

3-21-2000

## Balkanizing the Balkans

Paul L. Atwood

*University of Massachusetts Boston*, paul.atwood@umb.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp>



Part of the [International Law Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), and the [Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Atwood, Paul L. (2000) "Balkanizing the Balkans," *New England Journal of Public Policy*. Vol. 15: Iss. 2, Article 3.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.umb.edu/nejpp/vol15/iss2/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. It has been accepted for inclusion in New England Journal of Public Policy by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks at UMass Boston. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@umb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@umb.edu).

# Balkanizing the Balkans

Paul L. Atwood

---

*This article seeks to place the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Kosovo war in the context of the larger issue of NATO expansion. It argues that the question of ethnic cleansing in that province of Serbia was largely exploited by the United States, the creator and most powerful member of the alliance, to break up the former Yugoslavia, to divide it, and to make it more manageable for Western interests. In the guise of stopping Serb repression, NATO seized an opportunity to build more bases throughout southeastern Europe, including those being constructed in NATO's newest member states, Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary. These actions are deeply threatening to Russia, positioned as it is in either the former USSR or in former Warsaw Pact nations. The aim of NATO expansion is seen as an effort to weaken Russia, especially in the vital oil-rich Caspian Sea basin, which is being contested for a pipeline to flow either to the west through Turkey and Azerbaijan or through Russia's Caucasus region. NATO expansion also worries China, which fears its largely Moslem, far western provinces will seek some measure of unity with the Moslem republics of the old Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. NATO expansion, far from bringing stability to Europe, is inherently destabilizing.*

---

They have made a desolation and called it peace.

— Tacitus

The speed with which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) moved into the Balkans in the aftermath of the fall of Communism is stunning in its audacity. This expansion is a far cry from the outlook promoted by NATO's first military commander, General Dwight D. Eisenhower, shortly after he assumed command in 1950. "If in ten years, all American troops stationed in Europe for national defense purposes have not been returned to the United States, then this whole project will have failed."<sup>1</sup> The establishment of new NATO bases throughout the former Yugoslavia and beyond is seen by Russia as dangerously threatening, portending a new division of Europe and perhaps a new Cold War or worse. If one of the central rationales for NATO's expansion is taken at face value, namely, that the alliance must move eastward to contain conflicts which might lead to mass outflows of refugees to Western Europe, thereby destabilizing NATO members themselves, an endless chain of security commitments looms as more Eastern European nations join. As Senator Richard Lugar once said, "There can be no security at the center without security at the periphery."<sup>2</sup> Thus the stage is being set for renewed conflict with Russia and with the Islamic world that abuts the progressively enlarging security

*Paul L. Atwood is a faculty member of the American Studies Program and a research associate of the William Joiner Center for the Study of War and Social Consequences, University of Massachusetts Boston.*

zone. China, too, is alarmed at the growth of the North Atlantic alliance. The policies forged by the United States may bring the peace of the sword to the Balkans for the moment, but at what future cost?

The forces that induced the breakup of the Soviet Union in the late 1980s also led to instability in the Balkan communist regimes. Since then, in the guise of quashing ethnic conflicts for “humanitarian” reasons, the United States has backed nationalist-separatist movements throughout Yugoslavia, resulting in the incremental disintegration of the most successful, prosperous, and progressive — though not without important faults — communist/socialist experiments in the region. Beginning with Slovenia in 1991, the United States and other NATO parties have fostered or encouraged independence movements in Croatia, Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Kosovo, their rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding. In March 1999, and in close proximity to the Balkans, three new members — former parties to the Soviet-inspired Warsaw Pact: Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland — were admitted to NATO despite explicit promises to Russia that this would not happen. NATO now has bases in Greece, Albania, Macedonia, Bosnia, Croatia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Kosovo. In January 1999, oil-rich Azerbaijan, a short distance from the Balkans, within the old borders of the Soviet Union itself, requested a NATO base. What seemed inconceivable only two decades ago is now reality. What do U.S. policy-makers view as being at stake? — the United States is the prime mover in this. The most influential members of both parties are agreed on expansion. Would they venture to wage a war in Serbia, in the very backyard of Russia, while ostensibly extending the olive branch of peace and friendship to this erstwhile evil empire?

