

*America's Role in
Macedonia's
Dilemma
(1991 – 2013)*

Second Edition



By
Risto Nikovski

**Translated from Macedonian to English and Edited
by Risto Stefov**

America's Role in Macedonia's Dilemma
(1991 – 2013)
Second Edition

Published by:

Risto Stefov Publications
rstefov@hotmail.com

Toronto, Canada

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without written consent from the author, except for the inclusion of brief and documented quotations in a review.

Copyright © 2014 by Risto Nikovski & Risto Stefov

e-book edition

Contents

Grounds for the Second Edition	5
INTRODUCTION	10
I – Yugoslavia’s breakup and the situation in Macedonia.....	17
II – The U.S.A. immediately recognized all new countries except Macedonia.....	27
III – It was the U.S. and not Greece who challenged our name at the UN and overpowered us with a reference. The U.S. also managed Nimitz’s mediations.	40
A. Admission to the UN	40
B. The mediation process	50
C. There were no negotiations taking place in New York.....	53
D. An agreement with Greece is not only impossible but absolutely unnecessary	56
E. Could the name issue have been resolved in the early 1990s?	62
IV – Are renaming Macedonia and addressing the “Albanian national question” two parallel processes separately coordinated by Washington? Or, are the name dispute, Kosovo and the 2001 war part of the same scenario?.....	69
V – Year 2001 – key stone in the mosaic of American policy towards Macedonia - The Kosovo and Macedonia “humanitarian” wars!.....	86
A. U.S. and the 2001 War – The Albanians in Macedonia were outside of the project	87
B. How terrorists became “humanitarians”?	96
C. General Pande Petrovski’s precious “testimony”	102
D. U.S. role in the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement	115
E. Events with broad and long-term consequences	129
VI – Chossudovsky’s Analysis.....	136
VII – Why did the U.S.A. recognize Macedonia by its proper name in 2004?.....	140
VIII – The Interim Accord, the NATO summit in Bucharest and The Hague verdict.....	144
A. The Interim Accord.....	144
B. The NATO Summit in Bucharest.....	153
C. Why President Bush’s support was not enough?	158
D. The Hague verdict.....	160

E. What comes after the Interim Accord and Nimitz's mediation?.....	168
F. Replacing the reference with a name for use outside of Macedonia is a fatal solution	175
G. U.S. and Bucharest in 2008, The Hague in 2011.....	179
H. Who obstructed Macedonia from joining NATO? The U.S. or Greece?	182
I. Will membership in NATO deliver a better security system to Macedonia?.....	184
IX – Washington's role in relations between Skopje and Sofia	189
X – Testimonials.....	196
XI - Closing Remarks	214

Grounds for the Second Edition

After the First Edition was released, there was an occurrence that deserves our attention.

On October 24, 2013 the Greek Foreign Ministry issued an official statement entitled “The Problem with the Name” using an offensive and demeaning acronym of the meaningless reference. The document was interestingly loaded with lies, fabricated accusations and allegations regarding our account. Among other things, it reaffirmed the assertion that Tito “created” the Macedonian nation. There was also mention of the Hague verdict, de-emphasizing Greece’s conviction but greatly emphasizing a number of “violations” of the Interim Accord on our part...

There is a key part in this document, however, which explains Greece’s attitude towards Macedonia. Here is a quote:

“A State Department telegram, from December 1944, sent to various U.S. institutions, signed by the then Secretary of State Stettinius, among other things said: ‘The chatter about the Macedonian “nation”, the Macedonian “fatherland” and the Macedonian “national consciousness”, the U.S. government considers unjustified demagoguery which does not represent an ethnic or political reality, and in this current revival it sees a possible cloak for aggressive intentions against Greece!’”

1.1. But as usual, this Greek document which was certainly distributed around the world, was completely ignored in Macedonia with the exception of being mentioned on Channel 5 television. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Macedonia, whose job it is to react to such false information, of course did nothing. Our diplomats are more likely to be concerned about global warming than about Greeks claiming that we are a fabrication...

1.2. Looking at this another way, if we did not respond to such a statement made 70 years ago, even before the formation of the Modern Macedonian State, then surely, 70 years later when we have a sovereign and independent Macedonian state, the same

State Department and original author of the telegram should have reacted on behalf of Macedonia. By not reacting, does that mean that the U.S. today is following the same policy towards Macedonia and the Macedonian people that it followed in 1944? If the U.S. does feel the same way about Macedonia and the Macedonian people as it did in 1944, then that would explain why Greece has been so abusive. This definitely explains why Greece has never been punished, not even one time for the genocide, human rights abuses, land confiscation, exiling of Macedonians and a whole slew of other abuses it perpetrated against the Macedonian people over the years. Did Washington inform Athens of this? As far as we know it never happened.

1.3. American silence on the subject, of course, has its own merit, which we must not underestimate. However, one should not forget that activities are intertwined in international diplomacy: Why should Washington “rush” to our rescue if we choose to constantly keep quiet? In other words, we should have sought an explanation from the U.S. the moment we became aware of the information in the telegram referenced by Greece. Now we don’t know if the telegram was indeed real or a Greek fabrication to manipulate us?

Again... it is still not too late to follow up on this issue. But will it be done?

2. It is undoubtedly satisfactory to know that this book is undergoing a second edition. But the most important aspect about any book is to reach the reader. One time someone in America wrote an anonymous book and had it self-published but it would not sell. Searching for a solution, the author placed an advertisement in the “New York Times” stating that he was looking for a wife who fit the description of Anna, a character in his book! A second edition soon followed. This case was quoted in several books on marketing.

There were no such tricks done to promote this book. We have a strong impression, however, that our opinions expressed are being received with much interest. Let us hope that politicians too, especially in the international community, primarily in the

U.S., will make an effort to read it. The information provided is not only for Macedonia's interest but also for its neighbours as well as Brussels and Washington. No one should be left blind to the fact that: current policies aimed at Macedonia have proven to be totally inadequate. They have solved nothing and have caused a lot of damage. This is because these policies were unrealistic, unnecessary and uncivilized... Mistakes are always inevitable but must not be repeated.

3. The puzzle offered in this book is certainly not perfect or complete. However, it does accurately represent the genesis of the invented problem with Macedonia's name. Its essence, as stated in the book, is undeniable. Washington has managed and controlled 85 to 95 percent of this illegal process driven to annihilate the Macedonian nation and its country. Washington is in a position to help Macedonia in so many ways but has chosen not to. Worse than that is the indication that Washington is behind all the contention, blocking, blackmail and obscene and utterly unacceptable proposals and solutions. This is done with maximum coordination at the highest international level, using all available means, most of which are illegal, unauthorized and outside international law.

4. And, as a living wonder, despite all the ordeals and tribulations, over 20 years later all attempts at fraud, abuse, intrigue, public bullying... have not achieved any results; except for ruining the Macedonian state and pushing the Macedonian people into further destitution.

The military aggression against Macedonia in 2001 also failed. It was a limited and strictly controlled war that proved unsuccessful despite everything that was done to control it.

Time and time again the Macedonian people have proven to be indestructible.

5. The sad part about all this is that we, as witnesses of these events, have failed to sway Washington away from its failures. The U.S. has stubbornly continued to follow the same path with the same futile and medieval policies towards Macedonia. And

Brussels has unconditionally and unwaveringly followed Washington.

How long will these so-called “democracies” use force against a small and poor nation? Unfortunately no one can tell us because these “democracies” say one thing and do another. They don’t seem to understand that they cannot bring about democratic and lasting solutions by using undemocratic means!

6. The European Council in December (2013) definitely showed that Brussels has no intention of removing its blockades, stopping its blackmail and ultimatums, which are summarized in its anti-Macedonian politics... “First change your name and then membership!” And so it should be evident to everyone that the door to our country’s Euro-Atlantic integration keeps closing and will remain permanently closed until we lose our identity as a Macedonian people.

6.1. On the other hand, it is a fact that, in spite of the heavy investment, Nimitz’s mediation efforts have failed or have yielded no results. The past 20 years have shown that the mediation process is incapable of solving this case. We need to say this openly and to take every necessary measure to get out of this impasse.

6.2. We must add to this that we are faced with an “Athens” which has shown absolute indifference to all proposed solutions, even to their own erga omnes. The reason is not because Greece is experiencing a deep crisis and we need to wait for it to pass. This has been Greece’s general attitude and policy towards Macedonia and the Macedonian people for more than a century. Greece will not agree to any solution unless it calls for Macedonia and the Macedonian people to be wiped off the face of the earth! So, under such circumstances, no sane Greek politician would be willing to risk their neck and seek anything different! Greece has nothing to gain or lose by compromising on its current position, except of course the Hague verdict, which may cause it difficulties in the future. The best we can do for now

is to keep going back to the Court each time Greece violates the Interim Accord obstructing Macedonia from joining international organizations such as NATO and the EU. Washington and Brussels too will feel the burden of ignoring the Court's judgment, since they are both supporting Greece's violations of international law.

7. This has been going on far too long! We have spent over two decades attempting to find a solution and have been coming up empty. In these two decades Macedonia has suffered immeasurable damage in every aspect of its economic, political and ethnic life. Today (at the start of 2014) it has become very clear that the blade has hit bone. It is high time that we become aware that we have been taken this far and left in the middle of the tunnel. And that we need to find the exit on our own.

After we were blocked from joining NATO in Bucharest in 2008 our position in the "dispute" was greatly weakened. But since then we have received recognition from many countries which have strengthened our standing as a nation in the world. It is now high time we seek new solutions and take decisive action if we are to succeed.

8. We have a number of options but none are painless. Whatever route we take, our first confrontation will be with Washington. As the manager of the dispute, Washington will strongly resist any attempt to modify, let alone change, its intentions and plans that are embedded in its current procedures. We must be clear about that. Similarly, the same way Washington reacted to our application to the International Court of Justice in The Hague, Washington will react to anything different that we do. And thus we can only succeed if we are prepared to face Washington's wrath. If we don't build up enough courage, as soon as possible, to defend our country's fundamental interests then we will end up in the abyss.

We must be on the move and may our Macedonia remain eternal!

INTRODUCTION

1. It should be obvious by now that the Albanians were and still are the main target of American policy in the Balkans. The violent break up of Serbia and the creation of Kosovo, as a second Albanian state, is the best confirmation of that. When the Americans needed a loyal partner, the Albanians were there and ready to act. They were ready to settle their national issues and the Americans were willing to support them. Yugoslavia's disintegration was seen as an opportunity for all Albanians to unite and, in their view, correct historical injustices, for which they were ready to plunge into a war. Thus, their greatest aspirations fit perfectly with American regional plans in the Balkans and their involvement in Yugoslavia's disintegration. The Americans needed a trusted partner to act on the ground especially in the beginning, with the bombing of Serbia and Milosevich's overthrow, and they found that in the Albanians. The Americans were also involved in the creation of the KLA (Kosovo Liberation Army) and in its secret preparations for war. The Albanians were and still are a great asset to the United States not only because they are loyal partners but also because they are widespread over many Balkan countries. For example, there are Albanians living in almost all Balkan countries where, in some regions, their population is larger in numbers than that of Montenegrins, Macedonians, Bosnians and Croatians. They also have the highest birth rate in Europe.

1.1 The Americans, as we all know, are involved in both Macedonia and Kosovo. So, it would be theoretically impossible for American policies towards Macedonia not to overlap with those towards Kosovo. We know that the Americans always follow their own interests and those interests should be, at least in theory, complementary to those of the countries in which they are involved. So, are American policies complementary to both Macedonia and Kosovo? No! The Albanians in Kosovo were helped to create a second Albanian state and, jointly with the Albanians in Macedonia, they were helped to start a war against the Macedonian state. How was this helpful to the Macedonian people? It was not! Macedonia and Kosovo are part of the same American regional policy formulated to make full use of a)

friction and entanglement between the two nations, b) historical mistrust and confrontation between the states, c) promoting the Albanian eternal dream of achieving a greater Albania, d) promoting Albanian claims and “pretensions” on Macedonia and on the Macedonian people, and e) all of the above with deep aims at dividing the Macedonian people and creating strife between them...

2. Once we take into consideration that Macedonia and Kosovo are part of the same American regional policy and America’s involvement and partnering with the Albanians it is only logical then to substantiate that the KLA and the NLA (National Liberation Army) are part of the same story. And how did this happen? Well, when Milosevic initiated a campaign to “deal” with irredentism in Kosovo, the Americans found their historic opportunity to penetrate the region and create conditions for a new strategic partnership. And since the Albanians were a “traditional” enemy of the Serbians, thanks to Milosovich’s “tough guy” policies, the Americans found a willing partner in the Albanians. Then, after Yugoslavia’s break up Albanian-American interests became aligned to the maximum.

3. With American determination to create an independent Kosovo, two objectives were achieved. One, Milosevic (Serbia) was punished and two, the Albanians were rewarded for their involvement. While this process was coming to fruition, appetites became increasingly larger and attempts were made to separate Medvedja, Preshevo and Bujanovats from Serbia. These were three municipalities with a predominantly Albanian population which, the Albanians viewed as eastern Kosovo and not as southern Serbia. Albanian attempts, however, failed. It proved to be too much of a bite for them because they would have entered the valley of South Morava and taken part of Corridor 10, the main north-south Serbian communication link. Serbia would have retaliated harshly.

4. After their victory in Kosovo, naturally the next logical place for the Albanians to want to acquire lands was western Macedonia. And thus Macedonia became the next destination for Albanian expansionism which was to be achieved not only with

American blessings but also with American help. Enter the 2001 war. The process by which the “Albanian national question” in Kosovo was resolved was an unexpected success which, theoretically, in their minds, could possibly work in Macedonia. But by then, this was nothing new. The process in Macedonia had started with the Albanians boycotting the referendum and the Constitution, with “Illyrida” and with paramilitaries... which took place in the early years when the modern independent Macedonian state was being formed. These, however, were only small tremours then in a series of political earthquakes which in the future would have serious consequences.

4.1. There is no need to prove that Macedonia was both a target of American interests and Albanian chauvinism. All we have to do is look at every daily act perpetrated against it. Is there anyone who is not aware of Macedonia’s roots being systematically pruned? For years Macedonian lands have slowly, painstakingly and irreversibly been taken away from the Macedonian people. And now, more recently, just like it was done in Kosovo, it was about to be done in Macedonia with the war of 2001.

5. From what we know today, the NLA and the war of 2001 in Macedonia were a result of American regional policy. How? With their success in Kosovo and having their own military capabilities, the Albanians developed appetites for expansionism into Macedonia. But even so, how could they have directed their military campaigns in Macedonia and started the 2001 war without a clear signal from the Americans? Having interests in Macedonia and supposedly being a “friend” of Macedonia, shouldn’t the United States have stepped in and said “NO!” to Albanian aggression in Macedonia? This unfortunately did not happen, which means, and this will be proven in later chapters, that the Albanians had a clear signal from the Americans to attack Macedonia.

5.1. Now let us have a look at how Macedonia was being stifled from the outside. It was not hard for American planners in Washington to connect two exclusive opportunities that had emerged: one, Greece’s problem with Macedonia’s name and two, Albanian aspirations for Macedonian lands. These

opportunities were combined with American efforts to destroy Milosevich and spread American influence in the Balkans. After World War II the United States had no influence in this part of the Balkans because Albania was closed and not very attractive. Yugoslavia was uncommitted and alternated between East and West. Bulgaria and Romania were Soviet allies and Greece was never a loyal and willing American ally...

5.2. What about Greece's problem with Macedonia's name? If initiating the "name issue" was an exclusively Greek initiative, without Washington's involvement, then why did Washington immediately latch onto this opportunity and manage the entire process in accordance with its own regional interests? Why did Washington get involved in a bilateral, local, insignificant and trivial issue? Washington, of course did this to maximize its own opportunities. Naturally, it did it to combine its interests with those of Greece. The best evidence that proves this is American involvement in minimizing Macedonia's chances of joining the United Nations in 1993. It would have been impossible to preempt Macedonia's entry into the UN without active American involvement. No one in the Security Council, other than the Americans, could have ignored or disregarded the UN Charter the way it was done for Macedonia. No one would have dared to ignore so many international rules and impose two new and never before seen conditions on Macedonia's admission. No one could have suspended Macedonia and forced it to use an imposed reference for a name. This was theoretically impossible for Greece to have done on its own. It had to have outside help from a powerful supporter in the Security Council. And that supporter was the United States.

6. Christopher Hill, the man who we call the first U.S. Ambassador to Macedonia, was dispatched to Skopje in early July 1996. In the four years before that, since August 1992, his colleagues operated from Zagreb, Ljubljana and Sarajevo. In other words, Macedonia was completely forgotten, unrecognized and left stranded by Washington. Of course, this was not done by accident. American actions were dictated by American geopolitical interests in the Balkans.

Hill came after the war had ended but at a time when the Kosovo scenario was being prepared, which would lead to substantial geopolitical changes in the region. His coming may not have been directly associated with this event, but at the same time it can't be rejected as not being linked to it. In any case, it is worthwhile investigating it because it is an undisputed fact that, during the key years 1998/1999, when Hill was ambassador in Skopje, he was also a special envoy to Kosovo! That was the time when American interests centered in this part of the world and were focused in Kosovo. That was the time when the KLA operatives were being recruited and trained to lead the war in 1999. That was also the time when all the changes on the southern part of the Balkans, including Macedonia, were planned and would eventually lead to hardship and suffering in the wider region.

6.1. Hill however was “socializing” with the Albanians long before. In the beginning of the 1990's, during the dramatic communist regime collapse in Albania, Hill was working at the Embassy in Tirana. According to unofficial reports, coming from top Albanian politicians, Hill was the architect behind Berisha's government gaining power.

Hill was involved in the Rambouillet conference (along with Reeker!), when everything was done to convince Serbia not to sign an agreement with Kosovo.

About that event, legendary Henry Kissinger said: “The text of the Rambouillet Agreement, which asked Serbia to allow NATO troops to freely enter Serbia, was a provocation, which was to pave the way for the bombing. It was a terrible diplomatic document, what must never again be presented in such a way!”

6.2. Hill was one of those people in the circle of American ambassadors who were sent to trouble spots. After his tour in Macedonia he was sent first to Poland (for a deserved break) and then to South Korea, to solve local hot issues. His next appointment was ambassador to volatile Iraq, where dozens of people were killed every day.

