly as we can.

It so happens that events in Cuba enable us to make an effective comparison with Soviet Union's policy and achievements there. Our assessment will therefore take the comparative form.

If in this comparison we single out United States rather than the West generally it is because in the case of Yugoslavia the United States have now for a long time been the leader in the execution of Western policy and its taxpayers have born the main burden. In the case of Cuba the United States of all the Western Powers is the one most immediately concerned.

The break between the Yugoslav and Soviet Communist in 1948 was a fortuitous and probably unforeseen windfall for the West, as was for the Soviet Union the seizure of power in Cuba by Castro who at first was anti-American only in a general way. The aims of each progressive step of United States policy towards Yugoslavia after the Tito-Stalin break may be summed up as follows:

1. *Containment.* The minimal object of containment of the Soviet Union and containment of international communism to the then existing spheres in so far as Yugoslavia was concerned.
2. *Detachment of Yugoslavia.* Encouragement of conditions in Yugoslavia chiefly by the granting of unconditional economic aid, in which divergence's in communist thought might grow between the Soviet

²⁴ 'Economic Survey of Europe', United Nations, Geneva, 1960. Chap. VII, and 'United Nations Statistical Yearbook', 1959.

Union and Yugoslavia. At the same time encouragement of the development of varying practices in Yugoslavia in order to crystallise any rifts in communist theory (there was also a hope expressed at a later stage, to alienate in time the coming generations from Communism itself).

The aim here would be to go further than mere containment and detach Yugoslavia from the status of a Soviet satellite as then understood. Yugoslavia would thus no longer be a possible military base for any further Soviet expansion, and through its ideological rift with the fountainhead of communism it would be of little use to international communism.

3. *Detachment of other Communist countries and weakening of Soviet alliances.* Backing Yugoslavia would also mean supporting any tendency towards independence from the Soviet Union and international communism in other Communist countries. Thus similar detachments in the longer run would be encouraged.

4. *Causing internal confusion in the Soviet Union.* The development of divergence in thought and the survival of Tito's and other schismatic Governments would encourage forces causing divisions within the Soviet Union itself and also in international communism.

5. *A new military ally.* The inclusion of Yugoslavia in a chain of alliances of friendly states bearing in mind the possibility of war.

To allow for the progressive stages of this policy it was necessary for Yugoslavia, or any imitators, to be independent but remain Communist.

Thus American financial, economic and military aid was to be granted without requiring Yugoslavia or any other similar recipient to assume international obligations or carry out internal reforms repugnant to their Communist regimes. No steps were to be taken to encourage democratic institutions to develop in the Western sense and eventually replace the communist pyramid of power. True enough, the fifth object might be more reliably achieved if Yugoslavia were a free state in the Western sense, but the first four would be compromised. The inactivity of the U.S. government in the case of Hungary in 1956, whatever its immediate or ulterior reasons, was at any rate entirely with such a view.

The achievements of this policy after 14 years can be summarised as follows:

1. *Containment.* Physically, the Soviet Union has not extended its frontiers. During Stalin's life the then existing satellite were consolidated through political trials and the removal of Tito's sympathisers and other measures such as the appointment of Marshal Rokossovsky in Poland. During Stalin's lifetime the leadership of international communism remained in his hands but it can be said to have been contained, in so far as the policy towards Yugoslavia made a contribution. His successors have since extended the influence of the Soviet Union in many lands overseas.

2. *Detachment of Yugoslavia.* During Stalin's life Yugoslavia, thanks largely to the support received from the U.S. and the West, remained independent and detached from the mainstream of international communism.

Since Stalin's death the borderline dividing Yugoslavia's ideology from the Soviet Union's has become blurred. This is, however, almost entirely due to developments in the Soviet Union. Gradually full power there passed into the hands of men whose outlook on the theory and practice of communism is almost impossible to distinguish from Tito's. Chinese and Albanian Communist whose voices and writings penetrate to the outside world tend to confirm this.

Since those Communist who exercise supreme power both in Russia and Yugoslavia are now agreed on the need to preserve the independence of Communist States, American insistence on Yugoslavia's independence as a state has become irrelevant in this context.

Under the banner of neutrality and non-alignment Communist Yugoslavia has succeeded in making dealings with a Communist Government palatable to a great number of Afro-Asian non-Communist patriots. The Soviet Union, being itself a Great Power, could not have engendered the same confidence.

Further, the grouping of many non-aligned countries into what is little short of a loose anti-Western alliance took place under the leadership of Yugoslavia, small, Communist and independent. That Soviet Union and international communism have gained by this success is rather obvious but it has been proved by fact that not a voice was raised by the non-aligned at the Belgrade Conference in September 1961 when the Soviet Government resumed nuclear testing. The general behaviour and voting at the United Nations of many of the Afro-Asian States, to whom on many matters Tito acts as a spiritual leader, is also significant.

We have shown above, and the case of Djilas proves, that any alienation from communism of the younger communist is still not a factor of practical value.

Yugoslavia is thus not at all detached from the Soviet Union except in noncritical matters, while our assertion that she plays an important role in furthering international communism in concord with Russian Communists would be most difficult to disprove. Her public stand on every possible occasion - and especially on Hungary in 1956 and Cuba in 1962 - does nothing to contradict our view.

3. *Detachment of other Communist countries.* The changes in the Soviet Union have resulted in the Soviet Union now treating other European Communist countries more as part of a consultative Commonwealth than as colonies. True enough, Poland, Hungary and Eastern Germany achieved this new status in some measure by their own efforts in 1956 while Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Bulgaria are only gradually being granted it. But the Governments of all these states do not now seek further detachment. They are indeed more firmly in accord on important matters with the Soviet Union than they were before Stalin's death. Nor does any sane man doubt the Soviet Union's ability to check any important deviation.

The only Communist countries that may be deemed detached from the Soviet Union are China and Albania, but they are not detached in the sense of the above defined American policy. They are by their own definition more than less 'revolutionary'.

4. *Causing internal confusion in the Soviet Union.* The take-over of all power by Krushchev and his friends, their acceptance of Commonwealth status for other like minded European countries, as well as the introduction of many internal reforms (de-Stalinization) have eliminated for the time being the hope of any considerable confusion among Communist in the Soviet Union.

5. *A new military ally.* Since Yugoslavia has remained in Communist hands it has not been possible to include it in any alliances such as NATO. The Balkan pact, an attempt to bridge the gap between NATO countries and Yugoslavia, has remained a dead letter. The manifest ideological alignment with international communism would make any military reliance by the West on Communist Yugoslavia imprudent.

None of the aims of American policy can, therefore, be said to have been achieved. Now that the Soviet Union is no longer ruled by Stalin the basic premises of this policy have become obsolete. This is particularly true for the contention that the broader implications of policy beyond Yugoslavia's frontiers would best be served if her Communist Government remained in power.

Not to reappraise this policy and not revise it must mean continuing to sit behind the Maginot Line, staring at Stalin's ghost, while Krushchev and international communism, aided and abetted by Tito, go about their business.

We ourselves have shown in this article that through these 14 years Yugoslavia has remained firmly Communist, indeed, with practically the same team in power as was previously deemed to be 'ruled' by Moscow. We have also shown that economically it is quite phenomenally inefficient.

Therefore, further unconditional economic aid on the part of the United States can only serve to prolong and intensify this unsatisfactory situation and the trends which frustrate the aims of American policy.

We must add that the sole rational encouragement for Yugoslavia and some other members of the Communist Commonwealth to detach themselves really would be to help Yugoslavia peacefully to free herself from the Communist Government.

Soviet Policy towards Cuba. Following these five points of American policy towards Yugoslavia, let us state briefly five similar but opposing aims of the Soviet Union.

1. *Containment of American influence and power.* By backing the Castro regime and underwriting its survival, the Soviet Union aims at ensuring that American influence in Cuba becomes no greater than it was before Castro. This has manifestly been achieved.

2. *Detachment of Cuba from the comity of American nations.* Encouragement of divergence between the American and Cuban ways of life and general outlook; and of the development of practices and institutions in Cuba to crystallise Cuban detachment from the group of American nations that sympathise with American leadership and the Organisation of American States. The hope that gradually the younger generation will be turned towards communism.

By backing Castro economically and promoting the gradual assumption of power by Communists, the Soviet Union has already almost achieved these objectives.

3. *Detachment of Latin American states and weakening American alliances.* By backing Castro, the Soviet Union supports similar possible anti-American development all over Latin America. It can embitter differences that already exist. Regimes, like Castro's was at the outset, may be established in a manner which does not provoke a military action by the U.S. Backed by the Soviet Union but also inspired by the genuine desire for social reforms, their nationalistic policy would begin by expropriating foreign (mainly U.S.) interests and generally redistributing wealth in a way repugnant to America and her friends in Latin America. This would prevent, and to some extent already has prevented, the consolidation of an American minded community in the western hemisphere. Almost any determined measures the U.S. might take to obstruct such developments would cause dissensions among some of its Allies.

By fostering such developments, the Soviet Union may also cause actual rifts between the U.S. and its allies whose views on the social and economic development of Latin America are often not identical with the American.

4. *Causing internal confusion in the U.S.* The fostering of Castro-like regimes in Latin America would tend to cause divisions within the United States on the question of ways and means of coping with them. There is no unanimity of the opinion in the U.S. regarding all aspects of the policy towards Cuba, and the enlargement of the problem to a Continental scale would serve to sharpen differences.

5. *A new military ally.* At this writing Cuba is no longer a practicable American base. The formal nationalisation of Guantanamo would place the U.S. before the same dilemma militarily and before public opinion and the U.N. that Britain and France faced when Colonel Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal.

The establishment of the fishing base in Cuba, may still be what it is claimed to be but the shipment of nuclear armaments to which the U.S. has raised objection, was in accordance with the manifest object of making Cuba a Soviet military base. It is not part of this comparison to probe into entirely new problem of American reaction to the establishment of nuclear missile sites in Cuba, since a comparable American reaction has not taken place in Yugoslavia.

* * *

In the space of not many years the Soviet Union has achieved many of the aims it set itself in its Cuban policy when it took the decision to back the Castro regime. In fourteen years the U.S. has hardly achieved any of the aims of its policy in backing the Tito regime.

There is great similarity between Soviet policy towards Cuba and U.S. policy towards Yugoslavia. But there is one important difference. The Soviet Union has aided Castor's Cuba, backed Cuban enemies of the United States and encouraged the persecution of Cuban friends of America. The United States has aided Tito's Yugoslavia, backed its own Yugoslav enemies and abandoned its real friends in Yugoslavia. If this is not self-delusion on a grand scale, it is the taking of calculated risks with incalculable consequences.

THE SAD LESSON OF ONE NATIVE'S RETURN

Why bring up after thirty long years a mischievous juvenile attack by Mate Meštrović on me and those émigrés from Yugoslavia who were at that time associated with me in trying to find a democratic alternative to communist power in our lands?

I must show the naiveté of myself and my fellow democrats in believing that "common sense cum idealism" had to prevail in political life.

Dr Mate Meštrović, the son of our famous sculptor, had received his education in America finishing with a doctorate at some American college. He would surely see that in judging his attack on me I had suspected that an elder man had fed him many lies; that the sins against decency I held against him were rashness, failure to check on information, his general ignorance and, finally, his single minded pre-judgement of anyone advocating anything short of absolute state independence for the Croat nation.

Mate Meštrović did not heed my warning that with the political values and attitudes he had so far exhibited he was likely to be a harmful influence in any future free conditions at home. America, by way of her long democratic experience and traditions and the very size of her political arena, would be more capable than little Croatia of digesting the kind of politician he seemed likely to become.

Meštrović did return to his native land in 1990. Croatia was just emerging as an independent state. He entered the political void with the spurious aura of an elder statesman. This status he had acquired over many years in Croat exile politics as leader of the Croat National Council, an association of but five or six thousand among more than a million Croat exiles spread all over the globe.

In the first couple of years after his return to Croatia Meštrović changed two political parties. By the summer of 1995 Croatia had managed, in a manner still mysterious, to arm herself and collect an army of some 100,000 men to rid herself of the majority of its old Serb population. The President of the Republic of Croatia, and head of the ruling party, Dr Tuđman, thereupon proclaimed new elections to profit from the euphoria that followed this military victory. Meštrović chose that moment to change to a third party. This time he wormed his way into the ruling party just as this party was seeking by blatant electoral trickery to establish a two thirds majority in parliament. In the manner of non Nazis in Germany, who in 1933/34 tolerated Hitler's change of the German constitution which transformed Germany into a one party state, Meštrović and other fellow travellers of renascent Croat fascism helped Dr. Tuđman to pass almost two thirds of the milestones on the way to a Croat one party state.

Mate Meštrović has turned out to be just the sort of political figure no newly free state could possibly need. Conventional cosy mutterings in favour of "democracy" have not obscured his ambition to play a political role at any price. He himself revealed his character when publicly announcing the switch of his loyalty to the ruling party. His "long years in America, a country with its own manner of conducting politics had not" he claimed "prepared him for the importance of euphoria and symbolism in politics". "Swim with the tide" would be his motto.

Lucky America - to have got rid of a minor political chameleon. Poor Croatia - to have been landed with such a political maverick. Even so, sad to say, of the exiles who have returned to take part in Croatian politics the experienced turncoat Meštrović is far from being the worst man.

A CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PHENOMENA IN EMIGRE POLICY

Is the Third Yugoslavia A "Democratic" Alternative?

DANICA, Wednesday, March 18, 1964
by Dr. Mate Meštrović

Those who seek a third Yugoslavia have been saying for years that any other alternative would be unrealistic, because the governments of the United States and Great Britain wish to preserve Yugoslavia at all costs and hence will not allow it to disintegrate. These are the same gentlemen who claim that the West supports the Tito dictatorship because "democratic" opposition groups have been incapable so far of offering a "democratic alternative" to the communist regime. Once such an alternative is created, the West will withdraw its support from Tito, or will actively intervene in Yugoslav politics, and then the communist dictatorship will be overturned. Champions of the "democratic alternative" feel that the opposition of the majority of Croatian and Serbian organisations to their draft does not really matter so much. They claim that they already have the backing of the British and American governments, which is the most important thing. The armies of the West will occupy Yugoslavia and impose on the indecisive people a "democratic alternative".

One of the main propagators of the "democratic" - or should we say "undemocratic" - Yugoslav alternative to Tito is none other than the shipowner Vane Ivanović, who lives in London. Ivanović, who wants to become president of the third Yugoslavia, convened a "summit" conference in March last year, attended by Pešelj, Jukić, Predavec, Tošić, Purić and others. Their aim was to formulate a political platform and possibly set up some sort of provisional government-in-exile. Although most Croatian refugees sharply condemned the "summit" session, and although the Serbian press passed over it in silence, Ivanović was not deterred. In December of last year he arrived in New York *incognito* to consult with his close associate Dr. Branko Pešelj, and, it appears, to prepare a second "summit" conference which was to be held later this year. During his stay in New York, Ivanović called on an official of the Free Europe Committee, seeking financial backing for a magazine which would spread the views of the Ivanović government. Later the said Free Europe official tried to win over certain prominent refugees in support of Ivanović's draft, but with little success.

Some of the participants in last year's London meeting said "tęte-f-tęte" that Sir Harold Macmillan had given Ivanović a mandate to organise a "shadow government" which would later be installed in Belgrade's White Palace by the British or some other power (this was left undefined), and which was to happen after the fall of Tito's regime.

Sir Vane probably feels that he is uniquely qualified to assume the leadership of the third Yugoslavia and resolve the Serbian-Croatian dispute, given his upbringing, prominent military career, sports abilities and position in English society. In fact, Sir Vane possesses all the conditions for rapid advancement in the British Conservative Party. Sir Vane, incidentally, inherited money from his step-father Boćo Banac, the Dubrovnik shipowner, and Sir Vane's father, Mr. Rikard Kraus, was a deputy in the Croatian Assembly.

Sir Vane received a proper British upbringing at Oxford, and is also an expert on underwater spear-fishing. His book on the sport will certainly join Sir Isaac Walton's classic book **The Complete Angler** in the annals of history.

As a major in the British Intelligence Service in Italy during the Second World War, Sir Vane contributed in his own modest way to the defeat of "fascism" and victory of "democracy" in Croatia - i.e. to the "peoples' democracy", doing his best to torpedo *domobran* colonel Ivan Babić's mission aimed at winning allied support for the proposed Vokić-Lorković putsch in 1944. One day, when he writes his interesting memoirs, Sir Vane is bound to shed light on his role in this tragic event.

This biographical sketch clearly shows how uniquely qualified Sir Vane is for his chosen political role. It is precisely for this reason that Sir Harold Macmillan chose Sir Vane Ivanović for the Yugoslav leadership, just as he chose Sir Douglas-Home (the former Earl of Home) to take over the leadership of the British government. Naturally, there will always be those who take a sceptical view of Sir Vane's ambitions and abilities, but that does not matter; Disraeli had opponents who thought little of him, and so did Churchill.

But let us move to more serious considerations. Ivanović's "political activity" is unimportant and would merit no more than a cursory glance were it not symptomatic of a dangerous, wide-spread disease among émigrés, a disease which has paralysed some of them into a state of complete passiveness.

The conference Ivanović convened last March, like those he plans to convene in the future, was sterile and doomed to fail. Experience shows that it is impossible to formulate a joint programme which would be acceptable to the majority, or even a sizeable minority of Croats and Serbs either in exile or at home. What can be achieved is some kind of unofficial tactical agreement on joint action by Croats and Serbs, as in the anti-Tito demonstrations in New York and elsewhere. But agreement on establishing the third Yugoslavia cannot be reached for the simple reason that Serb extremists think of any Yugoslavia as an expanded Greater Serbia, whereas the majority of Croats want an autonomous state of Croatia. Moreover, implementation of the "programme" offered by Ivanović and his ilk relies on the intervention of non-existent foreign powers; it presumes the occupation of Yugoslavia by the British, American or some other army, which would impose the desired solution by force.

In our day and age we have seen the British empire crumble and England become a second-rate power. Is it reasonable to think that England, which was forced to recognise the independence of even small and economically weak former colonies such as Sierra Leone, Zanzibar and Somalia, could or even would want to impose on the Yugoslav nations a political solution to which they are opposed? It is symptomatic of the world situation that in Kenya the British handed over power not to some "moderates" but to Jomo Kenyatta, the leader of the Mau Mau terrorists who massacred so many English.

Ivanović and company are fooling themselves if they think their miserable little meeting in London last year constitutes a "positive state act". In fact their policy is one of total passiveness, and it has brought paralysis and mental stultification to many refugee groups. Over the years one of the main sponsors of such an anti-Communist policy was the Free Europe Committee. It supported the elaboration of various studies, which are now collecting dust in various desk drawers; it convened meetings and conferences, encouraged refugee proclamations to imprisoned brethren back home - and all this without positive results. Today it is obvious even to those poor, doddering politicians from Eastern Europe who for various reasons were forced to live off the handouts of the Committee, that nothing positive has come of all these "activities".

Charity work is a noble thing. But let us not confuse helping the old, the poor and the sick with work aimed at freeing Eastern Europe from communism. And finally, the Free Europe Committee could never have become the American equivalent of the Comintern, which conspired and plotted to overthrow existing regimes, for the simple reason that the United States does not actively go in for changing the *status quo* in Eastern Europe. The United States is a great beneficiary of the victory over Nazi-fascism in 1945 and has a major interest in preserving the *status quo*.

Is that too stern a judgement? Not at all. The gist of America's East European policy became quite clear during the Hungarian revolution in 1956. Speaking about John Foster Dulles's so-called "policy of liberation", John Spanier wrote the following in his book **American Foreign Policy Since World War II:**

"That this policy of liberation probably never meant more than a verbal appeal to the American people became evident during the anti-Communist revolts in East Berlin and other German cities in June 1953 and during the popular uprising in Hungary toward the end of 1956. In none of these cases did the Eisenhower administration engage in action - except for condemning the Soviet Union for its oppression of the Germans and Hungarians and for expressing sympathy with the victims of Soviet despotism. In Berlin it gave Germans from East Germany food packages instead of liberation, and in Hungary it even issued a promise to the Soviet Union that it did not intend to intervene. The *status quo* was thus reconfirmed."

We are actually witnessing the *postscriptum* to the Hungarian tragedy. A few years ago the American Government accused Janos Kadar of being a puppet in Russian hands, a traitor and the butcher of his people. Recently, however, the State Department has been seeking accord with this same Kadar. Recently **The New York Times** has been claiming that the situation in Hungary is not so bad, and even that the people are enjoying somewhat more freedom than immediately after the collapse of the 1956 revolution. And indeed, why should the world have it in for Kadar? Chamberlain signed the pact with Hitler in Munich in 1938; Churchill and Roosevelt carved up the world with Stalin in Yalta in 1945.

The United States is unable to liquidate Castro, who established a communist state in Cuba, a mere 90 miles off the Florida coast. Is one to believe, then, that the United States would bring down Tito's communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia? Indeed, there are no indications that the State Department has any such intent. Financing Tito with 3 billion dollars is not proof that Washington wants to remove Tito. However, it is not the duty of the United States to achieve the goals of Croatian policy. Croats should resolve their problems on their own. Croats do not want an American solution to the Croatian question, nor do they want a Russian or German solution, they want a Croatian solution. That is why Croats must realise that no one will defend Croatian interests other than they themselves.

Can Croats accelerate change in their part of the Balkans? I think they can. But the precondition is that they rely first and foremost on themselves. As the saying goes: God helps those who help themselves. Croatian policy must not proceed from the premise that nuclear war, which no one in his right mind wants, will bring a solution to the Croatian problem. Moreover we must be aware that the United States will not go to war to "liberate" Yugoslavia from communism, but it will not impede the collapse of that system either. On the other hand, the American press, public opinion and many individuals will have sympathy for and greet and support the just Croatian freedom struggle.

Let us take a leaf out of the book of the Jews who established the state of Israel in 1948. To be sure, the Jews constitute an influential and powerful minority in American society and were capable of offering substantial moral and material assistance to the establishment of Israel. Ultimately, however, the 500,000 Jews who were in Palestine in 1948 had to fight with weapons in their hands and they won out over the armies of neighbouring Arab countries. Had the troops of Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Saudi Arabia defeated the Jews, the Americans would have protested in front of the United Nations. America would have given the defeated Palestinian Jews asylum. But America would not have declared war on the Arab states in order to establish the state of Israel.

Let us remember that when the American revolution broke out in 1776, only one third of the American population actively supported it. Another third was neutral and the last third supported England, with at least 25,000 Americans fighting in the British army against the establishment of American independence. American revolutionaries only started receiving major assistance from France at the end of 1778, after they had themselves defeated English General Burgoyne. Similarly, the partisans began their uprising in Yugoslavia in the summer of 1941, fighting for two years before receiving any sizeable aid from England and America in 1943.

It may be too much to keep depending on "the lessons of history". I do not mention these examples to "prove" that Croats should do today what the Americans did in 1776 or the Jews in Palestine in 1948. But

it seems to me that what these historical examples show is that every nation fighting for freedom must first rely on itself.

What do we need to do right now to accelerate the implementation of Croatian goals? Last year saw some positive instances, which should be continued and reinforced. For instance, Croats demonstrated great solidarity in their support of Croats imprisoned in West Germany for having attacked the Yugoslav mission in Mehlem. The anti-Tito demonstrations in Santiago de Chile, Rio de Janeiro, San Francisco, Washington and New York also drew world public attention to the Croatian freedom struggle. Moreover, the publication of documents concerning Tito's financial aid to Nenni's socialists warned the world of the dangerous subversive work of Yugoslav diplomats. The work of all individuals and groups in the common fight against the Tito regime should be welcomed. Ultimately, it does not matter what someone was in the past or which organisation he belonged to. The most important thing is he is today and what he wants to become.

We must reinforce our activity in all fields of work. We should work more and be smarter about it. For instance, there is a need to uncover and thwart the hundreds of UDBA (State Security -Translator's note) agents who have infiltrated the ranks of Croats dispersed around the world so as to sow discord and mistrust among individuals and groups. Close ties should be established with the many students, intellectuals and workers who are to be found in West European and American universities and factories. These people need to be won over to work affirmatively against the communist dictatorship.

We must not miss a single opportunity to turn Tito's political "successes" into communist defeats. For instance, the arrival of 44,000 "passport-holders" (including many members of the Communist Party and UDBA agents) to work in West Germany, constitutes a success for the communist regime. Exporting its labour force reduces unemployment in Yugoslavia. The education of Yugoslav workers in West German factories can greatly help to raise the productivity of Yugoslav industry. And of course, "passport-holders" send dozens of millions of Deutschmarks back home to their families, money which the regime grabs and uses for its own purposes. But the sojourn of so many workers in West Germany offers a great possibility for various Croatian organisations to educate and inform these people. Energetic and intelligent activity among "passport-holders" can turn many of them into conscious fighters for the freedom and independence of the Croatian nation. In fact, Croats living abroad should aim the focus of their work at Croatia, not at barren debates amongst themselves. On the one hand, we who live in freedom should encourage and assist people back home, and on the other we should explain the Croatian peoples' desires and needs to the world at large.

Tito's dictatorship is its own worst enemy. Through injustice, violence, oppression and terror, the Tito regime is creating more and more enemies for itself, as a result of which a revolutionary atmosphere is developing in Yugoslavia, i.e. there is growing pressure for radical political change in the country. Milovan Djilas saw that when he wrote in his **The New Class** that "communist regimes are actually a form of covert civil war between those in power and the people". This civil war is not ending but continuing, and becoming increasingly more ferocious and bitter.

The Hungarian revolution showed that even a communist police state can be helpless when it has to fight the people. The communist secret police was unable to stop the revolutionary torrent in Hungary precisely because the uprising was a reflection of spontaneous, unorganised, irrepressible anger. The revolution was not organised by some small group of conspirators, but by an entire people, who were both leader and fighter of the revolution.

The communist dictatorship has opponents even among high-ranking communist leaders, civil servants, factory managers, and army officers. Tyrannies crush any form of visible opposition, which is why people conceal their thoughts, their real intentions and feelings, but deep down they remain vigorous opponents of the system, patiently waiting for the right time to destroy it. Khrushchev is a good example of a high-ranking communist leader who for years managed to conceal his true thoughts and intentions from a

mistrustful Stalin. Khrushchev was Stalin's faithful, obedient and submissive servant. But when Stalin died, Khrushchev crushed the Stalin cult, rocking the very foundations of communist belief.

It is impossible to predict when and how the critical hour will strike against the communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia. Perhaps some great economic crisis will rock the dictatorship. Perhaps Tito's death will offer an opportunity for sweeping change. Perhaps some change in the European balance of power will enable a change within Yugoslavia. Perhaps some entirely unpredictable development of events will provoke a crisis. But one thing is for certain. There is not a regime which does not periodically find itself confronting a serious crisis. France was plunged into a grave crisis in 1940 because of military defeat, and in 1958 because of the revolt of the French army in Algeria. And what will happen when de Gaulle dies, for die he must? Crisis gripped the Soviet Union in 1953 when Stalin died, and in 1956 when the Hungarian revolution erupted, and it is happening now again because of the Soviets' ideological break with the Chinese communists and the failure of Soviet agriculture. As we see, sooner or later every regime inevitably finds itself facing crisis. However, strong and vital regimes easily overcome crisis, whereas the weak succumb. And just as surely, to quote Napoleon, opportunity knocks only once for the person who seeks and is prepared to use it.

* * *

82 Portland Place
London W 1
April 18, 1964

Dear Dr. Meštrović,

I have read your article in the March 18th issue of *Danica*. I was then on holiday in Spain and so found the time to prepare this letter.

Publicly, I shall ignore your article since it says nothing of political importance; and as far as it concerns me personally, it is merely an *argumentum ad hominem*.

To the best of my knowledge this is the first time you have spoken out publicly on the political situation in Yugoslavia. I think it would be a pity if you were to continue your writing and any political engagement (which engagement, it seems, you would wish to be in the interest of Croatia and the Croatian nation) in the style in which you have begun; a pity for you, of course, but also perhaps for your cause.

That is why I ask you to have the patience to read this letter whose intentions are nothing but good, and which is written in the hope of dissuading you from pursuing the road you have taken. Rest assured that what you wrote about me in your article does not hurt me in the least. First of all, because it is all mostly untrue, and secondly, because no writing of such poor quality could hurt me, my ideas or my friends.

Your article can be divided into two parts. The first and more important part is what you write about the general attitude Croats should adopt in world affairs, with a view to liquidating the communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia. The consequences of that dictatorship's fall could bring political freedom to the Croatian nation. Here you have certain ideas. The second part specifically attacks the round table meeting in Stansted and me personally.

I should like to dwell on both sections of your article, starting with the first and more important part.

I would agree with your general analysis of the West's present Great Power policy towards Yugoslavia, Croatia, all our nations together or each separately.

Neither the United States nor Great Britain wish to change the "status quo" in Eastern Europe. I am particularly critical of this policy. In my opinion not only is it not in our own interest, it is not in the interest of

the West either. But I also understand that this is a view one must count on. It is worth trying, in various honourable ways, to bring a change to this policy, but, as I said, it is a policy one must count on.

Similarly, as you well observe, it is not the duty of either the United States or other powers in the West or East to achieve the goals of Croatian (and here I would add Serbian or Yugoslav) policy.

The conclusion you reach is that Croats cannot and should not want an American solution to the Croatian question, nor indeed a Russian or German solution. I agree, and would add that a British solution would not be any more desirable either.

You further conclude that a nuclear war would not provide any solution to the Croatian problem, nor would the United States (or anybody else, I might add) go to war to "liberate" Yugoslavia from communism. I agree.

You stand by the view that Croats should take a leaf out of the book of the Jews when they created the state of Israel, the American revolutionaries of 1776 and the Yugoslav partisans. Within the limits of the principle "God helps those who help themselves", here too I am with you, although I certainly do not approve of many of the methods used in your afore-mentioned examples.

So far so good, as the English would say. And now what?

In terms of self-help, apart from mentioning at some point that your aim was a free Croatian state, you say not a word about any political programme. You merely list certain steps which should be taken. What are they?

a) Solidarity, you say, in support of the Croats imprisoned in West Germany for attacking the Yugoslav mission in Mehlen. In a civilised country, as West Germany is today, and in the Western world as such, it would only harm the Croatian cause if, in the course of their national struggle, decent Croats were to express solidarity with acts of terrorism. In 1964 they must be mature enough to realise that nothing worthwhile can be achieved by means of assassination, bombs or consorting with thugs.

b) Anti-Tito demonstrations in Chile, Brazil and America. These demonstrations did not draw world public attention to the Croatian freedom struggle. If these demonstrators are such heroes, then let them demonstrate against Tito in Yugoslavia, and not hidden behind the skirts of the West's police, legal order and freedom of speech and thought. The demonstrations, in the news for three days and that was it, did not change an iota of U.S. policy vis-à-vis Tito. To suggest such actions to Croats is to paint a rather poor picture of them in western eyes.

c) The disclosure of documents showing the financial aid given to Nenni's socialists by Tito. I know nothing about this, but I would agree that it was good to publish the truth, if and when one had reliable access to it, about all seditious work by Yugoslav diplomats in the West.

d) It is this point in your proposals which could be fatal for you as a Croat, as an American and as a human being. You literally say: "The work of all individuals and groups in the common struggle against the Tito regime should be welcomed. Ultimately, it does no matter what someone was in the past or which organisation he belonged to. The most important thing is what he is today and what he wants to become."

This stand is a nebulous and innocent-sounding expression of the famous old rule that the end justified any means.

What this means in the context of the Croatian question as you see it in your article, is that it is enough (and not only enough but all-important) for someone to be against Tito and that he wished some nebulous free Croatia, for his work as an individual or as member of a group to be welcome, whatever the quality of that work might be. It does not matter, you say, that someone was once a member of, for instance, a

criminal organisation such as the *Ustashi* or that he might even have personally slaughtered innocent people. What matters, you say, is what that person is today and what he wishes to become.

I ask you: Do you realise what you are saying?

You thus, first of all, accept anyone who today opposes Tito's dictatorship. This means, specifically and without hesitation, you include as your ally every *Ustasha* and anyone else, under the sole *proviso* that he was against the Tito dictatorship. Secondly, your words mean that you accept (again without closer analysis) anyone who tells you today what he was today and what he wished to become. This would imply that for you a good companion might just as well be anyone who was a member of the Yugoslav fascist-type organisation, the Orjuna, then a democrat, then a functionary of (King) Alexander's dictatorship, then a Maček supporter, then a pro-partisan, and finally now became some sort of Croatian patriot. Unfortunately, there are already enough such adventurers, or at least those who at different times personally advocated such mutually contradictory ideas, both at home and among émigrés abroad.

Is it possible for you to comprehend that by your criterion, many of these people would be more destructive to the Croatian cause than many a Croat communist - not all Croatian communists, but many.

What might be our real purpose here on planet earth remains an unresolved (and for many an eternally unsolvable) question. But what has been clear for centuries, and sooner or later has become clear in every culture and religion, is that failing any agreement on the question "Why are we here?", we can at least say: "What matters is how we live, what methods we use, how we behave towards one another while we live on planet earth."

And so, if you care about the cause of Croatia, the cause of Croatian freedom and prosperity, you will achieve nothing, but nothing, unless you choose the means and the people to work with. "There are some people", goes the Croatian saying, "with whom I would not even go to church."

e) Finally, you suggest working on so-called "passport-holders". Were it not for your proposal to cooperate with absolutely anybody, I would have agreed with the idea of working to enlighten these people. But if you want to make *Ustashis* out of Croatian "passport-holders", I would say that it would be better for these people to return to Yugoslavia from the West with their own impressions, without contacting the kind of people with whom you seem to be willing to cooperate.

Further, your article makes no mention of any programme or ideas, apart from the general conclusion that opportunities come to those who seek them and are prepared to take advantage of them. As an old fisherman, I disagree with this Napoleonic precept, even in the realm of fishing. In other branches of human endeavour, including politics, such brazen opportunism is utterly amoral.