Once its World War II triumph placed the United States at the top of the global system constructed by Europeans over the last five centuries, NATO has been the creation and tool of this nation to achieve its objectives in Europe since 1949. In popular mythology, the United States entered World War II by default, pushed to the extreme of battle by its enemies. In reality, newly ascendant internationalists in Franklin D. Roosevelt’s administration saw a splendid opportunity to inject this country into the war and thereby defeat the Axis with relative ease, simultaneously exploiting the war-induced weaknesses of its allies, then putting the United States at the helm of the system and streamlining it for self-serving reasons.<sup>3</sup> The initial rationale for NATO, the first formal military alliance in U.S. history, was to contain Communism. The American public was led to believe in the late 1940s that the Red Army was poised to invade Western Europe.

We now know that Washington policymakers never believed this to be the case but feared the electoral growth, and hence potential legitimation, of communist parties in Western Europe, especially in France and Italy, in response to dire economic conditions in the wake of World War II. A turn toward Communism or Socialism would have stifled the internationalist objectives of those American elites who had entered World War II precisely to make Europe and Asia safe for their vision of a rational capitalist world order, one which had fractured twice in this century over rivalries among the powers that had created it. U.S. policymakers, wielding national power in the postwar period surpassingly greater than any ever achieved in history, believed an American imperium could establish conditions favorable to a rational global order.

As National Security Council paper number 48, the first blueprint for Cold War strategy, put matters in 1949, “The economic life of the modern world is geared toward expansion [requiring] establishment of conditions favorable to the export of technology and capital and to a liberal trade policy throughout the world.”<sup>4</sup> The Marshall Plan, which provided significant dollar capital to Western Europeans so they could purchase Ameri-

can goods and stimulate trans-Atlantic economic revival, and NATO were “two halves of the same walnut” in President Harry Truman’s phrase. In fact, both were military applications of U.S. foreign policy designed to isolate the Soviets and put them on the defensive while forcing them to prioritize weapons over consumer goods. It was also a way to reduce the former European powers to virtual subsidiaries of the burgeoning America, Inc., for NATO’s *raison d’être* also was driven by deep economic motives. American arms manufacturers, their bankers, and numerous other contractors would provide the basic infrastructure for the military containment of the USSR, with many guaranteed the same profits as during World War II, mostly at U.S. taxpayer expense. Thus domestic and international economic goals and military planning were inseparable, a salient fact that remains just as true to this day.

The rationale adopted in much discussion of the war over Kosovo was that NATO should take upon itself the effort to right a wrong that no other single power or institution, including the United Nations, has been willing or able to do, that is, to stop the ethnic cleansing of Albanians by Serbs and restore their basic human rights. This action is trumpeted as the first exercise of the so-called Clinton doctrine, which posits that, past errors and omissions aside, the United States and its agents will henceforth ride to the rescue to save lives and safeguard human rights when circumstances allow such action without undue cost.

As always, such prescriptions are couched in highly oblique language, but in this case the hypocrisy leaps out. For one thing, one of the NATO allies engaged in air strikes against Serbia on behalf of the ethnically cleansed — in U.S.-manufactured planes flown by U.S.-trained pilots — was Turkey, a nation whose record on human rights is abysmal and whose cleansing of Armenians early in this century provided the precedent for the Nazi genocide. Turkey has also driven at least two million Kurds from their homes, killing many more of them than the Serbs had killed Albanians — up to the time the air war against Serbia began. While it is true that any military attempt by the United States or NATO to stop the Turkish variety of ethnic cleansing would cost a great deal more than the Kosovo operation (something which, of course, is not in the cards), all the United States needs to do is cut off its arms supplies and economic aid to Ankara.