Hill was hired to serve as a deputy to the famous American bulldozer, Holbrooke, during the preparation and signing of the Dayton Agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina. Given his experience there, we can conclude that Hill was more than qualified for the events surrounding Macedonia, which were to follow.

7. This has been only a small attempt to throw some light on actual policies implemented by the United States in Macedonia, in all its years of independence. More details will be given in later chapters.

8. The United States is not only a military superpower; it is also an impressive innovator of cutting-edge technologies in the fields of information, film and music, literary, artistic and other works...

Through a system of competition, the USA has fostered a dynamic society that performs well and produces quality products and works that allows the best in each field of competition to rise to the top. The end result is high creativity. The United States of America, in essence, has been a leader in almost every sphere of influence. This is indeed inspiring and deserves recognition from all of us. No one comes even close to what the U.S.A., over the years, has achieved technologically and otherwise, which serves as an example for all of us.

9. It is true that in the last 20 years or so, since Macedonia became independent, the United States has contributed a significant amount of money to its development, which some say exceeded a billion dollars, a practice which has continued to this day. The Americans have funded a number of extremely important projects for Macedonia for which the Macedonian people are very grateful.

10. It is therefore important at this point for us to mention that this write up carries no malice towards the United States. It is only an attempt to clarify American policies towards Macedonia as viewed from a Macedonian perspective. American diplomacy

has never been “flawless”. On the contrary, with a foreign policy like that of the United States, where many divergent interests intersect, it is impossible to have flawless diplomacy.

11. It is also important to mention that providing direct aid to Macedonia does not change the substance of America’s political relationship with Macedonia. It only makes it controversial. Providing aid has a broader purpose. First, it creates an image of “friendliness” giving the impression that the Americans are Macedonia’s friends. Second, it allows the Americans to penetrate deeply into Macedonia’s various segments of society. Third, the Macedonians who directly benefit from American aid tend to become strong supporters of American policies. Fourth, much of the aid provided by the Americans is dedicated to supporting American experts who are sent to Macedonia to manage it. Fifth, everything that the Americans invest is done for sustained and lasting influence, without regard to what happens to Macedonia and what is left of it...

In other words, America providing assistance to Macedonia, in many ways, has obscured America’s true policies towards Macedonia because receiving aid is beneficial to Macedonian interests.

I – Yugoslavia’s breakup and the situation in Macedonia

1. Because Macedonia in the Yugoslav federation was a small country with limited resources, it found itself in the margins within that federation. The blame for that was in us and not in Belgrade. We made very little effort to change our situation. We felt as if we were bigger Yugoslavs than the rest and (consciously) neglected our Macedonian-ness. We read the “Politics” newspaper and watched TV Zagreb... We criticized and were ashamed of everything Macedonian. Then, and even today, we bought mostly imported products because we felt that our products, made in Macedonia, were not good enough. In other words, we thought we deserved better than what we could produce ourselves! [Translator’s note: Although the situation is rapidly changing today, there are segments of our society that still feel this way. This perception needs to change because if Macedonians don’t start appreciating themselves and their capabilities, no one will!]

2. We had no experience in running a state in the federation because most of us avoided politics. At home we had no serious institutions and in-depth political knowledge in geo-strategic issues, economics, diplomacy, security... The other republics did have and, as a result, built expertise in those fields. In practice, we did not produce any specialists because our people refused to take them seriously. We did not want smarter people than ourselves among us. This may be a Macedonian trait? To most people the “Party” was more important than the state. Loyalty, not quality was the key criterion... The situation was the same with the others, but we were the most “disciplined” in this regard.

3. After the dissolution of Yugoslavia we found ourselves completely unprepared and surprised, even after it became clear to us that the process was irreversible. The Slovenians, for example, had elaborate plans for a post-Yugoslav period. They even had arrangements with Croatia to form a confederation...

We were last in everything. Almost no one was aware or cared about what was happening all around us. We refused to look at

the evidence that the federation was disintegrating; even when it was clear that is was inevitable.

4. The then leadership failed to realize that the Macedonian people's future lay in a fully independent Macedonian state. Unlike the other republics, Macedonia took no immediate measures to secure its future after the Yugoslav breakup. Macedonians were accustomed to not getting involved in essential matters regarding joint state affairs. The political dignitaries in Macedonia felt there was no need to manage the separation process so they left it alone. The institutions in Macedonia, responsible for taking steps for the separation, were not even informed, let alone ready to act. The citizens were involved even less. The largest part of our citizenry did not even know what to expect let alone what was waiting for them down the line. With regards to official propaganda, Yugoslavia was a solid state and something undeniable.

5. Events were unfolding so fast that it was difficult to follow them, let alone understand them. The former local system did not build experienced politicians, let alone statesmen, probably because they were not needed. Fortunately for us, Kiro Gligorov came back from Belgrade. Gligorov had spent many years close to Tito, one of the political geniuses of the 20th century, and had learned a few things. Gligorov is criticized for what he did, but given the situation, had Gligorov not returned to lead Macedonia through the storm... who would have? Or, more accurately, had any different solution been applied would it have been any less risky for the country's future?

Today many people are saying that Gligorov worked very hard to preserve Yugoslavia and that he and Izetbegovich (Bosnia) remained loyal Yugoslav Musketeers to the end. Of course there is some truth to that. It is also true that the September 8, 1991 referendum was not needed. But the fact is that Gligorov was always in favour of an independent Macedonia. That needs no proof. Gligorov was in favour of an independent Macedonia even during World War II when, through ANOK, he advocated for that.

5.1. At issue here are Gligorov's wise tactics. Gligorov was well aware of the dangers that hung over Macedonia and was very careful not to create waves during Yugoslavia's disintegration. In addition to dealing with both politicians and the general public in Macedonia, refusing to accept the reality that Yugoslavia was falling apart, Gligorov had to also deal with the Yugoslav National Army (JNA) and its significant military capabilities. The JNA was in fact an overwhelmingly Serbian dominated army stationed in Macedonia. One short signal from Belgrade and, in just a few hours, the JNA could have taken down the government in Macedonia and dictated its own terms. The international community would have said little or next to nothing outside of condemning the takeover as a "barbaric act". Gligorov knew that and he also knew Milosevich's intentions. We know today from Mitsotakis and Samaras's talks with Milosevich that they were planning to divide Macedonia between Greece and Serbia. This confirms Gligorov's fears and justifies his willingness to quickly establish relations with the U.S.A. Gligorov reacted in the way that he did because he understood the dangers Macedonia was facing from Serbia. That is why he asked for several hundred UNPREDEP troops to be dispatched to Macedonia in December of 1992. The purpose of this intervention was not the "help" Macedonia but to prevent it from falling into Serbian hands so that eventually parts of it could become part of the "Greater Albania" project.

5.2. Gligorov, it appears, according to some experts, if indeed this was his idea, was not the first to ask the UN for peacekeeping troops. Izetbegovich had asked before him but his initiative was ignored. However, given the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the war breaking out, the UN decided not to repeat its mistake and responded positively to Gligorov. At least that was the official story. But then it is difficult to believe that the UN (an umbrella for the U.S.) actually waited for Gligorov to ask and then immediately sent troops to Macedonia. Where and how did Gligorov obtain this "secret information" telling him that Macedonia was in danger from Serbia; information which Washington couldn't have gotten on its own? Yes, troops were sent to Macedonia at Gligorov's request because without it there would have been no mission. However, it is likely that Gligorov

acted on instructions from the Americans. The mission was certainly beneficial for Macedonia.

On the other hand, what kind of troops could Izetbegovich have been asking for and where was he going to place them? Around Sarajevo? And what could have been achieved by that? The war was fought everywhere. In fact, if such forces were to be dispatched, without Serbian consent, it could have sparked more hostility.

5.3. If we are to look into Gligorov's politics a little deeper, in the period from 1991 to 1995, we will find that a key point in his politics was revealed in a statement that he made in Kran, on April 11, 1991, after the Yugoslav Republic presidents' meeting ("Nova Makedonija" July 16, 2012, "President Gligorov and Vice President Georgievski"). Gligorov then said: "Macedonia is interested in being part of the Yugoslav community, but if any of the republics breaks away we will not remain in the Federation." Maybe someone in his circle did not share this opinion and believed that Macedonia would remain with Serbia, but Gligorov was correct; everyone in the federation or a federation without Macedonia.

5.4. Gligorov had what it takes in terms of wisdom and statesmanship. We have to give him credit for that. Macedonia did not initiate the Yugoslav dissolution, Gligorov made that very clear. Macedonia left because others left first. So, Serbia had no valid reason to take its anger out on Macedonia. Let us not forget, Macedonia was never Serbian; it was awarded to Serbia by the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest. Let us also keep in mind that Serbia would never have willingly given up its share of the Bucharest "booty" and allowed the creation of a modern Macedonian state if it were not for the communists in 1944. As strange as it may sound, it was communist ideology based on proletarian internationalism that made that possible. Let us also not forget that Serbia did agree to a partial revision of the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest in favour of creating a modern Macedonian state.

Serbia's case proves and confirms that the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest is not cast in stone and can be changed with the

consent of other interested parties. Is this possible when both Bulgaria and Greece oppose it? Not today but with time and change, yes! But we will not discuss this here any further.

5.5. Of course it is also important to mention that Tito himself, for whatever reason, was a supporter of a federation with six republics, which included Macedonia. The final step to formulating a policy regarding this federation was taken at the AVNOJ Second Session on November 29, 1943 during which time the seed for a modern Macedonian state began to germinate. This was an important date that marks an historic turning point for the Macedonian people.

Tito never did reveal his motive for supporting the creation of a Macedonian state. Some believe he did it because he feared Serbia. Serbia, being the largest, strongest and most dominant republic in the federation would have been even stronger with Macedonia being part of it. Serbia would have dominated all state functions and treated the other republics like minorities. That, however, was less of a possibility if Macedonia were to be separated from Serbia and given its own status as a republic. Tito's reasons, for us are not important. What is important is that we were given a historic opportunity to fulfill an age-old desire to bring back our Macedonian state. Macedonia was separated from Serbia by Tito's regime; it was not created by Tito. Let us also accept the idea that Tito had his own reasons for doing this and let us, once and for all, dump the "thesis" that "Tito fabricated" the Macedonian people and that we owe him great gratitude. All this is nonsense perpetrated by our enemies to keep the truth about Macedonia hidden!

5.6. Considering what was said above, we need to ask: had Macedonia been involved in the initial stages of the Yugoslav breakup, alongside Slovenia and Croatia, would Serbia have intervened in Macedonia? And would Serbia have demanded Macedonian lands being given back with references to the Bucharest and Versailles Treaties? Given that it would not have been legal, could the JNA military have taken control of the Macedonian government and installed a quisling government in

Skopje, with pro-Serbian policies...? What would have happened to us then?

5.7. Would the referendum in Macedonia, had it gone the other way, have encouraged Belgrade to intervene? Gligorov was consistent regarding all these issues and the message was the same; we remain interested in Yugoslavia but, you know, in a whole Yugoslavia. But of course, at the same time, it was clear to him that there was no turning back. Gligorov made sure, however, that his message was loud and clear that Macedonia was not going to lead the dance against Serbia.

5.8. Various interpretations by people that Gligorov, cooperating with Izetbegovich, used the referendum in Macedonia in support of Yugoslavia first, and in support of an independent Macedonia second, are pure theories. The two key moves Gligorov made during the dramatic period when the Yugoslav federation was being dissolved were in no way symbolic of his personal and state priorities. At stake here was the ultimate and classic pragmatism; avoid war. He aimed to achieve his objectives without confrontation. The price of confrontation would have been much too high. And sure enough, Gligorov did exactly what he set out to do.

5.9. In the critical period, Milosevic did everything he could to drive Slovenia out of the federation but not together with Croatia. After a brief clash he ordered the JNA to withdraw from Slovenia and gave Ljubljana carte blanche to separate. Unlike in Croatia, Bosnia, Montenegro and Macedonia, he had no Serbians he could count on in Slovenia. So the steps that Gligorov took, when considering that Slovenia and Croatia were determined to oppose Milosevic when they were separating, reveal the true dimension of his genius. He achieved his objectives without unnecessary exposure and risk to Macedonia.

Perhaps Gligorov was a good bluffer? Perhaps he never played poker, but he had the instincts of a good poker player? Whatever he was, for Macedonia he was a good statesman with the nerves of a seasoned politician who had the ability to look far with

regards to Macedonia's foreign policy, especially during the period from 1991 to 1995, which worked well for Macedonia.

6. Today we can assess that Gligorov's foreign policy, in the period from 1991 to 1993, had long played the Yugoslav card. This is because Gligorov was worried about the wars in the other Yugoslav Republics and did not want to rock the Serbian boat. However, given the circumstances, it was not possible, let alone easy, to predict how long his strategy was going to hold out. It was very difficult to find the right time to tighten his policies while there was the real danger of the war spilling into Macedonia. There was also the internal problem with the Albanians, who, in the chaos, were seeking to exploit the situation in order to resolve their own national question. Gligorov was faced with maximum restraint and extreme caution in every political move he made. On top of that there was also the unwillingness of the international community to recognize Macedonia. Even though Macedonia did everything in its power to maintain peace and avoid war, the International Community left it in isolation and with very little room to manoeuvre. Facts and arguments listed in this write-up clearly will show that the main culprit for this was and remains the U.S.A.

6.1. Today we can ask: had Gligorov taken a more forceful approach on Macedonia's behalf towards Yugoslavia's dissolution, would Macedonia's position have been any stronger? Would it have speeded up Macedonia's recognition? But in essence what we are doing is speculating and widening the gap in our own divide. Had Gligorov expedited the process, today we could have been re-occupied by Serbia and erased from the world map. The only thing that is safe to conclude is that even though we did everything "by the book" and demonstrated to the International Community that we managed the post Yugoslav crisis in the period from 1991 to 1993, without spilling a single drop of blood, it did not bring us desired results. And, with regards to our position in the International Community, it proved to be extremely unproductive.

6.2. In general, however, we must admit that Gligorov's tactics in conducting Macedonia's foreign policy, which in those years was

totally in his hands, certainly contributed to Macedonia's stability. In other words, no matter how much inside and outside pressure was put on it, Macedonia did not destabilize or become prey to an outside entity. Macedonia avoided all pitfalls and not only became independent but it accomplished that by preserving the peace at home. Gligorov made some very valuable contributions which will be well remembered by history.

7. If there were any errors to be attributed to Gligorov's foreign policy they would have been that he was too tolerant and forgiving. During the Greek embargo against Macedonia, for example, when Greece was attempting to extinguish the life out of Macedonia by not allowing anything, not even life-saving energy to cross the Macedonian-Greek border, Gligorov allowed Greeks to freely cross into and out of Macedonia at will without even a peep. According to data collected by various customs officials, more than 100 Greek trucks and over 200 Greek cars freely crossed the Macedonian border on a daily basis, carrying a serious quantity of goods. If we were to stop them we would have caused a scandal and most likely the Greeks would have looked for some kind of solution. By allowing Greeks to go through our border without obstruction, we in fact avoided damaging our economy. We don't know exactly what would have happened had we reacted differently. But logic holds that had we had shown our teeth to them, they would have acted differently. How differently we don't know. But at the time, it was not in our interest to find out.

It is indisputable that our behavior to not reciprocate gave the Greeks an advantage which they used well. Even though what we did may have not been appropriate in general terms, it fit well with how we are, with our style and policy for tolerance, which we must admit proved to be successful because our state survived when expectations were that it would fall apart. Such behavior out of Macedonia was not valorized by the International Community because of other geopolitical interests, notably by the U.S.

8. In the beginning of the critical 1990's, Stoian Andov, belonging to the leading Macedonian political class, still had

some political pedigree. For many years he was a minister in Belgrade and had plenty of opportunity to learn the game of politics. There were also politicians from the “old school” that could have helped; unfortunately some were not in the game, while others remained in Belgrade. Almost everyone else was inexperienced. The first two Prime Ministers (except for Nikola Kličev, who led the technical government) were under the age of 30 and this was their first job! Instead of being trainees, which would have been normal in any other society, in Macedonia they had to undertake the leadership of a country and at a time when the country was faced with a wide range of unsolvable problems. The results were visible...

9. While the Yugoslav federation was falling apart, Macedonia was not sure what to do. The referendum for independence produced great results but the people were not sure what exactly that meant and what to expect. One of the kinks in this exercise was the Albanian boycott of both the referendum and the parliamentary vote on the new constitution which, we must admit, had its drawbacks. Part of the population did not undertake its obligations to do its stately duty and thus reserved its options for the future. It was the first strong indicator that building an independent Macedonia was not going to be easy. Also, International Community plans and intentions regarding Macedonia and the wider region were still unknown and no one knew what dangers lurked in the future. Unfortunately the situation is not much better today.

9.1. So, why did the Albanians boycott the referendum and the parliamentary vote on the new constitution? Such acts cannot be purely random, innocent, or domestically concocted. Macedonia had no “such” problems, to speak of, with its Albanian population especially like “Illyrida” and attempts to establish an Albanian paramilitary... All of these occurrences had to be connected and were part of a new scenario. In the meantime strategic planners in Western capitals, particularly those of major world powers, were exploring their options for a desired outcome in Macedonia. And, naturally they did everything in their power to influence the processes to go their way, in accordance with their own long-term interests. So, at the time, Macedonia was

flooded with spies and secret agents who were fully engaged in working for their country's interests and certainly no money was spared to achieve their goals. Unfortunately, much of what had happened in that time is still unknown to us to this day (2013).

Looking at this problem from the inside out, the Albanians in Macedonia were totally unprepared for what was about to happen to them inside Macedonia. They had no geo-strategic plans and coordinated steps of the caliber necessary to carry them where they wanted to go. So, there is no doubt that their actions in Macedonia were part of broader international logistics. Bombing Serbia and creating an independent Kosovo eliminates any doubt and confirms our suspicions that the Albanians were helped from the outside. Please read on.

9.2. Now, at the end of 2013, new and "most secret" information is emerging that places the United States in Kosovo before the Yugoslav collapse. According to some sources, the reason was to monitor and, if possible, to influence the situation in Albania. If that is true, that indeed the Americans were already in Kosovo, then did the U.S. participate in the events that began to unfold there during the 1960's? All events that took place ending with Kosovo's independence were done through demonstrations and fictional propaganda poisoning students worldwide. Objectively speaking however, none of this was possible without "foreign aid". Was the U.S. involved in the "Kosovo Project" from the beginning, from 50 years ago? This needs to be further investigated.