Your article offers no ideas, no programme, no principles around which one might develop some sort of reasonable discussion. That is why I started off by saying that your article was of no political importance.

Let me now pass to your points regarding our activities concerning the definition of the possibility of cooperation among the individual nations of Yugoslavia, in particular between the Serbs and the Croats, under conditions of freedom and justice.

Here again your critical view is very limited. I certainly recognise the possibility and justification of any criticism, but the sole concrete argument you deploy against our efforts is that it would be impossible to agree to establish a third Yugoslavia for the simple reason that Serbian extremists imagine any Yugoslavia as an expanded Greater Serbia, while the majority of Croats wished for an independent state of Croatia.

Let us put aside for the moment the question whether Serbian extremists represent the majority of Serbs. Your criticism is from the Croatian point of view. Let us say that it was true that a truly large majority of Croats wanted an independent Croatian state. That is a very fine ideal, but it is simply unfeasible.

First of all, in today's age of nuclear weapons and transition from a traditionally agrarian to an industrial order, the political, economic and defensive independence of small Balkan states (I pass over similar problems elsewhere) is idle fancy. Such fancies may be of tactical use in striving for personal, party and even national goals. But the possibility of a completely autonomous, independent, sovereign Croatian state graced by democratic freedoms simply does not exist, and that has nothing to do with the Serb question.

Secondly, even if such a possibility were to exist, one cannot forget that a large number of Serbs live in Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia. According to your concept, these Serbs would live in a sovereign Croatia, i.e. without any guarantee of their fundamental human rights other than those offered by the sovereign state of Croatia. Serbs remember how they fared the last time they were left to the mercy of a more or less sovereign Croatia. It is not reasonable to expect them to accept a similar order just like that.

You see what is happening in Cyprus (without going into the merits of the Greek and Turkish sides), a small, relatively unimportant island. In this day and age a state where a sizeable minority and the majority cannot agree on living together in freedom and harmony, without outvoting and oppression, is hard put to survive.

If there were no more Serbs in the world than those who live within the borders of historical Croatia, it would be extremely hard but perhaps not completely impossible to find a *modus vivendi*. However, according to your definition of an independent Croatia there would be an independent Serbia right next door. There is absolutely no doubt that if the Serbs lacked satisfactory guarantees for a normal life (it is hard to say whether such a Croatia could give them that), they would not find it difficult to impede the further peaceful development of an independent Croatia. Certainly, anyone who uses the phrase "A Free and Sovereign Croatia" without offering a solution to the Serbian problem, or anyone who silently passes over this root question, is simply fooling the Croatian people.

When things are unsettled, it is impossible to imagine that the European powers, the United Nations or some individual countries would not get involved in our affairs, as they have now, albeit reluctantly, become involved in Cyprus. They have to get involved, not to please all or some of us, but, each in its own way and its own time, because of their own interests. God alone knows how it would all end but if it ended with an untruncated, free and sovereign Croatia it would be a miracle. You should read what Dr. Maček, who was not born yesterday and is not a Croat as of yesterday, has to say on this subject.

Next comes the question of Bosnia-Herzegovina which, leaving aside for the moment the specific problem of the Muslims, would be a bone of contention between any independent Croatia and independent Serbia, even if the problem of the Serbian population in Croatia were somehow settled.

That is why nebulous talk about some kind of independent state of Croatia (even if it were the desire of the majority of Croats) is of no political significance. It is utterly impossible within the foreseeable future to defend this thesis, except with catch phrases. These are of no use to the people.

However, I do not accept your thesis that the majority of Croats want an independent state of Croatia.

Croatia has not had free elections for 35 years, i.e. since the advent of King Alexander's dictatorship in 1929 - free, as I understand the meaning of the word and as I hope you understand it. The truth is that under the slightly alleviated conditions that prevailed under the Regency, it became quite obvious that Dr. Maček's Croatian Peasant Party (HSS) obtained for its programme a clear emotional, moral and real, if not formal, mandate to fight for the interests of and in the name of Croats. A sovereign, independent or autonomous state of Croatia was not a part of the HSS's programme at the time. Since then, Croats have

had a state called the Independent State of Croatia, which, as you say, was a German or Italian solution to the Croatian question. Neither then nor later did the Croatian people have the chance to say freely whether they want an autonomous state of their own, and if so whether they think it can be achieved.

Consequently, just as you have the right to claim that the majority of Croats want an autonomous state, so I have the right to say: "That has certainly not been proven, but one should work politically so that the free right of Croats to express their desire for such a state was not prejudiced before they had a chance freely to express what they wanted. There is also the right of people, if they so wish, to try honourably to dissuade Croats from such a politically sterile vision."

For similar reasons (an absence of freedom of expression), it has been impossible since 1929 to establish what the majority of Serbs desired. But, not even you have established that the majority of Serbs were extremists for whom Yugoslavia was merely an enlarged Greater Serbia. According to you, the very existence of some Serb extremists suffices to destroy any possibility of a joint programme with the Croats. That is completely irrational and merits no comment.

The Croats, Serbs and Slovenes who met in Stansted, and who did so, please note, at their own initiative and each in their own name, wanted to sit down and talk freely to see (after a general discussion) whether it was at all possible under free, civilised conditions to find a common *modus vivendi*, and if so how. Everyone seated at that "round table" knew that both the Serbs and the Croats were capable of preventing each other from living in peace. It was equally clear that the words *modus vivendi* implied that both sides had to agree to some solutions, and do so freely, each by its own majority. These solutions could offer a life together, or perhaps at least partly together, or a break-up. In the latter event, a peaceful break-up was better than a violent one.

This is not to say that we all agreed on everything or that we agree even today, but the first step showed that it was possible, in freedom and in peace, to embark on something rationally and together.

Personally, I go further than many of my friends when I say that a peaceful break-up is quite impossible. As a convinced Yugoslav I go even further in saying that a break -up is not even desirable. But as a democrat I would respect the freely expressed wishes of the majority. As a free man I would opt not to participate in any violent break-up.

Of that part of your article that contains any serious criticism (merely two or three lines) there remains nothing.

Let me now move on to rather persuasive proof that you yourself share my view about the hollowness of your criticism. This is the section where you make assumptions which you then demolish; where you attack me personally and where there are things that you have either failed to verify, or things you have invented yourself.

Let me proceed point by point.

1. "Ivanović, who wants to become the president of the third Yugoslavia". Either someone planted this on you and you did not make the effort to verify it or else it is your own invention. In any case, it is untrue. It is merely a question of whether you yourself uttered this lie or whether you are too careless and too lazy to check out such an absurd piece of slander.

2. "(Ivanović)...convened a 'summit' conference in March last year." The conference was convened not by me but by Mr. Bočićar Vlajić. This again is something you either invented or carelessly swallowed as the truth.

It was not a 'summit' conference. That is a term you concocted and then used sarcasm to refute. I do not object to your sarcasm but it is rather pathetic. "Sarcasm is the highest form of rudeness and the lowest form of wit".

3. No one named "Purić" was present or invited. It is hard to tell at a glance whether the name "Purić" is a misprint, another careless instance of not checking the facts, or a mean trick on your part to have the public falsely believe that Mr. Boćidar Purić, the Prime Minister of the Yugoslav Royal Government-in-exile, was present. The latter (a trick on your part) cannot be ruled out given the spirit in which your article was written. Namely, it is no secret that Mr. Purić's government of civil servants was formed in exile during the war, in August 1943, at the initiative of the British. Since your article later claims (or reports without verification) that Macmillan gave me "the mandate to form a government", having Mr. Purić's name among those who allegedly took part in the Conference could help to reinforce your subsequent insinuation on my account. (Your news may not please Mr. Purić either, but that is his business).

4. (At the Conference) "Their aim was to formulate a political platform and possibly set up some sort of "provisional government-in-exile". I do not know you very well. We have met only twice and I cannot make a fair appraisal of your intelligence. But even twice is enough for me to think that you cannot be so naive as to believe, even if someone did tell you so, that this was really the aim of our Conference. Hence, I can only deduce that the invention is your own.

5. "Although most Croatian refugees sharply condemned the 'summit' session, and although the Serbian press passed over it in silence...". About the Croatian refugees, I do not exactly know, but I would not be surprised if most of the Croatian émigré press was opposed to our ideas and our democratic way. As you well observed, this does not deter me because I know that kind of press. However, it is not true that the Serbian press passed over the Conference in silence. This is another instance of being careless and not checking your facts, of reporting something you yourself do not know or else invented.

In fact, the first provisional text was published prematurely, unfortunately, and the more serious critically inclined commentators have had the decency to wait for the final text before passing judgement.

6. "In December of last year, he (Ivanović) arrived in New York *incognito*." You either do not know what the word "*incognito*" means or else this is another case of sarcasm. Another case of overturning the assumptions you make. I arrived in New York in my own name, stayed at the hotel in my own name and saw everyone in my own name, just as you did when, for instance, in the company of the *National Geographic Magazine* correspondent, you recently visited Yugoslavia and were the guest of Marshal Tito on Brioni Island.

7. "Ivanović called on an official of the Free Europe Committee, seeking financial backing for a magazine which would spread the views of the Ivanović government." I did indeed talk to F.E. officials, but always with only the two of us present. If you have any proof from one of these officials that I asked for support for some sort of government, it is a pity you did not mention it. In any event, I tell you that once again you are reporting things that are outright lies or your own invention.

8. "Later the said Free Europe official tried to win over certain prominent refugees in support of Ivanović's draft, but with little success". Unfortunately, I cannot know whether this is true or not because I have no first-hand knowledge.

9. "Some of the participants in last year's London meeting said "tęte-f-tęte" that Sir Harold MacMillan had given Ivanović a mandate to organise a 'shadow government', which would, etc. etc." Needless to say I have no way of knowing what the participants said "tęte-f-tęte" if one of those "tetes" was not mine. Knowing the people I work with, I am certain they are not so stupid as to say something so blatantly untrue. Either you are repeating something somebody passed on to you and you have failed to verify, or you are repeating a falsehood which your own common sense should have told you was a falsehood. The third possibility is that you invented it all yourself.

In any event, Mr. Harold MacMillan (he is not "Sir Harold", that at least was something you could have checked) did not give me a mandate to organise a "shadow government". He did not give me a mandate nor could he have given me a mandate. I did not ask him for a mandate nor could I have asked for a mandate.

It is entirely possible, albeit not very likely, that you have not the faintest idea about such matters. Therefore it pays to dot one's "i's".

I am a citizen of Yugoslavia, at present without a Yugoslav passport because I am a political émigré from present-day Communist Yugoslavia. If I did have the ambition to create a government (and, may I add, to be prime minister or president of the third Yugoslavia is not the same thing), I would only have the face to do so if I headed a party which, after free elections in Yugoslavia, were to win the constitutional right to demand to form a government. Such a constitution, in my opinion, should be the constitution of a Yugoslavia that has been accepted by the separate majorities of the Serbian, Croatian, Slovene and Macedonian nations, in free elections with the right to direct secret ballot. Only then could I wish and demand a mandate. Certainly not from a foreign citizen, but from the Yugoslav citizen constitutionally designated for this purpose.

I have written at such length so that, if you are a rational man, you might see that I am very far from possessing any mandate to form any government. To me these are not empty words or the stuff of jokes but rather a principled stand which I have had ever since I grew up.

10. "Sir Vane probably feels that he is uniquely qualified to assume the leadership of the third Yugoslavia."

This and what follows is the classic *argumentum ad hominem*.

You enumerate certain virtues which you have invented that I consider would qualify me to lead the third Yugoslavia. First of all, you do not know what qualities I consider necessary to lead the third Yugoslavia. Secondly, you do not know whether I consider myself to have these, or at least some of these qualities. But then you knock down the very qualities you have attributed to me. That would be childish enough in itself, but because you have a) inserted lies and b) insinuated something even worse, this paragraph is not innocent, it is malicious.

Let us leave aside "the upbringing, prominent military career, sports abilities and position in English society". Anyone can have a different opinion of me regarding the "qualities" you list. I have at least enough manners to find it repellent to argue over such matters, publicly or privately, when I am personally involved.

If you feel that I have, as you put it, all the conditions for rapid advancement in the British Conservative Party, you are free to think so. But your allusion (along with the sarcastic "Sir Vane") is clear. What you mean to say is that these very "qualities" are what make me unsuitable to lead the third Yugoslavia. That too is quite permissible. Only it is you who launched me as a candidate to lead the third Yugoslavia and it is you who is demolishing that candidate; you are probably too young and perhaps not sufficiently well-read to know that launching an image of a man only to tear it down is an old, transparent trick which is used for want of better arguments.

11. The references under point 10 and everything that precedes it might be considered childish and callow were it not for the allusions to my father and the falsehoods in regard to *domobran* Colonel Babić.

12. Your mention of my father - and the mentioning is in an article where, when it is a question of *Ustasis* or political speculators, you take the view that the main thing is what a person is now and what he wants to be - is simply aimed at presenting me to your readers as an ex-Kraus, i.e. of Jewish origin, at least in part. That, needless to say, is not naive, accidental or childish. It is what the Americans call a "smear", the

"establishment of guilt by association", an appeal to latent anti-Semitism among *Danica's* readers. As you well know, such anti-Semitism among *Danica's* people and their fellow-thinkers in Croatia was not latent during the war.

You know only too well that I am not to blame for my father's origin, just as I cannot take the credit for the fact that he was elected a member of the Croatian Parliament and that he was one of the founders of the Progressive Party at the start of this century (you might find it instructive to read its programme); just as you cannot take any credit for the fact that your father is one of the few great sculptors in human history nor are you to blame for his political adventures.

Your allusion is a positive act of malice for which you cannot hide behind negligence or laziness in checking your facts. That you did manage to find out, unlike, for instance, the fact that I attended Cambridge, not Oxford University, as you say I did.

13. Let me move on to Colonel Babić.

You say that "As a major in the British Intelligence Service in Italy during the Second World War, Sir Vane contributed in his own modest way to the defeat of 'fascism' and victory of 'democracy' in Croatia, i.e. to the 'peoples' democracy', doing his best to torpedo *domobran* Colonel Ivan Babić's mission aimed at winning allied support for the proposed Vokić-Lorković putsch in 1944."

The first thing that is obvious is that you are reporting something that has been passed on to you because you cannot have any first-hand knowledge of any side of the Babić story. It is also obvious that you did not check the matter, since it is impossible to do so, at least today.

Therefore, you do not have any moral right to draw conclusions on facts unknown to you.

The matter is made all the more serious by the fact that you are obviously prejudiced. You put the words "fascism" and "democracy" in quotation marks. In this context this openly places you on the side not only of my wartime enemies, but also of the enemies of our country and our peoples and our Allies. Of course, under the freedom brought by the victory of "democracy", you have the right to take whichever side corresponds with your views and aspirations. But let us be clear about where we stand and of whom we are talking. You then twist around the struggle against fascism and the victory of democracy by identifying the general struggle of war with the establishment of a "peoples' democracy" in Croatia - i.e. with communism. That has indeed happened in Yugoslavia, and hence in Croatia, but through no merit of mine or my modest contribution against fascism and in support of democracy.

Secondly and specifically in connection with Colonel Babić.

I am still bound by my signature on the British Official Secrets Act, but without breaking my word I can tell you the following with no hesitation and it would not bother me in the slightest if the facts here stated or my commentary were made public.

a) I was not a major in the British Intelligence Service. I was a major on what was called the British army's general list, as a volunteer armed with a permit from the acting Yugoslav Minister of the Army, Navy and Air Force who was for me at the time competent. There was no need for an oath to the King of Britain. (General list means that I was not assigned to any specific branch of the army or to any regiment.) I worked in a department which dealt with so-called political warfare, or as the Americans would say, "psychological warfare".

b) In the temporary absence of my boss I was sent to interview our war prisoner, Colonel Ivan Babić, in order to obtain information, if he was voluntarily willing to give it, on the morale of the army which he had left behind after flying over to the allied side and, if he wished and was able to say something, on the

psychological state of the civilian population he had left behind. He freely gave me the necessary information.

c) It was no part of my duty to ask him, nor did I ask him, whether he had any political mission. He did not speak to me about a putsch being prepared by Vokić and Lorković.

d) I did nothing, either modest or not, to torpedo Colonel Babić's political mission.

So much for the facts. Now for my own opinion to which I feel I am entitled.

In January or February 1944, when any fool already knew that the Allies were going to win the war, Colonel Babić flew over to the Allied side in Italy. Until then he had been (by personal choice, because he could have been a Royal Yugoslav Army prisoner in Germany or Italy) a colonel in the *Domobran* Army of the NDH (*Nezavisna Drzava Hrvatska*, Independent State of Croatia - Translator's Note), a state which had declared war on the United States in 1941. I do not remember exactly whether the NDH had also declared war on Great Britain, but under Allied agreement, an enemy of one allied state was considered the enemy of all allied states.

Had Colonel Babić personally wanted to take the side of the Allies at an earlier date, he could have chosen, as I said, being a war prisoner. If he had wanted actively to place his abilities in the service of the Allies, that too he could have done earlier. There were the partisans, and parts of the old Yugoslav army. If neither of these two appealed to him there were other ways to take part on the Allied side. *De jure* the *Domobran* army, the army of a country which had declared war on the Allies, was an enemy army. *De facto* in the rear-lines of the fronts it performed a certain service on behalf of public security in what was considered enemy territory or territory under enemy control. It thereby freed enemy units to fight actively against the Allies. This is considered an enemy position vis-à-vis the Allies. Before Colonel Babić's mission, the Allies had had no information that the *Domobran* army held any other view or that it wanted to be on the Allied side.

You claim, and I have heard this from other quarters as well, that Colonel Babić allegedly came to warn the Allies that one group of *Ustashas* (Vokić-Lorković) was planning to carry out a putsch against another group of *Ustashas*, and that the *Domobran* army would be prepared to play a role which might suit the Allies.

We are here referring to a time half a year after the fall of Mussolini and the capitulation of Italy, one of the Axis partners. It was also at the peak of Churchill's (and generally the Allies') policy, based on the proposals of Brigadier Maclean, finally to give the partisans in Yugoslavia full and exclusive help. The final decision had been taken at the Cairo Conference and confirmed at the Teheran Conference (both in December 1943). In other words before Colonel Babić's flight.

One would have had to be totally naive or completely uninformed (which Colonel Babić was not) to think that the British and Americans would jump with joy when they heard about the help Colonel Babić had come to offer them. It is quite silly to think so today. Obviously, such a mission was unfeasible at the time, given its timing and the prevailing conditions.

Unfortunately, in implementing Allied policy vis-à-vis Yugoslavia in 1944 and 1945, little consideration was given (how and why is a different matter) to King Peter, to the Royal Government-in-exile, to the political party leaders from Yugoslavia (including Dr. Krnjević), to General Mihailović, to our seamen (most of them Croats) who sailed all through the war carrying materiel for the Allies, and lastly to me as someone who, together with Bočo Banac, placed the fleet of the Yugoslav Lloyd shipping company at the disposal of the Allies from the very first day of the war and who served in the British army without pay.

All the people mentioned above, along with many others, some more and some less, some sooner and some later, contributed each in his own way to the Allied cause and were more entitled to Allied

consideration than Colonel Babić, yet we were all discarded - some elegantly, some quite formally, and some quite crudely - while our country wound up in the hands of the communists, who made certain contributions of their own to the Allied cause.

Now that you know the facts, you do not have to shed crocodile tears over the failure of Colonel Babić's mission or blame me for it, since I neither did nor could have had anything to do with that mission.

14. Lastly. "One day, when he writes his memoirs, Sir Vane is bound to shed light on his role in this tragic event" (i.e. the failure of Colonel Babić's mission). I shall not write such memoirs. First of all because, as I said, I could not write about my time in the British army without breaking my word and without the permission of the British military authorities. Secondly, and this possibly may be something you cannot understand, because I am not the kind of man who is capable of publicly disclosing private conversations, be they political or otherwise, conversations conducted with discretion and on the assumption that they would not be made public.

Here again you paint your own picture of me only to tear it down.

The above 14 points boil down, then, to the following:

A) Passed on to you and unverified, but certainly made public or completely invented by you (invented meaning false): Point 1, the first part of Point 2, Point 3 (which could have been invented out of malice), the second part of Point 5, Points 7, 9 and 13.

B) Invented and then overturned by you: the second part of Point 2, Points 6, 10 and 14 (here again invented means false)

C) Invented (and therefore false) by you: Point 4.

D) Possibly true: The first part of Point 5.

E) I cannot establish whether it is or is not true: Point 8.

F) True, but presented with malice: Point 12.

G) My small resume, under Point 11.

I hope you will give serious thought to everything I have written, especially to your politically irrelevant personal attack against me which, upon analysis, humiliates you as a man.

Please give up this method, if not your political stance, now while you are still young. Judging from your article, your attitude cannot help the Croatian cause, which you seem to desire to defend.

If you do not agree to change your methods and the manner in which you wish to act, then I honestly think it would be better for you to devote your talents to the political life of your newly adopted country. By virtue of the very size of its population, America will find it easier than Croatia to digest you.

With regards,
Vane Ivanović

The REVIEW, published by the Study Centre for Yugoslav Affairs, included this article of mine in 1964. Its very title removes the need for an introduction.

THREE FALLACIES OF AMERICAN POLICY EXPOSED BY MR KENNAN

The historian of our times is fortunate in being able to draw on the rich sources of raw material offered by the Washington of today. Very many of the debates which precede policy decisions find their way into print and are available to the public. If some debates fail to catch the public interest, there is no insurmountable difficulty in tracing their course. Certainly at no other place and time has so much of foreign policy making machinery and thinking been exposed to the public gaze.

Yet for the contemporary lobbyist or 'interested party' things are not quite so easy. True enough, it does not cost much effort for anyone interested in, say, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, China or Yugoslavia to discover the pressure groups, the individuals scurrying around Washington having a word here, getting in a memorandum there, drafting a declaration, sponsoring an appeal. It takes perhaps a little more to discover the mood and thinking processes of those concerned with foreign affairs in various Congressional or Senate committees or sub-committees.

There is, however, great difficulty in gleaning knowledge about the processes through which decisions are reached in the executive branch of Government. At first impact there is something novel and refreshing for the European in Washington when he meets the unfeigned courtesy of State Department officials and finds them willing in informal talks to discuss delicate subjects at length. But an end is soon reached and it seems all the more abrupt for the forthright and unaffected manner in which one has been received. There is no 'diplomatic' wariness, such as we know in Europe, to serve as a warning that an impenetrable screen will soon be reached.

For many years now American policy toward the communist regime of Yugoslavia has been one of the decisive factors in that state's life. I need not once again labour the point of the importance for small communist country of large-scale economic and military aid coupled with the prestige value in securing and maintaining the benevolent interest of the world's leading and most powerful democracy.

So far as we who try and argue a case for the establishment of the rule of law and conditions of elementary human freedoms in Yugoslavia have been able to determine, this American policy has been drawn up and executed by the Department of State. We have been most unhappy about it.

But for an extraordinary disclosure recently, we might never have known that on this very subject of American policy towards the communist regime in Yugoslavia there is a sense of frustration apparently also in the Department of State itself.

There must be something very queer when both we and people in the State Department are simultaneously frustrated by and critical of the trend of events in Washington. The paradox is worth an earnest attempt at reconciliation.

It is not easy to reconcile these two sets of criticism unless we bear in mind the all important element of time.

At the end of 1963 Mr George F. Kennan, one of the State Department's more eminent officers, now able to speak freely having retired from the Service, granted an interview to a Senior Editor of *Look Magazine* (19 November 1963). The leading quotation of Mr Kennan is as follows:

Congress and American people are so divided that American leadership is indecisive. It is high time we clarified our ideas, as a nation and a Government, as to what we want in our contest with the Soviet Union and the rest of the Communist world; whether we want these countries to change, to capitulate to our desires, or whether we want war. People who hold all these three point of view have influence in Washington.

Many of us have been able repeatedly to point to a series of American policy decisions over the years in connection with Yugoslavia over which there has been *little or no public debate in the United States*. Some aspects of this policy were, true enough, subjected to a desultory resistance in Congress, which was overcome on every occasion by the Department of State with relative ease. We have shown before, and can again, that the same trend of American policy decisions has persisted even under changing circumstances, and has always resulted in a gain, material or in prestige, for the communist Government of Yugoslavia. Very few if any of the expected fruits of this policy, however, seem to have accrued to the benefit of the United States of America.

In essence I think that the grounds for Mr Kennan's complaint must have developed fairly recently, while ours is an old one, though I am beginning to see some hope of recognition of it.

Let me first of all make myself quite clear about Mr Kennan. Nothing to be said here is addressed to him in person. His public record as a highly efficient, loyal and respected member of the American Foreign Service, Ambassador and Pulitzer Prize historian, is well known. Mr Kennan has often been described as an expert on communism, and during the critical years after World War II he was Director of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff. He has been Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to Yugoslavia at periods when both these appointments were not unimportant. As the *Look* article says 'It is a rare event when a top-rank diplomat like Kennan, who has served 29 years in the Foreign Service, breaks loose from the Establishment and speaks out on America's foreign policy failings'.

I feel we have the right to assume that what Mr Kennan, freshly out of the service, says is nearly identical to what others in the service who have been associated with him over the years in policy decisions on Yugoslavia would think and say on the subject now.

The essential features of American policy towards Yugoslavia may be gathered from the words of Mr Kennan quoted in the *Look* article. After each of his three main propositions I propose to insert my comments on their validity in relation to Yugoslavia and point to the results of their application in practice. In this way I hope to arrive at an explanation to the paradox.

1. *'I feel very strongly it is foolish to deny normal commercial intercourse to a country facing important choices between East and West'.*

The specific issue which prompted the remark (and on which I happen to agree with Mr Kennan) is whether or not to restore most-favoured nation commercial treatment to Yugoslavia, albeit a communist state. The matter itself is a minor point in the long story. The U.S. Congress held out some time against State Department advice but ultimately acceded. The key phrase in Mr Kennan's sentence lies in the words *'a country (Yugoslavia) facing important choices between East and West'*.

This simply is not the case and, except for a brief period just before the death of Stalin in 1953, never was so. I should like to demonstrate that this view of Yugoslavia facing a choice between East and West is the first fateful misapprehension that has been at the back of the American policy of trying to cajole the Tito Government into taking an international position away from the Soviet Union and on the Western side; a policy that may be described as fostering recalcitrant Communism in the hope that permanent splits in Communism would profit the West.

Since the Communist Party came to power, the foreign policy of Yugoslavia has passed through three stages. One can easily be led astray by letting various aspects of these three phases mask the fundamental ideological objective of the State as seen through the eyes of the Communist Party. Behind the fluctuations of foreign policy the firm objective of the Yugoslav State and Party has remained quite unaltered. Expressed vividly in the slogan "Socialism and, in due course, Communism", this objective is seen by Yugoslav Communist not only as a national aspiration but as the universal ideal of our times.

In the first phase, from the acquisition of power and international recognition in 1945 to the break with Stalin's Russia and Cominform in 1948, Yugoslav foreign policy remained openly within terms of reference dictated by the policy needs of the Soviet Union. Even so, there were divergencies in method and emphasis at that stage, resulting from the fact that while Stalin was experienced, elastic, subtle and conscious of his power, Tito was dogmatic, still ambitious and apt to be quarrelsome. I feel that this view of the first phase is universally accepted and does not require further elaboration.

The second phase came about not by the will of the Yugoslav communists, nor even of Tito himself, but through what I would now, with the benefit of hindsight, call the capricious rejection by Stalin of the leaders of Yugoslav communism. (I take it that no reader of this article is unfamiliar with the official Soviet-Yugoslav correspondence on the subject of the break, published in English by the Royal Institute for International Affairs, London. Here it was made clear that it was Stalin who rejected Tito. I need, therefore, waste no time in refuting the notorious *canard* about the gallant little group of Yugoslav communists who allegedly chose freedom from Soviet domination and oppression - a most welcome comforter to those in the West who saw an interest in helping some communists but found it distasteful to do so. A gallant little communist and a patriot to boot was just what would appeal to them.)

The policy foisted on the Yugoslavs in this second phase, could be fairly summarised as (a) defence against the political aggressiveness of Stalin and the Government of the Soviet Union (b) revival and strengthening of relations with the Western Powers in order to obtain much needed economic aid and even some military strength as a deterrent to the Soviet Army.

This is the period of the acquisition of a new status, not only in the eyes of democratic socialists and trade unionists in the West, but also of the development of a certain measure of popularity even in conservative circles in Western Europe and the United States. Much of this popularity has survived to the present day. Aided by the atmosphere of the new principle of coexistence, it lasted beyond the second phase, which ended in 1955 with the first visit to Belgrade of the apparently penitent duo of Krushchev and Bulganin.

But even in this second phase we may see that there never were - the whims of Stalin apart - unabridged chasm between the Soviet and Yugoslav leaderships either in foreign policy or in ideology. After Stalin's death, as soon as certain internal matters concerning personalities were settled in Moscow, evidence emerged of a trend towards not only renewed contacts but also co-operation between the two communist Parties. The first premier after Stalin, Malenkov, publicly said as early as 8 August 1953:

The maintenance of the policy of peaceful co-existence represents an obligation not only for the countries of the democratic camp (by which he meant countries with communist Governments among which Yugoslavia was once again beginning to be included) but also for the countries.

Statements by both sides gradually recognising the doctrine of differing road to socialism were on the increase during this period. They culminated in Tito's plain declaration upon his return from India in 1955, when he said:

*The Yugoslav Government will improve its relations with Eastern countries without changing its position vis-a-vis the West.*¹

At no stage during this phase is there any hard evidence of a betrayal by the Yugoslav leadership of the principle 'socialism and then, in due course, communism', and still less of any contemplation of a definite alignment with the West.

Tito was during the phase from 1948 to 1955 the precursor of the Soviet Government's policies of recognition of different paths to socialism inside the communist camp and of peaceful co-existence with non-communists elsewhere; a view with which we now know many of Stalin's lieutenants heartily agreed even while they were, on his orders, heaping insults on Tito.

¹ Borba, 13 February 1955

This phase, during which much was made in the West of any crumbs of evidence that the Yugoslav communists had forever broken with Moscow, ended with Krushchev's first visit to Yugoslavia. On arrival at Belgrade airport on 26 May 1955, he said:

Following the teaching of the creator of the Soviet State, V.I. Lenin, the Government of the Soviet Union bases its relations with the other States, large or small, on the principle of the peaceful co-existence of states...

We would not be fulfilling our duty to our peoples and the workers of the whole world if we did not do everything possible in the way of establishment of mutual understanding between the Communist Party of Soviet Union and the League of Communist of Yugoslavia on the foundations of the teachings of Marxism - Leninism.

It took a little time before both states and parties re-established full mutual understanding in the third phase which began in May 1955. and is still with us.

The changes in Yugoslav foreign policy since 1955 have been considerable. There has been a new momentum towards improving relations at all levels with Soviet Union and its satellites (which were, following the pattern established by Yugoslavia and with no manifest disadvantage to Moscow, gradually themselves to assume relations of some independence from the Soviet Union.) There was, of course, continued concern to maintain the good relations so far established with Western countries.

But, just as in 1945 Yugoslavia showed ambitions in the Balkan sector, now in 1955 a new area for ambitions appeared in view. The first journey to India by Tito at the beginning of 1955 opened vistas for the spread of Yugoslav influence among the underdeveloped and newly independent states. In April 1955 the Conference of Asian and African states took place in Bandung, when for the first time a certain organised solidarity was manifested among underdeveloped countries. In Belgrade, Bandung was not only warmly greeted (a glance at the relevant newspaper files is enough to confirm this) but Yugoslav communists seized this opportunity to establish influence by advice and aid, both in orientation of these countries' foreign policies and in their internal affairs. Ideological propaganda was not far behind in pursuance of the motto 'socialism, then communism' (in the form of trade-union links, military delegations, cultural collaboration, economic co-operation and directs to some countries, etc.)

There is considerable evidence available now of influence with Naser prior to the nationalisation of Suez Canal and with his subsequent policy of good relations with both the East and West. Premier Nehru has himself spoken of the guidance received from Tito at the time of the Hungarian rising.

In the more recent past nothing essential has changed in the foreign policy of the Yugoslav communists. There is, constant diplomatic activity in the three fields; the Eastern bloc, the Western democracies and the underdeveloped countries (to give all three most popular labels for the sake of brevity). But in pursuit of the policy of co-existence with these three groups of countries, the policy of the Jugoslava communists never limits itself to mere diplomatic and trade relations or even cultural or tourist exchanges. In the background is its universal ideological task. Thus Tito was to state at the Fifth Plenum of the Central Committee of the League of Communist of Yugoslavia exactly what he meant by active co-existence:

Active coexistence in the present stage is one of the strongest political means of struggle on the part of the international working class movement for social progress and for the strengthening of socialist forces and factors in the world.²

I have underlined the word '*in the present stage*'. In the same speech by Tito there is further evidence from which we can see that the Jugoslava communists do not view the principles of co-existence as 'eternal'. They look upon coexistence dialectically as a process which began yesterday, which goes on today but which may tomorrow be replaced by another, rather less pacific principle.

I continue to quote from the same statement.

² J.B.Tito: 'The Position of the Yugoslav Communist League on Current International Questions and tasks of the International Working Class Movement in the Struggle for Peace and Socialism', published by the *Review of the International Affairs*, Belgrade 1963, in English

From the point of view of socialist forces, the interests of socialism and peace are inextricably bound up with each other in the present stage of the mankind's history. (My bold italics - V.I.)