The United States could also have easily induced Indonesia to stop its barbaric activities in East Timor, where Indonesian troops or their paramilitary agents have caused the death of at least one-third of the population since 1975, a genocidal policy if ever there was one, long before the United Nations-mandated plebiscite resulted in an overwhelming vote for independence. Since the United States gave its blessing to Indonesia’s invasion of East Timor, selling it the enabling weapons in the first place, this nation shares responsibility for the tragedy there. In both cases — and there are numerous others, such as the atrocities against civilians in Sierra Leone’s civil war and the human tragedy again looming in the Horn of Africa — Washington has been relatively silent, making only symbolic and vacuous noises.

Meanwhile, the mainstream press covers these issues in a manner fundamentally different from its coverage of Kosovo. In a word, a double standard obtains for those despotic governments whose policies are in accord with U.S. international goals. No matter their crimes, however egregious, no serious sanctions will be enforced against the likes of Ankara or Jakarta. Dictatorial regimes like Serbia’s and Cuba’s, which do not play the game according to the rules laid down in Washington, are subject to withering if not cataclysmic punishments.

All of which raises the question of U.S. goals on both a global and a purely European



level. According to the UN Charter, some regional alliances are allowed, but NATO's actions in Kosovo violate that charter. The UN, which is supposed to be the international monitor and peacekeeper, has been hobbled since its birth by great power Security Council disputes and by blatant disregard in Washington. A world order in which the many small and undeveloped nations have more or less the same role in global government as that of individual states in the American republic, for example, California versus Rhode Island, is not the global regime Washington wants.

The role of "globocop" has not fallen by default to the United States; American hegemony over the international system has been the goal of interventionist elites throughout this century. Their vaunted idea of an open world economy in which commodities, capital, and technology flow freely across borders appears magnanimous, but it has been readily apparent that control of resources, industrial infrastructure, and military bases would primarily benefit the United States and the corporations the vision was designed to protect. As James Forrestal, the first secretary of Defense put it, "As long as we can outproduce the world, control the sea and can strike inland with the atomic bomb, we can assume risks otherwise unacceptable."<sup>5</sup> In the conception of American internationalists, the only supranational agencies necessary for global peace and prosperity at that time were the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, backed up by the U.S. military and its atomic monopoly and its alliance partners.

Again, this strategy was buttressed by reference to the threat posed by international Communism, an ideology which posited a much different vision of how to organize a society — its own hypocrisies and shortcomings notwithstanding — one which stood in the way of an American-led world order. Nationalism, whether of the revolutionary variety as in Vietnam or liberal as in Iran until 1953, also obstructed corporate access to the markets and resources of the greater world. As George Kennan, the author of the containment policy, put it in 1948, "We have about 50% of the world's wealth, but only 6.3% of the world's population . . . Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity."<sup>6</sup>

Though the Soviet Union was devastated at the end of World War II and, in the words of historian Melvyn Leffler, "had no capacity to attack American territory and had no ability to damage the American economy,"<sup>7</sup> it was demonized in much the same fashion as the Nazis had been, despite, or really because of, the fact that the Soviets defeated the bulk of the German juggernaut. They then found themselves in possession of much of the same territory formerly controlled by the Nazis, real estate that Washington had wished liberated of Nazi rule on its terms. The Cold War began with a refusal by Washington to permit international control of atomic energy through the UN, coupled with a claim that the Soviets were occupying Eastern Europe illegitimately — virtually every country the USSR occupied had declared war against the Soviets as allies of Hitler. The Soviet Union was occupying Eastern Europe for exactly the same reason the United States occupied Japan. The Cold War was intensified by a campaign to encircle the USSR with strategic bases capable of launching Hiroshima-type bombers. This had the quite predictable effect of stimulating the Soviets to accelerate their atomic bomb project, which succeeded in 1949, and to commit a vast proportion of their gross domestic product to military enlargement and to tighten their totalitarian grip on their satellites. These actions, in turn, were portrayed in the West as further evidence of the communist threat, and so on, leading to an increasingly ratcheted and deadly arms race, which, of course, provided the rationale for NATO, which also came into existence, by no means an unrelated event, in 1949.