II – The U.S.A. immediately recognized all new countries except Macedonia

1. Three federations broke up during the early 1990's. They were the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. From their decomposition, a short time afterwards, 22 new fully independent states emerged and 20 of them sought to enter the international political scene. With the exception of Macedonia, they were all immediately recognized by the world's major factors. No other new country was opposed except for Macedonia.

1.1. On December 25, 1991, the day the Soviet Union dissolved, the United States recognized the 14 new countries that emerged from it. About three months later, in March of 1992, these new countries opened embassies in almost every capital city in the world. The Russian Federation, by agreement, secured status for the successor states from the USSR breakup and as a result they did not need to be recognized. Moscow also assumed all the debt for the entire Soviet Union.

1.2. January 1, 1993, the day Czechoslovakia dissolved, Washington recognized both new emerging states, the Czech and the Slovak Republics. Very soon afterwards, Washington opened an embassy in Bratislava.

2. Because of the deep political crisis that the Yugoslav federation was experiencing during its breakup, and because there was confrontation between the republics regarding the future of that country, Yugoslavia's breakup was much more complicated. Unlike Moscow and Prague, where the breakup was executed by agreement, nothing was agreed about Yugoslavia. This naturally caused confrontation between the republics and resulted in wars breaking out. The ensuing wars produced many casualties, including millions of refugees and enormous destruction... The main culprit, of course, was Milosevic, followed closely by Croatian (Tudjman) nationalism and Slovenian selfishness (Kuchan), which certainly also played a role. The main victims were Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bosnia and Herzegovina still bear part of the blame for the war that followed. Montenegro fully supported Serbia's

policy and remained with Serbia and because Serbia was the inheritor of Yugoslavia, it did not need or ask for recognition.

3. In late 1991, while Yugoslavia was disintegrating, the European Community (EC), (forerunner to the European Union), formed the so-called “Badinter Commission”, consisting of five top constitutional court lawyers and judges from various European countries. Their task was to investigate each of the new countries and identify for the EC if they passed a certain set of criteria which would qualify them to be recognized by the EC. The Commission was led by Robert Badinter from France. Also included in the Commission was Roman Herzog who later became president of Germany (1994 - 1999). Such a report was also compiled on Macedonia in which the Commission recommended that Macedonia be immediately recognized. In fact, from all the resultant countries from the Yugoslav breakup only Macedonia and Slovenia qualified and were recommended for recognition.

4. Germany recognized Slovenia and Croatia in December 1991. This was contrary to the Badinter Commission’s proposal which was to be released at the beginning of January, 1992. There was an agreement reached in Brussels that recognition of post-Yugoslav states was to be done on January 15, 1992. But during a meeting, from extreme pressure from Germany (through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Frantz Dietrich Genscher) the EC too recognized Slovenia and Croatia and immediately opened diplomatic relations with them. Brussels ignored the Badinger Commission’s recommendations and Macedonia was left out unrecognized and empty-handed.

5. Soon afterwards, on April 7, 1992, the United States recognized Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Then a few months later, in August 1992, the U.S. established diplomatic relations with all three countries and immediately dispatched their ambassadors. Because of the war, the American embassy for Bosnia and Herzegovina was located in Vienna. Later it was moved to Sarajevo. Macedonia was not on the American list for countries to recognize.

In April, under pressure from the U.S., the EC recognized Bosnia and Herzegovina.

6. It is important at this point for us to have a comparative look at American attitudes towards Bosnia and Herzegovina versus those towards Macedonia.

6.1. By any estimate the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was extreme. The people of Bosnia, Muslims, Croats and Serbs, even though the Serbs were first to start causing problems, all must bear blame for the start of the war that followed. It is a fact that all political factors were deeply involved in confrontations with each other (on both ethnic and religious grounds) and that war was inevitable. Despite all this the U.S. still recognized Bosnia and Herzegovina and sent its ambassador.

6.2. But when it came to Macedonia, the U.S. did the opposite. It ignored all peaceful steps, compromises, cooperation, flexibility and all other valuable contributions the Macedonian government demonstrated in order to prevent a war at home and to avoid the escalation of conflict in the region. And what was Macedonia's reward? Certain isolation! Isolation that began then and has continued to this day! Two decades later Washington still puts up obstacles, delivers ultimatums and uses blackmail to hinder Macedonia from functioning like a normal state. In parallel, the U.S. did everything in its power to bring down Milosevich's forces in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. In other words, the Americans did everything in their power to make sure that Bosnia survived. In the meantime, they are doing everything in their power to push Macedonia down a slippery slope. Two quite different and opposing policies for two post Yugoslav republics! Why?

7. Unfortunately, early American recognition did not help Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the contrary! There are some who will argue that American recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina made the situation worse and accelerate the war. It is possible that some of the opposing political forces in Sarajevo interpreted the recognition as an act of provocation because there was no agreement on the future of the country. The Serbs were

absolutely against Bosnia and Herzegovina's declaration of independence. Supported by the JNA, irregular Serbian troops occupied 2/3 of Bosnia's territory and carried out ethnic cleansing soon after the recognition. Over two million people were forced to leave their homes and over 200,000 died in the war that followed.

7.1. The U.S., most likely, wanted to protect Bosnia and Herzegovina from Milosevic and that was its reason for the quick and early recognition. But, according to Badinter, the country failed to meet even the minimum requirements for recognition. In that respect, the recognition did not deliver on its objectives. U.S. recognition did not hinder Milosevic's plans and it is unknown, to us, if the recognition influenced further development of events, which is very likely. But someone else will have to answer this question.

8. The main international actors, led by the U.S., left only Macedonia unrecognized as an independent state. They left it unprotected. Serbia and Montenegro remained in the so-called Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, as the successor of the old federation and as such, re-admission into the United Nations, when it came up in 2000, and international recognition was not necessary.

9. Unlike Bosnia and Herzegovina, an early recognition of Macedonia by the U.S. would have stabilized the situation in the country and in the surrounding region. If Macedonia was recognized, then Mitsotakis, Samaras and Milosevic would not have had discussions about dividing it. Age-old Bulgarian appetites to make Macedonia Bulgarian would not have had a future. Albanian aspirations would have been curbed... and the Albanians would have behaved differently towards Macedonia. They would have not gone against official U.S. policy, highlighted by the recognition of Macedonia. But the U.S. decided to leave Macedonia wide open... it undertook nothing to help. There can only be one reason for this: "different interests".

10. The period from 1991 to 1993 was extremely difficult for Macedonia. It was financially bankrupt (before the breakup

Serbia and Slovenia controlled the financial system and had virtually robbed it), economically drained (with huge inflation, mainly generated by Belgrade), left in a security vacuum (the JNA when it withdrew took the entire armament stationed in Macedonia) and threatened by its neighbours (who were making arrangements for its division)... So, in place of giving it its support, if for no other reason than for being the only successor of Yugoslavia to behave peacefully, Washington, supported by Paris, London, Berlin and Brussels, left Macedonia in the lurch. Why?

11. In the meantime some states began to recognize Macedonia. On January 15, 1992 Bulgaria was the first country to recognize Macedonia. Immediately afterwards Sofia, without establishing diplomatic relations, took the opportunity to score some points. There were some outstanding issues regarding Macedonia's future upon which Bulgaria wanted to capitalize. What if Macedonia did not survive? Where would the "sheep", who had not yet realized that they were "Bulgarians", go? But then, according to Bulgarian logic, recognizing Macedonia was like recognizing a second "Bulgarian" state.

The situation where the United States, followed by the EC, showed refusal to accept and support the existence of an independent Macedonian state was a sufficient signal to declare to Macedonia's historic enemies that it was now open season on Macedonia...

12. The Turkish Ambassador was the first Ambassador to arrive in a fully independent modern Macedonian state. According to protocol, before being received by the Head of State, copies of the Ambassador's credentials were to be delivered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In Macedonia, however, it was customary for the Minister to receive the Ambassador's credentials in person, unfortunately, at the time, the Minister was away and there was no Deputy Minister. So the honour to receive the Ambassador's credentials had fallen on the Undersecretary, the third person in the Ministry. But due to lack of experience, those organizing the event made a mistake and instead of inviting the media to the next day's event taking place at Gligorov's (the President's)

office, they invited reporters to where the credentials were being delivered. Many foreign journalists and photographers arrived at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs exactly where and when they were invited. This was a disaster which cast a shadow on the main event. This shows how a tiny error in diplomacy can cause major damage.

13. The first group of six EC members (Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Denmark) led by Britain took no less than two years to recognize Macedonia after recognizing Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. The recognition took place on December 16, 1993, eight months after Macedonia's admission to the UN. They only recognized Macedonia by its reference and not by its constitutional name. Following that, they immediately established diplomatic relations. Other states followed suit.

14. The United States recognized Macedonia as an independent state on February 9, 1994, almost two years after it recognized Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Another year and a half passed before Washington decided to establish diplomatic relations with Macedonia, which took place on September 13, 1995, immediately after the signing of the Interim Accord, which was orchestrated by the United States. The U.S. had established diplomatic relations with the other three former Yugoslav Republics three years earlier! Why?

The American embassy was opened in Skopje in February 1996 and an ambassador arrived at the end of July, four years after the American ambassadors had arrived in Zagreb, Ljubljana and Sarajevo. Even though wars flared up all around the region, even though a major north-south communication corridor was blocked for two years and destroyed Macedonia's economy, the Americans were totally silent on the matter and continued to tolerate the destruction of the Macedonian state. They were in no hurry to do anything. Why? Was this part of their plan all along?

14.1. The way the U.S.A. acted during Macedonia's recognition process; its establishment of diplomatic relations, its opening of an embassy, its dispatching of its ambassador; these were all

classic indicators of U.S. policy being implemented. A policy which is still in effect to this day and has remained that way from the day it was implemented. But what has happened in Macedonia is not unique, similar policies, over the years, have been applied to other countries in similar situations. This is proof that Macedonia does not fit into America's regional plans in the Balkans. Is there anyone who truly believes that Washington refuses to recognize Macedonia because it was willed by Athens? One has to be very naïve to believe that. Let's say America works for its own and only for its own and no one else's interests, least of all Greece's.

We should always remember that the Americans work for their own interests and approach that fact with our eyes wide open. Everything that has happened can be argued in half a dozen different ways but the fact remains that during and after Yugoslavia's breakup, U.S. policy was aggressive and remains hostile towards Macedonia, pushing the country to the edge of a deep abyss. Given what was just said above and given that the U.S. is a big player in the Balkans, as well as a superpower, and it has the ability to do what it wants, it is only normal to conclude that the United States was and remains the main source of the problems that have faced Macedonia in the last 20 years. Had the U.S. exercised the same policy on Macedonia as it did on the other three ex-Yugoslav states, it would have recognized Macedonia then and there, together with the other republics. The fact is it didn't! Let's say for now that the Americans would have recognized Macedonia if they had had no other plans for it. The reasons why the Americans did not recognize Macedonia is because it would have been an obstacle to the realization of their long-term interests in the Balkans. More about this will follow.

15. Given America's status in the world in relation to Greece, it should be obvious to everyone that Athens couldn't have possibly had a role in American policies being implemented against Macedonia all these years. There are no facts or arguments upon which it could be argued that the U.S. had delayed Macedonia's recognition because of Greece. Or that Macedonia's admission to the UN and the imposition of the reference was the result of some kind of security problem or in support of Greek fears of

Macedonian aspirations. The same applies to the Bucharest NATO meeting in 2008. There is also the fact that in December 1993, Macedonia was recognized by six EC states, led by Britain, France and Germany, which immediately established diplomatic relations with Macedonia. As European countries, members of NATO and of the EU, they had more than double the obligation to support Athens. If anyone should not have recognized Macedonia because of Athens, it should have been these EC countries and not the U.S.A. However, they did take that step. But not the U.S.A.! Why? In fact it took Washington over another two and a half years before it dispatched an ambassador to Skopje. Why?

16. Some measure of a step towards implementing American policy in Macedonia was taken in December 1992 with the arrival of UNPROFOR. UNPROFOR was a UN military peace keeping mission sent to the former Yugoslavia and to Macedonia. It consisted of about 600 soldiers of whom about three hundred were Americans. Later, on March 31, 1995, the mission became independent and was renamed UNPREDEP.

In the beginning it looked like the U.S.A. had changed its attitude toward an independent Macedonia, at least in principle. Bringing UNPROFOR to Macedonia was interpreted as some kind of security guarantee for the unrecognized Macedonian state. Soon afterwards however, it was discovered that the purpose of the operation was not to secure and stabilize Macedonia but to stop it from falling into Serbian hands. It turns out that the Americans did have reliable information on Milosevich who had aggressive intentions towards Macedonia. So, the UNPROFOR peace keeping mission was dispatched to Macedonia in order to prevent a Serbian invasion. Later we will see that this was part of U.S. policy implemented in support of the Albanians in Macedonia and in the wider region.

UNPROFOR, later UNPREDEP produced positive results. Even though Macedonia was not recognized by the U.S., the peace keeper's presence curbed Milosevich's appetite for invading Macedonia. However, in spite of the peace keeper's presence, Macedonia still remained extremely vulnerable. The Americans

were certainly aware of that and, according to a number of facts based on events that followed, it can be said that it was part of the American plan all along: to save Macedonia from Serbian interference with all other options remaining open. We can say that UNPREDEP, for most of us, was a Trojan horse that hid America's true intentions.

17. Will history show why the Serbians did not intervene in Macedonia? The intervention did not take place probably because a) Milosevich did not have sufficient military capabilities because he was already fighting in Croatia and preparing to start a war in Bosnia; b) Milosevich believed that Macedonia would not be able to survive without Serbia and would return to Serbia on its own... His setback certainly was not because of UNPREDEP, even though U.S. troops were stationed on his border. If Belgrade had decided to go south, UNPREDEP would have been no obstacle. The small and symbolic force would have been quickly overrun or totally ignored. If anything like that were to happen UNPREDEP had its own, well-known exit plan. In fact UNPREDEP had no mandate to protect Macedonia, it was there to only monitor and report on the situation. It was there to act as an early warning system.

18. Milosevich was convinced that Macedonia would come back to Serbia on its own. Serbia's influence on Macedonia was long and very strong. With regards to security, Serbia felt that Macedonia was incapable of stopping Albanian irredentism on its own. With regards to economy, Serbia was Macedonia's largest trading partner and most of the trade was done through Serbian firms. Personal and family ties were also numerous and deep...

According to some analysts, Milosevich's assumptions were wrong from the start...

19. Looking at the problem another way, with UNPREDEP's dispatch in Macedonia, the Americans sent a clear message to Milosevich; stay out of Macedonia. Serbia's story about "Vardarska Banovina" being Serbian, suspended on August 2, 1944, was no longer valid. But apart from that, U.S. policy towards Macedonia ever since and to this day (2013) has been

unclear. A stable and prosperous Macedonia, it seems, does not fit into American plans. While telling Serbia to keep its hands off Macedonia, the U.S., it seems, had no similar message for Macedonia's other neighbours. There was no such message for Bulgaria or Greece, or least of all the Albanians, who enjoyed broad U.S. support and were treated as their best allies by the Americans. The Albanian leadership inside Macedonia, in other words, took the lead from the Americans and started to look down on Macedonia and demonstrate little to no loyalty to the country that was their home.

Without a warning from Washington to keep their hands off Macedonia, like that issued against Serbia, aspirations towards Macedonia by its neighbours will remain "legitimate".

20. All those who argued that, in the critical years and even today, the Americans are doing their best to guarantee Macedonia's survival and that the U.S. is Macedonia's partner, should be asked to explain a) why did Washington recognize Macedonia two years after it recognized Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, and b) why did it take four years for the U.S. to dispatch an American ambassador to Skopje? Was it because of financial difficulties? Was it because of Greece? Was it because Macedonia and the U.S. are "really" good "strategic partners"? Or was it because of "some other American interest" not yet obvious to us?

21. Some people believe that if the Americans did not want a Macedonian state to exist they would have easily extinguished it in the early 1990's. But had the Americans done that, they would have expanded and intensified the wars raging in the region which could have easily gotten out of control. It would have certainly involved all of Macedonia's neighbours who had traditional claims on Macedonia. The entire Balkans could have gone up in flames with unforeseeable consequences, just like it happened in 1913. The risk was too great, even for the U.S., and as Macedonians say, "fear guards the vineyard".

From that perspective, peaceful conduct was the most desired option when it came to dealing with Macedonia. Macedonia is of

great strategic importance for the entire Balkan region and must not be allowed to catch fire. And nothing was allowed to happen. Perhaps Macedonia is the key to the final, post Yugoslav outcome in the Balkans?

22. The United States has always and everywhere led its own American policies. The only time they pay attention to outsiders is when their interests align. Greece does not play a significant role in shaping U.S. policy, regardless of what the Greek lobby says. America's behaviour towards Macedonia has unambiguously revealed the true U.S. interests in the region, which have very little to do with helping Greece. On the contrary, U.S. policy in the Balkans, in the long term, is dangerous even for Greece.

Our first task in our diplomacy, politics and science must be to research, analyze and clarify U.S. policy in the region. If we don't do that we will be going around in circles.

23. When it was inevitable that an independent Macedonian state was about to emerge from the Yugoslav federation breakup in the early 1990's, Greece became very nervous. In its irrational state it began to fabricate reasons why an independent Macedonian state would be a danger to peace and stability in the region. In its irrational state Greece launched a massive propaganda campaign in order to keep Macedonia's status undefined. Greece's propaganda campaign of "crying wolf" had a strong impact and sounded convincing. But such claims, including the one that "if Macedonia was called Macedonia it would have claims on its northern province also called Macedonia", were dismissed as nonsense by the "Badinter Commission". Even so, 20 years later Greece still uses the same rhetoric to deny Macedonia its place in the world. In the beginning no one was sure if such hazards existed but today everyone knows that "such dangers" do not exist. For the past 20 years Macedonia had proven over and over that it has no claims on Greece. Even if it did, Macedonia has no military might or Great Power backing to be able to attack Greece and "liberate the whole of Macedonia"...