As long as Stalin held sway with what the Yugoslavs called 'stultifying dogmatism', there was danger for them. Such petrification of thinking, they claimed, impeded progress towards socialism. Stalin's death marked the end of a brief but genuine battle for survival. The accession to power in the Soviet Union and gradually in other Eastern European communist states of like-minded communists has enabled the Yugoslavs to concentrate since 1955 on other problems. How to continue to belong to the family of Socialist nations with the ultimate aim of 'socialism, then communism'? How to avoid being dogmatic both in their internal and their foreign policy? How to preserve whatever positions of economic advantage they may have gained with the Western countries?

Not only is there for the Yugoslav communists no question of a choice between East and West, but they clearly assert that their concept of co-existence is in strict conformity with the *present interests* of world communism. Indeed they agree with Krushchev that the fundamental differences with the Chinese today are not on the ideological plane, but are to be found once again in the struggle against the petrifying effects of what they call bureaucratic-dogmatic ways.

Political analysis of Yugoslav foreign policy in the Department of State assumes the existence of a choice for Yugoslavia and then contemplates specific matters only in this light. The questions that are asked are (a) What are trade relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union? (b) Will the Government of Yugoslavia become a member of the Warsaw Pact and Comecon? (c) Is Yugoslav communism more or less nationalist than other versions? (d) Or, as Mr Kennan has asked in the *Look* article, should long-term financing of Yugoslavia's industrial development be left entirely to Russia?

Without the assumption of a choice for Yugoslavia, these questions and the answers to them are irrelevant.

It is not irrelevant to reply that communist Yugoslavia had in 1946 73 per cent of its export-import trade with the Soviet Union while in 1963 the figure barely reached 30 per cent?³ In 1963 the Soviet Union's own figure of trade with the other 'People's Democracies' look quite different from what they did in 1946. There is thus also a switch of Soviet trade with the West over these years, as well as a Yugoslav switch.

Then there is the irrelevance of Comecon and Warsaw Pact membership. Whilst trying to increase trade with Soviet Union (and if they can get long term credits there for industrialisation why not?), Yugoslav communists are also trying to strengthen trade relations with South America and the countries of the Common Market. Though they have no intention of joining the Common Market, *for political reasons* (they do not qualify in any case for that club by its conditions of respect for Human Rights) they have none the less recently been granted trade terms by France equivalent to the old O.E.E.C. terms.

Again Tito's attitude is plain:

*For us, for the Yugoslav Communist League, it has been perfectly clear for a long time that the progressive development of social relationships and the material strengthening of the socialistic countries are the historic duty of socialist forces in the present period.*⁴ (My bold italics. - V.I.)

This, if it means anything, indicates that all communist countries should get what material advantages they can get from the West, East or anywhere else by whatever means they can.

It is hard to believe that, without certain changes among their leaders or without cogent tactical reasons, the Yugoslav communists would enter Comecon and Warsaw Pact. It may well be true that, after the abandonment by the Chinese of the common front of all communist parties, the Soviet leaders would prefer to see the Yugoslav Government and Party completely back in the fold. But I would question whether today Comecon and the Warsaw Pact are in the front rank of their offensive against the Free World. Does not Yugoslavia today, while only an observer with Comecon and without being a member of

³ See footnote 'Tito and the Satellites', *East Europe*, Vol 12, No. 10, 1963

⁴ See footnote 2.

the Warsaw Pact, represent a rather more powerful spearhead for 'socialism, then communism' in the countries of South America, Africa and Asia than she would if she were a mere soviet satellite?

On the question of the Yugoslav Communists' national independence, Western critics of Tito's policies, i.e. those who are primarily anti-Communist, seem to concentrate their attention on (a) The visits to Jugoslavia of Krushchev and President Brezhnev, (b) Increased trade and financial aid between the Soviet Union and Jugoslavia, and (c) The recent increase in Soviet cultural influences in Jugoslavia.

These factors may have their importance but they are insignificant beside the clear statement by Tito to the Supreme Soviet on December 1962:

*We (the Soviet Union and Jugoslavia) strive towards the **same goals, the establishment of a new society, socialism, communism...** For these reasons our views (Soviet and Jugoslav communists) on all important questions of international politics are **identical or similar.***⁵ (My bold italics. - V.I.)

In his speech in Skoplje in the presence of Krushchev, Tito was even more explicit both about present day relations between the Soviet Union and Jugoslavia and about the conflict between the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party and the Yugoslav Communist Party before and immediately after 1948. On this 'conflict of principles', which at the time seemed to Western experts on communism to be shaking the communist world, Tito had now this to say in the presence of Krushchev:

*We have now, as you can see, mutually come to the conclusion that many things that divided us in the past were only **minor matters in comparison with the enormous common interests and tasks that lie before us.***⁶ (My bold italics. - V.I.)

It is not difficult to see from these attitudes the degree of harmony that exists between the foreign policies and ideological task of the Soviet and Jugoslav Governments. One could not possibly assert that between Jugoslavia and the Governments of Western Europe and the United States there was a similar process of harmonisation. It cannot rationally be maintained, in the present state of international affairs, and in spite of all solemn calls for coexistence, that for the Yugoslavs to approach nearer to the Soviet Union in the spirit of the words quoted above could at the same time enable them to approach nearer to the West. And yet only this illogical assumption could make sense of the proposition that the Jugoslav regime faced a choice between East and West.

Recent significant successes of Jugoslav foreign policy are a far cry from what could be expected from a country which, as Mr Kennan asserts, is itself facing important choices between East and West.

In Asia and Africa and lately in South America there have been great successes. Let us dwell for a moment on the most recent trip by Tito to South America. Much of the comment on this trip in Western papers was to the effect that no great interest had been aroused in the world at large. Yet Tito's message to Brazil, Chile, Bolivia and Mexico was loud and clear all the time, and it is merely hiding one's head in the sand to pretend that nobody in these countries has paid heed. The correspondent of the Belgrade *Borba*⁷, who does not write out of his own head, says:

*These countries are abandoning the isolation into which they were pushed by the Monroe Doctrine ... Latin America is becoming aware that it cannot solve its problems within the frame of its own Continent ... It (Latin America) must resolve the specific problems it has **with developed countries in conjunction with other underdeveloped countries.*** (My bold italics. - V.I.)

In view of subsequent events in Panama do not the following words of this same article seem prophetic?

The whole continent is in a state of ferment but without showing signs of chaos as of yore; It exhibits precise tendencies ... Reactions which appear in the wake of this process may slow down or stop it

⁵ Borba, 14 December 1962.

⁶ Borba, 14 December 1962.

⁷ Borba, 16 October 1963.

temporarily, but it is a matter of days when (Latin American countries) will begin to develop stormily. Latin America is not what it was yesterday. Tomorrow there will be real changes.⁸

I cannot see how it could have been maintained and is still being maintained that the Yugoslav Government and Party faces any choices between East and West.

To have based an entire policy on the premise that a choice, which existed in some degree only for a brief period before Stalin's death in 1953, still exists today, explains in large measure why in the decade since then that policy has been without success.

But this is only the first of the misapprehensions on which American policy towards Yugoslavia was founded. Here is the second.

II. In replying to the question '*On what basis should we give aid to other nations?*', Mr Kennan is reported as arguing the economic and military aid was no check-rein to keep teetering nations from dropping into the pit of communism. Then comes a direct quote:

I personally am sceptical about foreign aid, especially when it is given as a condition of not going Communist. We should help those who say, 'We are going to survive whether you help us or not' - like Finland. When a country says 'If you don't help us we will go under', we should get off the trolley.

Now Yugoslavia is either communist or is a nation teetering on the brink of communism. If it already is, then what Mr Kennan means by 'dropping into the pit of communism' is 'dropping into a deeper part of the pit of communism'. In that case fifteen years of American policy of economic and military aid to communist Yugoslavia were given without the conviction that they were a checkrein to a fall from one level of the communist pit to another. Such a policy would stand condemned by sceptical Mr Kennan.

The only other alternative is that Mr Kennan considers Tito's Yugoslavia to be non-communist. His quoted words then lead one to deduce that in order to obtain aid Tito and company had to say: 'We are going to survive whether you help us or not'. For a country which 'faces important choices between East and West' the word 'survive' must mean 'not going communist' (as goes for Mr Kennan's example of Finland in the quotation).

There is nothing new in this. Any student of the history of Tito's advent to power would immediately recognise these defiant words. Such words, and the same gimmick, have been used ever since 1934 by the Yugoslav Communists. In their first contact with the West, the Yugoslav partisan leadership, which was communist, convinced Brigadier Maclean, the Head of the British Mission parachuted to them, that they could survive without aid. 'We shall be victorious in our war in Yugoslavia, first against the enemy, then against our Quislings and finally against any rival patriots.' So ran the defiant words then. They were a sure winner with Brigadier and the British Government. This gimmick has also worked with Mr Kennan.

To this the British and later Mr Kennan's reactions were: 'If we don't help them they will go under in spite of their brave talk'. What the British then meant to achieve by aid to Tito's partisans was first to prevent them being wiped out by the Germans and only secondly to prevent Yugoslavia becoming communist. Mr Kennan *now* can only mean that by giving economic and military aid he believes that, regardless of Tito's open adherence to communism, he and Yugoslavia would somehow finish up on the anti-communist side.

Rationally speaking, such hopes might well be applied to the non-communist Finns who would, of course, be lucky if they tumbled to such an easy techniques for extracting aid. To apply these canons to Yugoslav partisans was, it transpired rash enough for the British in the throes of war. But for that generation of the British, though not for Churchill himself, this was the very first direct contact with communism and it might be said that they had no time to pause and think.

To persist in treating the Yugoslav communists *today* as facing a choice between fellow communists and communist states in the East or elsewhere on the one hand and the West on the other is to display a

⁸ Borba, 16 October 1963.

degree of political innocence that is baffling. To insist, despite all the evidence, on treating them as non communists is almost incredible.

III. To go on to the third point. Mr Kennan is quoted by *Look* as saying, '*People who expect the capitulation of communist power are talking something so unrealistic they really want war*'

When applied to the Soviet Union and probably communist China today, this may well be so. There is much wisdom in Mr Kennan's view of the oversimplified and half-baked thoughts which so many opponents of communism bring to their criticism of the Department of State.

The situation of communist power in Russia between 1917 and, say, 1922, and in China in 1945, was emphatically not so. But that, alas, is water over the dam.

In the case of Yugoslavia it is by no means certain that communism would have taken root. Admittedly there was a powerful guerrilla force with an attractive national programme and a decimated democratic opposition, apart from the disintegrating Quisling forces. But the aid given by the Soviet Army in the closing stages of the war as well as the British/American/Soviet decisions at Teheran, Yalta and Postdam put the issue beyond doubt. Beyond, also, the possibility of democratic forces having any effect at all.

Communism would at any rate never have survived in Yugoslavia had it not been propped up and maintained by the Western Powers, first by Great Britain and then mainly by the United States. To regard Yugoslav communism as a power which cannot be removed without war is as unsophisticated a view as is the opposite attitude of seeing a communist under every bed.

* * *

We have shown how inaccurate were three views all of which were expressed by Mr Kennan in the *Look* article as leading views held in the Department of State.

The first was that there was or ever could have been a choice for Tito and the Yugoslav communists between East and West.

The second was that whether they were or were not communists, persistent, unconditional and at times even unsolicited aid would keep them away from close and intimate collaboration with the Soviet Union and other communist states.

The third was that, irrespective whether the U.S. aided or boycotted Communist Yugoslavia, the communist regime there could be overthrown in the course of a war.

In order to get away from the word 'communist', since this word is charged with so much emotion and ignorance in public and private debate, let me simplify the confusion of thought that has arisen.

Supposing being black was worth supporting rather than being white. Then the American policy for X would look like this:

(1) X stands before the choice of being black or white. By supporting him and also by not denying him commercial relations it is hoped he will choose to be black.

(2) But, regardless of the fact that he is already white or is teetering on the edge of becoming white, as long as he simply says that even without aid he will end up being black he should be supported.

(3) He is already white anyway and only a war can change it.

If experts on whiteness think and act in accordance with all these three propositions, palpably incompatible, the best that one can conclude is that they cannot see the wood for the trees.

In the case of Cuba and Vietnam similar judgements and policies based on pious hopes and confusion of the issues were soon proved inadequate. Here the United State government no longer looks upon foreign policy as a popularity contest but pursues with patience and perseverance its own national interest.

'No ordeal changes the nature of man', says De Gaulle, 'and no crisis changes the nature of States.'

Perhaps it will not be long before it is realised in America that it is the natural national interest of the peoples of Jugoslavia to form a part of Free Europe. The present Jugoslav State captured by the communists, who are a group with other aspirations, has remained essentially the same despite all it has been through, and as such can never give expression to the will of the people or serve the people's interests.

I venture to suggest that it is also in America's interest that all Eastern Europe, Jugoslavia included, should once again join a Free Europe.

In the *Look* article Mr Kennan carefully criticised the forces that according to him now paralyse American foreign policy. Because he dwells on the case of Jugoslavia, at least we Jugoslavs have learnt something. We have at last seen just why the Department of State has pursued its policy for our country and where it has gone wrong.

The fact that the Department of State now apparently finds itself to some degree curbed by Congress may for some be a source of frustration. The debate on foreign policy seems to have become livelier. All the critics cannot airily be dismissed as rightists. Discussion has shifted to a wider field than the inner sanctum of the Department of State.

To those of us who have watched dejectedly so many acts fortifying and encouraging the forces which oppress Human Rights and the rule of law in Jugoslavia, this development can only be a source of encouragement

*In April 1966 I wrote a letter to the editor of **Hrvatski glas** in response to Dr. Stanko Vujica's tempered and reasonable article entitled **The Logic of Yugoslavism**, appearing in its November 6th 1965 issue, No. 44. I believed that Dr. Vujica's article, which supported the division of Croats and Serbs, merited a proper commentary from someone who advocated not only lasting conciliation between Croats and Serbs, but also a rational Yugoslav political, economic and social system for our lands.*

*I never received an answer to my letter to the editor of **Hrvatski glas**, asking him to publish my piece. Here I give a shorter excerpt from the first part of my commentary, as it appeared in the August/September 1966 issue of **Naša reč**, a monthly magazine published in Paris and London for over 40 years by Serb exiles who **were themselves well-known democrats**.*

YUGOSLAVIA - MORE A CLUB THAN A HOMELAND

Serbo-Croat problems can be discussed from three points of view: the idealistic, the romantically sentimental (i.e. the irrational), and the rational.

When one of us thinks of his own particular interests and then wishes to judge between on the one hand the separate Croat or Serb solutions, and on the other hand the joint, Yugoslav solutions to the accumulated problems shared by both, he or she will adopt, consciously or not, one of the three viewpoints as defined above.

But in comparing Serb or Croat theses with Yugoslav ones, we must be careful to compare the idealistic with the idealistic, the romantic with the romantic and the rational with the rational. Otherwise, we cannot avoid finding ourselves comparing incomparables, and such comparisons lead nowhere.

The Idealistic Viewpoint (which, incidentally, is not at all irrational):

The idealistic Croat position would be this: based on the right of nations to self-determination, Croats are a completely distinct nation; they are peaceful by nature, mostly agrarian by tradition, and historically they regard themselves as defenders of the Christian civilisation in Europe. It is quite natural that such a nation should wish to be the master of their own home, especially after so many centuries of foreign rule.

The Serb viewpoint is based on a generations-long awareness of clear national determination and homogeneity. It would be difficult to find another nation with a more acute awareness of its own nationality than Serbs have for their Serbianism. After liberation from the Turks, the Serbs had their own sovereign state and an independent church. The Serbs claim to be fighters with a long tradition, yet they assert that they like peace. At the same time they are aware of their crucial geo-political position among the nations of the Balkans.

The Yugoslav viewpoint is that Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Bosniak Muslims and Macedonians, even possibly also the Bulgarians, are in essence one nation which, as a consequence of centuries of foreign rule, had been separated by religion and ways of life, and so it retained its original and distinct tribal identity. But under free conditions (which, it must be admitted, have yet to exist in the modern age), and with the passage of time, awareness of their fundamental sameness would certainly prevail.

The Romantically Sentimental Viewpoint:

I use this term, first of all, because it sounds pleasant. Nonetheless, this is an irrational viewpoint because it is an unreasonable and passionate application of the above described idealistic concept. One would have to be a psychoanalyst to be able to throw a more precise light on and define these conceits. I shall give only some of the main thoughts on which these viewpoints stand. The reader will easily recognise some of the main elements across which we come, alas, all too often.

The Croat irrational viewpoint is based on the idea that the Croat state exists because Croats have a right to it. It fails to exist in reality only when enemies of the Croat nation are stronger from time to time. Such enemies are numerous, but the most prominent of them are the Serbs. Serbs use force or Byzantine guile to impose their exploitative rule over Croats. Under the banner of the aspiration to be free of Austria-Hungary; by use of the hypocrisy of ostensibly Yugoslav-oriented Serbs; by supporting the paramountcy of the Serb dynasty and army; by masking their aims with the Yugoslav catchwords of Draža Mihailović and partisan slogans of brotherhood and unity and by profiting from the present-day rule of the Communist Party - Serbs constantly and continually strive to subjugate the Croats. According to this view, the Serbs are at the same time not only an uncouth Balkan mass, but they also can be equated with the primitive Christian concept of Satan. As such they are gifted with all the omnipotent characteristics of the divine. With the exception of goodness.

There is a simple way to get rid of this enormous and permanent menace and that is to have a free, independent Croat state within its own "historical" borders; then everything will be fine, not only for the Croats, but also for Serbs living within those borders.

Not a word is here wasted on how all this may be achieved, not a thought is given to the current problems of mankind - the social system, the vital problems of food and the economy, the Croat political position in Europe or even to relations among Croats of different views.

For Serbs, the irrational viewpoint stems from emotions tied to what they regard as traditions of honour that emerged or were reinforced in the course of the last century. The main elements are: the notion of a Serbia created by Saint Sava; prominent membership of winning armies in the Balkan wars and in the First World War and the fathering of the national dynasty. Fate has assigned Serbs the lot of being the Piedmont of the Southern Slavs. When things go wrong, it is because someone has betrayed the Serbs, first the legendary Vuk Branković, then the Croats and finally the Western allies in World War II. According to this view, care of Serb interests can be successful only if the Serb state extends to all areas inhabited by Serbs. Thus, Croats and any others who wind up living inside a Greater Serbia should be happy that they were being taken care of by the one group among the Southern Slavs capable of organising and maintaining a viable state. Again, not a word about how all this may now be achieved.

We also know quite a bit about the irrational Yugoslav viewpoint. The first phase was: Croats, Serbs and Slovenes are nothing more than the three tribes of the Yugoslav nation. Their separate patriotisms are merely the product of megalomanias of the simple minded. They should all be kept, whether they like it or not, within the framework of the Yugoslav state. In time they will see the light. Meanwhile, it would be better for them not to see their separate flags or hear the names of their historical figures. The second irrational phase of Yugoslavism is the communist one. National aspirations are simply a reaction to economic injustices. The social order must be radically re-arranged, class and individual exploitation must be abolished. Thus national aspirations will be reduced to the tame wish to preserve some national distinctions and harmless folklore. In time, old nationalisms will be replaced by Yugoslav "socialist patriotism", of course within perimeters that suit communist concepts.

Unlike the Croat and Serb irrational viewpoints, both the phases of irrational Yugoslavism have largely died out.

The Rational Viewpoint

Rational Croats say, and here I follow the words of Dr. Vujica, that to separate Serbs and Croats into two distinct states is a difficult but not an impossible task, whereas, in our circumstances, a multinational state is neither desirable nor possible. After dividing into national states, the nations of present-day Yugoslavia could, *if they so desired*, form a common market among themselves; preserve the dinar as a common currency and even form a regional military alliance. Thus, *a period of goodneighbourliness and economic partnership could emerge*. This is the sole basis on which mutual equality could be ensured.

Rational Serbs reject both the first Yugoslavia from 1918 to 1941 and the second under the rule of the Communist Party. They are not tied *a priori* to the monarchy; they do not count on the Serbs' fighting spirit and military prowess to achieve their goals; they digested Macedonia's separation and the acquisition of its own national identity. Like Dr. Vujica, they know that a solution to Serbo-Croat problems (which include the fact that for a long time now almost as many Serbs live outside Serbia proper as in it) would only be feasible by way of conciliation and a lasting agreement between Serbs and Croats. Whatever the solution, it would certainly require not only a wide sphere of a shared but also an equitable life with the Croats.

The rational Yugoslav view must answer, in my view, two questions. First: What is desirable? And the second: What is feasible? Today I should like to treat the question of what was desirable. In my next article I propose to discuss what would be feasible.

It is illusory today even to talk about a Yugoslav nationality being a factor in our complicated mutual relations. The vast majority of Serbs and Croats consider themselves just that - Serbs and Croats. The same applies to our other nations. It is not possible to bypass the Muslim identity in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The country's sizeable Albanian minority is only temporarily quiescent. If Yugoslavia is to exist under free conditions, a multinational structure with equality among the constituent nationalities simply cannot be avoided.

But, and this is a very big "but", in today's conditions no Yugoslavia based on free will and with an equal status for its national communities could even come close to being capable of guaranteeing the physical survival of its population, a rising living standard and state security.

As an independent economic unit Yugoslavia has all the characteristics of a small, still relatively under-developed country. In present-day Europe, such small units do not possess enough means of their own, nor a large enough labour force to be able to lift themselves out of their under-developed state, let alone to achieve industrial growth according to modern standards.

Thus, there immediately arises the essential question of how to join Europe and specifically how to take part in the common European market arrangements: Are we to approach this problem together or separately through independent national state units?

Some parts of our area are only in the first stages of transition from a traditionally peasant economy to an industrial society. Others are - to use a popular euphemism - under-developed. In other words, they are still economically backward. It is impossible to draw any borders between these two categories, so as to leave more affluent regions on one side, and poor regions on the other. A map of Yugoslavia divided on such lines would consist of a series of green dots to show relatively developed regions, mixed up with brown dots to represent economic wastelands.

On top of this, such lines drawn between these two categories would inevitably cut across every theoretically possible ethnic border between the several Yugoslav nations.

Relying only on herself, Yugoslavia cannot provide from the budgets of her richer regions sufficient subsidies to ensure a steady rise of living standards and political stability in her poorer regions, those with potentially revolutionary populations, such as Lika, Kordun, Northern Dalmatia, Herzegovina, parts of Bosnia, Montenegro and Macedonia.

Left to herself, such a Yugoslavia could at any moment be shaken to her foundations, if not actually destroyed. Present-day independent communist Yugoslavia has survived primarily by force. Then through American dollar aid thanks to occasional American interest in encouraging rifts among various communist regimes. Lastly today's Yugoslavia has survived through the inertia born out of the fear that the disappearance even of such a Yugoslavia might lead to something even worse.

We must also pause for a moment to consider the modern meaning of the concept of "industrialisation", lest this word join the category of such popular myths of ours as "sovereignty", "independent state", "heroic army", etc.

In virtually every modern industrial field, today's world lives in a time of explosive advancement of technology and diversity of products. The relation between the use of the human brain and efforts in industrial research on the one hand, and actual productivity and the labour force on the other is constantly increasing in favour of larger and larger investment in industrial research itself. Only large, advanced countries with their elaborate industrial complexes, with a wide range of professionally trained staff, with electronic calculating machines and a division of competently educated labour are able to take part in this phase of industrialisation in the second half of this century. For us, if we were left only to our own devices, industrialisation would mean nothing but stagnation, with obsolete installations and old-fashioned brains. Modern industrialisation is way beyond our possibilities, however naturally intelligent and completely united we may be.

That is why it is essential that we soon become economically and politically part of the European economy.

Of course, it would be very difficult for Yugoslavia to avoid a minor role or function in any European combination, whose members include highly advanced West European industrial countries. That is inevitable. But with a deft policy and mutually harmonious efforts, one can imagine all parts of Yugoslavia gradually and normally adapting to Europe in the second half of the twentieth century.

It is illusory, therefore, to talk of Yugoslavia as a state capable of *independently* feeding, prospering and defending herself and, at the same time, preserving the institutions of the free world and respecting human rights. (Tyrannies and dictatorships have their own pace and their own particular ways of temporary survival. I do not include them in this discussion because, according to my concepts and ideology, we are here concerned with the search for more lasting and free solutions.)

What applies to Yugoslavia as a whole must apply *a fortiori* to any separate independent states that would emerge in the case of her disintegration. Even smaller and more helpless than Yugoslavia, each one of these little states would be even less capable of guaranteeing political stability to its backward regions which, for *nationally moral reasons*, they must protect and bear the burden of their backwardness. It would also be more difficult for each little state to approach Europe. Even Slovenia and Croatia, our richer regions, would have to apply for membership of Europe with an industrial capacity and initial market far smaller than were the twenty or so million people who make up Yugoslavia today. Politically speaking, Slovenia and Croatia would soon find themselves in a role vis-a-vis the Austro-Germans and Italians similar to the one they had before 1914 when progressive-minded South Slavs in Austria-Hungary realised the importance of liberation and unification with Serbia and Montenegro. As for our poorer regions, they could only enter Europe in the role of beggars.

If we add that for reasons of prestige (if not pure necessity) each of these newly established states would immediately have to set up its own army (some would also need a navy and merchant marine), air force, railway and road system, an electrification system, national bank, currency and state administrative apparatus, then we are already approaching the realm of operettas.

And so any rational discussion of these problems must discard the alternative of dissecting Yugoslavia into still smaller independent units.

I really do not need to add that it is both desirable and necessary for Yugoslavia's individual nations, each in its own interest, voluntarily to agree to a union. Otherwise we could not talk about freedom and democracy. But the most important thing for us as human beings is to create conditions where humanism must always prevail over all choices of social dispositions or political structures, should these ever clash with humanism.

Passing silently over pretensions to an all-Yugoslav patriotism, the modern Yugoslav solution requires that Yugoslavia be more like a *club* than a true *homeland*. Yugoslavia should be imagined from the start as the fruit of resolutions reached by a number of commissions which would coordinate the many and various activities of the separate member nations. Abandoning the romantic sentimental viewpoint enables one immediately to imagine countless open and tacit compromises which would only take in concrete interests, and which might sometimes be regional in character and, on occasion, centralist. Under an agreed Constitution, those institutions and operations that had of necessity to remain centralist in character would themselves have to be policentrically distributed. Each member nation would have every chance to a free life, except for a completely full international sovereignty. International sovereignty is anyway only a passing element in the long history of our nations and must not become a millstone around our necks.

Every analysis of this kind of theoretical grouping, of such a *club for compromises*, would show that, apart from enjoying the advantages of a larger, politically and economically more feasible unit, it would have within it not just some but *all* elements that rational Croats and rational Serbs regard as essential for the survival of Croatia and Serbia.

Part Two

What is feasible

In the first part of this article I dwelled on a desirable Yugoslav solution. But what is feasible? Needless to say, a rational solution must propose a programme for the future which is at least *prima facie* feasible.

Yugoslavia exists today as a state, whereas Croatia and Serbia do not exist as independent states. Present-day communist-ruled Yugoslavia would have to be destroyed before one could even discuss the establishment of other independent states. The disappearance of present-day Yugoslavia might perhaps be achieved through a war involving Yugoslavia. A general war that would, apart from bringing other horrors, take place on our lands must be rejected as a rational solution. It is impossible to predict the kind of results a war would bring to all our nations.

The destruction of present-day Yugoslavia by way of revolution would be another way to lay the ground for the establishment of separate national states. In this case also it is impossible to predict whether this or that result might be achievable. Proposals for revolution, therefore, must remain in the realm of political speculation and have no place in any serious consideration of national interests.

It remains for us to contemplate the reform of present-day Yugoslavia by peaceful means. That involves the reformation of an existing state in a manner that existing power-holders could accept. It is impossible to reform Croatia or Serbia, since they do not exist as independent states.

It has often been said that history knows of no instance in which those in power had peacefully abandoned their posts and that this was especially true of communists. It would lead me too far from this thesis to try to refute its theory, but the history of the Roman Empire, to mention just one political organisation, is full of examples of ruling groups or individual rulers, no less determined than today's communists, who did loosen or agree to share their hold on power.

Though our communists did not submit themselves to real elections in 1945, they did have their publicly proclaimed programme. It can be said that the programme initially did enjoy the tacit approval also of some non-communists. First of all, the programme offered our nations an economic reorganisation to achieve a fair division of the means of production and exchange, a higher living standard and a higher standard of social justice; a resolution of our internal national problems and, lastly, a united and mutually loyal leadership.

It would be difficult to find an example where a political party had failed so dismally in implementing the very cornerstones of its programme. Any communist with a spark of conscience could not but admit, if only to himself, the catastrophic failures precisely over these cornerstones of the communist programme.

¹ *Naša reč*, December 1966, No. 178

One could not now disregard the possibility that many Communist Party members, and others, non-communists who play important roles in present-day Yugoslavia, would cooperate in adapting our lands to modern European conditions.

The rational Yugoslav view requires that any reform of present-day Yugoslavia embrace the following:

a) the identification of democratic principles which would establish the moral foundations of a union of our nations. The complete freedom of each nation to decide, by its own majority, at a national assembly, i.e. a constitutional Assembly, whether or not it wishes to remain in a completely nationally equal alliance is the cardinal and irreplaceable foundation of the democratic programme;

b) the elaboration of an economic programme to encompass all our problems, the most important being: the rehabilitation of agriculture, a rationalisation of industry, economic and financial measures to create an attractive climate for foreign investments and keep domestic money at home; a rationalisation of the institutions of public education, health and insurance;

c) the economic side of the programme must be progressive and incorporate the lessons learned from various communist measures. The purpose of state intervention in the economy should be to encourage growth and expansion of the national economy rather than to command and itself build the structure of the economy. The character and structure of the means of production are determined by domestic consumers and foreign customers and not by the brainchildren of statesmen and economic theorists or by the wishes of manufacturers themselves. In the present age of rapid technological change, no state power can determine and programme which part of the country's industry, or even what technologies, will be the most important to the country in ten or even five years' time;

d) efforts to convince progressive elements in the League of Communists of Yugoslavia and those non-communists on whose active cooperation the communist authorities rely, that important, true and effective reforms are inevitable, not only in the interest of our nations but also in the interest of any modern communist outlook. Otherwise, our communist reality will sooner or later lead to serious consequences for all, and to catastrophic consequences for them;

e) to try and convince the United Nations, some of the major powers or at least our closest neighbours, that it would be in their own interest that there be no perturbations in Yugoslavia that might jeopardise European or world peace;

f) with the cooperation that would stem from items d) and e), gradual reform of present-day Yugoslavia, so that without any doubt it remains all the time clear that the process was transitional and ultimately dependent on the decisions of the national assembly, i.e. constituent Assembly;

g) preliminary work to prepare elections of delegates representing each nation at the national assembly which would decide either to convert itself into a constituent Assembly of the new Yugoslav state union, or for the delegations to leave and go their own way in peace;

h) elections on this basis, not to be held in a vacuum but under the aegis of the transitional regime here described.

Until now (with the exception of the activities of the group of the Stansted meeting), rational Croat, Serb and Slovene emigres limited themselves to declaring what was desirable. I do not see that they differ in essence from what rational Yugoslavs desire.

But it is only those expressing rational Yugoslav views who have even tried to indicate at least the main lines of what might possibly be feasible.

Only when any rational Serb or Croat or Slovene or Macedonian or Bosniak-Muslim programme takes into account what was desirable for each of them separately, and also what was feasible, could any one of them claim with any validity to be compared with the rational Yugoslav programme.

Of course, it is no use simply refuting the idealistic or the romantic-sentimental Yugoslav solution. What is needed is a discussion of a modern Yugoslav solution which must dispassionately consider not only the interests of each of our nations but of all of them together, and set emerging ideas and programmes against the backdrop of present-day reality. We should always bear in mind the limits beyond which neither our will nor our means can take us.

I dedicate this work to

Bozidar Vljajic

distinguished and respected patriot, who in fifty years of political activity publicly and without respite defended the principles of modern democracy. As a Serb he was among the first who rose against the Vidovdan Constitution and all subsequent state systems imposed on us. He always stood for a modern concept of a pluralistic, just and free Yugoslav Union. To all who know him he preaches that politics may never be separated from morals. This article was published in London, 1967.

**DEMOCRATIC YUGOSLAVIA
AN OUTLINE FOR DISCUSSION**

Foreword

The sovereign decision concerning any proposed Union on the foundations of a pluralistic democracy and true equality belongs exclusively to the nations of Yugoslavia. But democratic practice requires, first of all and before decisions are taken, a detailed and thorough public debate about the institutions capable of securing a democratic order not only for citizens as individuals but also for national communities.

With this in mind political men from Yugoslavia, who live in the Western democracies, began a debate on a democratic alternative to the regime in power from the very moment of the establishment of Communist rule in Yugoslavia. For this debate to bear fruit it is vital that it be carried out in a systematic way and that the ideas it produces be bound together coherently.

I have taken part in a series of discussions in this debate. I now wish to present an outline for a democratic alternative constructed to reflect the views that have been expressed and in accordance with my judgement.

Of course this outline has no other aim but to serve as a basis for discussion. We are mainly concerned here with resolving our national problems in freedom and in a democratic way.

This outline, for which I bear sole personal responsibility, has no other ambition but to serve as an incentive for a further fair exchange of views and so to contribute to a tolerant discussion of matters of substance on a subject which is of fateful consequence for all the nations of Yugoslavia and their Union.

All I request of the readers of this outline is to give me credit for good will and honourable intentions.

A further subject of discussion should be the guiding principles for the procedure to be followed so that a transition may be made, with minimum disturbance, from the present totalitarian establishment in Yugoslavia to a pluralistic democratic order. But even the broadest outlines of such procedures cannot for the time being be foreseen.

* * *

It is worth while reminding readers in 1995 and later that at the time of publication of this brochure in 1967, Tito and the Communist party had been in power in Yugoslavia over twenty years and that they

appeared set to hold sway very many years to come. It should also be noted that at that time nobody, not even our Slav muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina, had become fully aware that this muslim community, though without a satisfactory name, had become to all intents and purposes a recognisable South Slav national community. Our Democratic alternative publications and communications thereafter treated the Bosniaks (as they decided to call themselves) as a nation or as equal footing to Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians.