The mission of NATO to contain the Soviets remained credible to the bulk of the U.S. citizenry as long as the putative threat remained. When the USSR disintegrated, because of the internal inconsistencies of Stalinism and an economy organized to meet what the Soviets perceived as the Western threat, which stressed guns over butter, NATO's rationale also collapsed. There had always been an unstated, and more important goal, which was to contain Washington's ostensible partners from undertaking independent economic or military policies vis-à-vis the new world order. In the postwar era this meant, according to Leffler, that "neither an integrated Europe, nor a united Germany nor an independent Japan must be allowed to emerge as a third force."<sup>8</sup> Today these policies are constantly reaffirmed, as in the infamous draft of a Pentagon Policy Planning Guidance document, reported by *The New York Times* in 1993, which argued that the United States must continue to dominate the international system by "discouraging the advanced industrial nations from challenging our leadership or even aspiring to a larger global *or regional* role."<sup>9</sup> (Italics mine.) As one senior State Department official put it, testifying before Congress in 1990 on NATO's future role, "We need NATO now for the same reasons NATO was created." The danger, he continued, was that without American leadership the Europeans would revert to type, "renationalize" their armed forces, play the "old geo-political game," and "shift alliances."<sup>10</sup> Economically, a danger exists that Europe might achieve something like Napoleon's envisioned Continental system or even Hitler's planned autarky. Eastern Europe would provide raw materials and cheap labor while Western Europe would contribute capital and high-tech industries, then close its markets to the United States and compete with American corporations in the larger world. Such a Europe, in Walter Russel Meade's conception, might produce its VCRs in Poland, not China, under U.S. corporate supervision, and "would buy its wheat from Ukraine rather than the Dakotas."<sup>11</sup>

Thus, having been rationalized into existence to stifle Communism, it turns out that NATO was just as much a linchpin of U.S. policy toward Western Europe — a way of containing or at least channeling its Europeanization — and a very big business indeed, one whose multifarious contracts, from military equipment to base construction and maintenance, led directly to the bottom lines of many of the largest U.S. multinational corporations, and from there to the U.S. Treasury. Multibillion-dollar budgets, many of them funded by U.S. taxpayers, were at stake. So were the careers of many U.S. and European officers whose services would presumably no longer be needed, prospects that augured deep cuts in the U.S. and allied military budgets and in corporate contracts, and a potential peace dividend for domestic social programs.

New NATO members and new bases require arms and money. According to a 1996 Congressional Budget Office study, NATO enlargement could cost U.S. taxpayers \$125 billion by 2012, assuming the stability of Europe's security environment. Other studies offer lower figures. The RAND Corporation estimates probable costs of enlargement at between \$30 and \$52 billion. The Pentagon assesses even lower costs — \$27 to \$35 billion — but leaks from the Department of Defense admitted to low-balling figures. "Everybody realized the main priority was to keep costs down to reassure Congress, as well as the Russians," said one unidentified source.<sup>12</sup> Whatever the figures, most of the cash flows directly to U.S.-controlled multinational corporations.

Institutionalized over a half century, NATO had become its own vested interest, one intimately linked to and codependent with the American military-industrial complex. That billions of dollars in annual contracts, salaries, and other expenditures would simply vanish or be put to other uses was inconceivable to those whose investments and careers

were at stake. If NATO was to remain viable, it would require a new and improved mission. No longer needed to thwart the Soviet bear, it would become the policeman of Europe and move audaciously to implement phases of the New World Order reaffirmed in traditional internationalist terms by President George Bush after the Gulf War.

Ostensibly aimed at providing reason and justice to a chaotic globe, this regime is intended to administer a system of international production and distribution headed by the United States for the benefit of the United States and, to the extent necessary to prevent them from bolting the alliance, its Western European allies. The first order of business is Europe itself. As Leffler demonstrated in his exhaustive study of the origins of the Cold War, the aim of Washington in the aftermath of World War II has always been to reopen Eastern Europe to the U.S.-led system. Indeed, the United States entered the war in Europe partly to liberate Central and Eastern Europe from Nazi rule, only to see it occupied by the Soviets in 1945. While the Russians were willing to compromise with their erstwhile allies, selling out nationalist/communist movements elsewhere, including the Balkan nation of Greece, Washington, after FDR's death, employed its economic and military preponderance to demand the East European prize completely on its terms, a position bound to result in Soviet intransigence. The resulting Cold War prevented the integration of the east into the U.S.-led global capitalist system, but the collapse of Soviet-style Communism in 1991 opened opportunities that U.S. policymakers understood and quickly moved to exploit.