24. But in spite of all attempts on Macedonia's part to alleviate all fears, these unsubstantiated "arguments" and manipulations were used against Macedonia at the UN to deny its entry by its constitutional name. Why? Was this another ploy to implement certain policies? Whose policies? Does Greece have that kind of clout in the world scene to push its personal agenda? No! Only major powers have that kind of pull! But because Greece initiated this process, i.e. "Macedonia must change its name before it can enter world institutions", Greece and Greece alone will have to answer to it and explain itself every time "why Macedonia must change its name". But who; what major power is behind all this and is truly holding Macedonia back? Someone should pose this question to the Americans who have kept their fingers in this process and have managed it from the outset. Outside of the Greek absurdities and harassments, including the bogus so-called "name dispute", is there anything tangible that should be holding Macedonia back? The Badinter Commission did not think so! If, however, there is something tangible, isn't it about time to reveal it so that it can be corrected and the country and people can go on with their normal lives?

But if there are no real reasons for harassing and holding Macedonia back, then there should be an immediate stop to it. This shameful political tragicomedy must end now!

25. In the context of the post Yugoslav republic recognitions, it is interesting to note what Canadian political analyst Jonathan Paquin (Jonathan Paquin: "Managing controversy - US stability seeking and the birth of the Macedonian state") has to say.

The delayed U.S. recognition of Macedonia, according to Paquin, was a result of American policy against "secessionist states that did not demonstrate a clear ability to maintain internal and external stability"! He bases his argument on the assertion that there was danger that a Macedonian-Greek military conflict may break out! In the same text, the author justifies the recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 1992, but without applying the same criteria as in the case of Macedonia – "sustainable stability". He

forgot to mention that when the United States recognized Bosnia and Herzegovina the country was already deeply divided, faced with dangers and completely dysfunctional. The war was at its doorstep and lasted nearly three years. Paquin, like Washington and Brussels, used double standards, which do not serve his honour, to justify Washington's policy towards Macedonia, while falling into his own trap.

III – It was the U.S. and not Greece who challenged our name at the UN and overpowered us with a reference. The U.S. also managed Nimitz’s mediations.

A. Admission to the UN

1. On July 23, 1992 the Macedonian government made a proposal to parliament for joining the United Nations. On July 29, 1992 the Macedonian parliament adopted a resolution to join the UN and on July 30, 1992 President Gligorov sent a letter of request to UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali formally requesting to be admitted to the world body.

2. The fact that Macedonia applied to the UN for admission late was not by choice. Macedonia was held back by its non-recognition by the U.S. and the EC (Washington, London, Paris, Berlin...). These countries were not willing to recognize Macedonia and thus would not open its admission to the UN. They were the same countries that would eventually decide Macedonia’s fate (with regards to its admission to the UN). And thus Macedonia found itself in a vicious circle. The “Macedonian Question” was put in the hands of the EC until late 1992 when the EC failed to find a solution at its Edinburgh Summit held in December 1992. The problem was then shifted to the United Nations and ended up directly under American influence.

3. By then the U.S. had pledged its support to the Albanians, which became obvious some time later. But that does not mean that Washington was not working on the case right from the start. The Americans, being engaged in the Balkans, which inevitably included Macedonia, simply could not stay out of Macedonia’s problems and sit on the sidelines, especially in critical times. We can say, with some degree of certainty, that the Americans were involved in Yugoslavia’s breakup which directly affected Macedonia. That fact has been repeatedly confirmed. Therefore, it is inconceivable to believe that Washington was not involved in the processes that were shaping Macedonia’s future. Washington’s delayed recognition of Macedonia proves that the Americans were active players in the game.

4. Macedonia's late filed application for admission to the UN was not in accordance with the advice of the main factors. It was premature and that's how it was treated. UN Secretary General, Boutros Ghali, kept it in his desk drawer for over five months and pulled it out only after a way was found to contest Macedonia's name. The procedure for admission was then opened in January 1993. It was no "coincidence" that several years later Boutros Ghali was rewarded with a lucrative gift by the Greeks, which, if my memory serves me right, was one million dollars. This, I am guessing, was Athens's show of appreciation for Macedonia's delayed entry and conditions under which it entered the global organization. This was one of the key conditions designed to cripple the Macedonian state; especially after being slapped with a reference instead of its proper name.

Did Ghali keep our application for membership in his desk drawer on his own or with American blessings... you decide!

5. On May 22, 1992 Bosnia and Herzegovina, Slovenia and Croatia were admitted to the UN without any problems. Even though there was a war raging in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it seems that it was not a problem for the U.S. and for all the others to recognize it. Macedonia, on the other hand, which had none of those problems, was not recognized. Why? Let's say it was not because of the delayed application, or because of some policy errors, or because of some concocted plot of Gligorov's, as some critics now claim.

6. The UN Security Council (UNSC) is the ultimate authority or governing body of the United Nations. Procedure dictates that the UN General Assembly make proposals to the UNSC as to which countries should be admitted and the UNSC admits them. The UNSC consists of 15 members, of whom five are permanent and belong to major powers. They are the U.S., Britain, France, Russia and China. These members also have veto power. The other ten are elected members with a two year mandate and every year five are changed.

6.1. It was the UNSC that disputed Macedonia's name and suspended its use internationally. On behalf of the EC, Britain,

France and Spain, as a non-permanent UNSC member, proposed that Macedonia be admitted to the UN with a reference. The U.S., at the time, did not get directly involved. However, do you think that if Washington had even the slightest concern about how Macedonia was treated it would have sat on the sidelines and done nothing? I don't think so. If Washington had given its blessings to Macedonia's entry do you think it would have entered the UN nameless? I don't think so.

6.2. There is no doubt that the UNSC was dominated by the U.S., which is the main financier of this world organization. And there is no doubt that the U.S. had already made its position about Macedonia very clear to the UN while Macedonia was waiting to be admitted. In 1992-3, besides China which sat on the sidelines and weak Russia which was thrown into chaos before it went bankrupt, it can be said with absolute certainty that Macedonia's entry into the UN was managed by the United States. Of course this was done in agreement with its EC proponents, whose "merit" in this should not be minimized. Greece, on the other hand, in spite of its posturing, had no direct role in this process because it was not part of the UNSC.

6.3. One of the key arguments that points to American involvement in denying Macedonia its rightful name is the UN's flagrant violations of normal admission procedures. Even though the UN Charter was precise in determining qualifications for membership, in Macedonia's case four new conditions were added which the country had to meet before it could be admitted into the UN!? This was a classic move of unprecedented blackmail, forcing Macedonia to join the UN without a name! It was this illegal manipulation of rules that forced the so-called "name dispute" on Macedonia and pushed it into limbo. Macedonia was forced to deal with an imposed obligation to seek a solution to its own name, which was disputed and could not be used internationally.

6.4. To be fair let us ask an important question. Who in the UNSC had the power and authority to influence new and unprecedented conditions to be added to the UN Charter of Rights at will? None of the UNSC members have that right and

authority of course. It would be considered immoral and illegal. Except for someone very powerful who is not likely to be questioned or challenged. And who might that be? The United States of course. No other party in the UNSC had that kind of clout. Not Britain, not France, not Spain and not even all three put together. This dance, no doubt, was led by the United States. Greece was completely out of the picture.

6.5. Considering that the UN Charter of Rights was illegally tailored for Macedonia to deny its entry into the UN with its rightful name and to impose a reference to it, we can freely conclude without risk of making a mistake, that it was done by none other than the coordinated effort of the United States. Everything else was technical and tactics. There are no facts or arguments to point to anyone else. If the United States was in favour of Macedonia entering the UN with its constitutional name, the reference would not have been imposed. If Washington felt that the reference proposed by Britain, France and Spain was not a good idea it would not have been accepted. This confirms that there were prior agreements made acceptable to the United States.

6. 6. There is no doubt that there will be a historical black mark left on the UN for the way it conducted itself towards Macedonia during its admission. This also clearly shows that the political interests of “certain” powers are placed ahead of respect for the UN Charter of Rights, which is a gross violation of International Law. The UN was put in place to avoid actions such as these and protect the rights of the weak and innocent, not to ignore them. This is usually how terrorists operate, working outside of the law.

7. Boutros Ghali assured Gligorov that admission to the United Nations with the reference would be brief, for only a few months, but that did not happen, which goes to show that the problem was not with Greece alone but also with someone else, someone very powerful. Did Greece alone have the clout to influence Ghali to pull such a stunt and get away with it? Or was this someone else’s doing? I believe it was not Greece alone. It had to be someone else in addition to Greece, someone much more powerful and experienced. So, I ask you, how is it possible for a

top international political organization to stoop so low and unscrupulously lie to a president of a country?

7.1. Looking at the problem from today's perspective, was Boutros Ghali bluffing or was this someone's plan all along? Ghali should have known, of course, that no solution, no matter how simple, could be realistically expected to be found in just a few months. So the question is why did Boutros Ghali make the promise to Gligorov? Was he convinced that Macedonia was not going to last long and would fall apart very soon? Was Ghali of the same mind, like that Greek extremist Samaras, who openly discussed Macedonia's quick demise? We can now say, with some certainty, that many analysts and politicians then were of the belief that Macedonia was not going to last long. Why? What did they know that we didn't?

Did the Americans have similar thoughts? Is that why they delayed Macedonia's recognition? The probability of the U.S. having such thoughts was high. Why else delay Macedonia's recognition for almost two years? Why tolerate Greece's illegal blockade on Macedonia knowing that the UN had already placed sanctions against Serbia and had cut off Macedonia from its largest trading partner? Everything was set in place to "strangle" Macedonia.

8. Not knowing what was going to happen, many countries delayed their recognition and waited for a final outcome. Macedonia of course survived the critical period and evolved into a relatively successful country despite all the huge external obstacles placed in front of it. It survived its domestic divisions, in good part stimulated, orchestrated and paid for from abroad. And it also survived its own mistakes.

Which confirmed the old story that Macedonians are survivors!

9. We would like, at this point, to take the opportunity to address some politically motivated accusations, demeaning Macedonians for accepting the reference as a condition for Macedonia's admission into the UN in 1993. Was this treason or some kind of irresponsibility on the part of the Macedonian leadership? Let's

say, right at the outset, that what took place in the UN was not the Macedonian leadership's doing and such accusations are baseless and only serve to divide the Macedonian people!

9.1. The news that a fully independent modern Macedonian state was about to emerge from the Yugoslav breakup had caused some alarm in the region. In August 1988 Greece was first to take measures to rename its "Northern Territories". This was done by decree issued by the then Greek Prime Minister. Of the 13 administrative divisions in the country, three were renamed. The new names given were "Western Macedonia", "Central Macedonia" and "Eastern Macedonia and Thrace". This was the first time ever that Greece officially used the name Macedonia. Use of the word "Macedonia" was practically forbidden in Greece because it was associated with the Macedonians living there, who, as a minority in Greece, have never been recognized and since Greece's acquisition of Macedonian territories in 1913, have been subjected to continuous oppression, abuse and to several genocides. Greece understood that a discernible independent Macedonian state would inevitably affirm the Macedonians as a distinct people with their own language, culture and traditions... And, as it had done in the past, Greece did everything in its power not to allow a Macedonian state to emerge. And by renaming some of its divisions to "Macedonia", Greece made it clear that the name "Macedonia" belonged exclusively to Greece and no one else (i.e. Macedonia) had the right to use it. There were many place names named "Macedonia" worldwide but Greece had no objections to those!

9.2. In other words, it was not the name that was a problem for Greece; it was the people; i.e. the Macedonian people who either lived inside Greece unrecognized or the Macedonian people who were forcibly evicted from Greece and had their properties illegally confiscated. So, right from the start the "existence of Macedonians" was a problem for Greece. But how could Greece openly challenge this problem without revealing its real motive and be accused of human rights violations? It used the next best thing and focused its objections on the country's name instead. Later the name was no longer an issue because Macedonia went as far as changing its constitution to alleviate Greek fears about

its Macedonian minority. When Macedonia declared in its own constitution that it was prepared to abandon the pursuit of the rights of Macedonians living inside Greece, it was no longer in Greece's interest to pursue that policy. Yet the problems continued for Macedonia. Why? Because the real culprits behind Greece, as we have seen from our research, bearing their full weight, were first the U.S.A., then France, Germany, Great Britain... This was a coordinated effort with Greece visibly standing in the fore...

9.3. Left alone, and with all those wars raging on the territory of former Yugoslavia, Macedonia had no room to manoeuvre. Washington, Paris, Berlin, London... all had sent Macedonia a crystal clear message: "If you want to join the United Nations, whose membership will open access to the IMF and the World Bank, then you must change the name of your country and your people. If you don't then you will shoulder the responsibility for your people being isolated and all alone." It was hard to imagine a greater threat of blackmail than this. Macedonia was already impoverished by the huge inflation generated by Belgrade. On top of that it lost the market it shared with the Yugoslav federation. It had insufficient reserves of energy and was depending heavily on imports from the outside, which were not functioning because of the illegal Greek embargo on one side and the UN sanctions on Serbia on the other.

9.4. Macedonia was left with little choice. The main international actors were determined not to allow Macedonia's integration into the international scene. Given the circumstances, the question was not whether but how long Macedonia was going to last? Many figured weeks or perhaps several months maximum; certainly not years. At the same time Macedonia's neighbours were discussing plans for its division... In such circumstances the normal thing to do was to look for an easier way out because the alternative would have been complete collapse.

9.5. Macedonia's admission to the UN was forced on Macedonia with Macedonia's name being disputed and with an imposed reference. Macedonia was never asked if this is what it wanted or signed any documents of acceptance. Macedonia never used the

reference for itself but simply tolerated it. This is a fact which must be constantly emphasized. Macedonia could not prohibit others from using the reference since this is how our country was registered in the UN. However we do have the right and it is our obligation to intervene each time the reference is used and to explain to people that it is an illegal reference imposed on the Macedonian people... and that our historical and constitutional name is and will always be Macedonia. If we keep silent and don't intervene people will use the reference in ignorance thinking that it is our name, which we chose for ourselves. We must do our best to not allow its use in anything. It is our joint responsibility to stop its use.

9.5.1. Our Macedonian diplomats in New York and Brussels (NATO and EU), after Macedonia's admission to the UN, made a huge unpardonable error by allowing the reference to take widespread use, which is not only offensive to the Macedonian people but it has plunged our country in a bogus dispute. We literally walked into a Greek trap with our eyes wide open.

When tackling this problem our diplomats abroad demonstrated diplomatic and political amateurism by a) accepting to "negotiate" our historic and constitutional name with Greece and b) by allowing the "imposed reference" to be freely utilized without objection from them. It would not have been difficult at all for them to say "NO!" to negotiating our own name and to say "NO!" to the use of the reference by other states, world organizations, media outlets and so on... It was within their right to do so, just like many Macedonian organizations and individuals did in private.

9.6. We will now take a look at Macedonia comparing its situation in the early 1990's and today (1913) in order to fully understand why some things, including the reference, were tolerated.

9.6.1. In that respect there are no major changes looking at Macedonia from the outside. Like before, Macedonia today is open to the same heavy pressures, blockades and blackmail it was exposed to two decades earlier when it was trying to join the UN.

Today Macedonia is pressured with the same ultimatums to change its name and give up its Macedonian ethnic identity in order to join NATO and the EU. But Macedonia today is not the same Macedonia that it was in 1993. If Macedonia continues on the same economic course it is on today, it can hold out for the next 100 years without having to join NATO or the EU. But has anyone told this to our politicians? Even though Macedonia has experienced drastic improvements internally and in some cases fares even better than most EU members for its size, politicians still insist on joining western clubs where Macedonians are not welcome! Why?

9.6.2. As mentioned earlier, from an internal perspective things today are radically different in Macedonia than they were two decades ago. Macedonia is moving forward. The country's economy is functioning relatively well despite the severe crisis that is shaking up the world... Macedonia has sufficient maneuvering space to move forward and even to say "no" to outside pressures pushing it to change its name. Today Macedonia can say "No thank you!" something it could not afford to say in the 1990's without consequences. Macedonia had no such options in those days because its survival as a state was seriously challenged. Today Macedonia has more choices and it can afford to say "No!" to the so-called "name negotiations" with Greece. At that time Greece and many others, including some of the major global players, did not expect the country to survive. Now it is clear that Macedonia is here to stay and the Macedonian people are working hard to keep it that way.

9.7. Macedonians are not proud that they were forced to swallow the name dispute and the imposed reference. In fact they were insulted and feel bitter about the whole experience! The New York experience was not only a major setback for the Macedonian people, it was an injustice to humanity and decency! It was an attack on global justice and democracy! It was disregard for International Law. And these things were not done by rogue nations or dictatorial powers, they were perpetrated by states that call themselves democracies... the U.S., France, UK, Germany... They committed illegal acts in flagrant violation of the UN Charter of Rights. They took a helpless fledgling nation

and, at its weakest moment, tortured it with intentions of extinguishing the life out of it. Why? Macedonia had no role in anything that was happening around it; not in the wars and not in Balkan politics. Why did these powerful states want to extinguish it? Macedonians should examine the facts and see the truth for what it really is and stop blaming each other for what happened to them in those critical times. The Macedonian leaders did what they had to do in order to survive. Their choices were limited because Macedonia was a victim of unscrupulous and dishonest Major Power manipulation, perpetrated purely for self-interest. Acceptance of the “real-politic” was probably the only move they could have made to assure the survival of our state. Everything else included unacceptably risk. Macedonia’s existence today is the best proof that the moves made then were the correct ones. In spite of all the obstacles placed before us, we not only survived but today we are thriving; exceeding all expectations.

Any attempts made to stay completely out of the UN in 1993 would have been dangerous for Macedonia no matter how we look at it. That, however, does not mean that, had we been a bit more persistent and stubborn, we wouldn’t have got some gains out of it? Macedonia had no idea and could not have guessed how far it was going to be pushed by the main factors leading its case. Perhaps one day, when the archives with all these secrets are opened, then we will find out. Looking at the situation from today’s point of view we should stop arguing and have no doubt that in 1993 we acted reasonably and responsibly.

9.8. Looking at the situation from the outside in, today, like yesterday, the same factors are treating us no differently. The same forces a) ignore the Copenhagen Criteria which they themselves have implemented, b) ignore the judgment of the World Court in the Hague, c) are prepared to use force against all democratic rules and principles, just to prevent Macedonia from joining NATO and the EU, d) work, again and again, outside of international legal limits... in order to “rename” Macedonia... What does this tell us? It tells us that there is incredible concentrated effort, primarily by the U.S., of countries to attain their own regional aspirations at Macedonia’s expense. There is little that they will not do to achieve their goals. However, if 20

years ago we could not resist their will, today we can but it is certainly not going to be easy. It is no joke going against the will of superpowers. Our main weaknesses are a) the largest domestic opposition party has a slender spine and is ready to bend to outside pressure, and b) Albanian aspirations for a “Greater Albania”. Albanian leaders are ready to solve their “Albanian national question” which is not only supported by the U.S. but it is internally managed directly by Washington.