Introduction

In looking at the problems presented in this outline we should be free both of prejudice and optimism. One should not blindly believe that this outline or that compromise or some constitutional structure, or a particular institution, can solve all problems. The hard facts of life have shown that the modern state itself, any state, however democratic its constitutional structure may be, by the very profusion of its functions and the extent of its powers, forces thoughtful people, especially the young, to question the efficacy of its primary functions of protecting the individual, guaranteeing his participation in deciding his fate and maintaining peaceful order. Nothing is gained for example, by reducing the power of a centralist government, if the regional or any other administrations that may take its place come, by their approach and manner, no nearer to satisfying the individual, his expectations or his needs.

The outline published here contains two fundamental propositions:

1. That an order founded on the concepts of parliamentary democracy and the full personal freedom of every citizen is not only essential for us but is also possible.

2. That the Union of the nations of Yugoslavia is necessary for the life of each one of them.

Pessimists, able to point to our experience and the conditions obtaining among us yesterday and today, have judged that we are not yet ripe for parliamentary democracy nor for true and effective political freedoms.

There is only one way to achieve parliamentary democracy **and this is to give life to it**. There is only one ripe time for the introduction of democracy. **The sooner the better**.

Every election, however unimportant, however clumsily or fraudulently it may be carried out is a lesson for the people for the next election. Freedom of speech, press and assembly and elections must be persistently and constantly demanded. The more often elections are carried out the sooner will it occur even to the least educated men how to ensure a freer election next time.

It would be naive to expect that such a process could mature smoothly. What is happening in Yugoslavia today is proof enough how much obstinate pressure on the part of the people is needed for the least gain towards individual freedom.

It should not be difficult to understand why so many of our people—Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians—should have reacted with a particularly lively and intolerant form of national feeling to the many adversities to which their history and geopolitical position have exposed them.

We have only recently gained the limited opportunity of attempting to solve our problems free of direct intervention by foreign powers. It is enough to mention only some of our problems to recognize how perplexing they are: a mixed population of several national groups with deeply ingrained traces of different cultures to which we have been exposed for centuries; considerable variations in the language; underdeveloped and passive regions interspersed with rich lands, and, finally, the fact that our first leap out of a traditional peasant economy should have coincided with the rapid industrial revolution in lands around us, together with the establishment of many powerful totalitarian state machines, both fascist and communist.

All this has given rise, apart from the tragedies that accompanied our foreign wars and civil strife, to a sense of isolation and perplexity a naive faith in high-sounding nationalistic slogans and one's fellow nationals strangely blended with contempt for authority and suspicion of those most similar to us.

Yet, nationalism has helped to explode the mythology of communism among us and other Eastern Europe nations. In our case, however, the increasing gravity of our national problems delays progress in our economic, social and cultural life.

The form our several nationalisms have taken in their present profusion, compels them everywhere and at all times to conflict with each other. That is why we have so far been unable (regardless of the communist regime whose leaders—former internationalists—have now given way to these same emotions) to step on to the European stage ready to adapt ourselves to modern concepts in Europe.

Quite justifiably even the smallest nations or national groups today enjoy universal sympathy when they affirm their national identity and seek cultural independence. Brotherhood and unity cannot be imposed. But it is at the same time difficult, not to say impossible, to disregard the degree to which we are all bound up with each other as well as the extensive community of vital interests shared by the nations of Yugoslavia.

There are only two theoretically conceivable ways of removing our national problem from the first place on the agenda of any of our enterprises.

One would be a peaceful separation; the other, a Union which had a chance of survival. A separation, in peace, of our several nations simply cannot be devised. In particular, a separation of Serbs and Croats, in a manner which would satisfy a majority of Serbs and a majority of Croats, is quite impossible.

The ideas set out in this outline are, of course, in favour of a Union. They rest on the following foundations:

1. The right of self determination of nations including (notwithstanding my own opinion stated above) the right of free withdrawal from the Union.
2. Equality, not only among individual citizens, but also among national communities and Member States.
3. A fair and equal distribution of the seats of the principal institutions of the Union among Member States, and a fair and equitable division of the executive business of the Union among the several nations.
4. General principles in defence of civil, political and religious liberties of all citizens constitutionally binding for the Union and all Member-States.

The Union here outlined respects all the basic principles of a civilized state. At the same time it is capable of coming to life and developing in the interest of all the nations of Yugoslavia.

What we now need most of all is to harmonize our concepts of nationalism with the present real interests of our peoples, both spiritually and in practice.

We shall only find peace and prosperity when we realize that, beside our individual patriotisms, we must develop a wider loyalty to a Union that can guarantee, to all of us, personal freedom and equality among the nations.

In the times in which we live and in the position we are in, separate national sovereign states are mere play with words. Sovereign national states are not of themselves a sure guarantee for what is essential in nationalism—the expression of national identity and cultural independence. It is no more difficult to secure such necessary guarantees in free association with kindred nations who live in similar circumstances, provided that the essential principles set out here are respected. And, of course, a Union must come by free choice.

Every individual rational patriot of any of the Yugoslav nations must in his heart know that we can in reality seriously speak only of a democratic reform of the existing Union.

When it has become clear to our public opinion which of the alternatives to communist power may be seriously considered we can pose the question whether the present regime (or some currents within it) are capable, in one way or another, of initiating or carrying out the necessary reforms.

This outline is consistent with one way of thinking. That is why it has taken its own particular form. But it should be plain that the very same principles may equally well be applied in other ways. All the more so as established patterns of governmental structures everywhere in the world tend to be dominated by technocrats and civil servants so that, in the longer run, radical reforms are inevitable and particularly so in our case.

This outline is concerned with the application in the Slav South of a principle known to us throughout our history but, alas, seldom attained.

This is the concept of liberty. It has long ago been well defined.

All men are created equal in the sense that they are all endowed with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The latter may also be described as the right to one's own way of life and one's own outlook on the world.

In their practical application, these rights of the individual are a possession limited by the need to respect the equal rights of other individuals which none are entitled to infringe.

Any political programme which desires to retain the loyalty of men over the long run must seek to harmonize these rights of individuals rather than try to offer an answer to Lenin's question who 'whom?'.

The steps needed to bring into effect the right to liberty have been frustrated and postponed for centuries. Realists invariably ridicule idealists even though it has never been shown that the former are more far-sighted than the latter. Institutions established by men to secure the right of liberty may, by their own negligence or human frailty, wither or go wrong. The idea, however, will remain and give birth to new attempts to regulate our affairs in conformity with human dignity.

In view of the important place that economic matters and foreign policy have in the state and society for the purposes of further discussion, some ideas from these domains.

Economic and Financial Policy

However important economic issues may be and however valid the conclusions we reach on financial and trade matters, they cannot of themselves solve national questions. Yet it is worth stressing, and in our circumstances worth constantly repeating, that no one who concerns himself with the national questions of Yugoslavia can avoid some fundamental economic truths. These are capable of imposing solutions which do not always go hand in hand with purely nationalist ambitions.

Without doubt, conditions in Yugoslavia have moved far from the order initially established by the Communists. The chain of reforms so far enacted has opened the door to a kind of mixed economy—state, co-operative and private. A democratic alternative must also contain, within the structure it seeks to outline, a set of guiding principles in the economic field.

The nations of Yugoslavia cannot, with their united forces, let alone each on their own, turn our—in European terms relatively primitive—economy into a modern industrial and social structure capable of surviving in the Europe of the third part of the 20th century. For such a task we lack sheer numbers; the necessary technology; natural resources; sufficient assets accumulated in the

past. In order to survive the years necessary for the education of our population in advanced industrial skills, and to develop our industrial research to the quality and the degree required by modern and not already obsolescent industries, we cannot do without a concern by others for our welfare. So far we have been useful to foreigners as workers or soldiers. Our lands have served as a source of natural wealth and as battlefields for the resolution of political problems outside and beyond our own interests. In terms of economics, the time has now come when it would be of advantage both to our immediate neighbours and to the great powers that our lands should reach, as soon as possible, the levels of economic development in Western Europe.

That is why one may rely with some confidence on the necessary credits from abroad and on other ways of aiding our economic development by foreigners. In the economic sense the primary function of a Union of the nations of Yugoslavia and its constituent Member-States would be to guarantee to other peoples in Europe and elsewhere the stability of the order established throughout our territories in this period of development. This involves rationalisation of our agriculture still the primary occupation of our population. In the absence of stability other nations will fail to see their interest in supporting our economic development. Moreover, we may expect that some of them might be moved, in the event of insecurity or chaos in our midst, to wrest from us something of what we have secured with so much effort. The Union is, therefore, the main guarantee of our stability. The overall framework of economic policy of the Union and Member-States should not, however, reach beyond the following functions:

1. The advancement and encouragement of agricultural and industrial research with a view to larger and more efficient productivity—on the land and in industry, the preservation of national assets and our natural resources.
2. The furtherance of foreign trade by foreign exchange policy, customs and quotas; the establishment of rational conditions for foreign investments and loans and also for our investments and loans abroad.
3. The fostering of economic relations within the Union not only between individuals but also between peasant and other co-operatives, commercial enterprises and Member-States. Here would be included the promotion of investments and loans inside the Union and between Member-States together with a rational distribution of contributions by Member-States to the Union and the division of customs revenue and quota benefits.
4. The implementation of the responsibilities of a rationally organized modern welfare state where action by public authorities is indisputable. This would cover public fields such as certain, but not all, aspects of social, educational, public health policy, pensions etc. The economic policy of the Union and Member-States should in any event point in the direction of a gradual freeing of agriculture and industry from rule by the central authorities, a process which the hard facts of life have already imposed on the Communist doctrinaires themselves.

One abiding truth to be learnt from stubborn economic reality is that the prosperity of any society is governed by consumers at home and buyers abroad and not by the wishes of Government authorities, the theories and plans of economic experts, and least of all by the desires of the population in the role of producers.

Foreign Policy

Jugoslavia is not only not isolated but from her inception has been in the path of any movements between East and West Europe. Her component nations have lived there for centuries. Neither the development of nuclear weapons nor modern technology seem to have changed the strategic thinking of the great powers who still pay great attention to our geopolitical space. Whether or not our nations elect in favour of a Union, none of them can avoid the consequence of our position. We are not only on the very borders of Europe and other Continents but we have, for a long time, lived in lands which are part of both the Western and the Eastern worlds. A misguided foreign policy, an ineffective one, or the absence of one, could frustrate the most reasonable arrangements we might make among ourselves.

Our vital interests in the field of foreign policy may be briefly stated:

International order should be founded on the universal and generally accepted principles contained in the United Nations Charter.

Yugoslavia has need of orderly and friendly relations with both the East and the West. Ideologies which guide other countries or prevail among us should not disturb the maintenance of orderly relations between them and us.

The role we might play in blocs which great powers construct for their security cannot be of decisive importance to any of them. Even so an uncommitted attitude or neutrality on our part cannot be a reasonable attitude for us to adopt in view of our geopolitical position. We know from our experience over the centuries, that the elements vital to our development in the long run are bound to the civilisation and culture of Europe.

In particular, political and economic conditions in our corner of the world demand that we should avoid seeking to exploit the antagonisms which prevail between East and West to reap some passing benefit, but that we, in the first place, should strive for stability in Europe.

Our interest would best be served with the earliest possible development in Europe that would put an end to the division of Germany and to the division of our Continent into two largely antagonistic camps.

It would benefit us if we sought to use our influence on Western European nations not to close their doors to Eastern European nations in their political and economic associations. It is essential for us, politically and in the field of trade, to maintain close relations with the West. There are the sources of credit without which we cannot progress. In the West are the main markets for our exports and it produces the goods we must import.

The exchange of goods with the East and the lesser developed world may in the foreseeable future develop usefully for us only if our foreign exchange position prevented more beneficial trade with the West. We should, therefore, not involve ourselves in any exclusive trading associations with Eastern Europe, which for a long time will and must remain, in spite of beautiful words, preponderantly in the interest of the Soviet Union. Without any regard to the ideologies which may today or tomorrow prevail among the great nations of Europe and outside it, it would be contrary to our best interest if any one of them should attain a dominant position inside Europe.

Our positive efforts in foreign policy must not go beyond our means. Less still should they be steered by the ambitions of those momentarily in power. Our positive foreign policy cannot go further than the Mediterranean, the Danube Basin and the Balkans. Our role should be to further regional association in trade and other spheres of public life between ourselves and our neighbours. Progress here should not in any way be antagonistic to the Soviet Union. But it should lead, without any need for intervention by the West, to a gradual but palpable diminution of the present dominating influence on the part of the Soviet Union over the nations of the Danube Basin and the Balkans. In any event, no real or rightful interest of Russia is served by the domination exercised today over the nations of Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union.

However acceptable these guiding thoughts on foreign affairs may be for the nations of Yugoslavia, together or individually, it remains true that our greatest problem is the mutual conflict of our nationalities. If we do not resolve this problem none of us will be able to play any constructive part in European matters. Our fate will continue to be decided over our heads. This can only be harmful to each and all of us.

My editor's foreword to the first book of discussions of the Outline of a Democratic Alternative for Yugoslavia, 1970 introduced articles written by some thirty supporters of the Stansted 1963 text of the Outline there agreed by nucleus of democrats in exile.

Later here I give my foreword to the second book of discussions, but in this place I give my translation of the article I contributed to the 1970 discussion.

THE ROAD OF DISCUSSION AND AGREEMENT²

Today's Yugoslavia is full of conflicts. Producers v. consumers. Established intellectuals and fast maturing students v. the political bureaucracy. The new class of managers and technicians clash both with the Communist leadership and the conservative workers and peasants.

Little wonder that the many conflicts have brought forth the desire in some of our constituent nations for a greater or an even full administrative and economic autonomy.

These phenomena cause serious discussions in the society as a whole. They deepen the chasm between the component nations themselves and the team of power holders. They have also permeated the Communist Party itself. Our situation is both serious and dangerous. The present rulers will prove incapable of surmounting any real crisis and especially so upon the disappearance of the one cohesive factor - The personality cult of its leader.

The Outline for a Democratic Yugoslavia is the result of much labour by men well aware of the crisis of the present regime. They have tried, by way of careful examination of ideas to find practical political ways of avoiding economic chaos and conflicts among our nations that might well bring with them intervention from outside.

Our secondary purpose was to examine how a new and just order in the present union might be established. Or in any of its succession states.

Without sane and clear views on this apparently secondary purpose, it was not possible to develop ideas coherent about our immediate goal. Any debate about a transition from the centralistic, one-party Yugoslavia to a democratic, pluralistic order proved to be a precondition for any discussion of this Outline or any other plan for a future order among us.

My own views on the Yugoslav idea, which stem from a tradition of which I am proud but whose practical applications so far I should prefer to forget, could not now, even for me, play any significant part in these discussions. That is why this outline concerns the four recognised nations of Yugoslavia - the Serbs, the Croats, the Slovenes and the Macedonians as well as the national group of Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims, (sooner or later these Bosniaks will have to declare whether they are a religion or a nation and under what conditions could they seriously claim and expect recognition of their right to self-determination). NOTE: Soon after the publication of this first volume of the debate on the Democratic alternative, all participants recognised the Bosniaks (Muslims of Bosnia - Herzegovina as a nation of equal status to the other South Slav nations).

I am able to restrain my Yugoslav patriotism and bring it into harmony with the essential interests of each Yugoslav nation. This means that I have to acknowledge, with a heavy heart, that Yugoslavs are today in a

² An article by Vane Ivanovic in the first volume of discussion of the Outline for a Democratic alternative for Yugoslavia, edited by Vane Ivanovic.

mini-minority in our country. They cannot be a factor of any consequence in our milieu in the foreseeable future.

I touched upon the possibility of resolving our problems by way of dividing Yugoslavia into several states. I should not like to leave any doubt about my view on this solution. I regard such a solution as undesirable. In the original introduction to the text of the Outline (which is reprinted at the end of this book) this stand of mine has already been clearly elaborated.

Readers will, I trust, gather that my attitude does not solely stem from the fact that I regard myself a Yugoslav.

In any discussion of a separation of the nations and a disintegration of the Yugoslav State, there is at least common ground in the proposition that by far the most grateful aspect of this question is the problem between the Croats and the Serbs.

No dialogue whatever is possible between those Serbs and those Croats who a priori and unconditionally seek separation. Such stands, of course, require both of the Serbs and of the Croats maximal (rather than feasible or even minimal) definitions of nationality and territory; of state interests and historical claims and rights. Surely nobody today could be so naive as to believe that the Serb nation and Croat nation could each achieve their maximal aspirations at the same time.

The collision between uncompromising, maximal, and at the same time mutually contradictory aspirations is bound to end in physical conflict. I have yet to see either side come out with predictions or programming for such encounters. It remains unclear how, with what manpower and weaponry these two nations would set about fighting each other; what allies they would each choose and what associates would be imposed on them; how long such a conflict might last; what its cost would be in human lives and other sacrifices; how each would deal with fifth columnists in their midst or guerrillas behind their front lines and, what surely must be of some importance, I have seen no prognoses of any victory. In other words, I cannot see how an organised Serb-Croat war would even be possible beyond sporadic killings, destruction of villages, towns and the economy over a long period of years.

We must therefore turn to the arguments set out by those champions of separation on both sides who declare that a separation could be achieved by peaceful means. While Serb and Croat ideas among such people are not identical they are in many ways alike. Both recognise not only the need but the possibility of negotiation, agreement and even compromises. Here, maximal claims must be seen as tactical moves rather than blunt demands sine qua non. Both desire good and peaceful neighbourhood upon separation. There are even hints of wide and deep economic and cultural co-operation, direct or within the scope of co-operative activities among our neighbours and in the rest of Europe.

The essential difficulty that immediately arises upon any consideration of separation is, of course, the fact that Serb and Croat populations are inextricably mixed in many areas. This is true not only of border regions where compromises on frontier lines might just prove reasonable but also of wider areas in which both sides see their deep sentimental and vital interest to be at stake.

The maximal Croat position in this case is: All the areas that have mixed populations are plainly parts of the Croat State, legally and historically established over many centuries. All those resident in this state who are not of Croat nationality, and this means a relatively large number of Serbs, would be citizens of Croatia and would share the fate of the Croat State. This Croat thesis thus, a priori, rejects the idea that the present state of Yugoslavia first be democratised by agreement with the Serbs and that only thereupon, under more tolerable and free conditions, the issue of self determination of the nations be put on the agenda and settled. The Croats reject this alternative on the ground that it is unrealisable and that if applied it would deny to the Croat nation its right to self-determination and national liberation. The main Croat argument behind this rejection is expressed in the well known words "the ruling Serbs have never been prepared to settle their relations with the Croats on the basis of respect for the right of self determination of a nations".

Whilst these are not entirely empty words, it is idle now to try to examine whether anything rational might be found in the term "Ruling Serbs", which encompasses a spectrum of three Serb generations, from Pasic, Protic, King Alexander, Davidovic, Stojadinovic, Prince Paul and Cvetkovic to Rankovic and his successors. What is important is to realise that, hidden behind this Croat thesis, though it apparently allows for discussion with Serbs rather than conflict, there is in the first place the demand for the establishment and recognition of an independent Croat State and only thereafter to allow for the possibility of discussion with the Serbs and the State of Croatia as negotiator. Needless to say, this procedure would deprive a large number of Serbs of the right to self-determination and national liberation.

Serb supporters of an agreed partition take the view that the experiment of living in a complex union with Croats and others had in fact retarded trading, economic, and cultural developments of the Serb nation and of the Serb state. A considerable section of the Serb nation was located outside the borders of classical Serbia. The state union of the South Slav nations had to survive under difficult circumstances both before and after the Second World War. Both these factors, in the view of these Serbs, imposed a centralist administration in the union they shared with non-Serbs. Such a Yugoslav union turned out to be as unpopular among the Serbs themselves, wherever they resided in the union, as it was among non-Serbs.

The resulting maximal Serb position on the problem of mixed populations in any area was that it was in the vital interest of the Serb nation for the Serb state so to extend that it encompassed all Serb settlements. One of the telling arguments in support of this view is the unforgettable experience of the Serbs under the Independent State of Croatia (NDH) in the Second World War, which resulted in the Serb determination never to allow such events to be repeated. But, whatever the merits of their arguments, one cannot disregard the fact that Serb supporters of separation also wish to establish a Serbian state before any negotiations. This procedure would of course in its turn mean that a large number of Croats would be deprived of the right to self-determination and national liberation.

And so, these two very similar but opposing Serb and Croat views, however more reasonable they might appear to be than the two extremist positions, must also lead to a conflict out of which I, for one, cannot see either the Serbs or the Croats emerging as victors.

If we examined the standpoints of quite a number of Serbs and Croats who still favour a state union of the Yugoslav nations, we would soon see that below the surface of both these groups harbour aspirations similar to those propounded by the advocates of separation. Here, unionists among the Croats would welcome an opportunity under which present day Yugoslavia, still under the paramountcy of the ruling Communist Party, might develop its present structure into an association for national states i.e. a confederation.

This process would in effect mean that, before any chance could arise for the national communities themselves to decide freely, each by its own majority, to exercise their rights of self-determination as national entities, the states themselves, would via facti manage to separate far enough from each other. Thus, any future discussion, agreement or compromise on union or agreement to separate would be in the hands of the states and not be settled by the national representatives of individual citizens wherever on the all Yugoslav territory they may reside (which process in an area where mixed populations everywhere create minorities, is plainly the only way of rescuing minorities from being voiceless).

Serb supporters of the Yugoslav State union hold a contrary view. They claim that only by preserving the present state of Yugoslavia, would there exist a guarantee for any future discussion and agreement between nations and not between states.

Whatever the merits of these two attitudes, it is obvious that the endless prolongation of the present regime's dominion will not create the conditions for any kind of free discussion whether between separate national states or between the national communities.

One is forced to conclude that all these "solutions" currently being circulated are nothing more than different ways of imposing pre-conceived ideas. Anyone who can see things as they really are and contemplates our scene with goodwill must know that things cannot be changed by magic wands or by

faith in miracles. One should distinguish between what is feasible from nostalgic wishes, ideal solutions or dreams of political trickery.

In present circumstances, and readers of this book know it as well as I do, it would be catastrophic if, out of the blue, we were all to find ourselves free before any sufficiently clear notions of what was desirable as against what was feasible had at least been in some manner publicly canvassed. In other, more blunt words, it would be fatal if we were to be left to the mercy of the violent, primitive, instinctive forces which upon sudden freedom would become rampant among us.

That is why an assembly of freely elected representatives of all the nations of Yugoslavia, able to exchange views, discuss and agree on the essence of the true interests involved, and without any pretence of being empowered to decide, is an unavoidable preliminary procedure for all of us. Whether such an assembly could discover guidelines towards a programme of some union or a peaceful parting - programmes that might find favour with the majorities of each component nation - is today quite uncertain. But even before any such meeting could take place there is the problem of preparing the ground for proper elections for such an assembly. We have to face the actual physical and overwhelming presence of the Communist regime. It has one advantage over any other regime. It is the one that exists. It must therefore, of necessity be the starting point. Could the present regime's dominion, while avoiding catastrophic perturbations, really be so far reformed as to tolerate such a projected free assembly? And, if so, could the process be so structured that no participating party's interests would be prejudiced beforehand? The entire enterprise of thinking and working for liberty must assume that the answer is "yes". Otherwise, we must abandon ourselves to serfdom or continuing conflict.

The Outline here presented and discussed has an advantage over all present plans or concepts for any separation, over a confederation, over a centralised federation, not to mention the despised concept of pure centralism.

What advantage? Those who over two decades of study and discussion finally produced the Outline became fully aware that there could be no solution in peace without something like the aforementioned assembly. It would be of no use discussing even the possibility of an assembly unless there was a concourse of minds on fundamental principles and their application. Only then could one contemplate ways of reaching the public through the defences established by the Communist regime against all thought from outside it. In other words, to begin with there would have to exist a coherent political attitude comprehensible to the wider public even if at first it had been formed inside a small circle.

That is why the fundamental principles and their possible application, as laid out in the text of the Democratic alternative at the of this book, are presented as fit for a comprehensive public discussion one day.

Even the hottest heads and the dimmest minds would have to concede that the fundamental principles and their application here set-out to protect more securely than any other conceivable solution the very first priority - the integrity and liberty of each individual.

Admittedly we go into many details. We do not do this in order to propose paragraphs of some constitution imagined by us to be ideal. Most people are not satisfied by a litany of principles or "feel good" words.

We go perhaps to the very limits of reason to give a credible and feasible picture of a structure that could be workable in real life. Its essence is that what must prevail are law and order; respect for the dignity of the individual human personality and equality among our national collectives.

If we were to succeed in initiating a public debate in the course of which a clearly articulated and defined political attitude were to develop, at least those of us advocating the Democratic alternative for Yugoslavia could not be accused of sitting immobile and silent in the course of the upheavals that will accompany the removal, sooner or later, of today's omnipotent rule of the Communists.

The interests of each of our national collectives are scrupulously taken into account in the presented Outline. The dangers of nationalistic euphorias sweeping over all our lands are so great that many,

possibly the majority of each nation, might be moved by one idea alone - remove the communists and all will be well once the nation is free. I should like to repeat here the few words of warning I wrote in my introduction to an earlier text of the Outline.

"Nothing is gained by removing power from any central administration if regional or any other administrations that took its place turned out to be by their manner of operation and attitude, no closer to the individual; to his expectations and his needs".

When discussing our reality it is important to issue this warning to each individual reader who may view all problems primarily or exclusively through the prism of the national collective to which he belongs. Anyone with the slightest insight into the practical implementation of democratic principles; into the problems of nationally mixed regions; into the economic and national defence problems of small states today must see that even with the best of intentions on all sides, one should not blindly expect that by the implementation of the principle of national self determination alone, without a thought to whatever might follow therefrom, could possibly produce a successful and lasting solution.

Our reality, as every other, is full of contradictions of all kinds. We are in the twilight of the period where masses could be galvanised by simple slogans. Yet today many are still apt to accept that they are being offered "loftier" and "better" views of the world, that some people are more "humane" than others.

The illusions of simplified ideologies are yet with us. Marxism and nationalism have not yet been replaced by the concepts of a realistic free life for the individual.

Yet the champions of such freedoms must themselves face a mass of most difficult problems that we know present themselves nowadays even in free conditions.

In the case of Yugoslavia some other problems will be at least as serious as are, for example, our arguments between what was a language and what was a dialect or just where should barbed wires be placed in our areas. Between communes, between provinces or between possible successor statelets?

Democrats, who desire to end the domination by one group over their entire society actually wish to replace this dictatorship by a system that is itself in the throes of a crisis. Let me mention just one aspect of this crisis.

Parliaments, however, freely elected, when they wish to carry out the will of their citizens run into many obstacles. In addition to free media able to criticise or propagate particular views there are the obstacles and filters presented by the machines of the established state, provincial and borough bureaucracies. In many cases bureaucracies have become self perpetuating oligarchies - oligarchies to a great extent independent of the not always easily assessable will of the society.

Beyond this, the very nature of private enterprise rules out the possibility of it being able alone to bear the burden of responsibility for the overall productivity, exchange of goods and services in complicated modern economies, even in the broadest sense. Not even I, therefore, would accept individual enterprises, personal or corporate ownerships alone if there were not some public bodies established by parliament specifically to take care of problems such as employment, foreign currency relations; under-developed regions, unprofitable but none the less vital utilities, public health, public pensions, social security etc. And by individual enterprise I mean also those operated by professional managers or by the workers themselves. Neither of these could truly be relied upon to be more capable of ensuring that their products or services were in the national interest than decisions of enterprising individuals.

There is also the question how should elected members of parliament act to ensure that, during their own time - limited mandates, national interests for the longer run be not damaged or compromised. Long term interests can seldom be gleaned in advance.

In order for us to become capable of facing these and other, here not enumerated problems of a modern technological society, it would simply not be enough to contribute ardent patriotic slogans, emblems of one's exclusive nationalism, myths of a glorious national history etc.

It will not be enough even to agree on an acceptable constitutional text and leave it at that. What is necessary is to try to inform the widest strata of our national collectives of the permanent difficulties of our geopolitical position on the very border between East and West and in the crucial era of transition from a peasant economy to industrialisation. Democratic ways must be protected at all times and on every issue.

That is why it is necessary, before anything else, to develop a modern democratic outlook and get used to democratic ways.

In 1980 there appeared in London under my editorship the second volume of discussions of the Outline for a Democratic Alternative for Yugoslavia first presented a group of Serbs, Croat and Slovene democrats, together with me, a Yugoslav at Stansted in England in 1963. Here is my editor's foreword.

DEMOCRATIC YUGOSLAVIA

Discussion Of An Outline, Volume II

Foreword

In order fully to understand the purpose of this book it must not be seen as an isolated act, the product of a given moment or a transient political situation. For any correct judgement of it, the book must be seen in its proper context. It forms part of a decade-old broad intellectual and political project, in which a circle of public figures, all members of the Yugoslav nations and resident in the West, took part.

Within the course of this work there have been a number of meetings, among them the Stansted meeting in 1963 in the course of which the participants examined and in principle accepted the thesis of the Democratic Alternative to replace the totalitarian regime today in power in Yugoslavia. The thesis comprises matters of principle and their application in basic state institutions of law and order.

My own precis of the *outline of Democratic Yugoslavia* was published in 1967. The collection *Democratic Yugoslavia - Discussion Of the Original Text*, which I edited, was published in 1970. It contained twenty-three contributions, freely chosen by the writers for the discussion of subjects raised by the idea of a Democratic Yugoslavia.

Down through the years the same circle of public figures has discussed the content and form of Democratic Yugoslavia in lectures, articles and essays.

The participants in this effort to work out the most appropriate and most just democratic alternative were not guided by any ambition to assume the role of some kind of representatives. Nor did they desire to create any political bodies. But they, though not organised, remained bound together by their common convictions

That the right to national self-determination was an inalienable right of every nation;

That a commonwealth of the nations of Yugoslavia, based on loyal agreement and equality among its nations, was the most reliable guarantee for the protection of the interests of the entire entity as well as of each of its nations;

That such a commonwealth of nations of Yugoslavia safeguards at the same time the liberty and dignity of every citizen, as an individual;

That there can only be one democracy that may rightfully bear that name, and that is a pluralistic democracy;

That a pluralistic democracy cannot be introduced or preserved without a free, informed and objective public examination and debate in the absence of which no enlightened, progressive public thought can be formed.

The public debate held in the country on defining and enacting the June 1971 constitutional amendments was restricted and orchestrated. It was based on a frightening ignorance of the state, judiciary,

constitutional and political institutions that were discussed. Consequently, it was bound to end in general confusion and produce constitutional provisions which - as practice has shown - not even the power-holders were capable of implementing.

This situation only confirms how right we were when we undertook, with our limited means and with proper modesty, to clarify notions in the conviction that we would thus be able to contribute, if only in the smallest degree, to initiatives aimed to crystallise a view in the public capable, in more favourable conditions, of trying to resolve the fateful problem that stands before our nations: to create a multinational commonwealth.

There is no need, therefore, to look for a "counter-revolutionary" or some conspiratorial motive for this book. Even if the communist leaders in Yugoslavia were actually able to claim that their system was freely accepted and supported by the majority of the people in the country, and even if the system were not forced to deal with the daily problems of its very survival, it would still be necessary to keep examining the possibilities for better and more efficient institutions for the people.

It is no secret, however, that in Yugoslavia (beyond the basic contradictions that always exist when a minority imposes its political system on a majority) the very process of decentralisation and the introduction of deeper and broader workers' self-management have brought about the erosion of the disposition the communists have named "democratic centralism" of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) in its self-assumed role of the "vanguard of the working class". Behind these words in quotation marks, as everyone in Yugoslavia well knows, lies nothing but the fact that the ruling LCY leadership has realised it had gone either too far or proceeded too fast, or even down the wrong road in easing central control over the entire population. In this concrete case, instead of shifting decisive power, as at least had been theoretically envisaged, to the workers themselves, divided into self-managing local communes and producing enterprises, power has begun manifestly to shift into the hands of the leaders of the eight pyramids of power (of the six component republics and the two autonomous provinces of the Serb republic).

The erosion of central and overall control has led not to thanks for the respite, but to newborn ambitions for greater and wider freedoms by individuals throughout the country.

The fact that in Croatia this respite produced a strong wave of Croat nationalism, which the leaders of Croatia's pyramid of power were unable or unwilling to resist, might have been understood, and indeed in some circles was understood as being connected with some clandestine counter-revolutionary movement. But, the patent spontaneity of the recent display of Croat nationalism, both in its extreme and in its reasonable manifestations in so many places and ways, on the contrary actually proves the absence of any organisation. In Croatia, as elsewhere in Yugoslavia, there is ample evidence that at issue throughout the country was a spontaneous enjoyment of the somewhat freer circumstances that developed in all segments of the people's lives. If anyone who is not a communist in body and soul could be considered a "class enemy", then President Tito was right when he declared that "nationalism and chauvinism" were the instruments of the class enemy. The observed manifestations of Croat, Serb, Albanian and other nationalisms were simply the most visible, if perhaps not the most rational reflections of the spontaneous desire of individuals across the whole country to change the present order everywhere - an order that had shown itself to be quite rigid and which by its very nature must ultimately prove to be brutal.

For all those who are not indifferent to their own fate and to that of their compatriots, it is not enough merely to follow events in Yugoslavia. One should realise the terrible danger which stems from the instability of a regime whose initial protagonists have aged, have become frail or have been removed, and whose present leaders hesitate between a respect for "legality" coupled with their desire for personal popularity on the one hand, and holding on to their privileged positions and, ultimately, the use of brute force, on the other.

The contributions in this book do not dwell, except in passing and only where necessary, on everyday developments in the country, on the present constitutional order, on the effectiveness of the recent amendments or on the discussions being held among the communists themselves. People in the country know far more about such things already.