Yugoslavia was one nationalist/communist movement that succeeded in remaining outside the Soviet orbit yet resisted Western pressures to conform. Under Marshal Tito, warring ethnic groups, particularly the Croatian Ustashe and the Muslim fascists, both of which had been the tools of the Nazis, and the Serbian Chetniks were suppressed. The newly resuscitated entity Yugoslavia was set on a course of socialist development independent of the USSR and to a lesser extent of the West. Noted for its harsh, totalitarian rule, the Tito regime nevertheless enabled Yugoslavia to prosper far in excess of the Soviet model and allowed a progressive movement that was opposed to tribal hatred and in favor of ethnic reconciliation to emerge.

Over the half century between the end of World War II and the collapse of Communism in the early 1990s, Yugoslavia was considered as a model for ethnic harmony, though this was a romanticization. Extremists kept the ethnic issues alive, at least below the surface, something Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia and the late Franjo Tudjman of Croatia would exploit for their own benefit in the 1980s. Yet simultaneously there had grown a decided movement toward ethnic reconciliation in tandem with growing prosperity, the only combination with any prospect of success. Daily life in Yugoslavia's major cities resembled that in the west of Europe, not the dreary poverty and ideological conformity of the Soviet bloc. Belgrade's cafés provided hospitality to a vigorous intelligentsia and artistic establishment, while Sarajevo's population was made up of many families tied by ethnic intermarriage. When the movement against Communism gained momentum, one significant faction throughout the former Yugoslavia desired more political democracy while advocating the retention of those socialist economic institutions that worked, something that did not comport with Western interests. Yugoslavia, which was different from both the West and Russia, showed potential to remain independent of both camps, something that was also anathema to both.

The United States and NATO countries have always said that their primary concern was to end ethnic slaughter, return stability to southeastern Europe, and foster its unity with Western Europe. Still, micronationalist independence movements among



Yugoslavia's ethnic groups were also encouraged to secede from the moment the anti-Communist rebellion emerged. As the most populous and strongest of the ethnic groups, the Serbs quickly became the focus of ethnic rebellion stirred up by ultranationalists among all ethnic minorities. Once the independence of Slovenia was recognized, with the prospect of Croatia to follow, the Serbian nationalists began purging areas of greater Serbia of all other groups, thereby leading directly to war in Croatia and Bosnia and, to a lesser extent at the time, Kosovo. Atrocities became endemic on all sides, further deepening ethnic hatreds and weakening the progressives of all groups who wish to overcome ethnic differences. As Zoran Djindjic, leader of Serbia's Democracy Party put it, "The U.S. spent more on bombs in one day than it ever spent assisting the democracy movement in Serbia."<sup>13</sup>

The Western press focused mainly on Serb crimes, but until the expulsion of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, the worst case of ethnic cleansing took place in the Krajina area of what is now Croatia, where at least 300,000 Serbs were forcibly driven from their homes and many massacred, a fact that received much less attention than atrocities carried out by Serbs. One reason that Serbia wished to displace Kosovar Albanians was to make room for the uprooted Serbs. Today, of course, Kosovo has been virtually cleansed — of Serbs and Roma. One French peacekeeper told reporters that he had been ordered to stand by while ethnic Albanians sought revenge against Serb families.<sup>14</sup> The U.S. public supported the bombing of Serbia because the Clinton administration said that this drastic measure was necessary to prevent genocide. While crimes against humanity certainly occurred, evidence is mounting that nothing approaching race murder was happening in Kosovo, although savage acts against ethnic Albanians intensified once Serbia came under NATO fire.