B. The mediation process

10. The UNSC Resolution 817/93, by which Macedonia was admitted to the UN, was provided through mediation and was designed “to overcome the differences over the name of the state and to encourage confidence-building measures between the parties”. There is very little doubt that Washington was behind putting first Vance and later Nimitz in charge of the mediation process, which shows that the Americans were extremely interested in the outcome of this dispute. There are many indicators that point to the mediators of only being formally under UN patronage, and were actually extended arms of the State Department, through which the U.S. implements its own policy towards Macedonia.

First, both Vance and Nimitz were State Department people with their base and logistics located in the U.S. where they are still stationed to this day.

Second, from March 1994 to November 1997, while Vance was mediator, Matthew Nimitz was special envoy to U.S. President Bill Clinton, advising him on Greek objections regarding Macedonia’s name.

Third, if it was really a problem between Macedonia and Greece (and not just Greece) then what was the problem? What was it based on? What was needed to be done? Why did the American President need a special envoy to monitor and report on it? Was this not a dispute just between Greece and Macedonia? Why was the United States so interested in this dispute? Even though it was a “one sided” dispute, it was still between two neighbours

which did not immediately put into question the safety of the two countries involved or the wider region, let alone the U.S.? If Washington did not have secret strategic interests in the Balkans, in which unfortunately Macedonia was embroiled, the American president would not have had a need for a special envoy to monitor and report on the situation! There are all kinds of conflicts and disputes going on around the world every day without “special envoys” or the U.S. being directly involved. Why was it so closely involved in Macedonian affairs if it didn’t have interests in Macedonia? Which means...?

Fourth, in November 1997, the UN Secretary-General appointed Nimitz as Cyrus Vance’s deputy and when Vance resigned in 1999 Nimitz became special envoy. This shows that the mediation process between Macedonia and Greece, conducted on behalf of the UN, was actually in the hands of Washington all the time. Could this be only a coincidence? We don’t think so! Do Americans get involved in other people’s affairs unless they serve U.S. interests? Do the Americans ever appoint special envoys in matters that don’t relate to their specific needs and plans? We don’t think so! Records show that Americans don’t get involved unless it serves their interests! Twenty years or so later we still get the same result, which confirms that this is all part of the same scenario, part of the same Balkan regional U.S. anti-Macedonian foreign policy.

Years ago, at the OSCE summit in Vienna, the United States insisted that an American be assigned to Bosnia and Herzegovina but the EU wanted the person to be exclusively European, so the meeting ended without an agreement. A few months later there was a news release naming Americans as functionaries in Bosnia and Herzegovina! When the United States wants something and it is in its interests to get it, it will do anything, including ignoring international law, agreements, democratic principles, procedures, practices and even justice...

Why would they act any differently about our name?

Fifth, Nimitz was a lawyer working for a law firm and, as a mediator, he was working alone. He did not have a team but the

UN legal services were at his disposal. Now, if he truly used the UN legal services, would it have been possible that UN experts would have advised him and guided him to illegally widen his mandate to recommend to Macedonia the use of alternate names other than the name of its own choice... during all these years? There is no UN requirement that forces a country to change its name, rename its language and to erase the true identity of its people! There was no such thing written in the UN Security Council resolutions either? If Nimitz is an expert and an independent mediator who is trying to find a “just” solution to the dispute and if he indeed was pushed by his UN advisors into the forbidden and prohibited zone, then why did he listen to them? Why follow their advice? And if the UN experts did not supply him with his logistics then who did? Saying that he came up with his own logistics is pure fantasy. He does not have the authority to do that and he wouldn’t dare do it on his own. He is well aware that his responsibility is huge. The fate and the future of an entire country are in his hands; not to mention the peace and stability of the entire region.

Sixth, although the problem, formally, is the responsibility of the UN, there is no budget for Nimitz. The function that Nimitz performs, on behalf of the UN Secretary General, is practically voluntary. His salary is symbolic, \$1.00 a year. There are several explanations as to why this is: a) to minimize UN interference in his work, b) for the UN not to call into question his terms, and c) for the UN not to require spending reports. If the UN had to allocate annual funding for Nimitz’s work then his work would come under constant UN scrutiny. No UN funding, no UN poking its nose in his business! If the UN is not the real manager of the dispute then who is? The real manager of the dispute is the U.S., which has *carte blanche* to do whatever it wants. The question that remains open here is not whether Nimitz is being paid for his services, but who is paying for them? And whoever is paying for them is his real boss? Even though Nimitz spends little time in his “mediation” role, someone is paying for it. And nothing comes for free in the United States.

Seventh, because of his financial arrangements, i.e. not being financially obligated to the UN, Nimitz was not obligated to send

the UN Secretary-General regular progress reports. Normally, when Nimitz met with the Macedonian representatives he only informed the Secretary-General on current developments and that was it. Someone else paid his expenses and dealt with the headaches associated with the process. It cost the UN nothing... No money and no headaches...

Eighth, the fact the Nimitz delivered proposals that were absolutely unacceptable to the Macedonian side, or in others, proposals that were well-aligned with American interests, which were in turn perfectly aligned with those of Greece, certainly explains who Nimitz's boss was. Every proposal Nimitz offered was fully compatible with American policy towards Macedonia and the wider region. Who else then, if not the U.S., guided and encouraged Nimitz to spread his mandate and call into question Macedonia's name, the Macedonian people's national identity and their language?

Ninth, the simplest logic compels us to believe that the architect of Nimitz's proposals was none other than Washington. Either the State Department or possibly a panel of experts appointed and paid for by Washington! What other plausible explanation is there?

C. There were no negotiations taking place in New York

11. The terminology we use to describe this basic problem which involves the future of our state is embracing. The vocabulary we use hardly describes the issue or at minimum describes it incorrectly. In the beginning all politicians call it "negotiations"! Now only a handful of so-called "experts" and perhaps the media call the mediation process in New York "negotiations". Unfortunately there are no "negotiations" taking place and there never were. Who in fact can, or is given the authority to "negotiate" the name of the state which is immortalized in the Constitution? I don't know exactly what is taking place in New York but it is not "negotiations"; a shameful term applied to the non-negotiable historic name of our country.

11.1. Without going into too much detail, we would like to emphasize that a) there was no mention of the term “negotiations” in the UN Security Council documents. What could a sovereign state possibly seek to be compelled to negotiate its own historic and constitutional name with another state? The language used in the UN Security Council document was “to encourage the parties to continue to cooperate” to “achieve a quick resolution to their differences”. And, b) at issue here is the classic mediation process. Who decided with whose assistance this problem was to be solved? The question must be closed the same way it was opened. The solution does not depend on a bilateral agreement between the parties involved, c) both sides have delegated representatives who in diplomatic circles are called “liaison officers”. Being in charge of the process and proposals, the mediator communicates through them with the two governments, d) the mediator, through them, filters his ideas and tries to come up with a proposal that would be acceptable to both sides, e) the “liaison officers” (on the Macedonian side represent Macedonia’s President) take those ideas to the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and wait for a response. When they receive a response they take it back to the mediator. And here their role ends, and f) the mediator waits for responses hoping for something concrete to turn up before resuming the cycle all over again...

And this, my friends, is what is happening in New York...

11.2. Those who consistently speak of “negotiations” and “negotiators” owe an explanation, a) who is negotiating with whom? b) Are the liaison officers negotiating with Nimitz, or among themselves? If it is both then it is some kind of trilateral deal not mediation, c) if they have indeed “negotiated” until now then what have they “agreed” on? d) If the “negotiators” are “negotiating”, then why does Nimitz come up with suggestions that are usually unacceptable to both governments? Who is responsible for that? The negotiators”? Nimitz ...? Who? Following the logic of how things work, if someone is negotiating something and brings home a resolution that does not correspond to the interests of his or her country, then that

resolution will be immediately revoked and, if necessary, the party making the decision will be punished. e) If the “negotiators” “negotiate” then how is it possible that they don’t know what Nimitz is offering? Well, you know, they just “negotiated” something and presumably they all “agreed” to that something? How then can the “negotiators” not know what that “something” was? Did Nimitz disregard their suggestions and surprise them with his own? f) Whose suggestions did Nimitz put forward, theirs, his, or someone else’s?! If the liaison officers “negotiated” something then that something must be what is offered by Nimitz, not something else! g) In order to “negotiate” at an international level, a previously prepared and agreed to platform for the “negotiations” must be put in place. This is an old and accepted practice or protocol used by countries which are serious and committed when entering such a process. Otherwise everything would be done irresponsibly, unprofessionally and ultimately illegally which will be harmful to the country. Is there proper protocol applied in these so-called “negotiations”?

There are more questions to be asked but what was put forward up to now is sufficient to show that the use of the terms “negotiation” and “negotiators” in the New York process is improper and the process itself may be flawed and unprofessional.

11.2.1. And it was all exactly like that, here is a statement made by Nimitz (“Dnevnik”, November 22, 2012), after a meeting in New York: “The two sides have expressed willingness to overcome the issue, I believe that it is not just rhetoric. The situation in the region requires that this problem is solved. The intermediates will bring these ideas to their governments, to see if they can be useful to go forward.”

Isn’t everything crystal clear now?

11.3. Let us also not forget that this terminology and process serves Athens to the maximum because it puts Macedonia in a subordinate position where it has to “negotiate” its own name. More will be said about this in the Interim Accord section.

11.4. After any successful negotiating process there usually is the signing of an agreement between the parties involved. To date this process has not worked at all for us. In other words, “negotiating” or whatever it is that we are doing has worked against our interests. This process, for us, has a multilateral character and this is how it must remain to the end. The process works the opposite for Athens. Athens wants a multilateral solution but Athens wants to be the one to have the final say. In other words, Athens wants to sign a bilateral agreement with all its interests remaining intact.

D. An agreement with Greece is not only impossible but absolutely unnecessary

12. At first glance, hidden in Nimitz’s mediation process is a minor but serious and extremely important segment of American policy towards Macedonia. It is the persistent insistence that any solution found to the problem must have direct agreement from Greece, which is utterly unacceptable to Macedonia. Macedonia has no problem with its own name and therefore has no need of such an agreement, nor was such an agreement a requirement in the UN Security Council documents.

12.1. If Macedonia were to enter into a bilateral agreement with Greece, then every outstanding issue on both sides must be addressed and resolved. One of the greatest outstanding issues is the situation of the Macedonian people living in Greece. The rights, not only of those Macedonians living inside Greece but of all those exiled and their properties confiscated since 1913 must be addressed... And that’s only one issue... Greece, it seems, does not care about issues that are important to Macedonia. So it goes to show that this one-sided problem has only been concocted in order to exterminate Macedonia, not to help her overcome age-old issues created by Greece.

That is why this entire process must end where it started; at the UN Security Council.

If a final agreement with Greece is signed, covering only a solution to our name, ipso facto, it will mean that all other outstanding issues between the two countries will disappear. That is how it works in diplomatic practice. In other words, if we don't manage this process properly we could end up losing out on all outstanding issues that Macedonia has with Greece, including the rights of Macedonians exiled from Greece...

Therefore, under no circumstances should we be signing this one-sided agreement with Greece; no matter what.

12.2. Even though it will be very difficult to get desired results, we still need to participate in a mediation process. A solution should and must be sought only through a multilateral process and never bilaterally. From the outset, this problem had been internationalized by Washington and Athens because it suited them that way. Together the US and Greece had more clout in tackling the problem and Greece avoided being fingered as the main culprit. This way the dispute lost its bilateral character and became the subject of many bodies. First the EC, then the UN... and more recently NATO and the EU...

12.3. However, after the Greeks and Americans achieved what they set out to do. That is, after Macedonia's name was suspended in the UN and a reference was imposed and after Macedonia was blackmailed and blockaded from entering NATO and EU, effectively after Macedonia was crippled, Washington decided to look for a solution in Greece. Any solution found must be acceptable to Greece. In other words, even in this scenario the U.S. still has a leading role. Both the U.S. and Greece get exactly what they want if the problem is solved bilaterally between Macedonia and Greece. There is nowhere in the world, other than when dealing with Greece, where Macedonia is at its greatest disadvantage and the Americans know that.

The well orchestrated U.S. policy towards Macedonia has come to the fore. American insistence on Macedonia signing the Interim Accord in 1995, among other things, paved the way for signing future and perhaps the final agreement between Macedonia and Greece, which Macedonia cannot afford to sign.

No such demands, however, have ever been made on Macedonia by the UN Security Council in any of its documents. According to the Security Council, the problem was opened by the Security Council and therefore it should be closed by the Security Council.

12.3.1. As we have said earlier, this proposed agreement with Greece has no organic connection to the UN Security Council resolution for admitting Macedonia into the UN; it is purely a bilateral agreement, even though it is connected to the same issue. The logic is clear – after a temporary agreement a final agreement must follow! In the analysis of the agreement, which will be provided later in this text, the document is not viewed as having important dimensions in regards to the final outcome. The fact that the U.S. has insisted that Athens have the final say on the agreement was confirmed by Nimitztz in an interview that he gave to the Voice of America before the 2008 NATO summit in Bucharest (details to follow later) when he announced that the Interim Accord no longer applied and a new agreement was required.

12.3.2. The Interim Accord is the first American diplomatic vision, which has taken the UN Security Council resolution out of place and settled Macedonia with a new and difficult commitment! It opened the way for Macedonia, which is utterly unnecessary, to be basically insulted by Athens. About what? About Macedonia's own name?! To ask for permission for what is already owed to it by International Law? Where is all this coming from...? On top of that Nimitz is asking Macedonia to sign something that would deliver the Macedonian people to oblivion... Are they asking Macedonia to willingly capitulate? Why?

12.4. The aim of a permanent agreement is to have a dual purpose, a) to force Macedonia into a humiliating situation where it accepts the unacceptable, and or to b) to put Macedonia into a deadlock because Athens will not yield to anything that Macedonia wants. There is no doubt that an agreement with Athens is not possible. The only way Greece will agree to

anything is if Macedonia is willing to capitulate. Is that what the U.S. really wants and is that why it is playing that card?

12.5. In continuing the mediation process, our efforts should now be concentrated on putting the talks under the UN Security Council mandate. We should not allow any more excursions to take place outside of it, as was the case for many years. As was the case with Nimitz's final draft which he produced in April 2013, for which he had no authority. We need to take control of the process and steer it in the right direction, we need to take control of the discussions that are specific to us, to our identity and to our language and tighten it to our advantage... We have rights and we need to exercise them... If we don't then we will allow others to lead us and drag us through the thorns. Then what will become of us when the final solution is drafted for us?

12.6. In the near future our goal should be to convince the mediator to conclude that attempts to "overcome our differences" with Greece, regarding the name of our state, have failed despite 20 years of trying and persistent effort. When this is done, and I am sure Washington will not agree, Nimitz, nonetheless, will have to inform the UN Secretary General and tell him that the ball is now in his court. And such a development would be most beneficial for Macedonia.

12.6.1. In parallel, while we are convincing the mediator to end the process, we have to go back to the United Nations and initiate new procedures to register our official, constitutional and historical name, which the old process illegally denied us. First, we have to come up with a precise strategy for this, supported by facts and arguments of which we have plenty. In this strategy, among other things, we must emphasize exactly what the UN Security Council's Resolution 817/93 directed us to do: "...differences should be resolved in order to preserve the peace and good neighbourly relations in the region..." which to this day has been done beyond expectations without our differences being resolved. In spite of the "differences", peace in the region has not been disrupted in the last 20 years, unfortunately the "differences" were not resolved either and it does not look like they will be resolved anytime soon. As far as neighbourly

relations are concerned, if “relations” are measured by one state challenging another’s state name while ignoring the people, then Greece is absolutely a terrible neighbour.

12.7. We promised the UN that we will “cooperate with the mediator to get a quick resolution in order to overcome the differences on the name of our state”. This, in no way, implied that we needed to have an agreement with Athens. The “differences” can and must be overcome by another means without an agreement. We don’t need a new UN Security Council resolution either. Why? There are always dangers, sometimes hidden dangers, for Macedonia when Greece is involved in the process. Being forced into an agreement with Athens puts us in an inferior position and we don’t need that. If there is no agreement with Athens then Washington too would have no means of forcing us to change our country’s name every time we attempt to join an international institution or organization. Overcoming our “differences” is a much better way of dealing with the problem than being forced to change our name. A name change also implies that our identity will be at issue next. There is no doubt that Nimitz, certainly at Washington’s request, will illegally and unjustifiably include our identity in his mandate. That’s when the picture will become very clear but it might be too late for Macedonia. Under the current circumstances, Washington’s insistence on an agreement between Skopje and Athens is nothing more than adding pressure on Macedonia to capitulate, to start waving a white flag or remain deadlocked forever. There is no third option.

12.8. Washington is absolutely aware that an agreement with Greece, which would incorporate minimum or no Macedonian interests, is still not a realistic option. Athens will agree to nothing less than erasing the Macedonian people and removing them from the global ranking of nations. Greece will not be content with just renaming our country and Washington is fully aware of that. Renaming Macedonia is no gain for Greece if the Macedonian nation “survives”. If the U.S. is well aware of this then it knows exactly what is expected! It knows that we need to “negotiate” with Greece in order to capitulate and give up on ourselves?

12.9. For anyone, including the UN and U.S., emphasizing that Macedonia must seek a solution through an agreement between Skopje and Athens is absurd, counterproductive and places Macedonia at a great disadvantage. There is no requirement from the UN Security Council for Macedonia to have an “agreement” with Greece, so why look for one? We are not obligated to do so by the UNSC! If we are required to talk with Greece then let us put all our issues on the table and work towards a mutual agreement. Let us invite an arbitrator and proceed like Croatia and Slovenia did, or even take our case to the Hague. The way things are today, there is no way we can work on an equal footing with Greece when we are held hostage, blockaded and blackmailed every time we want to do something that involves international organizations like joining NATO and the EU... And what is our choice under these circumstances? What other options do we have outside of being isolated or surrendering? Is that the kind of democracy favoured by Washington and Brussels? There are rules, procedures and principles in politics, like there are in boxing, for example, and boxers box by category; those are the rules. No heavyweight is allowed to box with a lightweight because we all know what the outcome will be well in advance. By the same token there are rules when it comes to countries which, it seems, don’t apply when it comes to Macedonia. Macedonia has been forced to face a situation where it sees no other choice other than to capitulate or be endlessly tormented. Why has Macedonia been placed in this illegal and unfair situation, and by whom?