Here we are dealing with fundamental problems which no one in Yugoslavia, no political programme, no individual, may ignore. Our problems are very grave and there are no simple or lasting solutions. Problems must be approached and discussed openly. Suggested solutions, in order to have any chance of acceptance, must be constantly subjected to free public discussion, public criticism and public examination.

When we talk about a pluralistic democracy and decisions made freely by the individual, local or the national collectives, these are not just empty words. No movement, no ideology, no revolution, no fervent patriotism or chauvinism can, in the alleged interest of some "higher" good, replace the freely expressed will of the individual to decide how he wishes to live in a society with other kindred individuals. Since we are not a homogeneous nation, our people cannot be denied the right, which they evidently desire in this period of their history, to act in many of their affairs through their national collective.

The starting point for the outline of "Democratic Yugoslavia" and for everyone who examines it in this book remains the freedom of decision by each individual. At the same time, there is provision for the individual to act through the freely elected representatives of each of the constituent national collectives of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians.³

What, none the less, remains paramount is that the structure of the proposed Commonwealth, the proposed division of the powers of its institutions, and the way in which this might be achieved, defends without any compromise the interests of each individual and his inalienable right at any time to change or adjust the institutions that govern the life of the Commonwealth and its component national states.

DEMOCRATIC YUGOSLAVIA

FOREWORD

The sovereign right to decide on the future organisation of their Union, based on the principle of pluralistic democracy and true equality belongs solely to the nations of Yugoslavia in the country itself. However, the democratic process suggests that before deciding, an exhaustive, comprehensive public debate should be held on the judicial institutions capable of ensuring the democratic order not only for citizens as individuals but for national collectives as such.

This is why from the very beginning of communist rule in the country, public and political figures from Yugoslavia living in western democracies launched a discussion on a democratic alternative which could successfully counter the regime in power. If this discussion is to be as fruitful as possible, it must follow a certain order and system, and link the ensuing ideas into a harmonious whole.

I have taken part in many of these discussions myself. Here I would like to present an outline of the democratic alternative, based on the opinions heard and on my own personal assessments.

Needless to say, the sole purpose of this text is to help stimulate debate. Its main point is to resolve our national issues in a free and democratic way.

In its final concept, the discussion is to devote separate consideration to the procedure necessary for ensuring that the transition from the present totalitarian system in Yugoslavia to a pluralistic democratic one is as smooth as possible; however it is still too early to define the procedure itself.

This draft, for which I am personally responsible, has no other ambition than to stimulate an objective exchange of views and thus contribute to a meaningful, tolerant discussion on the subject at

³In later papers of the Democratic Alternative the Bosniak-Muslims were added to this list of nations

hand, which is crucial for all the nations of Yugoslavia and for their Union. All I ask of the reader of this outline is to acknowledge my good faith and honest intention.

VANE IVANOVIĆ
Summer, 1967

INTRODUCTION

When discussing the problems set forth here, it is important for us to be free of prejudice or optimism. One should not blindly believe that this or that draft, agreement, constitutional structure or individual institution will of itself resolve all questions. Modern-day experience shows that, with the wealth of its functions and range of its powers, the modern state the world over (and that means every state no matter how democratic its constitutional structure) leads thinking people, especially the young, to question the effectiveness of its primary role, which is to protect the rights of the individual, guarantee that he takes personal part in decisions concerning his own fate, and safeguard the peaceful order. Nothing is gained by taking power away from any central administration if the regional or other administration replacing it comes no closer in its manner or behaviour to the individual, his expectations and his needs.

The draft presented in this book has two basic theses:

1. An order based on the principles of parliamentary democracy and on the full personal liberty of every citizen is not only necessary in our case, but also clearly possible.

2. The Community of Nations of Yugoslavia is necessary in order to safeguard the fundamental interests of each of them separately.

Pessimists who point to our past experience and to past and present conditions in the country say that we are not ready for parliamentary democracy or for genuine, real political freedoms.

There is only one way to test parliamentary democracy, **and that is simply to introduce it**. There is only one suitable time to introduce democracy, **and that is the sooner the better**.

Every election, however unimportant it be, however badly done or rigged, teaches the people a lesson for the next time. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assembly need to be constantly and persistently demanded. The more often elections are held, the sooner even the most uneducated people will think of a way to ensure freer elections the next time.

It would be naive to expect this process to unfold smoothly. Indeed, developments in Yugoslavia today only prove the need to keep pressing for even the smallest gain in individual liberties.

Understandably, many of our people - Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians and others - have reacted strongly to the many misfortunes brought down to bear upon them as a result of their history and their geo-political position, by adopting an intolerant form of national affirmation.

It has been only recently that we acquired the possibility of partially resolving our problems without direct foreign influence. It suffices to enumerate only a few of our problems to appreciate their gravity: a nationally intermixed population, deeply entrenched traces of the different cultures which held sway here over the centuries, sensitive variants of the languages used by individual national collectives, passive regions situated next to rich ones, and finally the fact that our first leap from a traditional peasant economy coincides with the sudden industrial revolution in countries around us and with the establishment of many strong, totalitarian state apparatuses of a fascist, and then of a communist persuasion.

Apart from the tragedy of foreign and civil war, all this made us feel alone and confused; it gave us a naive belief in ringing nationalist slogans and in our own compatriots, strangely mixed with contempt for all authority and distrust of those most like us.

For all that, there can be no doubt that strong nationalism has given our people and other East European nations a lever for exploding the myth of Communism at home. In our case, however, the acuteness of the national problem now acts as a brake on the wheels of progress in economic, social and cultural life.

In their present burgeoning form, our nationalisms are constantly odds, mostly with each other. That is why we have not been able (regardless of a communist regime, whose leaders, once

internationalists, have now endorsed the same emotions) to step onto the European stage, ready to adjust to modern conditions in Europe.

Even the smallest nation or national group rightly wins general sympathy today when it publicly asserts to its identity and seeks cultural independence. Brotherhood and unity are not something that can be imposed. But at the same time it is difficult, not to say quite impossible, to avoid the intermixture and broad mutuality of interests of all the nations of Yugoslavia.

Theoretically speaking, there are two possible solutions for peacefully removing the national question from its top slot on our every agenda.

Peaceful break-up or a Community with prospects for survival.

Breaking up, in peace and by nationality, and particularly the separation of Serbs and Croats in such a way as would satisfy both the majority of Serbs and the majority of Croats, is simply unfeasible.

The ideas presented here, which, of course, speak in favour of a Community, are based on the following:

1. The right of nations to self-determination including (my own stated opinion notwithstanding) the right freely to leave the Community.

2. The equality not only of individual citizens, but also of national collectives and member-states of the Community.

3. Equal distribution of the Community's main bodies and institutions throughout the territories of the member-states and equal division of the Community's affairs among members of the individual nationalities.

4. The general principles which defend the civil, political and religious liberties of all citizens, constitutionally mandatory for the Community and for all member-states.

Such a Community would respect all the principles of the modern civilized state; at the same time, it would be capable of ensuring that life and development reflect the interests of all the nations of Yugoslavia.

All of us need to adjust our nationalisms as quickly as possible, both in spirit and fact, to the true present-day interests of our nations.

We can find peace and prosperity only if we realise that apart from our individual patriotisms, we must also develop a broader loyalty to a Community which guarantees all of us personal liberty and national equality.

Given the age in which we live and the position in which we find ourselves, separate national sovereign states are for us merely a play of words. They in themselves are no magic guarantee of what is most important in nationalism: asserting one's identity and cultural independence. The necessary guarantee is not any harder to achieve in a free Community with kindred nations living under similar circumstances, provided the principles discussed here are respected. But this Community must be the result of free will.

In his heart of hearts, every rational member of each of the Yugoslav nations must know that this democratic reform can only refer to the existing state Community.

Only when public opinion in the country is clear on which of the alternatives to the communist regime can come into consideration can one ask whether the present regime (or currents within it) is capable of undertaking or implementing the necessary reforms.

This draft is consistent with a way of thought and hence it has its own form, but clearly the same fundamental principles can be applied in various other forms as well. All the more so as existing power structures the world over are striving to win supremacy for the technocracy and civil servants and radical reforms are being imposed everywhere, including in our country.

This draft seeks to apply to the Slav South, today or tomorrow, a principle which runs through our history.

That is the principle of freedom, which was best set forth long ago as follows:

All people are equal in that every individual is endowed with certain inalienable rights. These rights include the right to life, the right to liberty and the right to pursue one's own way of life and to hold one's own views on the world around us.

The actual exercise of these rights is understandably restricted by the need to respect the equal rights of other people, other persons, which no one is empowered to obstruct.

Any policy which wishes to attract people over the long run, must strive to adjust these rights of the individual, rather than seek an answer to Lenin's question: "Who Will Get Whom?"

The steps needed to put the principle of freedom into practice have been thwarted or postponed for centuries. Realists are forever mocking idealists, but it has yet to be proven that the former are more farsighted than the latter. Organisations for the safeguarding the principle of freedom can, as a result of their own failures or human failings, collapse or take the wrong road. But the principle itself will remain and generate ever-newer efforts to render peoples' lives worthy of man.

My review of this book appeared in no3, vol 3. September 1980 edition of the SOUTH SLAV JOURNAL published in London, editor Mr. N. Marčetić.

Mr. Basil Davidson had been head of the SOE Yugoslav section in Cairo, at a crucial time in the winter of 1942/43. As is known from Colonel Sir William Deakin's memoirs and from other sources, Mr. Davidson, whom I suspected of being a Communist, arranged for Captain Deakin (as he then was) to visit the British Prime Minister in Cairo and present to him report by the Yugoslav section of SOE in Cairo (which I myself, incidentally have never seen). This report and Deakin's arguments persuaded Mr. Churchill (as Sir Winston then was) to authorise an investigating mission by SOE Cairo to Tito's Partisan H.Q. somewhere in occupied Yugoslavia, without seeking approval from SOE London H.Q. Captain Deakin had, before the war, helped Mr. Churchill in preparing his biography of the first Duke of Marlborough. It was considered that a report to the Prime Minister brought by his young friend and strengthened by personally presented arguments would be favourably considered. Captain Deakin was the officer chosen to be parachuted in May 1944 over the Montenegrin mountains as head of this investigating mission. Thus began the period of the Yugoslav Partisan version of wartime operations, military and political being propagated and largely accepted in the Western world. Sir Winston himself, Sir William Deakin and Sir Fitzroy Maclean, the main personages connected with British decision to support the Partisan movement have all published their memoirs. So has Mr. Davidson, in two books. The publication of this second book gave me a chance to record Davidson's role in the shadows and give, for the first time in public, some idea of another side to the generally accepted story I had given it in my book "LX memoirs of a Yugoslav" published in New York and London in 1972 but the book was little heeded. This review was one more attempt to reveal some of the backgrounds to the fatal British decisions, a background in which the known communist James Klugmann and the suspected communist played important roles.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS EUROPE

Had Mr. Davidson's book appeared at the end of the last war it would probably have reminded you of a Hollywood B film scenario. The "goodies" - Southern European Communists - finally overcome the "baddies" - the German and Italian armed forces.

In the plot, so far as it is discernible, the "goodies" lead the young fighters for liberty to the gates of the millennium. aided on their way by a few enlightened British officers and smiled upon from afar by a benevolent Soviet Union. The "baddies" - and for the convenience of the story, the German and Italian military are identified most of the time as nazis and fascist respectively - are fortified by the reluctant support of the timid masses of the conquered nations. They also enjoy the covert support of toppled Kings, overthrown and exiled pre-war governments, politicians and capitalist. They benefit from the undercover manoeuvres of British conservative politicians and bankers. But, above all, the "baddies" have the collaboration of all natives who for one reason or another appear to stand in the path of Mr Davidson's vision of post-war paradise.

Such selective hopscotch over the terrain of South European guerrillas could not have been meant for readers only interested in "anti-nazi scenes" in Italy and Yugoslavia. Pictures of partisan warfare in Yugoslavia have already been shown by several authors, notably Mr Davidson himself. The record of the meeting of British participants on Yugoslav and Greek resistance, edited by Professor Phyllis Auty and Mr Richard Clogg under the auspices of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (1975), as well as Miss Elisabeth Barker's "*British Policy in S.S. Europe in the second World War*" (1976) must rank as the definitive British contributions in this field, short of any new discoveries to be made from as yet unrevealed British papers (of which, one has gathered from several authoritative sources, many important ones, both 'pro' and 'anti' partisan, have been destroyed)

Mr Davidson writes after the appearance of these two valuable records and almost forty years after the events he describes. His book is replete with reflections and hindsight. These turn out to be no less selective than his memory. It is reasonable to ask: "Why all this now?"

For the purpose of this review the main scenes concern the Yugoslav partisans. Let me, therefore, get the Italian partisan picture out of the way.

Mr Davidson says (p.16) that the choice for Italy, upon Mussolini's fall, was not between "Badoglio or Bolshevism", but "between winning a new national unity, or, short of that, unlimited disaster". Actually, the choice for Italians in the summer of 1943 (and there could seldom or anywhere else have existed such national unanimity) was how to extricate themselves and their state from the alliance with Germany and reach the peace conference as allies of the victors rather than the vanquished. Mr Davidson's story of the choice before Italy is the version put out by the clever and adaptable communist Palmiro Togliatti at the time of his attempt to use what could be mustered for Italian guerrilla to amend in the Soviet favour the Churchill-Stalin "deal" on immediate post-war influence. By not specifically mentioning Italy on the one hand and Poland and the Baltic States on the other, the war leaders had implicitly left Italy to the West and the others to the Soviets.

Mr Davidson quoted Luigi Longo's "communist inspired order of 10 April 1945" (yes, 1945!) to the Italian five-party guerrilla (the Italian "goodies") with its "call for all out action 'at the appropriate moment' against enemy strong points". this sort of action always was, and is, considered to be proper and prudent guerrilla warfare. It won Mr Davidson's political approbation and military support when he was sent as the British Liaison Officer, as 1945 dawned, to the Communist led guerrillas by the Italian section of SOE. But more than two years earlier, on Christmas Eve 1942, at a time when , as Mr Davidson himself testified (Auty-Clogg record p. 253) there was only one sole Liberator aircraft available to supply all Greek, Yugoslav and other missions together, a senior British SOE officer was dropped to "reinforce orders" to General Mihailovi}. These orders were in Mr Davidson's ringing phrase (p.104): "Let the gallant army of General Mihailovi} come forth from the heather and the ling and hurl itself against the enemy's railways". Mihailovi} replied the way Mr Davidson's "goodies" would also have replied in 1942, while continuing to suffer nazi and fascist oppression: "Nothing doing, brother, until we hear the sound of Allied gunfire". But Mr Davidson immediately condemns his Yugoslav "baddies" for having (already in 1942!) received enemy cash and responded to a direct arrangement with the German Army for "spying out the land, killing partisans couriers and sympathisers and betraying partisan positions". (p.105)

The double standard seen in the course of the Italian antipasto are more fully evident in the ample Yugoslav portion.

The Theme of Mr. Davidson's parable, the zig-zags of his story and the message he wishes to convey, reveal the man himself and the motives that moved him. A glance at some of the scenes will show that Mr. Davidson has been consistent for almost half a century.

In Chapter Two (pp. 46 and 47) while introducing his young self to a reader, Mr. Davidson offers his sardonic sense of humour in describing the Thirties: "The hugely funny spectacle of millions of workless British people". "The ingeniously humorous experience, for the unemployed, of having to pass a 'mean test' ", "five bob: forgive me, twenty-five pee". "Bracing days, if comical: and no question of mollycoddling idlers' ." "Amusements ... such as the 'National Front' of Sir Oswald Mosley", "the Union Jack and other curious inspirations" and so on.

The author, now in his own middle sixties, shows that he still clings to the views he held in his youth. Many others erstwhile held such views and became impatient for change. Some became Communist, other socialists of one hue or another (among them the national socialists - nazis - of Germany and fascists of Italy). Robert Skidelsky has written: "Trying to 'explain' the Marxist commitment of the 1930's rather than accepting it as a reasonable (or at least rational) interpretation of the events of the time will always seem objectionable to some who fancy themselves as the 'best and brightest of the day' ." I certainly do not wish

to irritate Mr. Davidson by offering any 'explanations" except to say, in hindsight and again in the words of Skidelsky: "The Marxist generation was wrong about the condition of the economy, wrong about the intellectual resourcefulness of capitalist democracy, wrong about the Spanish civil war, wrong about the nature of the menace facing the West, wrong about the motives of the British government, wrong about the Soviet Union".

By 1980 it has become common knowledge (and Mr. Davidson has not been in cold storage) how these idealistic radicals and revolutionaries have behaved all over Eastern Europe (and not only the regrettable Stalin) once they seized power.

Mr. Davidson shows extreme tenacity, and a very strong stomach, in holding on to the knowledge and ideas he acquired in his youth.

Another indication of Mr. Davidson's set attitudes is the neat way he slips his SOE chiefs, British subjects (civilians and military) at war with Germany, into the category of conscious and active nazi collaborators.

The uppermost ranks of SOE, he says, "were filled to a man, by senior businessmen and bankers or others aspiring to be such when the war was over" (p. 71). In his review in the TLS of Sir William Deakin's "*The Embattled Mountain*" Mr. Davidson wrote of the "nabobs of SOE" in London, men "from banking and commercial circles who had wished from various motivations for the Kings of Greece and Yugoslavia to regain their thrones so that the pre-war set-up in these countries might be revived". He was content only to hint about "the subtle influence of the men in SOE who had for so long backed the wrong horse".

Now, in 1980, Mr. Davidson reveals to us the identity of this "wrong horse" so assiduously backed by his cast of demons in SOE.

"SOE's chief aim and job" defines Mr. Davidson (p. 71) was "promoting armed resistance, a work which took SOE into the middle of politics: and politics of a special kind. This was the politics of upheaval and protest, the subversion of conservative order, even of revolution".

Now for Mr. Davidson's sleight of words. He goes on: "If you (he means the SOE bankers, etc.) had to dabble in protest and upheaval - and how else are you going to promote resistance to establish order? - then you had better get it done by persons who would limit the damage and prefer, wherever possible, to help people like themselves". (p. 72)

It was Hitler's New Order in Europe that was the order these "grouse shooting City men and squires of SOE" were by their patriotic duty and convictions pledged to destroy. By calling Hitler's order the *established order* Mr. Davidson equates it in the reader's mind with the *conservative order* of the banker's preference at home. Ergo, the British civilians and soldiers in SOE, those, that is, who were not Marxist are, according to Mr. Davidson, committed to support "those people in Europe who would do least damage to Hitler's New Order", i.e. people most commonly described as wartime collaborators.

"The wrong horse" which the nabobs of S.O.E. were backing is revealed to be an animal called Adolf Hitler. Mr. Davidson and I need not be reminded of a similar twist executed by the Yugoslav partisans, the classic double patriots of the last war: "We are only patriots in Yugoslavia" said a prominent partisan to me "and we shall see to it that anyone else is dubbed a collaborator".

The most lurid scenes of Mr. Davidson's anti-nazi war are the close-ups inside the SOE and G.H.Q. offices in Cairo. Heroes and villains intrigue and finally come to grips with each other in the operational section of SOE for Yugoslavia; files disappear, some reappear but others never do; purges of personal abound; arrests are just avoided; plots and subplots are explained; conspiracies of silence suggested; whispering campaigns uncovered; murder just prevented; forged telegrams to the Prime Minister from the commander-in-chief exposed.

In his own corner of all this activity Mr. Davidson found James Klugmann providing another opportunity for his wit (p. 83). Klugmann had been a communist private in the Pioneer Corps. By the time of Mr. Davidson's arrival Klugmann had "sunk to officer's rank by sheer weight of literacy ... and if the war had gone on long enough he must unavoidably have fallen to the rank of General Klugmann". This man, explains Mr. Davidson "found his truths grounded down the avenues of time, very various but never mythical". It turns out that Klugmann's oracle was History. It was the gospel of scientific Marxism suitably adapted to his audience. His audience were the Canadian miners recruited by S.O.E. for parachute drops in Yugoslavia because they were Croats and Communists. Large and serious resistance in Yugoslavia, and to a varying degree in all other occupied countries, Klugmann explained to Mr. Davidson and the miners, came and could only come under left-wing leadership and inspiration. Whole ruling classes had collapsed in defeat or moved into compromise with the nazis. Allowing for notable individual exceptions, the beaten were divided into three groups: those who would conciliate the conquerors; those who despaired of any rescue; those who shared nazi beliefs and aims. The right wing sold out; the centre disappeared from the scene. The people, the ordinary people, would not risk their lives for Kings and conservatism.

Mr. Davidson does not attempt to explain (nor does he explicitly condone) the forces of the communists' discipline combined with their blindness to the features that later became to be called Stalinism. But he does say (p. 95): "the Great Russian revolution of October 1917 formed for these men and women the source and origin of all useful social progress in our century. It was also that the further means of progress - the whole sense of revolutionary internationalism - had become incarnate in the Soviet national State. Through hell or high water, the Soviet Union remained the workers' homeland whose defence must come first".

This was the gospel preached by St. James Klugmann (H.M. commission and all) to his disciples, to Mr. Davidson, his juniors in SOE and to the Canadian communists, before they were, one by one, dropped in British uniform over my country.

In 1980, when communist ideology is dead as a force of conviction and his Yugoslav fellow fighters, as well as the "workers" of Eastern Europe, have long ago learnt enough about their "homeland" and its satellites, Mr. Davidson produces praise for James Klugmann and the Soviet Union by injecting only the faintest damnation.

All the British who took part in, or were witness to, the process decision to back the Yugoslav partisans, stress the military factor as the principal, or as in most cases, the sole reason. As though Clausewitz had never existed.

The British military problem, as Mr. Davidson succinctly puts it was "to get into Fortress Europe and stay there". There was another angle to the military problem. Among Winston Churchill's many achievements perhaps the most valuable was his success in leading his nation to ultimate victory with the absolute minimum of casualties. Among his many tasks, a relatively low priority was of necessity accorded to the long term effect of large casualties among Allied warriors. (With the noble exceptions of Sir Alexander Glen, Colonel Bailey and a handful of others, there was little sympathy for General Mihailovič's similar concern for the Serb nation; the General having witnessed relatively greater carnage among his own in the First World War.) Over the years we have learnt to live with this fact of life in a small country at the cross-roads of great power interests.

But, the acceptance of the primacy of the military imperative does require somewhere, somehow, a critical analysis of what this military decision achieved for the British. Mr. Davidson's hindsight does not go to such lengths. With the attitudes he brought to the problem, and as shown in this book, one could hardly have expected him to launch into disclosing that once they began receiving considerable military supplies, military recognition as an Allied army and, finally, all but formal political recognition, the partisans no longer pursued "relentless guerrilla warfare" which was their main claim for British military support. Like everyone else in the field, the partisans were after Alamein and Stalingrad taking up positions for the

coming post-liberation phase. Indeed, with this in mind, and at the very time in the early spring of 1943 when the momentous decision to back the partisans began to be implemented by the British, they themselves were negotiating with the German for breathing space and time at the price of ceasing operations exactly where quiet and the regularity of military traffic mattered most to the Germans, and of agreeing to fight only their guerrilla rivals. They were content, like Mr. Davidson's Yugoslav "baddies" to leave the defeat of the Germans to the great Allies. In the agreement, repudiated only at the last moment on the highest level in Germany, they had agreed to repel, together with Axis forces, any British landings in Yugoslavia and so to defend the established order inside Fortress Europe, thus reverting to their collaborationist attitude of the period before Hitler's attack on Russia in June 1941.

Moreover, Mr. Davidson is silent on how, in one sector, British arms, when finally obtained by the partisans, were used primarily in the Soviet interest to beat the Western Allies in the race for Trieste. Nor do Mr. Davidson's anti-Nazi scenes include the arrangements by which British arms and Allied aircraft were employed against the partisans' native rivals rather than against Axis military targets. I know from an eyewitness, pace Brigadier Maclean's account of a German garrison having been bombed by American Flying Fortresses at Leskovac, that on the occasion of the destruction of that city there were no German garrison there.

But, the Partisans and General Mihailovi} were not the only ones to have taken up positions for the period beyond the coming German defeat.

Mr. Davidson claims (p. 63) that he was a political innocent. It would appear that he is being too modest. His book, he avers, (p. 279) is an "insight into elusive and ambiguous motives and emotions". It certainly provides most valuable first-hand evidence of the motives and emotions reigning in the Yugoslav section of SOE Cairo under Mr. Davidson that propelled the British into the breakthrough for the ultimate military decision.

The pivotal *political* impetus given by SOE Cairo Yugoslav section to the *military* decision is set out plainly.

Firstly, Mr. Davidson, as already notes, defined as SOE's chief aim and job "...promoting armed resistance ... took SOE straight into politics ... of upheaval and protest" (p. 71). The description in his book of James Klugmann's fully written passages about the "hope and vision of radical democracy" (pp. 97,98,152,184) demonstrates that politics, and politics of a particular sort, were uppermost in the mind of the chief of the Yugoslav section SOE Cairo long before there could have been consideration of the partisans' "holding down enemy divisions" and before decoded intercepts of secret German traffic had become available to him as evidence. (Incidentally, one matter of importance remains to be cleared up. General Sir Colin Gubbins, Mr. Davidson's military chief, appears to deny in the introduction to the Auty-Clogg record that SOE Cairo had access to the crucial intercepts, even in paraphrased form. If Mr. Davidson's revelation is correct, the event would appear to constitute a startling breach of the security of Enigma and a commensurate degree of failure on the part of the German to notice it.

Secondly, Mr. Davidson says, and yet does not say explicitly, in this book (it is about time he "quit stalling") that, as 1942 turned into 1943 he sent the then Captain Deakin "over the heads of all the intervening hierarchy" to the Prime Minister to pave the way for their immediate Cairo SOE chief, Brigadier Keble, to present his memorandum to Churchill. If not entirely written by the SOE Yugoslav section, this memorandum must have been thoroughly vetted by it. The memorandum, described by Mr. Davidson as "shrewdly composed" (p. 119) states: "If the situation (of not supporting the partisans) continues, either the Russians or the Americans will, for different reasons, take a practical interest". The effect, says Mr. Davidson (p. 119) was "enormous and immediate". Winston Churchill (no political innocent, he) got the message. "The Cairo 'partisans' had won", exults the spiritus movens of this victory.

Mr. Davidson does bestow some credit to others for this political salto mortale. Captain Deakin, he tells us, knew all the information in the intercepts and was in favour of helping the partisans. And Brigadier Keble too; but the motive ascribed to him by Mr. Davidson was Keble's ambition to be Major-General.

The rest followed as night follows day.

The ensuing Communist seizure of power in Yugoslavia was rendered inevitable once men of the calibre of Sir Winston Churchill, Sir William Deakin, and Sir Fitzroy Mclean had found themselves in effect committed to it. Whether this was or was not in the British military or any other interest remains a moot point only for real political innocents.

* * *

The key to the question why Mr. Davidson has now returned to the Yugoslav scene is, I think, this. The middle-aged and elderly Mr. Davidson has devoted his manifest literary skills, his boundless energy and stamina, and his undoubted courage, to spreading the gospel according to St. James Klugmann to young African "goodies", potential successors to his Yugoslav comrades who had joined the radical upheaval of the Forties. The cast of the successor "baddies" has long ago been identified, some even in this book, which will be useful as the prophet's vade mecum for the African scenario. The Afrikaner heirs of the racist Smuts who hold effective power in Fortress South Africa are the "nazis". The remaining white settlers are the "national frontiers". The traditional tribal chiefs are the soon-to-be-exiled Kings. Their adherents are collaborators of the nazis". They are supported by the successors to the western bankers, businessmen and conservative politicians of the old anti-nazi war. All of them, in varying postures and strengths, stand in the way of the dual liberation of the people of Africa, from the Boer order and any remaining traditional African establishment. Small matter if during the ensuing holocaust some ardent young African should carry in their knapsacks, in addition to Mr. Davidson's guide-book, the marshal's batons of Tito, Bokassa or Idi Amin or if, after its end, real power should pass, not to the public at large, pluralistic democracy, one man one vote and all, but to new white men.

The final version of the Outline first published in 1963 was published in 1982 upon being settled in London on 22 February 1982.

Some of the participants of the 1963 Stansted meeting had died. None, of course, had changed their minds. They were replaced by younger men who shared our views. In particular, it should be recorded, Mr. Adil Zulfikarpašić and Mr. Teufik Velagić joined the Executive Committee representing the views of the Bosniak Muslims, who as will be seen in the final text, joined the Serbs, Croats, Slovenes and Macedonians as a component nation of Yugoslavia on terms exactly equal to the other ones.

THE DESIGN FOR A DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

Preamble

The right to decide on the future organisation of whatever for of association of the nations of Yugoslavia, based on the concepts of a pluralistic democracy and true equality amongst them, belongs exclusively to the nations themselves at home. Respect for democratic procedures requires that before any decisions are taken there should place a thorough and comprehensive debate on the state institutions necessary to secure a democratic order that would satisfy not only the citizen as an individual but each of the national collectives concerned.

That is why, from the very inception of communist dominion over the country, men from Yugoslavia living in western democracies began their debate on a democratic alternaive that might successfully challenge the regime in power. To be fruitful any debate requires discipline and methods so that acceptable ideas might be woven into a harmonious whole.

The design here presented is the fruit of many years of debate and labour that followed the inaugural round-table conference on the Stansted Estate, SUrrey in England in 1963. Of course, this text has no other aim or ambition beyond sparking public and fair exchanges of viewa on the problem facing our nations. We trust that in presenting it we may be seen to have initiated a down to earth, tolerant discussion on issues that will determine the very future of all nations of Yugoslavia.

Introduction

After more than four decades of unrestricted power communist rule in Yugoslavia has bred a host of disquieting developments in the political, economic and cultural fields. Its attempts to resolve the national conflicts in Yugoslavia are merely superficial. In truth, discord among the nations of Yugoslavia has taken new forms and has spread to other spheres of public life. In many ways contentions have deepened, bringing with them impending dangers for each of the nations of Yugoslavia and all of them together.

With the aggravation of difficulties among the nations and also in the spheres of economics and finance, conflicts have erupted in the higher echelons of the League of Communists. Efforts to reorganise the Party have been undertaken not so much to liberalise the preseten totalitarian power but rather to preserve it. Under the weight of these trials and worries, the communist ranks are seized by anxiety and confusion that cannot remain withouth serious effect on the stability and resilience of their regime.

In these circumstances it is the duty of men of good will and enlightenment from all the nations of Yugoslavia, at home or in the free world, who seek a truly democratic solution of their political, social and national problems to devote themselves to the development of a democratic alternative to the preseten communist regime. Such an alternative must embrace the whole area of Yugoslavia. It must outline, in

contrast to the power structure of the ruling dictatorship, the features of a future Commonwealth of the nations of Yugoslavia established on democratic and mutually agreed foundations.

Fundamental principles

In accord with the principle that every nation is endowed with the right to its independent national sovereign state, this right also belongs to each of the nations of Yugoslavia. The starting point of any accord among the nations of Yugoslavia is the recognition of the right of each of them to declare, through its freely chosen representatives, whether it wishes to remain in the Yugoslav Commonwealth or whether it will demand its own independent state. Should any one of the sovereign nations of Yugoslavia decide to establish its own independent national state, it has, on the principles of national self-determination, every right to create such a state.

Nevertheless, we consider that to try and establish separate independent states and to do so in a manner aimed to satisfy separate majorities of Serbs, of the Croats, the Slovenes, the Macedonians and of the Bosnian Muslims is likely in the course of setting frontiers, to produce fatal conflicts that would bring into question the interests of each one of them. The prime purpose of the design here presented is to bring into harmony the sovereignty of each nation with a commonwealth that would enable and secure a free life and the national identity of each nation.

Application

1. The Commonwealth would be an association of five sovereign nations - the Serb, the Croat, the Slovene, the Macedonian - which would establish a Commonwealth state composed of five Member States: Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia Hercegovina and Macedonia. The question whether Montenegro is to be a separate Member-State or is to be united with Serbia would be decided by national representative of Serbia and Montenegro.
2. The primary purpose of the Commonwealth would be to preserve the sovereignty of each of the five nations of Yugoslavia; to guarantee the equality of all member states; to reconcile their individual interests in the Commonwealth.
3. Member-States would have, by their general character as states, through their right of self-establishment, and by the extent of their competencies, the character of state from the point of view of legal doctrine.
4. The territorial boundaries between member-states would in general follow the present division of Yugoslavia in Peoples' Republic. The boundaries between Serbia and Croatia would be decided by the national representatives of Serbs and Croats, elected to the Constituent Assembly and guided by the wishes of the Serb and Croat boundary populations.
5. The first Constitution of the Commonwealth would be decided by a single chamber Constituent Assembly, elected, in accord with a common electoral law, on the same day, by all adult citizens of the Commonwealth of both sexes. The electoral system must be founded on the number of citizens of each national minority. The decisions of the Constituent Assembly would be valid if they were voted by the majority of Serb, the majority of Croat, the majority of Slovene, the majority of Macedonians and the majority of Bosnian Muslim national representatives to the Constituent Assembly.

The majority of national representatives of any one of the sovereign nations of Yugoslavia, elected to the Constituent Assembly, would be empowered to decide not to take any further part in further constituent procedures and to demand the separation of the nation it represented into an independent sovereign national state.

6. The first Constitution of the Commonwealth would provide Commonwealth organs and the procedure for constitutional revision as well as for the exercise of the right of national self-determination after the Constitution had come into force. In particular, the Constitution would allow for provisions determining whether, in the procedure for revision, Parliaments of Member States should take part by way of ratification of any proposed revision.
7. On the basis of their right of self-establishment Member States would enact their own Constitutions and Laws independently. The Constitution and Laws of Member States would have to be in harmony with the Constitution and Laws of the Commonwealth.