In the guise of reining in murderous Serbs, NATO continues to break up Yugoslavia as a prelude to privatizing its industries (Yugoslavia's auto industry was much better than the caricature of the Yugo in the Western press, a lampoon called forth by its very success) and ensuring that Western capital gets in on the spoils. It is often overlooked that the former Yugoslavia and especially Belgrade are situated on the Danube, the primary commercial waterway of southern Europe, and Kosovo is the site of Europe's richest silver and lead mines. In Michael Parenti's words, the aim is "to break it up into little neo-colonial, right-wing, ethnic, nationalist banana republics that can be totally kicked around."<sup>15</sup> Just as the rest of the former communist states in East Europe are being "third worldized," so will the former Yugoslavia be impoverished, with its social programs annulled, and opened to Western capitalist investment at bargain-basement rates with extremely cheap labor available.

The U.S. media have systematically spun a myth that Serbia refused to sign the Rambouillet Accords. No such concordance existed. The term "accords" means that both sides had come to a mutually agreed-upon settlement, which was not true. NATO simply demanded that Serbia allow the organization's troops to occupy Kosovo and to transit the rest of Serbia as well. No independent state would sign such an agreement because it patently would surrender national sovereignty, something NATO claims to respect. The Rambouillet wording was designed to guarantee rejection. The Serbs made a counterproposal, offering to allow United Nations forces, with a component of Russian troops, to police the human rights situation in Kosovo. NATO rejected this outright and when Serbia subsequently abjured the NATO proposition, it was demonized as a rejectionist outlaw from the community of nations.

Compare this with the U.S. government's *laissez-faire* stance toward Indonesia's



butcheries in East Timor. UN forces have gone in to stop violence there as a result of pressure by ordinary citizens throughout the world who believe that to do nothing is to be guilty of a double standard. Milosevic is certainly a bloody tyrant but not much different from many others with whom the United States has collaborated, like Suharto in Indonesia, Mobuto in Zaire, the Shah of Iran, and even Saddam Hussein before the Gulf War — and to a great extent with Milosevic himself during the Dayton conferences, when he was promised that no charges of crimes against humanity would be leveled against him for Serb barbarities in Bosnia. The difference is that they played the game Washington's way and for that their crimes were overlooked — even financed. If Milosevic had acceded to NATO demands all along and cooperated with the breakup of Yugoslavia on American terms he would be portrayed in the Western press as a great statesman, and his very real crimes would be played down as indeed they were after the war in Bosnia.

NATO is not yet the global policeman, but it is certainly the gendarme of as much of Europe as it believes it can finesse — a zone that is being progressively enlarged. Many former Soviet clients, fearing the future return of their former overlord, have reached out to NATO, which has leaped into the vacuum left by retreating Russian influence. When the Soviet Union began to break up and announced the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact — the mirror image of NATO — it did so on the basis of strenuous promises that NATO would not exploit Russian weaknesses. But exploit them it has by admitting former Warsaw Pact nations and by entering into negotiations for oil exploration in the Caspian Sea periphery of the former USSR. When we consider that two former national security advisers, Brent Scowcroft and Zbigniew Brezinski, as well as former secretary of State James Baker, former secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, and former Treasury secretary Lloyd Benson, Democrats and Republicans alike, are consultants for U.S. oil companies aiming to reap lucrative contracts with the government of Azerbaijan, the real aim of U.S. foreign policy in this part of the world begins to come into focus. Major investors hope the next oil bonanza will result from reserves beneath the Caspian Sea as other sources are expected to diminish.

The U.S. government therefore wants the vital pipeline carrying this resource to travel through the territories of allies, not through Russia. One can only imagine the fallout if a stronger Russia could somehow cut off American access and divert Mexican and Venezuelan oil strictly to its purposes. Yet despite all claims of friendship toward Russia, most Republicans and Democrats support measures that they hope will ensure Western control of this critical asset, much of which was formerly located within the boundaries of the former Soviet Union. The great race to capitalize on the known oil reserves in Russia's former Muslim republics in Central Asia also conflicts with China's policies in that region. Turkic tribes there are poised to secede as well, hoping to align with their Islamic fellows to the west and south. As Brezinski noted in *The Grand Chess Game*, the aim of U.S. policy must be to break up and divide the former Soviet Union. That logic extends to formerly communist Yugoslavia as well, which it seems is gradually being shaped to serve as a launching pad for the next foray farther east.