12.10. Washington’s insistence on “agreeing” with Athens has placed us into a precarious position where we have to beg for mercy from the torturer. Let us also not forget that we have been put in this position with the support of others standing behind Greece... primarily the United States.

12.11. So it seems that our “partners” or those who we perceive to be our “partners” are pushing us into self-destruction... for us to crash and burn... at the hands of Athens who can’t wait to see us disappear. And as long as we are here the U.S. will do anything in its power to help Greece achieve its greater

aspirations; see our country crash and burn and the Macedonian people disappear from the face of this earth. And that, my friends, today is America's real-politic towards Macedonia.

12.12. In the end, what is interesting about all this is the fact that Washington has no clear stance on the Greek position in the dispute. Washington, it seems, supports Greece for no apparent reason. The Americans insist that we "find a name" and that we make some "tough decisions"... (Reeker), but never once have they mentioned what the other side (Greece) is expected to do, if anything. The fact is, however, that Washington wants to achieve this goal differently than Greek. While Athens insists on an instant solution immediately with *erga omnes*, Washington offers bait on a hook: "a new name for external use as a substitute for the reference"! This too is *erga omnes* but in stages and with a slight delay. But then, a few years or so later, it will become *erga omnes* because we will need to change our passports, customs documents and a whole slew of other things... and in the end, our Constitution. And as such, we will be renaming ourselves step by step.

But by now it should be clear to everyone that whoever supports Greece supports the idea of sacrificing Macedonia and the Macedonian people. Why else would Washington publicly advocate for Macedonia to change its name and for the Macedonian people to abandon their identity?

E. Could the name issue have been resolved in the early 1990s?

13. Some time ago a thesis was launched that implied that it was possible to solve Macedonia's name problem in a favourable manner in the early 1990's and it was possible for Macedonia to have smoothly joined the UN. One of the main advocates of this thesis was Denko Maleski, first foreign minister of independent Macedonia. I worked with Maleski in the then Ministry of Foreign Relations for about a year or so.

13.1. There is no doubt in my mind that Maleski was guided (though not completely) in the developments of our country's foreign policy and he undeniably carried a lot of weight. However, the main role was played by Gligorov, who controlled all levers of foreign policy by his own hands. The role of the minister then was to strictly carry out Gligorov's instructions. However, regardless of what Maleski claims, his ideas, given the circumstances, have no merit.

13.1.1. In speaking to the media, Maleski, many times, made claims that in 1992 there were other options open to Macedonia to join the UN. Maleski claims British Prime Minister John Major, at a meeting in Downing Street, proposed that we use the name Republic of Macedonia (Skopje). Source: Utrinski, April 9, 2013, story devoted to the 20th anniversary since Macedonia's accession to the UN. This time, as he did other times, Maleski conveyed to the media that he believed that the U.S.A. stood behind Major's proposal.

In a column published in "Utrinki" on June 5th and 6th, 2004, Maleski claimed that John Major's message was for us to accept the adjective (Skopje)... "Then they (Britain) and the U.S. will issue a joint declaration in which they will conclude that the problem was solved"!? "Ride the wave and solve the problem now while the tide is high because the great powers will lose interest in your problem," was supposedly the message from the British!?

13.1.2. However, in his book "Bebeto od Katran", Maleski while describing the meeting he and Gligorov had with Major in Downing Street, in London, on September 3, 1992, he does not mention anything about the U.S. From his and Gligorov's conversation with Major, documented in great detail on pages 405 to 409 in his book, there is nothing conclusive that would suggest that there were "other options" available. The fact is that Major proposed that we immediately change our country's name to "Republic of Macedonia (Skopje)" because he said "it would have increased our chances of joining the UN". (This is more proof that Macedonia's admission to the UN was blocked!). Major said that without this change "it would be difficult for your

friends to help you”. When Gligorov asked what was Great Britain’s position on this matter, Major openly said: “I can not give you a definite answer!” He then added: “The EC cannot reach a consensus because Greece will not agree to anything”. Major frankly admitted that: “I am afraid that the same will happen even with any compromise you offer!” So, according to Maleski’s own notes, Macedonia would have been blocked no matter what alternatives it was prepared to offer. When Gligorov insisted that Major give him an answer, Major said: “If you accept the name with ‘Skopje’ then you will give us a chance to help you”. When Gligorov asked for guarantees, Major clearly said that he could not guarantee anything. Major’s last words ended with: “I can understand your reluctance to change the name of your country!”

Where Maleski found these “other options” is not clear.

Maleski does not only not mention the U.S. in his book but obviously has pulled this other information of some sort of joint US-British declaration on our behalf, from his sleeve! And to those who have first hand information about this it is clear that such a thing in diplomacy is unthinkable! Titans don’t stick their noses in tiny waters. It is hard to believe that Maleski thought that if we accepted the adjective (Skopje), Athens would be placated? Such a thing neither was, is or will it be possible under current circumstances.

Only Maleski knows why there is such a vast difference between what he wrote in his book and what he wrote for the column. And about some “other options” he spoke about he will have to explain what he means by those himself.

Speaking of the column, Maleski made another unforgivable mistake when he concluded that: “In the general euphoria, let us not forget that over the last few decades Macedonia’s constitutional name has been changed three times; People’s Republic of Macedonia, Socialist Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Macedonia, while our identity has remained unquestioned”!?

How is it possible that a professor of international law, without regards that he was a foreign minister or not, did not know that we did not change the name of our state, which has always been Macedonia, and that only references were added to reflect its current political status which has no connection to its name? We today will have no problem calling our state “Democratic Republic of Macedonia” or “Parliamentary Republic of Macedonia”... and thus the problem is solved. That, however, has nothing to do with the identity of the people, the language...

But these possible and acceptable changes to us are not acceptable to Washington, Brussels, Athens... Because they do not achieve their goals! Because they do not take into consideration changes to the Macedonian people’s identity, which is at the core of this problem.

13.1.3. It would appear that we were expected to unilaterally concede, as a gesture of goodwill, without getting anything in return, which in diplomacy, rarely, if ever, happens at all. Major suggested that we voluntarily make a change to our name and accept the consequences at own expense just to attempt to join the UN... with no guarantees... But before we changed our name we would have to change our Constitution, which enshrined the name of our state. Was Major expecting Gligorov to act on his own in this regard? And who had the authority to arbitrarily change the Constitution without committing a crime. Taking such a step was unimaginable back in Macedonia.

At minimum it would have been an unpardonable mistake to accept Major’s suggestion which was not even a formal proposal. During the Edinburgh Summit in December of the same year (1992) Athens rejected an identical proposal made by Robin O’Neill without even giving it a second thought. Thus it would be only logical to assume that Major was not aware that our problems with Greece were much deeper than what name we chose for ourselves. Major may not have been aware that Greece wanted no less than to obliterate everything Macedonian and nothing that was offered would have been acceptable. However, the fact is that Major, and Britain as a whole, had some sympathy for our efforts and sincerely wanted to help us. This I also

confirmed through my personal experience, while I spent time in London. Unfortunately, the British too had no room to manoeuvre and they were not allowed to do anything more for us.

13.1.4 The meeting with Major took place in September 1992, during which time Gligorov had already formally submitted our application for membership to the UN. The application was submitted at the end of July of the same year. Boutros Ghali did not process the application because it was surrounded by controversy.

13.1.5 Ambassador Robin O'Neil was the one who came up with the idea of adding "Skopje" to the end of our name. He represented the United Kingdom while chairing an EC meeting when he proposed this solution. O'Neil was familiar with our problems with Greece and I had several opportunities to meet with him and discuss them during his visits to Skopje in the second half of 1992. O'Neil was also familiar with our aspirations and remained a true friend of Macedonia.

13.2. So, it would appear that the necessary conditions for solving the name issue in the early 1990's were simply not there. Then why was the government blamed for this debacle? The government was blamed because people had no understanding of what was happening behind the scenes and that Greece had already made up its mind a long time ago that it did not want a Macedonia or Macedonians to exist. The only reason this problem surfaced when it did and the way it did was because Greece was caught by surprise when Macedonia was about to declare its independence. What people also did not know and unfortunately many still don't know is that Greece is not alone in this... the U.S., Germany, France... are behind Greece. Many just don't understand that the "Macedonian Question" has been reopened with the obvious intent of closing it permanently. Everything else that was done was done to tie and bog down the Macedonian people and make them turn against one another. Right from the start, everything was technique and tactics well-managed from the highest level, from the world's only superpower, the United States itself. Let's put it another way, if the Americans wanted to solve this problem in Macedonia's

favour, with minimum eligibility and without calling into question the identity of the Macedonian people, the problem would have been solved a long time ago and it now would have been part of history. American interests, unfortunately, were quite different from Macedonia's.

14. The “Macedonian Question” which practically was the essence of the problem, or rather Greece's need of Macedonia and the Macedonian people to disappear from the face of this earth, at least in those early years, were not known to the majority of European politicians. The best confirmation of this was Lord Owen's visit to Skopje and Athens in January 1993. Owen was meeting with President Gligorov when he first heard the Macedonian story which left him incredibly optimistic. It was obvious that he had come to the wrong conclusion, assuming that the problem was with us and thought if this was the case then he should be able to solve the problem in Athens!

Included in Lord Owen's delegation was also renowned German Ambassador Geert Ahrens. While continuing on his way to Athens, Owen left Ahrens in Skopje. I knew Ahrens personally, we both served in China in the early 1970s. He told me that Owen left him in Macedonia so that he could liaise with Gligorov and, through him, finalize the details of the deal that Owen was going to hammer out with Greece!

Of course, nothing like that ever happened. A cold shower revived Owen in Athens. The plans for meeting in Skopje were cancelled after his return from Athens. Instead of having a formal meeting, we sort of ran into each other in the halls of the Petrovets Airport during which time nothing was mentioned about why Owen had come to this region. The meeting went about as if nothing had happened in the previous few days. Our conversations had no theme! We were all stupefied and lost in space without a compass. We can understand why he was like that but us too? He told us nothing about what happened in Athens.

His naivety was not in question; we chalked it up to ignorance!

IV – Are renaming Macedonia and addressing the “Albanian national question” two parallel processes separately coordinated by Washington? Or, are the name dispute, Kosovo and the 2001 war part of the same scenario?

1. To fully understand America’s role in the Macedonian dilemma, after the Yugoslav breakup, one would have to uncover all organic connections that exist between the so-called “name dispute” and the resolution of the “Albanian national question”. One would also have to understand American policy in the Balkans, events that took place in Kosovo in 1999 and the 2001 war in Macedonia.

2. We have already shown that Macedonia’s entry into the UN, by its official name, was denied and suspended from international use. We have also shown that all this was orchestrated by Washington. Careful analysis of the puzzle has revealed and confirmed that the denial of Macedonia’s name is closely connected and imbedded in American strategic interests in the Balkans. What we don’t know is who initiated this first, Athens or Washington, but it has become quite clear that the U.S. used it as a tool to implement its regional plans in the Balkans. We have also demonstrated that, when it came to Macedonia, the U.S. was willing and prepared to violate the UN Charter of Rights, ignore the International Court of Justice ruling in The Hague, not to mention international principles and procedures, to rob our country of its name and our people of their identity...

This is how America behaves not only in Macedonia and in the Balkans but worldwide. America always exercises its global policy in its best national interests. Macedonia is only in its way because we don’t fit with its main goals. So, given America’s desires and super power status in the world, it is only natural to conclude that American desires supercede those of Greece. So, it is only natural that the U.S.A. is using Greece to achieve its own aims; destroy Macedonia and the Macedonian people! But why? For self-interest, of course!

3. It is crucial for Macedonians to understand that what the Americans are seeking from Macedonia is not an isolated and

arbitrary solution but a solution that will benefit and would be in line with American interests in the region. Our name is a means for America to achieve its goals in the Balkans. The main role for American strategy is played by the Albanians. Greece and Bulgaria are just additional tools that are needed to achieve its goals. Serbia no longer has a strong role because it has already been sacrificed for other American plans.

4. Along with the name problem, and in correlation with it, runs the process for solving the “Albanian national question”. There can be no doubt that the manager of this process is none other than Washington. There can be no mistake that the U.S. used military force in order to create Kosovo; a second Albanian state. This goes to show that American interests are directly aligned with Albanian interests and the U.S.A. will do anything in its power to protect those interests even if it has to erase Macedonia and its people from the world map. So, the Americans have latched onto existing disputes, such as the one with Greece about the name, and have taken them to new heights. The name is not a problem but the Macedonian identity is. Solving the so-called “Albanian national question” heavily depends on removing the Macedonian identity, which Washington has no qualms about doing. U.S. Balkan policy heavily depends upon strengthening the Albanian position in the region. This is an important American project in the long-term which unfortunately has negative consequences for Macedonia and the Macedonian people. Not just for the Macedonian state and the Macedonian nation but also for the entire region. The first victim of this policy was Serbia. Now the U.S. is focused on Macedonia. Soon it will be focused on Greece. Greece has yet to recognize this problem because it is blinded by anti-Macedonian hysteria and historical emotions. Perhaps Athens will recognize the danger when it’s too late. Serves it right!

4.1. I had an interesting personal experience with the “Albanian national question”. During my tour in Tirana, sometime in June 1998, I received information that the Albanian Academy of Sciences, at the request of the country’s President, Redzhep Meidani, wanted a platform to address the “Albanian national question”. I found out that a document was being prepared for the

ambassadors of France, Germany, Italy... and, of course, the U.S.A. It became clear to me that this document was not in the interest of peace and stability in the region however, since no one had any objections to it, it was published in October of the same year. There was no doubt in anyone's mind that this document advocated a greater Albanian state.

4.2. When he was asked what the American position on this document was, newly appointed American Ambassador Limpreht first ignored its significance. When we insisted that this document promoted a Greater Albania, which included territories belonging to three or four of Albania's neighbours, Limpreht thought for a moment and said he would read it again. His final judgment was that there was nothing contentious in it and that it did not call for use of force to achieve Albanian national objectives. Even then it seemed that the Americans had no problem with Albanian nationalism and extremism. But later, it seems, they saw this as something that would serve American interests in the Balkans! They were already deeply involved in secret American-Albanian military preparations and the document was just another tool in their overall strategy.

I was assured that the document contained nothing that called for using force and that it categorically rejected any use of force in resolving the Albanian national question. But before Limpreht could give such assurances, the document had to be modified and watered down to make it more benign and palatable. There were no new objections after that.

This episode clearly revealed the real U.S. policy towards Albania and the Albanians and Washington's understanding of Albanian objectives and national aspirations. This policy became public in 1999 when the situation in Kosovo exploded. During the period when these conversations were taking place, American forces were secretly engaged in the recruitment of KLA operatives and the preparation of secret camps in Albania. Naturally, the use of force followed not only with extensive U.S. support but also with sophisticated American weapons. So, it soon became clear why the U.S.A and Ambassador Limpreht stood behind the Albanian document calling for a resolution to

the Albanian National Question... This did not happen by accident, clearly it happened with American blessings. Events that followed absolutely confirmed that!

5. Washington never had any great trust in the Slavs in the Balkans or in the Greeks. The dissolution of Yugoslavia and the wars that followed turned the Albanians into a major U.S. partner. Credit for this, of course, must be given to Milosevich and his extreme policies, which took the region hostage for almost a decade. During and after Yugoslavia's breakup, America's main opponent was Milosevich. Albanians, on the other hand, were traditional enemies of the Serbs and were directly confronted by Milosevich. Thus, the way was now clear for a new partnership to open between the Albanians and the Americans. At the same time, the Albanians were willing to die for the realization of their dream, a greater Albania, for which the Americans were more than willing to oblige them. So, with interests aligned a great partnership was in the making.

6. The U.S.A. in the Balkans was playing the Albanian people's card and not particularly Albania's as a country. But, even avoiding support for Albania, by supporting the Albanian people, Washington gave its direct support to Tirana which constantly advocated on behalf of all Albanian people, wherever they lived even though Tirana had no mandate, much less the right to represent Albanians outside of Albania. Albanians lived in Kosovo, Montenegro, Macedonia, southern Serbia, Greece, etc... even in the United States. The same was also practiced by other Albanians, including those living in Macedonia. Even the Albanian Ambassador to Skopje often used unacceptable vocabulary, completely dismissed by our Macedonian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

6.1. During Albania's 100th anniversary celebration a six metre Albanian flag was hoisted in the village Greshnitsa, in Kichevo Region inside Macedonia, with Ahmeti's blessings. Source: "Nova Makedonija", November 20, 2012. The flag raising was illegal but its purpose was to show that the Albanian celebration was possible in all so-called Albanian territories. This part of sovereign Macedonia was considered Albanian territory by the

Albanians. According to Ahmeti: “The Albanians will not allow any daring black hand to reach for it and take it down...”

The Albanian Ambassador to Macedonia in Skopje said: “The dimensions of this unusual flag in the ‘Albanian territories’ today is an expression of respect...” If the Macedonian government could do nothing about Ahmeti, it should have at least expelled the Albanian Ambassador for making such a disrespectful comment. This, unfortunately, was not done...

6.2. Because no one in Macedonia reacted to this incident, the famous Jason Miko took it upon himself to react (“flaw in the Framework Agreement”, “Dnevnik”, November 29, 2012). He quoted a statement made by Bujar Osmani in which he said: “As a sign of mutual respect, all Macedonian citizens should share the Albanian joy and should not raise the question whether it is legal to fly the Albanian flag, because the Albanians will interpret it as a provocation?!? Ascertain that: “You Bujar, obviously do not understand the concept of the rule of law!”

The highly respected Jason Miko was absolutely right, but not everything was clear to Bujar. The statement is an expression of DUI’s hypocritical policies and severe provocations which are taking Macedonia for granted and treating it like it is worthless.

And no one is doing anything about it! Bujar is and, therefore, is in the right!

6.3. It is common practice for Tirana and for Albanians everywhere to use the term “Albanian lands” when referring to regions outside of Albania. This is nothing more than open and classic irredentism.