Member-States could not enact constitutional an legal provision which would be contrary to fundamental human rights and rights of citizen and which would differentiate between citizens of the Commonwealth by reason of their sex, nationality, religion, domicile or political affiliation.

Distribution of power

The Commonwealth would enjoy only such powers as would be explicitly granted to it by the Constitution - the first Constitution and subsequent amendments. All other powers would belong to Member-States.

The competence of the Commonwealth should include:

1. The establishment of the Commonwealth. The Constitution, Commonwealth Laws, the Executive and the Judiciary of the Commonwealth, as defined in this design.
2. Foreign policy and international relations. Member-States would be entitled to establish within the diplomatic missions of the Commonwealth their own cultural, commercial, tourist and emigrant agencies.
3. National Defence with the following limitations. The competence of the Commonwealth would include (a) The establishment of guiding principles by way of basic laws; (b) the organisation, direction and command of special defence units and institutions in war and peace. Apart from these specific functions, national defence in times of peace would be in the competence of Member-States with the Member-States having their own budgets. In times of war the entire national defence would fall under the competence of the Commonwealth in the establishment of their own national defences.
4. Finances of Commonwealth. The revenues of the Commonwealth would be directly provided by customs charges and indirectly by contributions from Member-States in accordance with scale to be determined annually by the Parliament of the Commonwealth.
5. In the domain of civil and criminal law the Commonwealth would enact basic laws with the guiding principles, while the elaboration of such laws would fall under the competence of Member-States. In the domain of civil and criminal judicial procedures the Commonwealth would have exclusive legislative competence. In accordance with the fundamental principles governing relations between a Commonwealth and Member-States, and as has here been stated, all powers not explicitly granted to the Commonwealth by the Constitution would belong to the Member-States.
6. Monetary and foreign exchange matters, with the National Bank as the emissary institution, and Customs, so that the Commonwealth would form a single monetary and customs region in accordance with specific agreement amongst Member-States.

7. Trade. The Commonwealth would establish guiding principles, harmonise trading policies of Member-States, and supervise the application of the general guiding principles it had drawn up.
8. In the domain of Transport, Posts, Telegraphs, Telephones, Radio and Television, the Commonwealth would enact general legislation, drawing up guiding principles.
9. The Commonwealth would be competent for basic laws concerning Citizenship whilst the elaboration of such basic laws and the granting of citizenship would fall to Member-States.
10. The Constitution would set out guarantees and procedures so that in the services of the Commonwealth and its institutions the nations of Yugoslavia, Commonwealth and national minorities would each be represented in proportion to the number of citizens in the Commonwealth. (Example: The Ministries of the Commonwealth, National Defence, Command, the Constitutional Court, the National Bank, etc).

The Constitution would provide corresponding guarantees in regard to the composition of the Government of the Commonwealth and the Head of the State.

Institutions of the Commonwealth

1. In the interest of ensuring the equality of Member-States and individual nations the seats of the principal organs and institutions of the Commonwealth should be distributed policentrically among Member-States and not centralised in the territory of one Member-State.
2. The supreme organ of the Commonwealth would be the Parliament of the Commonwealth consisting of two Houses: The National Assembly and the Council of Members of States. The National Assembly would be elected on the same day, in conformity with a common electoral law, by adult citizens of the Union of both sexes. The electoral system must be founded on the number of citizens of each nation and national minority in the Commonwealth. The Council of States would consist of an equal number of delegates elected for each Member-States by the Parliament of Member-States. Each national group in the Parliament of Member-State would elect for the Council of States a number of delegates that correspond to the proportion which that national group of Parliament bore to the aggregate number of Members of Parliament in the Parliament of the Member-State.

The two Houses of the Parliament of the Commonwealth would be equal in power.

Political Laws, such as laws establishing the organisation of the Commonwealth, laws establishing the relations between the Commonwealth and Member-States, and laws determining the political rights of citizens, primarily the Electoral Law, would be decided upon by a two-thirds majority in both Houses. Legislation of a non-political character would be decided by a simple majority in both Houses.

3. The Constitution of the Commonwealth would contain provisions defining the function and powers of the Head of State and the Government of the Commonwealth in conformity with the principles of parliamentary government and of full equality of the nations of the Commonwealth by applying the principle of rotation and limits to terms of office.
4. The Constitutional Court of the Commonwealth would decide on the constitutionality of the laws and procedures of the executive of the Commonwealth and on the compatibility of the laws and acts of the executives of Member-States with the Constitution and Laws of the Commonwealth. The Constitution of the Commonwealth would provide organs of the Commonwealth competent to supervise the application of

the Constitution and its Laws on the part of Member-States. The Constitution would also provide for sanctions in the case of violation of the Constitution and the Laws of the Commonwealth by organs of Member-States. The Constitutional Court would furthermore have competence for the protection of human rights of citizens of the Commonwealth from violation by institutions whether of the Commonwealth or of Member-States.

Binding principles for the Commonwealth and member-states

1. All citizens of the Commonwealth would enjoy full national, civil, political and religious liberties and would enjoy equality throughout the territory of the Commonwealth without regard to their sex, nationality, religion, domicile or political affiliation. All citizens of the Commonwealth would have the right of unhindered movement, residence, employment and political activity throughout of the Commonwealth.
2. The trading, social and cultural policies of the Commonwealth and Member-States within their competencies, should be founded on the principle of respect for the dignity of the human individual and on rationally conceived principles of the welfare state. In the economy all three sectors - the private, the co-operative and the public - should occupy their appropriate places so as to harmonise the interests of individual members of society with the interests of society as a whole. Individual enterprises and central institutions in the public sector should be distributed among individual boroughs, Member-States and the Commonwealth in order to achieve harmony of their interests.
3. In particular, the following should be guaranteed; free co-operative association and the establishment of co-operative property, the right of peasant property; free trade union association and the introduction of real participation of producers in enterprise management and income in a manner that would take account of the economy and society as a whole.
4. Freedom of religion and conscience and the freedom of churches, religious organisations and the public expression of their faiths to be guaranteed throughout the territory of the Commonwealth. Churches and religious organisations would be separated both from the Commonwealth and Member-State and they would at the same time be guaranteed freedom from interference by the authorities of the Commonwealth and Member-State in internal religious and church matters.
The churches would be guaranteed freedom of religious teaching.
5. Unlimited freedom and independence of the press and all other media of information.
6. Unlimited freedom of artistic creation, cultural activities, education, science and research, and unlimited freedom of Universities.

We agree on the principle stated in this text and we bind ourselves to support the essential ideas laid out in this text of a design for a Democratic Alternative.

Dr. Branko Pešelj, Desimir Tošić, Franjo Sekolec, Vane Ivanović, Adil Zulfikarpašić, engineer Vladimir Predavec, Nenad Petrović, engineer Teufik Velagić, Dr. Bogoljub Kočović

Under this title the "SPECTATOR" of London published my review of the recently published book by Duff Hart-Davis "Hitler's Games: The 1936 Olympics" by Century publishers.

A friend of mine in London said to me: "I have read your article in the Spectator masquerading as a thief".

I draw attention to the Spectator's editor's footnote: "Vane Ivanović represented Yugoslavia in the 1936 Olympics hurdling". They got a bit more than they bargained for from an aged athlete but were kind enough to publish anyway.

NOT PLAYING THE GAMES

The German Olympic committee was commissioned to stage the Olympic Games in Berlin before Hitler had acquired power in Germany. Mr Duff Hart-Davis has revealed in detail how the Nazis exploited this opportunity for their political ends.

The young should thank the author for recalling the mood of the Thirties in western Europe and America. German rearmament and aggressive policies toward neighbours were shrugged off with obdurate complacency. Fear of another war, dread and unknown communist giant and American isolation all contributed to Europe's ruinous immobility. The logic of appeasement rested on the perception that Hitler was not merely a hot-air buffoon.

Complicity in the Nazi government's conversion of the celebration of the 11th Olympiad, as originally conceived by Baron de Coubertin, into glorification of the Third Reich was but one of the series of self-destroying accommodations by the civilised world.

I cannot, therefore, share the author's verdict that there was any real and massive deception on Hitler's part. Mr Hart -Davis has, to be sure, uncovered items of deception devised to sweep the more conspicuous evidence of Nazi measures and brutality out of the view and hearing of the relatively few visitors to the Games. But German propaganda made no substantial effort, nor could it have made one, to efface existing awareness in the west of the way the Nazis had set about their business of acquiring and maintaining power, and to obliterate what was known of their persecution of Jews and others. Upon the reoccupation of the Rhineland in early March 1936, any remaining uncertainty about the Nazis' ends and means had surely evaporated.

The International Olympic Committee were no greater fools than the rest. The international organisers and most of the athletes knew quite enough of the Nazi regime not to be taken in. The view that prevailed was that the Olympic Games were an idealistic enterprise destined to survive over the long-term. The world, and with it the Olympic Games, might not always live up to ideal, but participants in Berlin, by their comportment, friendly and fair competition among individuals of many races, creeds and nationalities, would demonstrate before the German public a more attractive version of human relations than the concept of the Master Race.

These hopes were frustrated. But not solely through the monstrous achievements of Nazi propaganda. The seeds of the jungle that has grown and now overwhelms the Olympic Games were sown when Adolf Hitler was nothing but an excorporal.

The two original sins stem from what were in many respects noble motives. They are the same sins that destroyed the classical Greek Games even before the Roman conquest: professionalism and politics. By 1920, people everywhere had begun to ask why should participation in sport at a higher level of excellence be restricted to de Coubertin's amateurs who enjoyed the leisure and means to train and compete. Soon, athletes in most sports began to benefit from sporting scholarships, publicly financed

training and coaching facilities, voluntary contributions and so on. By 1936, amateurism was on the wane and only a minority of my fellow competitors in Berlin were not covert professionals. Today, the majority of aspirants for the 1988 Olympics in Korea are professional entertainers in search of contracts.

The world being divided into national states, the International Olympic Committee from the very first in 1896 had no alternative but to leave the selection of participants to national bodies and to them only. The inevitable consequences of the intrusion of nationalism was that even before Hitler's time Olympic events had, step by step, assumed the form of competition for prestige among national teams. Individual performances became mere statistical detail. The Olympic ideal receded into background. Adolf Hitler's unforgettable contribution to this distressing catalogue was to reduce the process to the absurd.

The Olympic Games as they are now held may survive one more generation. The International Olympic Committee seems to have become a replica of the impotent United Nations nourishing the hope that its members might prove to be diplomatic enough to forge political compromises to avoid boycotts, reprisals or worse.

The contribution of such spectacles to the Olympic spirit will in the future be nil. Moreover, as venues for professional entertainers sponsored by their states, the Olympic Games, as occasions of unique character, have already been irreparably damaged by world championships of equal prestige in most sports,

It is difficult to see how under the present dispositions politics might be eliminated. An entirely new and independent initiative by a modern de Coubertin might salvage the role of the Olympics as a rare manifestation of fraternity among men in the field of sport. On the following recipe: A new Olympic committee, not consisting of representatives of states, to select and invite individual competitors from all over the world, not on the basis of their citizenship but on their performances during the past year, in such numbers as would make competition among individuals practicable during the Olympic fortnight. No flags, no anthems, no patronage by the head of the host state. Competitors to wear the same apparel bearing only identifying numbers. No team events whatever. No events such as diving, skating, and others where judgements of placings are made by politically prejudiced officials instead of in accordance with measurable performance. The Games to be held in one place always. Greece comes to mind.

The recipe, if enthusiasm and finance could be found, might remove the most pernicious features of nationalism and politics. Alas, I cannot see an end to professionalism as long as individuals rightly remain free to decide how they would prepare themselves for the high performance expected in Olympic competition.

Nothing can take away from Mr Hart-Davis's masterly exposure of the appalling story of complacency and fear of war that prevailed in the Thirties that were highlighted by Hitler's Games. One may hope that his book has opened young eyes to the same kind of complacency and fear of war that prevails now which cannot but incite a Third World conflict with timing and weapons chosen once again by power dedicated to world dominion.

The Times published on 20 May 1987 so far as I know the first sour note concerning communist dominion over the people in Yugoslavia in the form of my letter to the editor. For us democrats from Yugoslavia the publication of this letter was a momentous occasion. Actually, it did little, if any, good.

POLICY ON YUGOSLAVIA

To the Editor of the Times,

Sir, Ms. Beloff has asserted (May 18) that British policy towards Yugoslavia was a "benediction" of the enemies of Yugoslav democracy. Mr. Renton (May 19) confirms Britain's encouragement of the Yugoslav leadership's commitment to policies of political democratisation and economic liberation.

The question is: "Who are the enemies of democracy in Yugoslavia?"

Every constitution of Yugoslavia since the Communists were installed in power in 1945 (not without British benediction and help) has explicitly entrenched in law the exclusive leadership role of the Communist Party in every sphere of the country's life. For instance, according to paragraph 133 of the present Constitution anyone who, anywhere or at any time, utters a sound unwelcome to this leadership is liable to prosecution for the crime of enemy propaganda or confusing the public. Short of dismantling the Constitution and removing itself from office any commitment to political democratisation by such a leadership is just so much hot air.

The only measures of economic modernisation and liberation worth the name have been workers' self-management and much restricted market economy. Everybody in Yugoslavia knows that these measures have been frustrated to the point of tragic farce by the Party's overall grip on the economy and the creation of yet another set of Party bureaucrats to control workers' continue to be merely word addressed to Western creditors as long as the Party's monopoly of decision and execution remains the paramount factor in the economy.

The Communist Party in its entrenched leading role, and nobody else, stands plainly identified as the one real barrier hostile to any step towards democracy and economic modernisation in Yugoslavia.

Let us hope that the exchange of views in your columns between Ms. Beloff and Mr. Renton will have drawn attention to the truth that since the Stalin - Tito break in 1948, Western policies of unremitting financial backing and benedictions bestowed on the Communist leadership of Yugoslavia have been as useless politically, economically and militarily for the West as they have been discouraging to the friends of freedom and democracy in Yugoslavia and to the hopes for economic stability there.

I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

Vane Ivanović

This article gives my concept of the idea and should also serve as an explanation why I myself have devoted a good part of my life in sponsoring it and why I still have hopes that the concept of Yugoslavia is only "on hold".

The article was published by the magazine "Naša Reč" in London in 1988 and was taken from my lecture to the Association of Serb writers and Artists in London on 7th February 1988.

THE CRISIS IN THE YUGOSLAV STATE IDEA

Since the first modern union was created in the Slav South, the Yugoslav idea - usually called Yugoslavism - has suffered, by my count, *ten* serious blows. And while the union of Yugoslavia has in a sense lived on to see the present day, it still remains in question.

I should like to use this opportunity to examine the *political* history of Yugoslavism, of the Yugoslav state idea, since 1918. To be sure, cultural, ethnic, economic, territorial, even atavistic and other conditions, mentioned only cursorily here, all continued to influence political life and events.

As is often the case with historical notions, the political term "Yugoslavism", as it was known among our people in the last century, stood for a variety of notions from the very beginning. For some, it was a distant ideal, for others an achievable political programme. As the notion of nationalism developed, Yugoslavism (which, let us remember, came close on the heels of nineteenth century persuasions of modern Serbianism, Croatianism and Slovenianism) for some meant an historical stage in the course of self-determination and the realisation of a *single* Yugoslav nation, while for others it represented an unwelcome obstacle to expressing and winning international recognition for individual, already formed national identities. Moreover, public perceptions of Yugoslavism changed in themselves, albeit no more so than many other modern notions, such as Marxism, socialism, liberalism, etc.

There is not much to be said about how the actual political idea of Yugoslavism came into being. It was a nineteenth century dream that one day the Southern Slavs would have foreign rulers no more. After centuries of striving, the Slav South would finally create a unified political organisation which would reduce to a minimum the influences of inherited ethnic and territorial traits. Individual tribes, as it was said at the time, tribes which had only recently become aware of their national identity, and which long ago had been torn apart by the two rivals for leading the world empire - Rome and Constantinople - and by other historical battles waged right here over their heads, would, with the coming of freedom, merge into a modern Yugoslav state which would take its place among the other already defined nations of Europe. In their idealism, the champions of Yugoslavism believed that the *internal* organisation of the new common state would facilitate or hamper, but certainly not *stop* this historical development.

With the establishment of the new state in 1918, however, it transpired that a key condition, i.e. *to identify the common state with the individual homelands as they were understood at the time*, had not been fulfilled. Considering the way things began, it did not even seem likely that this condition would all that easily be fulfilled in the future.

Nonetheless, there was an undefined feeling that the union had not been merely an accidental, minor product of the policies of imperialist powers, but that it had indeed been created by the will of the vast majority of Southern Slavs, admittedly only by way of their tacit consent in the atmosphere of the revolutionary events that took place towards the end of the war.

It is more or less clear now, that in those first years of the new community, the Yugoslav idea actually *had no self-image*. It was as if it had been put together on a nebulous foundation of heart, emotions, sympathy and love. Everything about the idea was vague and unclear. Most important of all, the ideas of

Yugoslavism inherited from our ancestors contained no notions of mutual relationships between *the individual, the nation and the union*. Instead, the public was presented with a ready but imaginary whole.

Today we can judge that from the beginning the Yugoslav idea should have been, above all, logical, sensibly constructed and firmly built in order to be clear, simple, real and alive; able to be formed into a straightforward, clear and above all comprehensible picture which every normal person could immediately see and understand; able, in time, to penetrate the psyche of each constituent nation as an integral, central, crystal clear concept. In other words, the Yugoslav idea had no need to be *loved*, it needed to be *understood*.

There was no movement or individual capable of extracting the Yugoslav idea from the realm of the romantic. In all the nations, the established logic, the then living intellectuals and the lively awareness of individual nationalities were simply not disposed to accept the Yugoslav idea, and less still to carry it out. Without a clear picture of the Yugoslav idea to present, there never arose any universally accepted belief in Yugoslavism.

The Homelands and the State

What happened in a state in which, in the view of more or less all its public, there never was any identification of the state union (save for exceptional, brief periods of time) and the unsatisfied demands of the homelands? How did all this happen in the first ten years of the life of a country that at first looked as if it had the necessary qualities for resolving problems democratically and also possessed its *raison d'etre*, *however nebulous*?

The very name of the new state contained a fundamental obstacle to Yugoslavism as the guiding idea of the new union. The name proclaimed a union of three separate nations (the Bosnian Muslims and Macedonians were not considered ripe for self-determination at the time). How did they ever imagine, I wonder now, that by confirming before the whole world the right of these three nations to self-determination, and by establishing their existence as mature, sovereign nations, they could *suddenly* be able to create a *new* nation? In any case, the idea and aim of one Yugoslav nation was not even mentioned in the Vidovdan Constitution of 1921.

The realisation that after December 1, 1918 we had *three* homelands in one state meant that the appearance of the very *first* shortcomings and problems in the economy, in cultural and administrative fields were bound to create *ill-will* towards the union. Let me give just one initial example of the disparity between the idea of *the homeland and the idea of the state*. To the Serbian nation, or more precisely the large majority of Serbs, the new order did not look like a fatherland which would gather all Serbs under a single roof, although both the state administration and the army were largely in Serb hands. To the Croats and Slovenes, who until shortly before had fought not only against the centralism of Vienna and Budapest, but had also struggled for their own independence, the new order did not at all seem to be an attainment of their own free states.

Soon young people rioted in the streets, especially in Croatia and Dalmatia, but these omens of what was to come in the Second World War were not then taken as seriously as they should have been.

The disparity between the homelands and the overall state were reflected in all walks of life, particularly in culture and the economy. Their practical political repercussions could be felt in the state structure, in the administration, in legal notions and, of course, at elections and in parliament.

The thread that ran through all political events in the first Yugoslavia was the succession of political clashes between the *centralist* concept of the union (which in many eyes, unfortunately, was identified with

Yugoslavism) and the striving for recognition of the right of individual homelands, a striving noticeable not only among the Croats, but among Serbs and others as well.

Centralism seems less difficult and intolerable in a nationally homogeneous country than in a multinational state. The Croats and Slovenes were already aware of this well-known truism. Their political and civic leaders had already developed routines which they were to use for their centrifugal stands and behaviour in Yugoslavia. For the majority of people in prewar mono-national Serbia, the centralist model was natural and acceptable, and so many Serbs interpreted every word about autonomy by the others as reflecting a desire for secession.

In the euphoria that followed the end of the First World War, which finally put an end to the nineteenth century, in the era of fresh hope, new prospects and a new state, the domestic public was astounded when the Croat Peasant Party won a huge majority of the Croat vote at the elections for the constituent Assembly. Anyone who did not immediately understand the historical importance of this decision soon had his eyes opened by the refusal of these elected Croat deputies to take part in the final decisions of the constituent Assembly and by their proclamation of a Croatian republic. These moves were all the more important since by the expansion of the franchise, the whole Croat people had for the first time in their history actually taken part as an entity in an electoral process. The panic that arose over the Croats' possible secession, a panic then born, remained always present. Given the plethora of demagogues on all sides, it was not noticed that the leaders of this dominant Croat party well knew that conditions were not ripe either at home or internationally for their actions to be anything more than tactical moves in their struggle for a broad autonomy, i.e. in their struggle against centralism. It is a historical fact that, individual demagogical outbursts notwithstanding, they never lost sight of the fact that a union of equals with the Serbs and other nations remained paramount in the Croat interest.

There is no question that its proponents let the Yugoslav idea down during the country's spell of free political life. But equally to blame were the freely elected national leaders in all the nations, people who had been born and who had matured politically in other states. Above all, these latter, ostensible democrats failed to give life to universally acknowledged human and individual rights. Most political leaders failed to realise that a federal compromise would in the fullness of time resolve the contradiction between the notion of individual *homelands* and the notion of the overall *state*. The abstention of the Croat deputies in particular ultimately cemented unitarianism for a decade, so giving scope to a more or less unimpeded expansion of traditional Serb institutions throughout the union. In other words, the frail democratic union did not develop the conditions for ensuring that its very existence be not questioned every time there was a clash between the idea of the homeland and the idea of the state.

Many events, sometimes short-lived and barely noticed (I do not refer to the 1928 assassination in the Parliament), but providing some material or political advances, were to prove historically more significant than the maintenance of the Yugoslav idea. This first ten-year period was the *first* blow to Yugoslavism.

A homogeneous Nation created by decree

Unfortunately for us all, King Alexander decided to cut the complicated skein of entanglements with his sword. He decreed the birth of a Yugoslav nation and decreed the end to the nations which had hitherto existed. By the logic of this imposed constitution, *one* homogeneous nation, although created by decree, was *ipso facto* to have only *one* homeland. The King's action, dictated *from above*, dealt the *second* heavy blow to the Yugoslav idea, especially so because the wording of the King's choice intimated that it had been made in the interest of Yugoslavia. The only alternative, he alleged, was the falling apart of the country.

The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes officially became *Yugoslavia*; it was formally recognised internationally but, given all its absurdities and contradictions, it was in disarray domestically, bound by the chains of censorship and by a ban on all political activity. It has never been demonstrated that in a

multinational community an imposed centralism could provide more rights and democracy. That is why this period of some five years marks the *third* serious blow to the Yugoslav idea.

This period ended with the assassination of the king in 1934. Prince Paul launched talks with leading political figures, some of whom had just been released from internment. But they all had rather obsolete mandates from bygone, then more or less free elections. On the eve of the outbreak of the Second World War, an Agreement was hastily forged between the central government, on behalf of the Crown, and the Croat Peasant Party. The fact that, despite all election difficulties and intrigues, this party had openly enjoyed the mandate of the vast majority of the Croat nation, gave the Agreement, as an important charter for the preservation of the Yugoslav union, the appearance of a solution to what had been until then the union's most acute problem: Croat autonomy. But the charter left everyone else under central rule and so the other nations, each for their own reasons, were turned into the new acute problems for the union. The "Croat question" was temporarily stilled, but the union itself remained simply words on paper. The pace and the very manner of resolving everything *from above* contributed to this *fourth* serious blow to the Yugoslav idea.

This was the background to the tribulations brought on by Hitler early in 1941, when he was at the height of his power. The all-Yugoslav government, formed at the invitation of the Prince, faced Hitler's ruthless ultimatum while it was itself in a condition diametrically opposed to the classically known maxim *-power without responsibility*. These ministers bore *responsibility* but had *no power*. Without elections and without agreement mandated to govern, power in fact remained in the hands of the Regency. In the ensuing confusion, ministers could do nothing else but think both as servants of the common state, and at the same time as delegates of their own individual homelands. The dreadful irony added to this situation was highlighted by the decision to send the all-Yugoslav prime minister secretly to Germany, by night, to sign the Axis Pact. That signature placed all our nations, without their knowledge, on the side of Hitler and Mussolini in World War II. On paper, the integrity and borders of Yugoslavia were left intact by the submission of March 25th, 1941. It looked as if this would save the state, and with it the individual homelands. This surprising show of identification between the state union and the homelands remained unconvincing for many reasons. The principal one was that this apparent rebirth of Yugoslavism had emerged before our and the world's public as a vassal of Hitler's New European Order.

The developments sparked by the events of spring 1941, let us remember, had been predetermined by Hitler's urgent need to dominate the Balkans, whether the Prince's Government agreed to it or not, and whether the rest of us accepted it or not. All our territories would anyway, in one way or another, have come under *de facto* Axis rule, directly or indirectly. In pursuance of Hitler's policy of "divide and rule", the "vassal territories" would sooner or later have been torn asunder and deliberately pressed to turn against each other.

The futile signing of the Axis Pact by the Prince and this all-Yugoslav government constituted the *fifth* heavy blow to the Yugoslav idea, which had never even been envisaged without freedom and independence, let alone under renewed vassalage.

There is no need to describe the conditions of life under the Axis enemy occupation. A situation had been created which paved the way to terrible outright civil war. I say *civil* because, unfortunately, the nature of the emerging hatreds and atmosphere constituted a classic case of fratricidal, not international war.

At first, the Yugoslav idea simply vanished. This was the *sixth*, seemingly *fatal* blow to the Yugoslav idea.

The new State Idea

In the course of the war, however, the Yugoslav idea re-emerged. As in 1918, it emerged as an undefined, initially unarticulated awareness that when things truly get tough we rush into the arms of those closest to us. It was no irrational fluke that the astute communist leaders decided to use the Yugoslav banner under

which to declare the aim of liberation from the occupiers, while at the same time pursuing their own specific goals. Among those who welcomed the partisan guerilla movement and struggle and among those who had no alternative but to submit to it, there emerged a conviction in the necessity to restore Yugoslavia.

No other declarations in favour of Yugoslavia were forthcoming, especially not from the government-in-exile or from King Peter.

With the partisan movement holding sway at the end of the war and covering the entire the country, which now included Istria, Rijeka and the Slovene and Dalmatian regions all formerly under Italy, Yugoslavia was re-established.

The new state structure propagated the formula of "brotherhood and unity". From the outset it was, on paper at least, federalist and thus it appeared to mark an important correction of the previous system. But, with the new Constitution entrenching the leading role of the Communist Party; with the exceptionally charismatic role of the head of state, and through the practice of democratic centralism (which ensured absolute dominance by the leadership of the monopoly party), centralism for the second Yugoslavia was the reality.

It would be the greatest delusion to see the first, so-called socialist constitution of the second Yugoslavia, and all its laws and regulations, as analogous to constitutions in the civilised world. Socialist constitutions, inherited from the "Great October Revolution", do not express social compromises but a programme of action. They do not set the framework which those responsible to the public (including those temporarily in power) must honour, the framework that provides mutual checks and balances. Here the constitution is nothing more than a *list* of social values which every *subject* must support. With such a structure, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia showed from the very beginning that its "predestined role" was in reality a return to the order before the French revolution.

In the absence of freedom of speech, freedom of the press and other individual liberties, the people simply became the object of all sorts of regroupings, fantastic economic experiments and constant violence. Not surprisingly, therefore, I consider this communist order, implemented under the slogan of a new Yugoslavia, i.e. the imposed identification (again *from above*) of the separate homelands with the union state, as the *seventh* serious blow to the Yugoslav idea.

And before the people could recover from the "revolutionary" steps taken, let us not forget, *after* the Yugoslav Communist Party had attained power, fears and a general sense of uncertainty were revived upon the rupture between the Yugoslav communist leadership and the Cominform, i.e. Stalin. At first, all concepts of *individual homelands*, which had seemingly also died, identified with the union *state* of Yugoslavia as the only existing guarantee of survival for the individual nations; in other words, the Yugoslav idea re-emerged as a primary political factor at a time when there was fear for bare survival, again caused by outside factors, this time in the form of Stalin's enmity, not Hitler's.

The information media penetrated all parts of Yugoslavia with messages that most diverse political circles and journalists in the West, especially "progressive" ones, i.e. leftist intellectuals and bureaucrats, were convinced that Tito had personally resolved our long-standing national problems, that there was no alternative to Tito's stand in defence of Yugoslavia's freedom and non-alignment to any of the Great Powers.

However, the cruel reality of life in the country, which foreign friends did not wish to see, was reflected in such familiar descriptions as: moral-political suitability, paragraph 133⁴, Goli Otok⁵, the secret police, the

¹ This paragraph of the Yugoslav Penal Code deals with the so-called "verbal delict".

personality cult of Tito, etc. The new class, with its *libido dominandi*, found it useful to steer its propaganda in favour of a "federal order", all in the name of equality, brotherhood and unity and the Yugoslav state.

This Yugoslavism, recommended (with generous financial backing) by our friends, is what I consider to be the *eighth* heavy blow to any serious concept of the Yugoslav idea.

A Repeat of Homeland Versus the Union State

In contrast to this reality, there was a resurgence (as under Austria and Turkey and during the first Yugoslavia) of individual national cohesion, again concentrated on flying from central government pressure which operated under the banner of Yugoslavism. This discontent reached its zenith during what was known as the Croat Spring. The spontaneity and strength of reborn national awareness among the Croats, and the Serbs, soon reminded Tito of Radi_'s unification of the Croats under his national leadership, of traditional Serb resilience, of Slovene doggedness and of the enigma posed by the Muslims. Like King Alexander before him, the new squire of Karadjordjevo⁶, put an end in one fell swoop to what he considered to be an unpredictable development. This was the *ninth* blow to Yugoslavism because it, too, was depicted as coming to the rescue of Yugoslavia.

Tito, along with his experts, came up with an original long-term solution for us. While, of course, ensuring that the new 1974 Constitution retained the afore-mentioned programme of action for communism and the Party's monopoly, he introduced a form of decentralising the state administration. But it was not to the benefit of individuals or national groups as such; rather it played into the hands of the self-elected communist oligarchies in the constituent republics and the Serb autonomous provinces. Moreover, the delegation system of many tiered manoeuvred elections, invented in order to frustrate any public desire for direct elections, was taken to an absurd extreme by distancing the voters completely from any kind of say on the social or legal system. In the event of the death of the country's life-long president, for instance, Yugoslav sovereignty would be represented both at home and internationally by a Presidency consisting of delegates from the eight republican and provincial oligarchies, reinforced by the presence of the Party's own direct delegate. This decree appeared to elevate the national principle to the highest level. The Constitution apparently promoted nationalism to the highest political category in the country, this time, however, firmly in the hands of the several communist republican and provincial monopolists. All other social or political issues were secondary and ultimately insignificant. The only exception was the issue of the individual being the *subject* and not citizen of his republic or province. Contrary to the declared desire to satisfy certain particular national aspirations, the new constitution in fact sought to satisfy only the *general* interests of the *state union* or the *special* interests of the constituent *republics and provinces*, but *never* to satisfy individual interests which, as we have all long known, should be the foundation not only of personal existence but also for the survival of every political system.

It is difficult to see how the ruling party's aristocrats, in command of the economic and legal "native reservations", could among themselves achieve a consensus that would remove the only two problem solutions available to the leaders of all Yugoslav presidency: the right of veto by any one of the republics and provinces, or majority voting. Both alternatives carry the risk of the union disintegrating whenever any more serious disagreement arose among them.

Parallel with a growing awareness of how impossible it was, with such political factors, to arrive at an agreement for consensus, a compromise which rationally accepted would be binding, there developed a growing move away from Yugoslavia as a state union that was capable of offering a prospect of protection

⁵ Goli otok is an island off the northern Adriatic coast, which was used as a prison camp and was especially busy after the country's break with Stalin in 1948.

⁶ Karadjordjevo was a formal royal estate which became one of Tito's hunting lodges.

of common interests. This awareness exists today not only among Croats, Slovenes, Bosnian Muslims and Macedonians, but among Serbs as well. At the far end of all growing discontent are national confrontations, although it remains of vital importance for all our nations to maintain the general geopolitical framework we have vis-a-vis our neighbour states.

Then there is also the economic crisis largely caused by the *fantasy* that the self-management system and the introduction of some aspects of a market economy could possibly function while control of the entire economy remained in the hands of both central and now eight separate political leaderships, each of whose bureaucracies decrees its own centralistic plans.

This concept of homelands and their increasingly tenuous and fragile relationship with the union state is the *tenth* blow to the Yugoslav state idea, since even this transparent and unsuccessful trick is depicted as securing the common Yugoslav state.

After Ten Blows to the Yugoslav State Idea

Let us see what we could conclude from the fact that the idea of mutual support among our nations has appeared *only* in moments when they all faced a threat to their very survival, and this idea serving as a kind of life belt which otherwise lies in some corner, neglected and forgotten.

First: The need for individual self-preservation holds sway as a last resort over the need for national self-determination.

Second: Attempts to enthrone Yugoslavism (as an expression of an otherwise dormant urge to save oneself when on the edge of a precipice) and to present this concept *from above* as the supreme value shared by all our individual nations - have all *ingloriously* failed.

Third: If the Yugoslav idea were nothing more than an expression of loyalty by all nations and individuals to a supra-national club such as the British, German and Italian states, instead of being presented as a *substitute* for what is Serb, Croat, Slovene, Muslim or Macedonian, then for us and for the rest of the world it would mark a progressive stage in our final acceptance of a supra-national and humanistic understanding that ultimately we were all equal members of the human race.