The British called their competition with Russia for domination in southern and central Asia in the nineteenth century the Great Game. The play was hardly confined to these two powers. Such frolics primed the carnage of the First World War and the multiple holocausts of the second. Hiroshima and Nagasaki ought to have been the proverbial handwriting on the wall warning us of the endgame of such folly. Yet NATO is playing the game for keeps, gambling that its virtuosity can avoid an apocalyptic showdown with Russia, at its weakest condition in over half a century, despite much historical evidence

that when threatened, Russia does not back down and reacts with force. One reason that the Russians have reentered Chechnya with such savagery is to rebuild their former image in the face of what many in Moscow perceive as deliberate tactics on the part of the West to humiliate them. Their claim of bombing strictly military targets is a page torn from NATO's record in Kosovo. China, too, is alarmed. At this rate, a plurality of the UN Security Council at any one time is likely to be composed of NATO members. The notion that the expansion of NATO will foster stability is delusory. Russia and China, frightened by a Western military coalition on the march, are already moving to shore up a tenuous alliance. Even if NATO is momentarily successful in its stratagems, the outlook for a peaceful twenty-first century is inherently corrupted, and we ought not lose sight of the dispiriting fact that the twentieth has been the bloodiest thus far. ❀

---

## Notes

1. Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., "NATO Enlargement: To What End?" in *NATO Enlargement: Illusions and Reality*, edited by Ted Galen Carpenter and Barbara Conry (Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 1998), 199.
2. Richard Lugar, "NATO: Out of Area or Out of Business: A Call for U.S. Leadership to Revive and Define the Alliance." Remarks delivered to the Open Forum of the U.S. State Department, August 2, 1993, 3.
3. In American national mythology, the Japanese assault on Pearl Harbor was a sneak attack. The United States, which supposedly was doing everything in its power to avert conflict, had, in July 1941, completely embargoed oil and steel. On November 25, 1941, it issued what amounted to an ultimatum to Japan demanding that Tokyo quit China and Indochina and abrogate the Axis alliance, a stipulation that amounted to a Hobson's choice for Japan. Historians have long known that the U.S. government was well aware that an attack was coming in the Pacific and that all Pacific commanders had been issued an official war warning. New documentary evidence, in addition to much already known, has shown that American cryptographers knew the attack would be at Pearl Harbor. Whether FDR received this information is debated, but he had a direct pipeline to the Office of Naval Intelligence, which was decoding the material. Quite apart from the evidence, the logic of the situation dictated that Hawaii, as the new headquarters of the U.S. Pacific fleet, would have to be the target if the much weaker Japanese were to have any hope of fighting to a negotiated settlement in their favor. The real issue is why FDR *desired* war. See Robert B. Stinnett, *Day of Deceit: The Truth about FDR and Pearl Harbor* (New York: Free Press, 2000).
4. Quoted in Benjamin Schwarz, "NATO Enlargement and the Inevitable Costs of the American Empire," in Carpenter and Conry, *NATO Enlargement*, 73.
5. Quoted in Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press 1992), 17.
6. George F. Kennan, Policy Planning Statement 23, "Review of Current Trends U.S. Foreign Policy," February 24, 1948, in *Foreign Relations of the United States: 1948. I* (Part 2), 523–526.
7. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, 6.
8. *Ibid.*, 17.
9. Patrick Tyler, "Excerpts from the Pentagon's Plan: Prevent the Emergence of a New Rival," *New York Times*, March 8, 1992.
10. Quoted in Carpenter and Conry, *NATO Enlargement*, 83.
11. Walter Russell Meade, "An American Grand Strategy: The Quest for Order in a Disordered World," *World Policy Journal* 10 (Spring 1993): 21.
12. Carpenter and Conry, *NATO Enlargement*, 1.

13. Quoted in "Why Yugoslavia? The Truth Behind the NATO Bombing." Transcript of Yugoslavian Educational Forum, International Action Center, San Francisco, February 2, 1999.
14. Tim Judah, "Kosovo: Peace Now?" in *New York Review of Books*, August 12, 1999.
15. Michael Parenti, Remarks, Yugoslavian Educational Forum.