7. As was already mentioned, events in Kosovo, which culminated in 1999, were secretly prepared by the U.S. and the UK. Their military instructors, private military companies, like the MPRI, had already been training KLA military operatives in secret camps in Albania. The U.S. and the UK were instrumental in providing the NLA with arms and ammunition though, not to be underestimated, the arsenal that was robbed from Albanian

military depots during the chaos that took place in Albania in 1996/7. These activities were carried out to fulfill the prerequisites of two primary American goals: a) the destruction of Milosevich and b) the unification of all Albanians.

8. Following a successful military operation in Kosovo in 1999, a brief war took place in Macedonia. There is little doubt that the war in Macedonia was deliberate, planned and started in Kosovo, which at the time was a U.S. protectorate, although formally, under UN auspices. The NLA was created and prepared by the same forces that created the Kosovo UCK. After achieving positive results in Kosovo, it was only logical that the next Albanian target would be Macedonia (and the three municipalities in southern Serbia, which we will not discuss here). The original intent was to destabilize Macedonia and “liberate” the parts of it that the Albanians considered “Albanian territories”. This would have been the shortest path for achieving a “Greater Albania”. But when that plan failed, the Albanians and their supporters resorted to plan “B”. In the centre of plan “B” was the Ohrid Agreement, which was to achieve the same goal; to recompose Macedonia contrary to all world experiences and practices where a minority would be elevated to majority status and Macedonia would become a pluralistic society and divided more than ever before. Means were created where the majority could be manipulated, paving the way for the state’s gradual destruction. Ethnicities were institutionalized and with that, in place of overcoming the divisions, they became categories in the constitution. The consensus that was achieved was always only a temporary solution, the next step would be the final solution.

9. The independence of Kosovo was the decisive step towards the creation of a so-called “Greater Albania”. After separating Kosovo from Serbia, the question was no longer if, but when this project would be completed? By liberating Kosovo and creating a second Albanian state, 70% of the total project was already completed. The next step was to tackle the “liberation of Albanian lands” from Macedonia. The three municipalities in southern Serbia and the four in Montenegro were of less importance. And, for now, liberating Chamiria from Greece was not the plan.

10. The concept of a “Greater Albania” is not “imaginary” as some want to assert. The dream of all Albanians living together in a single state is not a pipe dream. It is enshrined in the preamble of the Albanian Constitution and it is in its advanced stages of implementation. Pandeli Maiko, Former Albanian Prime Minister, in a TV interview in Tirana, at the beginning of the new millennium, clearly stated that: “The process has been initiated and is now irreversible”. Many Albanians in Albania share this opinion, including political, scientific and intellectual elites. In the period from 1998 to 2002, over 100 top Albanian elites were asked the question of what a “Greater Albania” means to them. Only Gramos Pashko, Vice President in the first Berisha government, after the democratization of Albania, now deceased, said that it was a meaningless pipe dream. None of the others rejected the concept as impractical. The explanations given, in general, were very brilliant, sound and precise but the term itself was ignored. Nobody had a clear idea of what it really meant but no one was also distanced from it.

11. During the celebration of Albania’s 100th anniversary, at the end of 2012, Albanian Prime Minister Berisha used the occasion, while speaking in Verona, to remind everyone that (Greater) Albania’s borders extended from Preveza to Greece, to Preshevo in Serbia, and from Skopje to Podgoritsa in Montenegro (“Nova Makedonija”, 28.11.2012). Even though his statements challenged the territorial integrity of four sovereign states, no one reacted.

11.1. Lately there have been a number of nationalistic provocations originating in Tirana. They are no doubt the result of Albanians achieving a number of successes in the region and now they feel the need to put their demands forward. A culmination was recently reached when an illegal Albanian monument was removed from the centre in Preshevo. To this Berisha responded with the words: “This shows that Serbia is a racist country” and that “one day ethnic Albanians will unite in one country in the Balkans”, and that “this act proved once again that there is only one way that the Albanian people can enjoy their freedom, which they have acquired with their blood and that

is by the unification of the Albanian people!” (“Dnevnik” 21.01.2013).

12. The “Greater Albania” project was masterfully run right from the start. Activities on the project intensified sometime in the 1960’s, in Kosovo, and culminated (but not finished) with Kosovo’s independence. Everything done to this day (2013) was done without any technical, tactical, or strategic errors. The project progressed at a slow pace, millimetre by millimetre, and eventually reached its main goal; independence. Tirana played a role in all this, there should be no doubt about it. However, although the Albanian state was established in 1912, it lacked the statesmanship and long experience necessary to do this. The Albanians in Tirana definitely lacked the capability to manage such a process and so did the Albanians in Kosovo. So the question is, who and from where were the strings pulled? The answer is yet to be determined. For now we can only say that, with little doubt, in the period during the Yugoslav disintegration, this process was managed by the USA.

12.1. The Albanians, all these years, did not work on these plans alone. This is confirmed by a small but concrete example. There is no question that the famous American analyst and activist Janos Bugaiski is a major Albanian lobbyist. Sometime in the early 2000’s, he participated in a regional conference in Tirana. Manifestations in his vocabulary, although disguised, advocated for a greater Albanian outcome in the region. Now all we need to do is find out who financed Bugaiski? For this particular conference it was confirmed that the American Embassy in Tirana covered his expenses! Were the Americans willing to pay for someone with whose views they did not agree? Obviously not!

13. Milosevich, in his tribulations, not only crippled Serbia but also turned the Balkans into a victim of violent American policies, including the policy to violently solve the “Albanian national question”. In its attempts to impose its own interests in the Balkans, the United States has blocked all positive regional processes. Up to date the collateral damage has been Serbia and Macedonia and indirectly Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the future,

without a doubt, U.S. policies will also prove extremely harmful to Greek interests.

13.1. In regards to Macedonia, this American policy began by blocking Macedonia's recognition in the early 1990's and reached its peak during the Kosovo crisis and the 2001 war in Macedonia. Had the crisis in Kosovo not taken place, the 2001 war in Macedonia would have been unthinkable. In fact, the war in Macedonia was a continuation of the Kosovo war, with the sole aim to finalize the "Greater Albania" project.

14. The "Greater Albania" project is not only alive and well but is reaching fruition. Kosovo, no matter how we look at it, is undoubtedly a new Albanian state which encompasses about 70% of the total "Greater Albania" project. But in order to complete the entire project, Albanian nationalists need to liberate Macedonian territories. But in order to do that they need Macedonia and the Macedonian people out of the way. Removing Macedonia and the Macedonian people from the picture would definitely solve "the Albanian national question" and pave the way for the unification of (almost) all Albanians.

14.1. Up until now, after trying everything, for purely tactical reasons, the Albanians in Macedonia have not been involved in resolving the so called "the name dispute" between Macedonia and Greece. They were waiting for others to build up the case. Now, however, Ali Ahmeti has launched an international offensive and is expecting results in the near future, similar to what Bulgaria did in December 2012. This means that pressure from these sources will mount and grow. Ahmeti will push Macedonia to join NATO and the EU as quickly as possible. In turn the U.S. will pressure Macedonia to change its name. With his political pamphlet "It's time to join NATO" ("Dnevnik", April 13, 2013), DUI, led by Ali Ahmeti, made this announcement right after the local elections, after Kichevo was albanized. He did this, no doubt, in coordination with Washington where the regional scenario had been planned. There is a strong impression that the published text, which looked like a political manifesto, was probably not even formulated by Ahmeti's party.

14.2. Our assumptions above have been confirmed by DUI spokesman Bujar Osmani, in an interview given for “Utrinski Vesnik” dated July 14, 2013 in which he said: “In June, after returning from the U.S.A., Ahmeti, two months ago, announced that a public debate must be opened in Macedonia and in the region regarding the problem with the name. And that is exactly what he did. That it was done in Sofia, where he was visiting, is purely a coincidence”! Any doubt that this was coordinated between DUI and the U.S., from where Ahmeti returned with clear instructions, is removed by the fact that Philip Reeker arrived in Skopje in the middle of June and openly sought public dialogue around the “name dispute”!?! (“Dialog za sporot za imeto”, “Nova Makedonija”, 20/21.06.2013). He also called for negotiations between Belgrade and Prishtina (Dachich and Tachi) and asked that we follow their example. This naturally caused a storm of protests and objections from the top Macedonian journalists, experts, columnists... This was the first time Reeker was treated negatively by the media.

During the same interview, Osman repeated exactly what Reeker had said: “We are looking to start a dialogue, to open public discussions on Nimitz’s proposal and its details. Then the two sides must sit down and begin direct dialogue under the auspices of the international community, just like the Kosovo-Serbia talks”! It only makes sense in the face of this complete failure on the issue that the Americans would ask us the impossible and, most foolishly, to only further push ourselves against the wall. But what do the Albanians want from this? Was it not clear to them that Nimitz’s latest proposal was immediately rejected by Athens? Should we, therefore, still publicly debate it...? What would be the purpose? Greece already rejected the proposal! In every case, however, Washington’s goal is not for us to come up with a solution but to ruin our position and push us closer to the abyss... To prepare us for capitulation. There is no third option.

15. While we are on this subject, it will be interesting to get some insight into what Stoian Andov had said in his columns in the weekly magazine “Focus”, published on March 15 and March 22, 2013. From a historical perspective, Andov has reminded us that

while Fascism was penetrating the Balkans at the beginning of World War II, to win over the Albanians, Mussolini also played the “Greater Albania” card. In August 1942, Italy announced the formation of a “Greater Albania”, which included Kosovo, parts of Montenegro and parts of western Macedonia. This, as well as Eastern Macedonia’s occupation by the Bulgarians, was a fascist creation. Pavelich’s Independent Croatia also fell into this category. Interestingly, then, as it is now, the Greek part of “Albanian lands”, primarily Chamiria, was left out even though it was under Italian occupation.

Andov has highlighted this parallel because at the top of it is the U.S. which, like fascist Italy of the 1940’s, is attempting to realize its own plans in the Balkans. Andov, of course, did not elaborate on this, but the similarities are crystal clear: The Americans are trying to “purchase” Albanian cooperation by offering them what they want the most, to realize their hundred year old dream. What else can they be but happy because, thanks to the Americans, they now have an independent Kosovo, with which the main part of their project is complete. What remains now is the part in Macedonia.

15.1. Andov has also highlighted the fact that Austro-Hungary too had used the “Greater Albania” card to protect its interests from Russia in 1876 when the two empires came into contact in the middle of Macedonia, along the Vardar valley. In that agreement, confirmed in 1897, “Macedonia and the Macedonian people were deliberately not mentioned because both empires saw them as a major obstacle to achieving their imperial interests in the Balkans,” concludes Andov. The same scenario, it appears, is being repeated in the 21st century with Macedonia still being the “main obstacle”, this time for the realization of American interests in the region, again through a “Greater Albania” and by using the so-called “name dispute” to remove the Macedonian people from the picture.

15.2. It is true what Andov said; that today there is no Austro-Hungary, there is no Kaiser’s Germany, there is no Nazi Germany, or Mussolini’s Fascist Italy and that all their ideas about a “Greater Albania” have proved devastating for the

Albanian people. But it seems that the Albanian leadership has forgotten all that or it does not want to remember it. It also does not want to see that the same thing is being done to the Albanians today by the Americans, whose only motives are to gain a foothold in this region. So far the Albanians, however, with the Americans behind them have been very successful. To separate Kosovo from Serbia was not a small thing, regardless of Milosevich's historical errors. Kosovo was by far the biggest bite around the "Greater Albanian" project. Now, everything else is a matter of time.

15.3. For reasons only known to Andov, he concluded that the "Greater Albania" project in the past was "devastating for the Albanians people". Without showing any fact or argument, he claimed that: "A large number of Albanian people know that changes in the Balkans as well as the "Greater Albania" project, in the past, have brought the Albanian people and the other people living amongst them, much suffering and tragedy. This thesis, however, has nothing to do with reality. Only the last part of it is true and that is that the Albanian people's neighbours have done all the suffering. Also let us say that the greater part of the Albanian dream has, this time, been achieved with Kosovo's independence, achieved by use of force by a world superpower no less. And on top of all this, very few people know what is really happening in this region. Or do you still think is it something else? But when we also add developments in and around Macedonia, including the 2001 war, then we discover that Macedonia too is being slowly and unscrupulously albanized! Is everything now crystal clear? If not, let us mention the fact that the "Platform to resolving the Albanian national question" is also in progress at this point in time. If that is hard to believe then let us remind you that in 1988, the Albanian Academy of Sciences, a government institution, produced a document which elaborated on the concept of a "Greater Albania" and no one, and we mean no one, of the "main" players condemned it. Which goes to show that this concept was secretly supported by the biggest players of them all, the United States of America!

Andov himself will have to explain how he arrived at his conclusion, which we believe is completely wrong with regards to what is happening today.

15.4. Andov's assessment ignores the messages sent to us by Meiti Dehari, Musa Xhaferi, Thaci, Fatmir Besimi, Ali Ahmeti... where Albanian hymns are sung in Macedonian schools, Albanian flags are waved inside Macedonia, etc., only as symbols of election campaigns relating to local elections (March / April 2013) and nothing more. These are the doings of local politicians trying to score points with the Albanian population, that's all. But they are not. Albanian flags flying alone on 30-metre masts, forceful change of schools and street names, such as those in Slupchane, are not just temporary and symbolic gestures, they are public statements of Albanian desires and of what is to come to this country in the future... All these are manifestations of an irreversible "Greater Albania" happening inside Macedonia, of which people like Andov are in denial and do not want to acknowledge, so they ignore and tolerate them.

15.5. Let us remind Andov and all those like him, of what Mexhiti said in the Diaspora before the local elections. "On March 24, during the elections", he said, "we want national unification, we want an ethnic Albania! We don't need a war or a crises, we need quiet, peace and democratic legitimately, with a pen in hand circling the number around the name of our commander Fatmir Dehari and to make Kichevo part of ethnic Albania. It depends on you and us whether Kichevo will be part or remain outside of the ethnic Albanian map...!" ("Republika", 15.03.2013). According to the same source, Fatmir Dehari, then candidate for mayor, now mayor, said: "I am telling you that the unification of Kichevo will be the unification of Albanians. The merger of Kichevo is not just a dream of the people of Kichevo but of all Albanians. We want one Albanian administration from Tirana with Mayor Basha extending to other Albanian communities, stretching over to Struga in Macedonia where another Albanian mayor will wait for us going to Kichevo where, there too, you are to be welcomed by another Albanian mayor and from there to Gostivar and Tetovo, reaching the capital of Izzet Mexhiti, City of Skender Bey, Hasan Prishtina and others,

continuing to Kumanovo. All these are Albanian administrations, exactly what we all desire; all this is part of Albania, our dream!”

Is there anything more to be said? We must be blind and deaf not to see and hear what is going on in our own country! Is everything not crystal clear? There is nothing clearer than the definition of this policy! Is this part of the “Great Albania” dream or not? Andov and everyone like you, please wake up and watch your country slowly slide into oblivion!.

15.6. Let us also mention that in the fall of 2012, during the opening of the new school year, the Albanian national anthem was played on at least three separate occasions, not to mention at the University of Tetovo! (“Obvinetelot se zakanuva, himnata si echi”, “Dnevnik”, September 21, 2012). The festivities were attended by top Albanian leaders from the Macedonian parties including Ahmeti from DUI. What else do we need to say in order for you understand what’s going on in Macedonia?

About the Albanian national anthem being played at the opening of the new high school in Lipkovo, Prosecutor Svrgovski, according to the same source, said: “It is a benign form of offense because the school was built with foreign donations!” This statement was verified to be true! So there you go. We are not only deaf and blind, we are stupid as well!!!

The prosecutor should have at least explained why only the Albanian national anthem was played when the funds were in fact donated by the EU’s IPA-funds and by a Bulgarian municipality? It would have made more sense to have played the EU or the Bulgarian, or both anthems. How was this connected to the Albanian anthem? Or did the prosecutor not want to rock the Albanian boat?

The various articles published in the press, about the enrollment of new students at the Tetovo State University, gave the impression that the university taught in the Albanian language. It was Albanian, English and finally Macedonian. It was printed the same way in the diplomas, memos, letters, etc... in all the university’s documents.

15.7. The ecstasy experienced by the Albanians celebrating Albania's 100th anniversary engulfed even Suleiman Rexhepi, head of the Islamic Religious Community. He said: "The unification of Albanian lands is God's will and therefore we have an obligation to go back to the way it was before... and Albania will have a unique border created by God. The Islamic Religious Community, with all its facilities, is ready to contribute to the national cause and respond to every call towards the unification of all Albanians!" ("Rexhepi: It is inconceivable for Albanians to live in five countries", "Nova Makedonija", November 28, 2012).

15.8. In late April 2013, DUI announced that Ahmeti, its leader along with a delegation that was to include Medzhiti and Dehari, was going on an official visit to the United States in May at the invitation of our proven "friend" Philip Reeker. Like the announcement said, the purpose of the visit, among other things, was to thank the Albanians for their large numbers that turned out to vote in local elections; an election which achieved their goals. Even though the voting process was illegal.

Need we say any more? Except to add that Mexhiti is DUI's Vice President and DUI is the largest Albanian party in Macedonia, which is also part of the ruling coalition in Macedonia's government. Is there anyone who does not understand what's going on here?

15.9. Let us also not forget the Albanian party in opposition. According to "Republika", December 7, 2012, DPA leader Thachi, on many occasions, declared: "In Chair we will not allow the song 'Makedonsko Devoiche' to be sung and the Albanian flag will never be smaller than the Macedonian", "... the Republic of Macedonia has no future, but to be a bi-national state, with two constituent peoples - Macedonian and Albanian", "There will be a Macedonia but there will be no Macedonian people, if Macedonia wants to survive it needs to be a state of the Macedonian and Albanian people", "You will accept the demands of the new agreement (with the Albanians in place of the Ohrid Agreement) and you will be asking if there is more!" (As reported by Robert Popovski's TV show)...

16. We can say with certainty that this is the unilateral policy of all Albanian politicians in Macedonia today. Until recently, if this was what members of DUI were thinking, which we believe it was, they did not articulate it publicly. Now they have entered a new phase. In fact, they no longer hide anything. This change took place after Kosovo became independent and after the 2001 war in Macedonia. If Kosovo had not become independent, the war in Macedonia would not have taken place and there would have been no demographic evolution in Macedonia. The old Albanian policy had been to have five or more children in order to achieve the “Greater Albania” dream. This process was well on its way and had received a lot of help from the Albanian Religious Order which would not allow young believers to its mosques until they had at least five births. This is how they were aiming to “invade Macedonia” and achieve their “Greater Albania” dream... Today, however, they have a new strategy called – albanization of parts of Macedonia... by American treachery...