Fourth: Yugoslavism, therefore, *is not, cannot and never could be a rival* to separate nationalisms; it is merely a factor useful for their national survival.

Fifth: In order for this salutary urge to be presented vividly, accepted and then rationally implemented, starting from *below*, what is needed are time and tolerance, not decrees and dictates. Considering the history of mutual relations among our nations, one should start out with minimum ambitions which would not antagonise anyone. In short, today the idea of Yugoslavia should be promoted more as a *protective political club than as a common homeland*.

Sixth: An important contribution to rational Yugoslavism, taking into account the said protective club, is the **Outline of the Democratic Alternative** where the underlying principles of the common geopolitical framework and their free implementation are carefully elaborated on the basis of an objective assessment of our nations' real strengths and possibilities. This Outline, which has encouraged and made its impact on the *spiritual foment* in our country, similar to such foment in western Europe, is today already quite well-known.

This Outline presents a long overdue picture of the Yugoslav state idea which need not be instinctively loved, but which can be understood and endorsed.

What is to be done? To put it bluntly: can the concept of a mutually protective Yugoslav *club* succeed in forestalling the Lebanonisation of our territories; in lifting the danger of sporadic civil war which could go on and on, while the foreign allies of our several warring groups would be states for whom our interests remain the last thing on their minds.

Obviously, it would be better not to wait for climacteric events to happen before we hastily try to act reasonably. Surely we have learned at least that much from our recent history!

There is thus an urgent need to give people in the country a description of a free Yugoslav club, which logically means presenting a programme that *is feasible for the people to create from below, not by someone from above.*

This is not impossible. The nature of the elements crucial to such a rational common future is not and never has been such (not in our region, not in the Lebanon and not elsewhere) that if people had freedom of expression and free elections, i.e. if they were a factor in politics, they could not first identify the problems and then, in a parliamentary way, gradually and peacefully resolve them.

At issue is not some academic discussion but a concrete reform of the reality. Therefore, we must take as our starting point the existing situation, however disagreeable we may find it.

Although the danger of outside intervention in our affairs is smaller today (no thanks to us) than it has been since 1918 or 1945, one should resist any temptation to try to destroy the present situation and system by any abrupt reversal. One can only call for a non-violent *transitional situation* and gradual democratic reform, since in any general mayhem and lawlessness, it is the individuals in whose name reforms would be undertaken that would suffer first and foremost. In other words, *civil and legal* order must be respected at all times.

Machiavelli observed that "needed reforms are often thwarted because those who benefit from the existing situation are profoundly aware of their own interests. Although seemingly entrenched in the *status quo* and inert, they are actually mobilised to defend their interests. Their potential successors, more numerous and perhaps even stronger than they, are dispersed, unidentified and seldom prepared as individuals to jeopardise the little freedom and means they still enjoy."

In accordance with this age-old rule, not a single communist apparatus has ever yet renounced power of its own free will. If pushed, it prefers to contemplate applying the "iron hand".

But every thinking person realises that in our case it is much too late now to *protect the communist orthodoxy with the sword*, while counting on *financial support from the western democratic world and, at the same time, seeking approbation from Moscow.*

Why is it too late? The West justified its generous aid to Yugoslavia in the belief that the heresy of our communists might cause confusion in other communist states. But now, thanks to that policy or not, we are already witnessing the Soviet break with China; the effect of *Solidarity* in Poland; the distancing of Hungary and Romania and also Czechoslovakia, and, finally, the arrival of Gorbachev. Using the "iron hand" to preserve communist orthodoxy in Yugoslavia, for the sole purpose of ensuring that the present situation remained stable, cannot contribute anything at all to the West today. As for Gorbachev and comrades, if they are really so committed to *glasnost* and *perestroika*, then the forced cementing of communist orthodoxy in Yugoslavia can only strengthen the self-confidence and resistance of their domestic orthodox opponents and hamper Gorbachev's present international policy.

And what about this orthodoxy in Yugoslavia which is to be preserved by an "iron hand"? Allow me to enumerate a few of the divergences already observed from original communist orthodoxy in Yugoslavia, divergences which reduce Lenin's said list to words on paper and to brute force. The Party, whose members are plagued by mutual mistrust, has long since known that it is lagging behind many of the

important processes that are taking place in our society. The cultures of individual nations have today departed outside Party ideology. Although implementation of the law (particularly in political matters) and respect for human rights are not what they should be, they are subjects of extensive public and private debate in Yugoslavia today. Introduction of the market economy; hard currency accounts for individuals and companies; decentralisation of the economy into eight units; the inevitability of a clash between economic planning and human nature. Self-management and the ideology on which it is ostensibly based, have slid into the realm of the romantic.

Facing a Historical Decision

I am sure that many people in power in Yugoslavia have realised that their future, especially at the personal level, is no longer guaranteed by the "irresistible tide of history" and that they have recognised the need to stop the process of disintegration.

In the general uncertainties of the present situation, those in power therefore face an historical decision.

Let there be no mistake about it; only those members of the existing apparatus who are capable of *really* applying the power they hold and carrying out irrevocable measures of democratic reforms, could *initiate a transitional period*.

Retaining what remains of their original orthodoxy, many of them know that they are ready at least to "*reculer pour mieux sauter*", i.e. to put their ambitions on hold until the advent of more promising circumstances for themselves, their families and their ideology, when they could try to move forward again, but now liberated from the monopoly of power and the sole responsibility which had driven them to a dead end.

Such a realistic initiative today requires courage. However, in helping to salvage the ship, these initiators might alleviate their personal share of the historical shame they bear and possibly earn credit for things that would be respected and leave their mark.

If democrats and patriots in the country (among them economists and legal experts who have been crying to be heard for years) were freed to cooperate on the *transitional period*, on free communications and on competing ideas and initiatives, it would mark a crucial step towards building the first foundations for a rational Yugoslav club. It would be illusory to believe, however, that democrats would be willing to serve as nothing more than window dressing to preserve the existing system.

The Homelands in Harmony with the Modern State Union

Let us now leave aside speculation on the future, and return to the subject at hand.

The main reason why the idea of a supranational union (such as Great Britain, for instance) has yet to take root in Yugoslavia lies in the self-perception of each of our nations. It is a tragic irony that the very idea of a union is envisaged not as being to the specific benefit of each of the component nations but for the benefit of God knows whom else outside Yugoslavia.

Although visible on the world stage, not one of our separate nationalisms has progressed much since 1848 in its national self-awareness or expressions of it. All these nationalisms leave the impression of cleverly defined assumptions and elaborate theories about their own national traits, based on contrived mutual differences in temperament, particular achievements in war, literature and other arts, in religion and economic development. Under these pretty pictures, however, all our nationalisms are deeply marked

by the primordial instincts of tribal solidarity, crude and uncritical instincts, that remain their primary characteristics. Such a type of an individual nationalist is also invariably unitarian. Unitarians believe that their own nation is composed of people who all think and feel the same. And just as fatally, he believes that his is the leader nation, not, say, among Japanese or Argentines, but precisely among those nations closest to his who are, of course, in truth most like his own. This unitarianism led to the politically naive idea that in today's Europe nationality was in itself a sufficient, indeed the only quality, that should serve as the basis for political programmes and independent states. National unitarianism continues to support the *historically* incoherent, almost childish notion that concepts concerning ethnic differentiation can be used as levers or weapons with which to defend *individual liberties* also. This is foolish and infantile since liberty of the individual is in utter contradiction with the notion of a state union of completely like-minded people.

In short, not one of our nations (and here I include the newly recognised Bosnian Muslims and the Macedonians) has as yet dispensed with its utopias. Indeed that is why they not only trail behind West European nations but have also suffered innumerable more psychological shocks and defeats than Yugoslavism.

The *ten* heavy blows inflicted on the Yugoslav state idea over the course of seventy years have not killed the hope, at least not mine, that with time and through the political programme of a Yugoslav club a way may be found to bring the urges of individuals and the irresistible demands of separate nations for their own homeland into reasonable harmony with the modern common state. This is a more suitable guarantee of self-determination and international independence than could be achieved by way of little independent successor states or through renewed close alliances with nations whose bear hug we have already experienced.

Ever after the collapse of communism in most of Eastern Europe in the second half of 1989, the Times and much of the British press believed that communist rule in Yugoslavia still had a role to play. On 22nd January 1990 the Times did publish my letter given here. It was not until May 1990 that the BBC World Service broadcast an interview with me. The letter in the Times and the interview with Mr. Sreten Debeljački were the first chance I had to "toll the other bell". This phrase, which in a softer adaptation into English language would be - "Another voice", was the title of my autobiography "DRUGO ZVONO" published in Croatia in 1993 and in Serbia in 1995.

TITO'S LEGACY

Sir,

There is an important matter which I feel you may have had in mind when writing, in your leading article of January 20, that there was no more Titoism than communism alone.

The Titoist State was different from the former Soviet European satellites. There, the communist rulers were installed by the Soviet Union. The moment it became clear that the Soviets would not interfere to protect their puppets the existing regimes began to collapse, each in its own way. Putting aside, for the moment, Britain's wartime role and the Soviet's last-minute military aid to implant communism into Yugoslavia, the communist system was established by the Yugoslavs themselves.

For the last 41 years Titoism has survived in great measure through Western help. The first reason for this help was that successive Western governments perceived the preservation of an independent, but communist, Yugoslavia as a possible source of confusion in satellites and as an important bulwark in the containment of Soviet imperialist power.

Another reason was that Western governments were persuaded by the Titoists that in this multinational State with ancient, and possibly catastrophic, animosities and rivalries the communists were the sole guarantors of Yugoslav, Balkan and, therefore, European stability.

The satellites are no more. The Soviet Union is not what it was. Containment, if it ever had any effect, and the need for Yugoslav independence under Titoism would appear to have run their course. The real elements of instability that remain in the Balkans are provided by the Yugoslav and Albanian communist monopolies.

What gain or sense can there be for anyone, anywhere, in 1990 to advocate (as you do in your leading article) building on any aspects of Marshal Tito's legacy, communist or not exactly communist?

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

Vane Ivanović

The Spectator published the following article as my reply to Mr. Basset's text written under the title "Emancipation of the Slavs", Spectator, 7 July 1990.

YUGOSLAVIA UNITED?

Sir,

In an early preface to her book *Black Lamb and Grey Falcon* Rebecca West wrote a warning. She had noted the phenomenon of people from Britain and elsewhere in the West who, on becoming 'interested' or otherwise involved in the Balkans were moved to take up the cause of one of the Balkan nations. She herself went on to espouse for the rest of her long life an intransigent and intolerant version of the Serb cause.

We South Slavs have known this phenomenon ever since Western politicians, diplomats, officers, foreign correspondents, businessmen and tourists began visiting the Balkans in the last century. At times their interference was appalling, on occasion useful, at least for some. Now comes an almost ludicrous example of this phenomenon. Mr Richard Bassett has produced ('Emancipation of the Slavs', 7 July) a hotchpotch of arbitrary assertions, ignorance, known canards and plain nonsense, under the palpable influence of a tiny rump of Croats dreaming of a revival of Habsburg Catholic Vienna and Budapest (the principle oppressors of the Croat nation for centuries).

Mr Bassett writes of the 'artificial link between Central European Catholic Kaisertreu Croatia (i.e. loyal to the Habsburgs) and Balkan Serbia'. He does not know or does not want to know that Yugoslavia was established more than a year before Mr Bassett's 'diplomats, intellectuals and ethnographers' had even begun to assemble at Versailles. I do know because my Croat father and Serb maternal uncle were members of the Croat *Sabor* (Parliament) which on 29 October 1918 unanimously declared the independence of South Slav lands and people from the Austro-Hungarian Empire and voted, with but one dissenting voice, to send representatives of the newly declared and established South Slav State to sign the act of union with Serbia on 1 December 1918. The modern union of 'seven million' Catholic Croats (number to be checked by Mr Bassett) with Orthodox Serbs was therefore not a 'joke marriage' imposed by the Great Powers.

Mr Bassett has also failed to discover that the movement for some form of union of South Slavs, based not only on the bond of race but on innumerable other historical factors, first flourished in Croatia more than 80 years before Versailles.

It is notorious that those who wish Yugoslavia to break up see Bosnia as their favourite ground for the fatal conflict. Apart from mixing up Muslims and Serbs Mr Bassett does not appear to realise that Bosnia is the homeland of Slav Muslims (who prefer to call themselves Bosniaks) amounting to about 50 per cent of the population, as well as of Bosnian Serbs, about 30 per cent, and of Bosnian Croats, about 20 per cent. They are all inextricably intermixed, especially in the towns. No possible true frontier can be drawn between any of them. The Bosniak Muslims are now recognised as a nation by all (except Mr Bassett, and Croat and Serb hotheads), and there is no incentive or interest for them to choose pragmatically between being merely Muslim Croats or Muslim Serbs. President Tudjman of Croatia has recognised this fact of life.

Bosnia is in fact an indivisible mini-Yugoslavia. Far from becoming the cause of inevitable conflict Bosnia is the vital anchor that will prevent Croats and Serbs going off in different directions. Any break-up of

Yugoslavia must mean an attempt to divide Bosnia between them. This will mean forcing almost two million Bosniak Muslim into a separate Croatia and a separate Serbia, and also forcing the state of Croatia to leave many Croats in Serbia and the state of Serbia to leave even more Serbs in Croatia. No democratic Croat or Serb state government could possibly dare face its own electorate with such proposition . The sole way in which Croats, Serbs, and Bosniak Muslims could possibly be satisfied that *all* their co-nationals were protected in one state is to maintain an overall union with equal cultural and legal rights for all individuals of each nation wherever the individuals may actually reside, i.e. some sort of a democratic South Slav union. This is the very opposite of a break-up of Yugoslavia.

Vane Ivanović

Upon my return home in September 1990 I was interviewed by several publications in Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. I pick as the most typical of my arguments an article published by the paper NEZAVISNE of Belgrade on 8th May 1991 just before the states of Slovenia and Croatia formally began their existence.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF NATIONS, NOT THE SOVEREIGNTY OF STATES

The recent elections in Slovenia and Croatia should be seen as a watershed in the life of present-day Yugoslavia. Within the confines of the imposed constitutional order, a sizeable portion of the citizenry engaged in political decision-making on questions put before them, casting their secret votes in free elections.

It was noticed both here and abroad that voters gave their greatest blessings to individual national strivings. The surge of nationalism has clearly given our own and other peoples of Central and Eastern Europe a means to explode the myths of communism and to put an end to the Party's monopoly rule. One must therefore reconcile oneself, initially at least, not only to the burgeoning of separate patriotisms but also to another phenomenon. Separate extreme nationalism marked by intolerance of others and, above all, of those closest to and most like us is a feature neither unique among us nor original in the world.

To the extent that this phenomenon among Croats and Slovenes (manifested also among Serbs in what for now is a different way and on different occasions) is an inevitable stage of national recovery, or even national rebirth, it should be welcomed, despite all undesirable incidents and excesses. If, through membership in their national collective, individuals wish to act politically to defend and preserve their identity, language, religion, culture, tradition and customs, then that is simply an affirmation of the universally recognised rights to national self-determination and national sovereignty.

One must not forget, however, that nationalism in itself also carries a collectivist current which is no weaker than any of the other "isms" which have obsessed and crazed the masses in their day, usually with dire consequences. Let us hope that in all our nations people of reason will prevail over the hotheads who, more than anything else, bring shame to their people.

Once free elections by secret ballot are held in other parts of Yugoslavia, as is inevitable, they will obviously raise the issue of whether to re-organise the existing community or see it collapse.

A crucially important question is whether there will be agreement between the existing republics, with a view to creating a confederation, or whether there will be agreement between the principal sovereign nations of Yugoslavia through their respective elected representatives, regardless of where the voters of each nation may reside in Yugoslavia.

In the former case, following the principles of state law, each republic would obviously be considered sovereign. In our own case, however, such state sovereignty denies life to a much older principle: the self-determination of sovereign nations as such. Some of our nations have large minorities living outside the territory of their parent state and would thus not be able to have their say. I must repeat in order to stress that it is universally held that an existing nation, should it so wish and deem it to be in its own best interest, is entitled to create a state (either its own exclusive state or in a state community with other nations). This principle of national sovereignty precedes the right of any existing state to decide, either on its own or in accord with other states, in what state and how any nation or parts of nations shall live.

Apart from this cardinal principle, there are also certain practical considerations. Firstly, various notions and traditions of statehood and the struggle to safeguard hard-won state rights and gains played a role in our own defence of national identity when under foreign imperial powers. After a lifetime of trials and

tribulations Supilo still unflinchingly taught us that, even under such conditions, *the struggle for statehood and recognition of state rights is an important but not the sole means*. The state is a means for the nation, not an end in itself. Some of us never even had identifiable states of our own in the past, while others had them for centuries only in the form of dusty and unread charters or only in vague popular memory. And yet down through the centuries our nations preserved their identity, religions, culture, homes, traditions and customs, i.e. all the elements that make a nation a nation.

Secondly, in considering the possibility of confederation, some of those arguing the priority of sovereign state powers are condemned to rely on mutually contradictory historical and ethnic territorial arguments to prevent some of their people living in other states. Theatrical, provocative gestures affirming state sovereignty would be swift to come. All this would inevitably result in arguments, hopeless imbroglios and conflicts.

Thirdly, an important practical and political consideration is this: the present trend in Europe (whose institutions we so wish to join as equal partners) is taking quite the opposite direction; it is moving towards the economic and political integration of Europe's nations. The question here is mainly one of how, when and under what conditions each long-established state will cede the sovereignty of its own parliament in favour of the European Community, without damaging or destroying its own national identity. To present ourselves to such a community as candidates for equal partnership, while constantly stressing the continuous ever-strong independence of sovereign Slovenia, sovereign Croatia, sovereign Serbia, etc., would be politically infantile and would merely reinforce old West European prejudices about the Balkans.

The human spirit is striving the world over to separate national independence from the all-embracing sovereignty of the state. The need to reduce state powers in economic affairs is no longer disputed nor is there much of a desire to increase the bureaucracy's involvement in peoples' lives. The greatest irony of our century is that the era of the state began withering away not with the advent of the communist proclaimers of this withering in Europe in 1917 but with the demise of communism in 1989.

The public here at home, and especially those who even under today's conditions have obtained clear popular mandates, should be well-informed about the theoretical and practical advantages of negotiation *between equal sovereign nations* - as proposed in the draft of the Democratic Alternative - rather than by way of negotiation *between states*.

The possibility of circumstances degenerating to the point that separate statelets would try to establish themselves without possessing the political and economic conditions for the reality of independence is something I simply cannot take into serious consideration. I cannot bring myself to accept that any of our nations would be inclined to wound itself or to allow itself to revert even to the mildest forms of foreign domination.

This is an important interview published in Borba of Belgrade in 13-14 June, 1992 under the title "Vane Ivanović, A Yugoslav Gentleman"

My interviewer was Nadežda Gaće, a rare human being. She possesses the graces of a most attractive gentlewoman, the most brilliant competence as a journalist, the understanding of human problems of an ideal priest, the resolution of a fanatic without being one, the stamina of a marathon runner, the courage claimed by Serbs and Croats for themselves (let the reader choose between them), the management of a business tycoon. And all this with a heart of gold.

FEAR BEHIND AN EXCESS OF HATE

At a time of uniforms, arms and rampant poverty in Belgrade, it was difficult not to notice the tall, elegant eighty-year-old gentleman strolling down the city streets. Truth be told, his specific dress style and figure attract attention even in London and Paris. He is perhaps better known in international business and social circles than in Belgrade, being a shipowner, a diplomat, an athletics champion, and part of circle of well-known businessmen and intellectuals...

Vane Ivanović. Hat and cane. An impeccable suit and shirt with a stiff collar. A man whose rich life is reflected in his appearance which captivates everyone from the first and whose wisdom and serenity has a calming effect on the people he deals with.

For us in Yugoslavia, in this new, and old and oldest Yugoslavia, in these times of sorrow and shame, the appearance of Vane Ivanović means that we will hear what one of the founders of the Yugoslav Democratic Alternative and still a committed Yugoslav has to say of the troubles of nations and errant ways of politics.

Q. In an interview to the paper "Borba" just over a year ago you said that as someone born before the creation of Yugoslavia you wanted it to survive you. Instead you have survived it. How does that make you feel?

A. As long as thirty years ago my friends and I gathered around the Democratic Alternative took the view, which we published, that to create separate, independent states on our territories which would be to the satisfaction of the majorities of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians and Bosnian Muslims was a disastrous illusion. The path of separation would lead to fatal conflicts and bring into question the vital interests of each nation as such.

Obviously, we were too naive in believing that something like that could never happen. What happened in the course of 1991 and is happening today shows that there obtains a lack of wisdom and reason in these parts. The economically independent and sovereign states of Slovenia, Croatia, and of course Serbia, Bosnia and Macedonia are nothing other than mirages presented to nations by out-dated idealists or people who have God knows what kind of other undeclared, but certainly dangerous interests of their own at heart. I hope that all these people will be held accountable one day, although history is often unjust. Unfortunately, of all these illusions perhaps the strongest role was played by the mirage of a Greater Serbia. It is a very dangerous illusion, not to say downright nonsense, to claim that defense of the interests of individuals belonging to a particular nation is epitomised in defending their symbols, their flag, in the expansion of territory and state administration. Sooner or later this is bound to lead to physical clashes in the course of which previously ordinary, normal citizens commit criminal acts: where they kill and destroy, all in the name of patriotism.

I wonder what kind of inferiority complex must one have to think that present-day Serbia possesses the physical and moral qualifications to defend Serbs in Slavonia and elsewhere in Croatia where these Serbs settled more than 250 years ago. They are no less Serbian today than are the Serbs in Čačak. Down

through the centuries, these Serbs, and through my mother's family I am such a Serb, not only preserved their language, identity and customs, but also helped to preserve the Orthodox Church itself. And all that without some Serbian statesman declaring that "nobody dare strike a Serb."

The claim that there was a need for somebody to defend such Serbs and that Serbs must live in ethnically clean regions, i.e. cleansed of others, shows that the Serbs who support such a fantasy suffer from a terrible inferiority complex. They feel that they cannot hold their own in the company of others. Another aspect of this complex is the attempt to present Serbia/Montenegro as "Yugoslavia" not only to the rest of us in former Yugoslavia, but to the world at large. For me this is evidence not only of naivete but of insolence as well. It is a transparent attempt to try and dupe the world into thinking that such a "Yugoslavia" was the legitimate successor of the state that had been a founding member of the United Nations and member of all other international organisations. They have here in effect gone so far as to contradict their fundamental thesis. Having been seen as the proclaimers of a Greater Serbia, they now appear too shy to call their own country Serbia and call it "Yugoslavia". At the same time, these very people claim that the "old" Yugoslavia had been a prison of the Serbian nation.

But to answer your question directly. I am convinced that an unthinkable disaster has happened to us; it is difficult for a reasonable mind to accept that ordinary people can be brought into a situation where they kill others, destroy homes, towns, cultural monuments, in a word everything, all in the name of one or another version of national patriotism. I would just like to say something about what I have seen personally. I spent a few days in Konavle and visited the entire Dubrovačka Rijeka area. I had the opportunity of slowly driving and stopping along the entire road from Cavtat to Mokošice in Rijeka Dubrovačka in broad daylight I did not see a living soul. All the buildings were either badly destroyed or burned down.

The fact that the ancient town of Dubrovnik itself was relatively less damaged does not diminish the responsibility or guilt of those who attacked it. The relatively limited damage could only mean that someone in the military or in the Serbian leadership realised what a scandal it would be in Europe if anything even worse happened to Dubrovnik.

Q. You are obsessed, with reason, with what you saw in the Dubrovnik region. For those of us who live in various regions of the former Yugoslavia it may sound cynical if we say that is the past. Obviously, the human mind will find it difficult to understand the crimes and destruction in Bosnia.

A. Whatever the degree of my condemnation of the conflict between the Serb and Croat people, and, I repeat, it is a tragedy for both nations, we are witnessing a far worse and more shameful tragedy in Bosnia: in Sarajevo, Foča, Mostar and all other towns in Bosnia. The Muslims are living through their own tragedy and I would say they are paying for the unresolved and unfinished Serbo-Croat conflict. I am convinced, or I was convinced, that it had long been obvious to everyone that the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims represented a separate ethnicity which stems directly from their faith. It is similar to the sole real difference which any serious person can see between Serbs and Croats, also primarily attributable to their respective religions. That is why the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims received civilization's recognition as a South Slav nation on a par with the other Yugoslav nations. To deny this today or to say that they were merely former Serbs or former Croats is to commit a deliberate libel against a whole nation. Moreover, Bosnia-Herzegovina is the only territory which our Muslims can consider home. It is a disgrace for every Croat or Serb patriot who contributes in the name of his own patriotism to the division of Bosnia between the Serbs and Croats. This European scandal has assumed terrible proportions, especially when military operations and physical force, artillery and rocket-launchers, and "volunteers" from neighbouring states are used to bring about a situation where Bosnian Serbs and Croats acquire larger chunks of "cleansed territories" by driving out Muslim women and children and destroying their homes in towns and villages.

Perhaps the Muslims in Bosnia went into this war totally unprepared, in the illusion that it would never even occur to anyone to do what is being done today. I must admit that I had such illusions myself, and so I cannot criticise the Muslims for being unprepared. Given the present confusion in Bosnia-Herzegovina, I am not at all surprised that the Muslims reached for weapons themselves and set out to kill

Q. War, killing, destruction, sowing hate, all this constitutes the politics of our leaders and rulers, but one day they will find themselves without arms and will probably revert to peace.

A. It is highly probably that when "peace breaks out" the 1991 population census will prove to be "outdated". An entirely different ethnic map will have to be drawn. It is difficult to say now how all this will look, but the newly created situation will obviously be reflected in a redistribution of the population in many areas. It is impossible to guess how certain well-known principles will be implemented - principles such as: "border changes based on force will not be recognized", "those expelled must be allowed to return to their homes", "the existing situation is to be respected" - and which of all these versions will prevail, but, in the interests of all everyone in the former Yugoslavia, younger generations will have to find ways to establish communication and the basics of economic existence: an exchange of services and goods. I am convinced that many interests common to all of us will remain, regardless of what various politicians, heroes, state fathers and national gangsters and mafiosi say and encourage today.

Citizens by day, fighters by night

Q. Many predict, and unfortunately it is realistic to expect that even after peace is established, numerous extremist groups will remain and the people living in the former Yugoslavia will have to live with terrorism for years to come.

A. Even though we still do not know what the possibilities will be and how we will define the desired calming of the situation, I must say that there is another very serious problem here. Even if a compromise were to be found tomorrow afternoon for a life for Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, reached of course by those who now pretend to represent all these various elements, there is still the question of what would happen to the unknown number of military groups or individuals on the Croatian as well as the Serbian and Muslim sides. They are all armed and they possess large quantities of hidden weapons. Were one to compare this situation with the situation in Northern Ireland it is not difficult to conclude (and to fear) that all these various formations with their ideas and methods of operation will lead to a similar situation in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, and possibly also in Serbia and Montenegro.

Q. You spent approximately a month in Croatia. How would you assess the Croatian political scene and what do you think about the "young Croatian democracy"?

A. As is known, under the leadership of the HDZ (Croatian Democratic Union - Translator's note), when the new Croatian state was founded on May 30, 1990, the prevailing atmosphere was that in the course of establishing or preserving the new state, a situation needed to be created where it would be imperative to remove from any effective people of Serb nationality as quickly as possible. In this view, the local Serbs had two counts against them: Firstly, that they had indeed hitherto held many leading positions in Croatia since they were the ones who excelled in devotion to the overthrown communist order, and thus had to be dismissed anyway, and secondly, that as Serbs, they were not considered absolutely necessary as citizens to the new Croatian state. One cannot avoid the impression, therefore, that the Serbs in Croatia had reason to begin feeling endangered and that such an atmosphere was in the course of being positively created.

Perhaps because I watched all this from a different angle, it was clear to me that what was called Ustashi terror in 1941 and 1942 could not happen today. First of all because there was no one today who would stand, like Italy and Germany, behind an Ustashi regime. Secondly, because of the partisan past of so many Croats, an Ustashi atmosphere had no serious chance of being revived. But these rational reasons do not override irrational fear which is not to be under-estimated. What local people had done to one another during the last war will obviously have left more hatreds in these parts than what the occupying forces provoked in their day. But what has also happened was something that may not have been positively intended. The national Croat euphoria showed many aspects of a neo-Ustashe atmosphere. Soon after the outbreak of the present conflict the Croat state found large areas outside its control. Croats find it hard to accept that their homeland should be divided into two. The European Community and United Nations appear to be exerting their pressure on leading politicians in the present Croat state and to propose an ample degree of autonomy for Croatian Serbs (a degree of autonomy the Serbs had not enjoyed inside Croatia before). It is now doubtful whether this would now satisfy the Serbs in the Krajina region or whether after these concessions were granted they would ask for yet more. And so in an

evidently undefinable sense, the present leadership of the Croatian state, headed by the HDZ, could well be regarded as in some degree responsible for the situation that developed in Croatia and led to war.

The Army seeks a State

An analysis of the policies pursued by those presently in power in Croatia and Serbia leads one to the inevitable impression that political circumstances would have developed quite differently had the people who grew up with the communist mentality not stayed in power (though under different names) both in Croatia and in Serbia. They have an absolute discipline which gears them towards the centre, and anyone who does not agree with the centre, even in minor details, is considered an enemy rather than merely a political opponent.

Q. You visited Slovenia, the first republic which seceded from Yugoslavia. You were highly critical of the leaders of both Serbia and Croatia. How does Slovenia look to you?

A. Only a few weeks before Slovenia seceded, individuals in the leadership of Slovenia (here I exclude my friends, the Liberals in Slovenia) assured me personally that theirs was simply a policy not of secession but one of achieving clear accounts between Slovenia and the other nations with which they were then in the community. Only three bare weeks after these assurances, these same people declared Slovenia's secession. What is there to say about Slovene sincerity?

However, judging by what I recently heard and saw, it seems that people have widely started thinking differently in Slovenia. And there is something else. I cannot forget that among the main architects of this very Yugoslavia which the Slovenes were now renouncing we can include prominent Slovenes like Kardelj, Kidrič and Dolanc, whose roles we need not discuss here. Similarly, I do not forget that it was only after 1918 that the Slovenes for the first time in their history had attained a situation where they were largely their own masters.

Q. The Yugoslav Peoples Army was long considered the principal factor of Yugoslav stability. It left Slovenia in humiliation, it left Croatia in defeat; in Macedonia it is restricted, and from Bosnia it is retreating as not only defeated but as greatly to blame.

A. For many years the Yugoslav Peoples Army was an "untouchable" organism which had not only to defend the state of Yugoslavia but also the order which I call the Titoist version of socialism. When Yugoslavia began to disintegrate, the Yugoslav Peoples' Army clearly had the "will" to try to hold onto as much territory and as many economic and popular means as possible in order to survive. In other words, this existing army found itself in search of a state, instead of the normal position of a state or its successors trying to form an army for their defense. The fact that the leadership of this army was actually mostly in the hands of Serbs originating from outside classical Serbia fortified the Army's resolve to try to impose its control over the political turmoil in non-Serbian lands. It tried to do so at the cost of destruction still to be realised and assessed. It failed in Slovenia and in Croatia and it is not succeeding now in Bosnia-Herzegovina either.

Q. You seem to be well-versed in our domestic circumstances and problems, but you are also familiar with the way people think abroad. How important are we really to the world?

A. Unfortunately, one has to say that this region of ours is today of marginal importance to the development of world affairs. It is no more important than Cambodia, Afghanistan, Lebanon, the Israeli-Arab conflict. While the Western countries still suffered under the illusion that our people and our territories would constitute some sort of obstacle to a Soviet imperialist breakthrough to the West, one could talk of the special importance of the Yugoslav region. With the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and in Yugoslavia, this illusion has been shattered. No one in the West is afraid that our war would spill over into neighbouring countries, except with regard to the refugees.

The West is only interested in seeing us calm down somehow, because that way would be the least costly for them. Nothing more. Unfortunately, Europe did not, for instance, get "upset" over the destruction of

Vukovar. I am afraid that those who decide the fate of nations are not aware of our troubles, just as I am certain that many of our people did not deserve such neglect.

Q. You could be said to be a sworn Yugoslav. After what you yourself describe as your deep grief, do you remain so and do you still believe in the Yugoslav idea?

A. Yes. I am a Yugoslav and all southern Slavs are my brothers and closer to me than any other nation. After all this slaughter, destruction and everything that has gone on which I consider to be tragic and criminal, I feel that inevitably there will sooner or later, instinctively arise an urge for all of us somehow jointly to find, each in our own interest, a common *modus vivendi*.

In other words, all that we are left with is a reasonable and rational Yugoslav idea and so the possibility of reaching at least some sort of harmony which will help us to survive in the Balkans and in Europe and so that each of us may find his own free place in these parts.

This article published by "Dialogue", issue no 12, in December 1994 was printed by the: Association DIALOGUE of Paris, 17 Chemin du pont d'Herville, 78520 Guernes, France

My argument for the need of a supreme world body to be divided into two chambers, one representing the world's states, is set out as first tentative proposal for a world wide debate. "Vederemo", as the Italians would say.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE UN

Almost a year ago I made a proposal for a reformation of the United Nations. I found a little favour, but I persist. Here is the gist.

As was the case of the old League of Nations, the UN claims to be an association of sovereign nations. It is, in fact, an association of sovereign states.

Sovereign states have had their rights universally recognised for a long time. They are able to deal with many of the needs and ambitions of their populations. But there are huge areas of human life where every modern sovereign state have been shown to be inadequate, and in places dangerously so. Most of the world's sovereign states fail in one way or another in longer term to be successful social, economic and financial units. Many are unstable, internally insecure and incapable of defending themselves which as sovereign states they claim to be.

Let me turn to the most dangerous of the many Twentieth century challenges to the already inadequate sovereign states.

Since the acceptance of the idea of the free self determination of nations it has become to be universally regarded as the right of any national community, wherever situated, to proclaim its sovereign identity and to assert its right to secede from the sovereign state in which it finds itself and to proceed to create such associations as it desires, including its own sovereign state. As we all know, there are hardly any sovereign states that are nationally homogeneous and hence the challenge. The world has lived about two centuries of repeated yet unresolved confrontations between sovereign states and sovereign nations.

Let me deal with the notorious example of Yugoslavia.

In many respects a successful union of South Slav nations, Yugoslavia had unresolved problems among her component nationalities which caused the break up of its sovereign state. Some of the resulting states were themselves also born with their own scenarios of incipient conflict between the sovereign state and the national minority contained within their borders. Civic political manoeuvring soon developed into open warfare, aggression by the largest, the grabbing of territory and bestial clearing of areas.

It is the misfortune of the South Slav nations to have become the most widely known modern battleground in this conflict between sovereign states and sovereign nations.

Bosnia-Herzegovina (BH) became one of the successor sovereign states of Yugoslavia, recognised by the UN and other sovereign states. All three of its component nations - the Serb, the Croats and the Muslim - are now, to say the least, discontented but mainly the Bosnian Muslims and the Croats since the Serbs first grabbed and cleared most of "their" BH territory. But later the Croats and Muslims have also fought each other for territory inside BH. The latest "solution" presented by the UN was to divide the BH state into ethnic regions which cannot be achieved without more land grabbing warfare before any peace could be agreed by the belligerent leadership. The plan, if it is ever agreed, would at best leave BH with kilometres

and kilometres of ethnic frontiers that cannot be sealed against aggression, refugees, smuggling, hostage taking, personal revenges, spying etc. Whatever the regional frontiers might turn out to be inside BH, large populations and armed individuals and groups of each of these nations will remain outside "their" region of BH, especially in the cities. Moreover the proximity of Croat regions of BH to the sovereign state of Croatia and Serb regions of BH to the sovereign state of Serbia will facilitate ultimate annexation of such marchlands by the sovereign states of Croatia and Serbia. This would leave Bosnian Muslims in a much reduced region rendered unviable by its own inadequacies, further unsettled by those Croats and Serbs who must remain within it, and so probably being forced to make perhaps surprising accommodations in order to survive.

And so we have the spectacle of the UN, i.e.: the world's sovereign states, assisting in the destruction of a newly recognised European sovereign state, BH and BH's own three sets of national extremists i.e.: the very embodiment of the concept of the **sovereignty of national collectives will be left to their violent best to destroy this sovereign state, BH.**

The UN, being an association of sovereign states was unwilling/unable to intervene in the internal affairs of sovereign Yugoslavia **to aid the dissatisfied communities within it by way of promoting a peaceful reconstruction or a peaceful step by step partition.**

Faced with sovereign Communist Yugoslavia's collapse from within the UN recognised the hastily formed nationalist successor states as sovereign without pausing to reflect that the eruption of the several nationalistic euphorias the still existing Communist electoral and referenda procedures and police apparatus (with democratic processes largely forgotten under half a century of totalitarian rule) were bound to produce instant states, instant constitutions and not much democracy. Little regard was paid to national minorities created in the mixed and interwoven populace in the newly created sovereign states. The inevitable results were conflicts about frontiers, the grabbing of land and evictions of "others", all inspired by the hitherto leading Communist in each nation freshly, turned into "democrats" and so extremely as their nation's leaders. It is with these leading protagonists of the conflicts, that the UN has exclusively been negotiating the peace possible with the voiceless populations of about 24 million all over the territories of the former Yugoslavia, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of direct innocent victims in the areas where conflicts, ethnic cleansing and destruction had taken place.

To turn to the general from the particular. The manifest failure of the present world organisation to restrain **both sovereign states and the rampant nationalism of sovereign nations (and the story of ex-Yugoslavia is but a tragic example of conflicts that are waiting to happen elsewhere) moves me to submit that it was high time to look again at the UN as presently controlled and functioning.**

Here is one way of dealing at the UN with confrontations between sovereign states and sovereign nations and in the interest of world peace restraining sovereign states or nations from acting their own.

The present world organisation, to be reconstituted as **two Chambers. The first to be the Chambers of Sovereign States with its Council following the model of the present Assembly and the Security Council with veto powered permanent members.**

The second Chamber to be the **Chamber of Sovereign Nations (qualification to be accepted as a member nation to be agreed at the time of reconstitution). This Chamber also to have its Council composed of permanent members representing the world's most numerous nations, other members taking their turn in the Council.**

Resolution in the Chamber of Sovereign States and its Council to follow the present model of the UN Assembly and Security Council. Resolutions in the Chamber of Sovereign Nations to follow the voting system in the European Union with votes in accord with the numerical size of each member nation. But resolutions in the Council of Sovereign Nations to be one member one vote with veto powers for permanent members of the Council.

For "important" resolutions (to be defined and agreed) the two Councils would sit together and resolve on the basis of one representative one vote and with each permanent member of each Council preserving veto power.

The General-secretariat of the whole organisation would continue to act as now; collect contributions from member states for the organisation's many functional and also for the cost of the Second Chamber and its Council, etc. etc.

How would all this work out? The world's great states and the great nations would all have interests on both sides of all issues between sovereign state and sovereign nation. One veto would in any event be enough to protect either a great state or a great nation. The lesser sovereign states and sovereign nations would most probably be moved to behave as members of two chamber parliaments elsewhere in the world have learnt to function. At any rate, the UN (its name would obviously have to be changed) cannot by this reconstitution become any weaker than it is today.

It is to be hoped that many nations in a minority or otherwise undesirable condition inside a sovereign state (especially if it happens to be in majority as in South Africa) might find relief at the hands of a Chamber of Nations **so that the fact of sovereignty of a state could no longer provide absolute protection for the perpetrators of oppression and other injustices. At the same time sovereign states, once established, should welcome a world organisation that was able to protect their state machinery and even their very existence from being destroyed without the explicit approbation of the Chamber of States.**

The test of any effective transformation of the world organisation must be the ability of this supreme world body to **impose its solution each time there is a confrontation between a sovereign state and a sovereign nation, something the UN, in its present formation and with presently existing powers, has been unable to achieve.**

This epilogue is, as is proper, my sole contribution to this collection of my past writings stretching over a period from 1949 to 1994 - over fiftyfive years.

My basic theme was one that could be gleamed even by the most bored reader. The vital need that South Slav (Yugoslav) nations should conduct their relations with near neighbours and Great powers, is some kind of egreed harmony. The form such associations should have on the political labels given them are of secondary importance, as means always should be to the end. Otherwise shall have no say in oor lives nor will our descendants have in their lives.

If I were not vain I would ask readers not to read this epilogue any further then its title. I say in Latin I concocted: If you wish to see a monument to our discord, look around you.

SI MONUMENTUM VIS NOSTRAE DISCORDIAE, CIRCUMSPICE

Epilogue

Upon the dissolution of the Yugoslav state union, I became a citizen of the Republic of Croatia. Relying on my human right, recognised in the constitution of this and other states in the area of the former Yugoslavia, I say that I am a Yugoslavian whenever I find it necessary to declare my nationality. I am well aware that in the view of most people this nationality no longer exists. For me, to be a Yugoslav does not mean belonging to some supra-nation, to a fifth or sixth South Slav nation, nor to some tribe, clique, party or conspiracy. To be a Yugoslav means to me to be a person who cares for the interests, aspirations and, indeed, for the very survival of each South Slav individual and each South Slav nation, and in particular in their relations with immediate neighbours and other nations and states.

It is clear to me that we all still have many interests in common. It would be of advantage to each South Slav nation to declare and defend these interests in an atmosphere of mutual harmony with each other. This is not an Utopian vision. It is plain common sense. Even if such a degree of co-operation were not in practice attainable it would surely be in the interests of each of our nations to seek to live as peaceful and harmonious neighbours. The fact that inhumane extermination has become the order of the day has produced a schizophrenia in my mind that I find hard to cure. I add, pace the claims of extreme Serb and Croat nationalists that were the presently silenced majorities of both these nations able to speak they would not condone what has happened since the beginning of 1991.

I am not in the slightest degree upset when some Croat nationalists describe me as a Yugo-nostalgic. This implies that I regret the passing of communist Yugoslavia whose dominion over our lands in fact caused me to spend 45 years in exile. This slanderous label also makes me appear to have been a supporter of order in the first Yugoslavia, its Belgrade centralisation and King Alexander's dictatorship. Nor am I perturbed by the knowledge that it has for long nettled some Serb nationalists that I never fell for the "Yugoslav" cover they provided for Serb domination over others in Yugoslavia. I am, of course also galled to see the present Serb leadership finding it convenient to give the Serb/Montenegrin federation the name of Yugoslavia and to use this ruse to seek to grab, as the "successor" of the former Yugoslav state, to all of its registered foreign real estate, status and other assets. This pseudo-Yugoslavia conceals the

failure of the Serbs and Montenegrins to arrive at an agreed name for the federation. The duplicity inherent in this false label is also intended to support a future "claim" as possibly worthy of international recognition for some enlarged Serb state that would incorporate non-Serb nationals whether they liked it or not.

I am astonished that it has not been noticed and acknowledged that none of us had in fact been attacked from outside Yugoslavia. No neighbour has invaded us. No Great power has occupied us. Everything that has happened has its source within the area once called Yugoslavia and was done by people who had all until recently been Yugoslav citizens.

It is imperative for all the people in these parts, and especially the coming generations, to realise that we have no one to blame but ourselves. The nationalistic madness that has inflamed the minds of large numbers of Serbs and Croats, the two largest of our nations, is not the result of the horrors that have overwhelmed us. It is their primary cause.

Nothing ever came of the public debates and necessary negotiations, propounded since 1963 by the advocates of the Democratic Alternative for a peaceful transition period following the decline of communist control. Instead of reasonable examination and discussion a climate of reckless haste was created (Upon the American Declaration of independence from British colonial rule in 1776, I pray to remind readers the processes of debate argument, delays and the final compromises, took, unlike the Yugoslav speeding a full twelve years to produce the new state's first constitution.).

The translation of a politically infantile society in which all life had hitherto been guided and controlled from above for two generations, into circumstances in which individual responsibilities in all aspects of social issues and compromises are paramount cannot be the business of ideologies. Whilst the rise of national awareness among us no doubt provided that decisive impetus to the withering away of communists rule, raging nationalism turned out to be the one and sole idea that could be gleaned from the behaviour of each nation. Inevitably, the many measures necessary for the democratisation of society were largely thwarted and many of them forsaken.

We know that the first and decisive elections in the newly created states of Croatia and Serbia were held according to electoral laws and procedures inherited from the communists (who, of course, knew only too well how to achieve "democratic majorities"). Thus the immediate successors of the communists (almost all of them actually former Communist party members recently converted to Christianity and democracy) became the possessors and controllers of "social property". By these means they had at their free disposal everything but minimal private property. Thus "endowed with the right" also to determine the ideology of their nation they gained possession of all the media, ready cash in the country, hard currencies etc. Virtually overnight, this control provided them with the power to organise mass movements and stage meetings of excited men and women. The right of citizens to consider, unhurried and in peace, other political solutions for the constitution of their new state's structure was severely restricted.

Let us consider what happened in Croatia and Serbia through the combination of sheer ignorance and lack of caution exhibited by these persons. It would be more to the point to be attribute the course events took to the deliberate blindness and the visionary egoisms of the new national leaders, flattered and emboldened by their servile acolytes.

* * *

Let us first consider Croatia. When one looks back today it is not possible to understand the depth of ignorance and the degree of levity shown by those who took on the complicated task of establishing Croatia as a state. They selected and glorified the idea that Croat statehood by itself was the one patent and decisive aim of the Croat nation, forgetting or not knowing that an achieved statehood was but one of the means in the struggle of the Croat nation for the recognition of its identity and its right to liberty.

How was it, I ask, that among these leaders who had themselves been professional historians there was no adequate awareness even of Croat history's recent course? Ante Starcevic in his time and in the context of the Habsburg Empire (which then appeared destined to rule over the Croat nation for centuries to come) advocated in the latter part of the nineteenth century and fought for Croat statehood. This appeared to him to be the means by which the Croat nation might achieve wider self rule. A climate might thus be created in which the Croat nation would feel that it was itself largely responsible for its own affairs on its own territory. The notion of statehood thus became to be expressed in the form of the paramount political slogan for the Croats. At the time it was believed by many and not only the Croats that the essential means for a grouping to be recognised as a nation could be expressed in the maxim; "A nation cannot be regarded as being a nation unless it became recognised as a state-possessing nation" - Staatsnation, was the German word for this. Until statehood had been achieved a nation remained merely a tribe or something like it. Had I been alive at the time I might well have supported this means of achieving the Croat right to liberty. But, historians at any rate, should have known that the concept of the nation and its right to identify itself and determine whether it would associate with others or not, had developed far beyond the sole simple right of a national grouping to its own state.

And so it came to pass that with all else thrown aside, nationalistic ideologues fixed their eyes on a concept of the state's role already, obsolescent elsewhere even in Starcevic's day. Come what may - was their cry.

The Croat nation already possessed by the middle of the nineteenth century all the attributes necessary for recognition as a nation. In spite of foreign dominion and the status of serfs of the majority of its population for almost nine centuries, there was a community in its ancient homeland easily recognisable through its specific character, its own language its own culture and customs. And all this without having its own state as this term is understood today.

I am increasingly concerned about the fate of the Croat nation, and indeed for its very survival, when I see that the entire Croat cause now appears to rest on this single factor of statehood in disregard of all other elements that go with identifying a nation capable of caring for itself in modern Europe. The present Croat leadership has spent little time in considering the conditions for membership of the European Union as it now is and even less effort in complying with them. For full membership of the European Union a single minded nationalistic Croat state is an impediment and not a qualification. It is particularly difficult to understand that the historians in the Croat leadership did not warn their colleagues that upon the proclamation of a manifestly nationalistic Croat state there were bound to come to the fore men who under the banner of a defensive self determination slogan would be capable of converting unspoken Serb fears into passive resistance and then armed revolt. The hostile mood of Croat extremists and the many displays of crude Croat prejudice against so many entirely innocent Serb citizens of Croatia encouraged the sense of self-preservation of the primitives. This obscured to Serb eyes all reasonable new Croat legislation dealing with the status of Serbs and their rights in Croatia. The leading local Serb primitives, not unexpectedly, resorted to seizing territory, sure that somebody "far over there" would understand and encourage them. And, sooner or later, provide arms and supplies.

Generals and other senior military in the Croat leadership who had acquired professional qualifications in the JNA (Yugoslav People's Army) should at least have had some idea of the inevitability of armed conflict upon any sudden collapse of Yugoslavia. Primarily, of course, over frontiers and not only with the Serbs of the Croat Krajina. They knew, or should have known, that the departure of Croats, Slovenes, Bosnian Muslims and Macedonians from the ranks of the JNA would mean that weapons, arms factories and other installations would fall into the hands of the Serbs remaining in the JNA. The smallest dose of caution needed in such circumstances should have made them steer the Croat leadership toward long-term patience, to procrastination in negotiations to avoid local outbursts with the aim also of heading off even some pre-planned revolt.

Prominent former communists and former Yugoslav secret service officers newly in the Croat leadership should have known more of the mentality and methods of their recent Serb comrades. After all, the path that led Serb communists to leading positions in Serbia was very similar to their own recent ascent into the

leadership of the new Croatia. How come that they failed to reveal to their new associates the character of the men with whom they would have to deal on the Serb side, like it or not? To many western statesmen and diplomats it was clear in 1990 that, upon the collapse of Yugoslavia, the Croats would have to face the well known figure of Serbia's leader. A patient, treacherous autocrat, the like of general Franco; a man who like Pasic would never reveal his ulterior motives. A man known to them to be ready and capable both in private and in public to acknowledge, approve and sign documents and then renounce his undertakings, retrace his steps or take unexpected ones and, on top of all this, was known ruthlessly to sacrifice supporters and friends.

Thus was set the course of Croat state policy while the legally established opposition was barely able to mention possible perils, let alone suggest alternative policies. It became manifest in Croatia that the sole way to acquire and retain power, jobs and other privileges was to know when and how to beat the patriotic chest, sincerely or not.

Foreign policy is founded on the faith that Croatia's "foreign friends" would, without exception or hesitation, defend documents signed granting international recognition of the sovereign Croat state and its equally recognised borders. It is sad to see the bitterness of Croat leaders as with each day that passes it becomes clearer even to the dimmest minds that "friends" like the United States or Germany primarily protect their own interests, nowadays particularly as co-operative members of international bodies. From the end of 1993 it became increasingly evident even on this side of the Atlantic that the elaboration and definition of American interests were under question. No need to remind ourselves that there are four powerful American institutions all contending for the decisive role in defining American interests and determining action abroad. In Germany, Kohl has just survived the recent elections and Kinkel, whose party, holding the balance in parliament with the reward of the office of foreign minister, enjoys only minimal support in his own party. So much for the "friends" as seen by the present Croat leadership. Britain and France are in crises over important elections which may well bring about significant changes in their policies concerning their membership of the European Union and also in their attitudes towards all the Balkans. Yeltsin's Russia (as much as "friend" of the Serbs as Germany is of the Croats) remains an enigma. Russia's state structure itself is still far from settled, so trying to define her interests is mere guesswork. Some of the moves of the Russian government in regard to Serbia, Croatia or Bosnia seem more like a search for trump cards meant to be effective elsewhere, i.e. on issues which must be the prime concern for the state of Russia - vis à vis the West, the U.S. and NATO.

If it had been realised that "friendly" ties can disappear overnight, there would have been evidence of other policy options being explored. As it was, the appearance on the scene by the spring and summer 1995 of a Croat military force of over 100,000 men secretly recruited, trained and armed, showed that from the very first an aggressive military option had been decided on for the restoration of the rebel territories. The opposition in Croatia at no stage pronounced itself to be opposed to the military option except as a last resort.

The deliberately fostered war atmosphere, precisely because it has proved so successful in the event as Serbs were driven out of the densely populated Serb settled regions of Croatia, bodes ill for the manner in which Croat interests would be pursued in Bosnia - Herzegovina. At stake there would be Croat conduct towards the Bosnian Muslims and not only towards the Bosnian Serbs.

The policy of the Croat state should surely be: A realistic policy towards any and all of the more powerful foreign states cannot be founded on reliance on "friends". All foreign states should be persuaded, each of them in a suitable manner and with appropriate arguments, that it would be in its own interest to support the existence, stability and prosperity of the Croat state. The preservation of the Croat war option and all that this entails, sensational short-term achievements notwithstanding, is an excessively burdensome policy for the future of Croatia. It must undermine the economic life of the nation and its state and thus also undermine any attraction the state of Croatia may have for the powers that from time to time exhibit interests in Balkan stability.

* * *

Unlike Croatia, Serbia in 1990 found herself ruled by the still extant communist party apparatus. It had merely changed its name to "socialist". The Serb national idea, just as the Croat one, found its sole expression in worship of the national state. What the newly nationalistic rulers had inherited from their old comrades was the valuable, detailed knowledge and skills of exercising and preserving complete power. Some of the elements of power control I have already mentioned in reviewing the Croat case. I mention another successful technique which is true for both cases. This involves manoeuvres with the originally communist drafted electoral laws in order to hinder and curb parliament itself and manacle the parliamentary opposition. All the measures of democratic processes gradually adopted over many centuries by the parliament in England and in other democratic parliaments in more recent times, appear to have been carefully listed and analysed in order to produce constitutional texts and laws painstakingly designed to obviate all restrictions to the power of the rulers. Mutatis mutandis, one can draw parallels between the schemes of Croat and Serb rulers and the machinations of feudal lords.

The Serb (and Montenegrin) rulers secured control of the media and inherited the entire "social property". (The capital proceeds and subsequent incomes derived from previously plundered, "nationalised" or otherwise acquired property, which the communists never formally registered or accounted for. It had been left at the covert disposal of the self-perpetuating oligarchy of the communist party). The socialist inheritors of these means to power thereupon proceeded to adopt poetically inspired nineteenth century cravings for Serb expansion and the recent lamentations of Serb academicians into a modern edition of the Greater Serbia concept. From the libraries and studies of intellectuals the idea of this Greater Serbia gradually flowed to the streets. "The nation has happened" was the cry, which hurts the ears and disregards the structure of the Serbian language as it does the English in my translation.

I am reminded of a specialist in such procedures. On the very first page of his "Mein Kampf" Hitler wrote: "Only when the boundaries of the Reich include the last German, without affording assurance of supporting him, does the need of the people give a moral right to acquire foreign soil." When he came to power, Hitler soon created an atmosphere that made Germans believe that their Sudeten compatriots in Czechoslovakia were in danger of extermination. In a series of swoops these Germans were incorporated into the Reich by the acquisition of the soil on which they lived. A neat consummation of Hitler's programme.

The same postulates of "justifying" aggression, the right of the Serb matrix state to be concerned about Serbs outside it, suffering real or imagined misfortunes were served to "justify" the Serb homeland's right to extend its frontiers if there was no other way to protect the very last Serb, wherever he may be settled.

The attempt to carry out this policy brought before the eyes of the entire world by way of television, the destruction of Vukovar and the shelling of the ancient city of Dubrovnik from its surrounding hills and from the sea and, in due course, the violence in Bosnia - Herzegovina.

There is beyond naked belligerence yet another side to Serb state policy. Its contours might have been gleaned at the very outset even by casual observers. The Serb rulers have always insisted that Serbia, the matrix, was herself not at war. When it seemed to be in the interest of the matrix state, it was argued that the Serbs of Serbia were only "rooting for one's side in the contests" taking place on the other side of their border.

When, under the pressure of international economic and financial sanctions, this border with Bosnia was closed except for humanitarian convoys, (the UN and others had not been fooled by the matrix's claim of not being at war) the Serb authorities had to face the fact that the object of a Greater Serbia had to be presented to the outside world as secondary or even non-existent. Serbia's interests after all were not always identical with the interests of Serbs outside Serbia. None the less there was overwhelming evidence that the aim of Greater Serbia, to be achieved by war if need be was and remained the paramount choice of Serb state policy. The abandonment of Serbs outside Serbia was explained at home as a delay until "better days" returned. The Bosnian Serbs would be left to cope as best they could in the

areas whence they had by Serbia's help driven out almost everyone else. The fact that by the middle of 1995 the Serbs in several Krajina districts of Croatia and in many Bosnian areas had experienced the same fate as their erstwhile victims, revealed what a "fata morgana" the Greater Serbia idea had turned out to be.

People everywhere were able thanks to global TV coverage to witness acts by Serb individuals and groups, as well as the actions of the Bosnian Serb army newly organised by officers from the JNA. None of these Serbs operating in Bosnia could have found their weapons lying in the streets. World-wide satanisation of the Serb government followed as night follows day. Alas, through general ignorance, this world-wide satanisation spread over the entire Serb nation. The protests of courageous, demonstrating youth in Serbia and the appeals of some elders shows, in my view, that the Serb nation was by no means unanimous in support of the government's war and expansion policy. But the sad truth had to be acknowledged that a nation silenced by its own rulers is none the less forced to suffer the consequences of its rulers' policy.

The rulers of the Serb state began to try to persuade the Great powers that it was any event worth supporting the Serb state and its prosperity. It would be in their interest, it was claimed, to re-establish Serbia as a dominant Balkan power to ensure stability in the entire region. This could only be interpreted as a signal to the Great powers that in the view of her present rulers Serbia herself was now in jeopardy after the catastrophies that have followed the early war successes. Now, at the end of 1995 with almost two million Albanians densely settled in the Kosovo region and about 400,000 Hungarians and others in the Vojvodina district it has become patent that a minority national conflict loomed inside the matrix, once the Greater Serbia policy had failed.

There is little chance of the Albanians agreeing now to common life with the Serbs short of a concession to an unprecedented degree of autonomy. And even less of a chance of reversing the two hundred year old exodus of Serbs from Kosovo to Croatia and Bosnia by a peaceful civilised and gradual return now of these Serbs to their ancient settlements in Kosovo. Uncounted thousands of Serb refugees from Croatia and Bosnia have crowded into Serbia to increase the number of Serbs from outside who have settled in the matrix much earlier and are now an unsettling feature in the government, police and militia.

Western Europe, the United States and NATO are bound to re-consider any expectations they might have had about the stability of Serbia. The Greater Serbia policy has in the space of four years produced results exactly opposite to what had originally been intended.

* * *

I have so far not mentioned the prevailing economic and financial situations in Serbia and Croatia. Alas, a few words will suffice.

There is one phenomenon that predominates over all other economic factors or trends. "Social property" (this, most pernicious of communist bequests) is long overdue for denationalisation or re-privatisation. It is in fact being carried out in both states with the clear purpose of preserving the greatest part of it (some say more than 90%) under the direct or covert control of those in power whilst "the remainder" of this old "social property" would graciously be earmarked for "fair distribution".

"Thus, after four years of fine words and promises the sole form of re-privatisation that is actually taking place is by way of crime.

The complaisance of the authorities in both Serbia and Croatia, and indeed their manifest promotion of this category of plunder, represents an European scandal. The elevation of notorious Balkan and Levantine petty larceny to the level of state policy attests before the entire world to the nature of the

parties in power in Serbia and Croatia and to the present impotence of parliaments in both states to put an end to these practices.

Josip Broz Tito has truly left us fatal pupils.

* * *

The political interests of foreign states and the world's institutions have been mentioned. One may discern differences among these states in matters of substance or in timing but what they have in common was evident from the very start of the drama.

- 1) To prevent our conflicts from spilling over into neighbouring countries, especially to the rest of the Balkans.
- 2) To minimise the flow of refugees and those expelled into neighbouring countries and beyond. To return refugees home as soon as possible.
- 3) To ensure that troops, sent into the fray by the UN or by individual states, are not drawn into the fighting and, especially, to avoid casualties or loss of life of such troops.
- 4) If their interest should so require to "maintain a cease-fire" or a possible "peace". In no circumstances are any such foreign troops to act as "peace makers".
- 5) Under pressure, "to do something" about the horrors and persecutions, many states carried out, and others supported, private and public humanitarian missions, some under the aegis of the UN.
- 6) Officials and diplomats, even government ministers, were offered first as sponsors of political compromises, and later as sponsors of cease-fires and more permanent stable settlements.
- 7) Throughout these interventions a noted priority of the Great powers was to avoid clashes among themselves over any of our problems which were regarded by them to a large extent as peripheral to their main interests.
- 8) To ensure that their representatives, be they statesmen, diplomats, soldiers, humanitarian workers or journalists, remained as neutral as possible. This involved closing eyes to covert arms traffic and the smuggling of arms by all local belligerents.
- 9) Having abjured sticks, the use of carrots to encourage the sides in the conflict to a cease-fire and ultimate peace.

It proved very hard to adhere to all these nine mutually agreed policies and measures.

There were many occasions when the difference between "peace keeping" and "peace making" became difficult to assess. Certainly, the local belligerents were mostly in confusion on this issue of policy however clear it might have been to the world's chancelleries. Despite numerous cease-fires there was no peace for a number of years. The policy of "peace keeping" never really got off the ground.

Without invoking Russian and Chinese vetoes sanctions and arms embargoes were imposed. These were measures that went beyond "peace keeping". Air strikes were introduced. "Peace making" was now overt, though restricted to a type of bombardment that did not put ground troops at risk (until some were made hostages, that is). "Limited peace making" joined "peace keeping" as a failure.

Added to this was a negative effect. Though humanitarian relief operations did much to save lives, feed, supply and help in resettling persecuted and evicted citizens, many of these operations were seen as facilitating the forced expulsions of people and the ethnic clearing of areas.

A very serious aspect of the several stages of foreign intervention was that the elaborate stabilisation plans contained two most grave blunders. First, the maps produced contained suggested demarcations of areas that implicitly condoned population expulsions and the taking of territory by force. They also implicitly recognised (in spite of fine words and many undertakings to preserve the state of Bosnia Herzegovina) a de facto division of this state between a Croat-Muslim entity and a Serbian entity. This leaves Bosnia-Herzegovina nearer to fiction than to fact. As the Croat-Muslim accord has so far survived only through U.S. pressure, it is likely that when this pressure is lifted by the end of 1996, the intended state of Bosnia-Herzegovina might well find herself "composed" of three entities rather than the presently arranged two.

The fiasco of foreign intervention (or, non-intervention, if you like) would have been complete had not the most overt of "peace making" measures taken place at an airfield in Dayton, Ohio, U.S. in December 1995.

There, the three presidents of allegedly sovereign states were isolated together until they signed a series of documents in the English language. None of them, as has been shown by their declarations for home consumption had the time or personal capacity or competent enough advice and guidance, to take in the full import of all the steps to which they had agreed. Sovereign governments indeed! As far as I can judge they spoke as if each one of them had signed different documents. How will these sovereign governments behave once the "peacemakers" had lost their interest in them?

Under the leadership of the U.S. and evidently with the assent of Britain, German, Russia and Spain (acting for the European Union) the NATO peacemaking force will stay in our area for one year.

It was clear to me as it was not to many South Slavs that the establishment in the wake of Yugoslavia of separate states and the inevitable mutual conflicts about frontiers, would result, in a tragedy for all of us. The Great powers will after all leave us having condoned much aggression and forced population distribution. The forced re-distribution of the population may reduce areas of future frontier conflicts but it has not established frontiers like the Swedish-Norwegian frontier. We will be left with three states, Serbia, Croatia and a sort of Bosnia-Herzegovina, all three of necessity armed and policed to the teeth, inevitably antagonistic among themselves. Such states cannot afford democratic processes. freedom of the media, free speech etc. sensitive as they must remain to suspicions of spying, fifth columns, conspiracies, treason and so on.

* * *

Yet, I am convinced that the overwhelming majority in all our nations even in areas not directly afflicted, have had enough of all this.

With the failure of the great powers to "make" a satisfactory peace with a reasonable hope of future stability, what now? .I have no convincing answer to that question today.

Obviously populations as such, even in the most democratic countries could not of themselves bring about general settlements. One can, however, list those persons who could not possibly be regarded either as capable or as desirable to play any part in any possible serious future accords.

1. The present leaderships of Serbia/Montenegro and Croatia.
2. The present highly radicalised leaderships of Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats.

3. A lesser disqualification should apply to the Bosnian Muslim leadership who were only radicalised by the initial campaigns to exterminate their compatriots.
4. Serbs who consider all Croats to be Ustachas and Croats who regard all Serbs as Chetniks.

Most readers could certainly add other categories to this brief list.

* * *

Yet, beyond this negative list there are some positive and promising elements to record at this time of pessimism.

I do not advocate revolutionary undertakings, organised by individuals or movements, however clearly they might voice the dissatisfaction of the so far silent public in the whole area of the disintegrated Yugoslavia with what has been going on for four years. Revolutions may begin with one purpose but the inevitable violence will always deform initial aims into something else, usually much worse.

Both Serbian/Montenegro and Croatia's have parliaments. However elected, however manacled by government powers, however many parties there may be, parliamentary oppositions do exist in both states. This is a fact known to the rest of the world. The spread of global information that now exists has reached a degree unexpected only a few years ago. Modern technologies (unnecessary to describe here) have spread all over the West and East. Global influences of all kinds, working both ways, disregard state frontiers. It is not easy to assess the rate of decline of state structures and so the contraction of sovereignty as the means of blocking influences from abroad. But the trend is palpable, and so far, it seems to be unstoppable.

At all events, we are no longer alone and doomed to be silent inside our sovereign frontiers. As long as parliamentary oppositions exist and behave in accord with civilised procedures, perhaps surprisingly quite well known in the Balkans, we can count on outside support, however tentative at first in the face of the sovereignty taboo. Financial and economic, possible also diplomatic pressure, might be incited as news if infringements of human rights emerge from our states. The establishment of access to the public media, of a free private press and TV, are the areas to be watched.

The rest would have to be up to our populations. Opposition parties in Serbia and Croatia, for instance, would be encouraged if they knew that somebody outside was watching them and their moves towards personal liberties for all citizens. They would abandon "politically correct" rhetoric and resolutely oppose military solutions to conflicts,

In Bosnia-Herzegovina these, admittedly idealistic processes would have uneasy paths. There are three sides there to almost every problem.

The claims of the present leaderships that they wish their states to join the western world will have to be publicly exposed to ridicule. Both Serb and Croat leaders claim to wish to join the West, a West not seen by them as the cradle of law and order of various splendid cultures or of civilised political systems and free economic enterprise, but as naive milking cows. On the eve of the new millennium leaders in both Serbia and Croatia contrive to turn customs, feasts and ceremonies inherited from our past into kitsch circuses as if the people of the West and the rest of the world lived on Mars and could not see what these Serb and Croat "statesmen" regarded as statehood.

* * *

I end this epilogue as I began. At least some readers may conclude that we of the Democratic alternative, who since 1963 advocated peaceful, just and intra-nationally equitable solutions to the problems facing all of us in Yugoslavia, were not naive, never mad and certainly not impractical.

Our main message was that labels such as confederacy, federation, autonomous regions, etc, even the concept of a formal Yugoslav union, should take second place to the concept of mutual harmony among us being vital to each and all of us in our relations with neighbouring countries and the Great powers. It is our own discord and not any interference by the Great powers in pursuit of their interests that is our great destructive force.

The present picture of our lands I can best give is by adapting the words on the tablet in St Paul's Cathedral in London in memory and honour of its architect, Sir Christopher Wren (who, incidentally, attended the same school in London as I did - Westminster School, though somewhat before my time).

SI MONUMENTUM VIS NOSTRAE DISCORDIAE, CIRCUMSPICE