There should be no doubt in anyone’s mind that all this is done with Washington’s blessing; the true manager of this new Albanian process. There should also be no doubt that this process was most likely initiated by Washington a long time ago. Part of U.S. long term plans...

16.1. With the changes in Kosovo in 1999 and in Macedonia in 2001, the geopolitics of the Balkans entered a new, previously unimaginable dimension. This was only possible thanks to the U.S.A bombing Serbia and Belgrade and to the American-Albanian aggression against Macedonia, which has remained an unfinished story because its 2001 expected disintegration failed to materialize. Now everything is done from the inside to gradually albanize Macedonia.

17. Not to leave things unsaid, it is important at this point to mention the so-called “conflict” that took place between Tirana and Washington, which occurred at the beginning of 2013. In one of his statements, Berisha made a claim that Albanian territories extended from “Preveza to Preshevo...” This statement

apparently caused some dissatisfaction in Washington, which replied with the statement of its own that said “there will be no new border changes in the region”. There are reports that claim that Washington presented Tirana with a memorandum (probably a verbal note) which criticized extreme Albanian nationalism exercised in the region. Some rejoiced at the prospect thinking this may be the end to the “Great Albania” project, but I believe it was only wishful thinking on their part. Tirana got its nose bent out of joint because it ran ahead of itself. It unwittingly revealed its true future intentions. By doing so Berisha jeopardized the negotiations between Belgrade and Pristina, between Dachich and Thachi, which were an absolute priority for the Americans at the moment. The U.S. wanted to open up prospects for Kosovo with the agreement between Belgrade and Pristina, but it failed. The Albanian nationalist rhetoric got in the way, which may have adversely affected the negotiations. In other words the sharp American criticisms were not about “challenging” the “Great Albania” project but helping it along, which for the most part, has already been achieved.

Tirana got one on the nose because it got way ahead of itself. Berisha spoke outside the script, which was only intended for home use right before the election and, by doing so, put a knot in American interests in the region.

But statements made by Medzhiti and Dehari about albanizing parts of Macedonia did not bother our “partners” in Washington. Why should Washington be concerned when American plans for revising borders are peacefully done inside Macedonia in parallel with Macedonia’s destruction, also from the inside?

V – Year 2001 – key stone in the mosaic of American policy towards Macedonia - The Kosovo and Macedonia “humanitarian” wars!

1. Macedonia did everything it could to avoid the wars that followed the breakup of Yugoslavia. It allowed the Yugoslav National Army (JNA), consisting mostly of Serbian soldiers, to take away huge caches of arms, technical equipment, transport equipment and other facilities... common property worth billions of dollars, just to avoid confrontation. And in place of being rewarded for its peaceful and civilized behaviour, Macedonia became a victim of someone else's interests. Worse than that was the short, 2001 staged war which had devastating consequences for Macedonia.

2. A large part of the hardships, sacrifices and unimaginable conditions created in the 10 years after Macedonia's independence was the 2001 war. Macedonia was thrown back another 10 years. Of course this was by no accident. Terrorists, trained and armed in Kosovo, attacked Macedonia and inflicted immeasurable damage. All this was directed by the U.S., with aims of realizing its own interests in the Balkans.

3. Macedonia's army and police suffered unprecedented indignity in this war. A handful of terrorists, as they were initially referred to by NATO Secretary-General Robertson, put the Macedonian forces and political structure of the country into shame... starting with the country's President and Supreme Commander of the army, the government, General Headquarters and the Ministry of Internal Affairs... A small gang of mercenaries held the entire country hostage from the Tetovo fortress. Our huge investments in security forces up to that time proved to be fruitless. We realized that we had no security system and had to improvise on everything. In these dramatic and critical moments, the situation looked more like a deliberate sabotage than an organized defense against the aggressor.

At the time we had no idea that behind the terrorists stood the U.S. Then, as today, very few people were even aware of what was happening behind the scenes. Even today, most people don't

want to think about 2001. They either don't want to know or are not willing to face the truth.

4. Insult on top of injury, an unprecedented disgrace for the Macedonian state was the drafting and signing of the Ohrid Agreement; its content in particular. From our side it was negotiated by extremely inexperienced but particularly ambitious personalities. In contrast, the Albanians employed foreign experts.

A. U.S. and the 2001 War – The Albanians in Macedonia were outside of the project

5. The 2001 war was a key segment and the best benchmark of U.S. policy towards Macedonia. It was the key stone in the mosaic of American politics. Unfortunately the war inflicted historic damage to Macedonia. Macedonians were forced to make strategic and irreversible concessions. This created an open question that led to the belief that this perhaps was nothing more than a perpetrated act and a design on the fate of our country? And yes it was! We must acknowledge today that what was done then was done to fulfill American plans in the region through the "Greater Albania" project. The war that took place in 2001 was primarily a war to "liberate Albanian territories". This goal was to be achieved through the destabilization and breakup of Macedonia. This plan, however, did not work out the way it was expected. The plan failed despite the unprecedented weaknesses demonstrated by the Macedonian side.

6. It is interesting to note that, at the beginning of 2001, the Albanians in Macedonia were left out of the plan and were completely caught by surprise in the events that led to the 2001 war. In the end, the leaders of the DPA and PDP parties had to sign the Framework Agreement, even though at first they had no idea what was going on. This is proof that a) the war was not about the rights of Albanians in the country, and b) the war was not organized by the Albanians but by the Americans. Who else could have had the ability to exclude Xhaferi, Thachi and other

Albanian leaders in Macedonia from this fateful historic Albanian event, directly connected with their future?

6.1. Without any doubt it can be concluded that if Albanians, even those from Kosovo, were the real instigators and leaders of the 2001 war, and not someone else, then the war would have been conducted on a Pan-Albanian basis. In other words, it would have been done in coordination with all Albanian leaders in the region, including those in Macedonia? This would have been an all-Albanian project, as was, for example, the case in Kosovo and the KLA, when secret camps were created in Albania and fighters were recruited from everywhere, even from the U.S. If the aggression against Macedonia was done exclusively by Albanians, then why include some Albanians and exclude others? Both Tirana and Skopje (Tetovo) would have had the same role as Prishtina. Meaning, to attack Macedonia would have been “an all Albanian plan”. However, all Albanians were not included in this plan which means it was someone else’s plan.

7. There is no doubt that the entire operation in Macedonia was coordinated from Kosovo. The entire planning, training and other preparations, overall logistics, etc. were carried out from Kosovo. A strong confirmation of this is the fact that in the first three months all military operations in Macedonia were driven from Kosovo. Every day operatives were crossing the border back and forth. This shows that everything was organized and coordinated in Kosovo, including transportation.

7.1. Let us not forget that everything originated in Kosovo, the NATO protectorate, which fell under NATO command, led by American generals who had tens of thousands of troops, some foreign but mostly American. We should also emphasize that Kosovo, in all its segments, was deeply infiltrated by CIA operatives as well as other relevant U.S. intelligence services which had an eye on everything that was going on inside Kosovo. So, the question that needs to be asked is; how could these Albanians organize, train, raise arms, cross borders on a daily basis and carry out military operations in neighbouring Macedonia undetected and without the knowledge of the U.S.? Is it possible that the NLA leadership alone, from Prizren, Kosovo,

led a war inside Macedonia with NATO and the United States unaware? It is unthinkable!!!

7.2. Things came out with the first five NLA releases, which informed the world that the Albanians were fighting for the “liberation of the territories”. Journalist David Binder in “Newsweek”, dated March 22, 2001, quoted Ahmeti as saying: “Our sole purpose is to remove the Slav forces from the territory which is historically Albanian” (article by Jason Miko – “Vrakianie na kolesek”, “Dnevnik”, March 7, 2013).

In the same column there was a quote from an article written by Patrick Bishop for the “Telegraph” published March 12, 2001 entitled “Macedonia began with an attack” in which Patrick wrote: “Albanian rebels in Macedonia want division along ethnic lines and say they are ready to plunge the Balkans into another conflict unless their demands are met.” There was also an article by Peter Beaumont and Nick Wood (“Observer”, March 11, 2001) which quoted a statement made by Shkelzen Maliki, a prominent journalist in Prishtina, in which Maliki said: “I am familiar with the ideology, mentality and motivation of the forces that caused the armed conflict in Macedonia. I met with them, especially with immigrants from Europe. They tried to convince me that Macedonia is an artificial creation, formed to harm the Albanian nation. They argue that the forced separation of the Albanian nation is a historical injustice. This injustice should be corrected, they say, by dividing the Macedonian Slav from the Albanian part. The Albanian part should be allowed to unite with Kosovo or, better yet, to become part of a united Albanian state.”

7.2.1. Given the circumstances, there truly was no place in this war for Xhaferi, Thachi and Imeri of the DPA and PDP (Albanian parties in Macedonia). No matter how extreme they may have been, in their own way in terms of the “Albanian national question” they tried to solve their problems through the institutions, to which they belonged. The fact that they were not very successful in this area was because the state leadership made some serious miscalculations. It quickly became evident that after the Yugoslav breakup, Macedonian authorities did not pay enough attention to the Albanian minority in its society which

was in need of urgent measures to overcome its problems. Its neglect gave the 2001 war some legitimacy, although that was not the reason for it. The basis of the 2001 war was a “Greater Albania” and to serve U.S. interests in the region.

7.2.2 Turning the “war of liberation” into a “humanitarian war” for the rights of the Albanian people in Macedonia was a total farce. This war, right from the start, was led by the National Liberation Army (NLA)! If the original mandate was to “fight for rights” then why did they need a “National Liberation Army”? The war was not started to fight for rights, it was started to fight for something else. The name said it all: their intent was to “liberate” territories, not gain rights! Menduh Thachi was absolutely right when he argued that: “One cannot gain human rights through a war, one can only gain territories...” (KOD TV show, aired on Channel 5 on June 26, 2011)! Robertson’s terrorists, guided by their mentor no doubt, quickly changed the aim of their war from “liberation of territories” to “fighting for human rights” but their intentions unfortunately remained the same!

7.3 We should not discount the idea that only Washington could have started a war in Macedonia without including the Albanians of Macedonia and could have changed the “character” of a war after it was started! The evidence is there and there is no doubt that the real intention of the war was to “liberate” Macedonian territories. Had the liberation succeeded there would have been no need for local Albanian participation and there would have been no problems coming to the fore. The local Albanians would have “enjoyed” the fruits of their “liberation” without a single casualty of their own. As the “neglected” people they would have been more than satisfied... but, unfortunately for them, the operation was not a success... Now they are stuck with a big problem...

7.4. The KLA was well-trained, had war experience in the Kosovo war and was accustomed to using state of the art American weaponry including rifles with night vision equipment. Sometime down the line, the KLA was regrouped. Part of the force was transferred to the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC) and

became the Kosovo army. The rest of the force was demobilized and dismissed. A lot of these former fighters had no jobs... especially the ones from Macedonia. These fighters became the initial recruits for the NLA which later was expanded to include Albanians from Macedonia. And thus a planned breakup of Macedonia was being arranged.

8. According to all indications it should have been an easy job. Macedonia was already falling apart and a war would have driven it deeper into the abyss. The chaos, they figured, would have driven deep political divisions between Macedonians and cause the country to collapse, thus making the “liberation” of territories not only possible but easy. Although their predictions were largely correct, that did not happen. This was totally unexpected by Washington... Macedonia did not collapse...

9. Confirmation of the deep U.S. involvement in the 2001 war in Macedonia is the fact that the U.S. had already “taken over” Macedonia’s military. At that time Macedonia’s military was in need of reform, so management of this process was handed over to a private American mercenary organization called Military Professional Resources Inc. (MPRI). This was an independent organization consisting mainly of U.S. military veterans who, more or less, followed Washington’s dictates. Private companies such as this received their licenses to operate from the State Department and the Pentagon, and then worked for money wherever they were sent. They basically ran proxy wars. They went everywhere the State Department directed them. Colonel David Hackworth from MPRI wrote: “...in the former Yugoslavia we operated under the shadow of the Pentagon and under the engagement of the State Department...” (See “Wanted: guns for hire...” at <http://hackworthe.com/09jul01.html>).

This is how MPRI came to Macedonia. In 1998 the Macedonian government signed a contract with MPRI, to reform the Army according to NATO standards. The American veterans came to Macedonia in 1999, with special plans and ambitious tasks. And, as we shall soon show you, they actually played the role of a Trojan horse. They entered the Macedonian Army General Headquarters through the front door and did everything in their

power to prepare the Macedonian military to fail in the 2001 war. In other words, they prepared Macedonia for capitulation...

9.1. In order to understand what happened we need to mention that MPRI, before coming to Macedonia, was in Kosovo. It was first engaged in creating and training the KLA force in secret camps in Albania. After that it became involved in the Kosovo war and, ultimately, in the Kosovo Protection Corps. In 2001 MPRI “harmoniously” coordinated “the liberation of Albanian territories” from Macedonia, from both Skopje and Prishtina. And how do we know that? Well, during the evacuation of several hundred terrorists from Arachinovo, conducted at the request of NATO (USA), we discovered that there were also 17 American “trainers” belonging to MPRI trapped among the terrorists!

9.2. Upon their arrival in Skopje, MPRI did everything in its power to weaken the Macedonian military and the Macedonian Ministry of Defense. Source material and details for what we are about to tell you, regarding MPRI’s involvement in the Macedonian military, comes directly from Macedonian General Pande Petrovski.

9.3. Before continuing any further, let us say that the MPRI team, while working in Skopje, was in constant contact with its MPRI colleagues in Kosovo. As we mentioned earlier MPRI created the NLA, i.e. the Albanian terrorist group that invaded and attacked Macedonia and led its operations in Macedonia. So, what we are telling you here is that the MPRI organized a war against Macedonia at the same time as it was conducting reforms in the Macedonian military. In other words, the MPRI was aware of everything that was happening inside the Macedonian military and that classified information, that it was entrusted with, was passed on to the NLA. The NLA knew everything about the Macedonian military; the movement of its unit, its schedules, positions it was occupying... down to the level of morale, political, security and military readiness. Similar information was sent to Kosovo to inform its colleagues there of the situation in Macedonia and its structures. This was invaluable information for the aggressors. With the MPRI in its ranks, the Macedonian

security forces were fighting a foe who knew every move they were going to make before they even made it! But, unfortunately for them, they underestimated the Macedonian military's capability in the battlefield. Their assumptions turned out to be unrealistic. The Macedonians were a lot tougher than they thought!

9.4. In any case, it wasn't long before the MPRI handlers in the Pentagon realized that their main goal was unattainable by aggression alone so they transformed their efforts into a "humanitarian" operation. In other words, they dressed the wolf in sheep's clothing!

10. This is more concrete proof that the Americans were also involved in the operations in Macedonia, not just the Albanians. If the Albanians had run the war on their own they would not have just given up so easily and so quickly. They would have done everything in their power to achieve their "Greater Albania" dream by detaching lands from Macedonia. They would have even risked a wider confrontation in the Balkans. But, it seems, those steering the war were not prepared to take such an excessive risk. They were top pragmatists who quickly adapted to the conditions and switched to plan "B". The objective of plan "B" was to accomplish the same thing but peacefully through a "Framework Agreement". They did not fulfill their initial task by force but the war paved the way for realizing the same thing... gradually... in the not too distant future...

11. Many hidden lies and intentions came to the fore when the "purpose" of the war was changed. How can they say it was a "humanitarian" war when it was started from the outside and it did not include the Albanians inside Macedonia? Was this a rebellion or a war? If it was a rebellion why was it fought by an organized army (NLA)? Who were its leaders inside Macedonia? Who invited the outsiders to come to Macedonia and fight for their human rights without them? What kind of rights were they interested in if they were not at all involved in what was happening? Thus by changing the aim of the terrorists, as Robertson called them, the project lost its foundation. Is this not enough evidence to show that someone else was behind the plan

called “NLA” and someone else stood behind the 2001 war in Macedonia and that the Albanians were never alone?

12. The Albanians in Macedonia were part of the political system. They were MP’s, ministers, directors of public companies ... and had no basis, no logic and no specific and sustainable need to take up arms and begin shooting at their colleagues with whom yesterday they had sat together in Parliament and in government... First, even with the emergence of the NLA in the hills, the Albanians in Macedonia had no justifiable reasons to pick up arms and fight against their fellow Macedonians. Second, there was no critical mass of discontent in Macedonia because, as unusual as this may sound, at that point in time inter-ethnic relations in Macedonia were on a level of mutual tolerance, even though there were many unresolved issues vital to the Albanians in Macedonia. And third, between Xhaferi and Thachi on one side and Ahmeti and Velti on the other, they had no chance of finding common ground to start a war. It was difficult if not impossible for them to have started the war in Macedonia. Until the U.S. (Frowick) imposed the war on them Xhaferi had no need to talk to Ahmeti.

The details of what happened in 2001 are not sufficiently known even today, let alone at that time. Something happened that started the war and still, to this day, no one has investigated and analyzed its causes. In 2001 we knew nothing, today at least we have some ideas.

13. The old folks were right when they said “the wolf may change its hair but will never change its nature”. So the Americans, our “partners”, as many Macedonians even today call them, may have changed the nature of the war but not their goals. They adapted new conditions to achieve the same old goals. Their task was reformulated: “If they couldn’t immediately ‘liberate’ those territories all they needed to do was set the conditions and be prepared to ‘liberate’ them later”. And this is the situation we are finding ourselves in today!

13.1. If not before, then certainly when the nature of the war was being changed, the Americans initiated the next phase of the

project which would eventually be called the “Ohrid Agreement”. By restructuring parts of Macedonia, they found sophisticated ways of opening up opportunities, which after a certain period of time could be completely albanized peacefully. Thus an albanization process was introduced inside Macedonia which, over time, would federalize the country and create conditions for a “legal” separation and alteration of boundaries.

Does anyone out there have and doubt that this is exactly what is happening inside Macedonia today, all these years after the 2001 war?

14. The sixth announcement made by the NLA was the transformation of the war from “a war of liberation” to “a humanitarian war”, thus creating the opportunity to legitimize aggression. When this announcement was made, i.e. when the Albanians in Macedonia said they were fighting for their rights, they immediately received open support from the United States and NATO. Experts like Peter Feith, and others of similar expertise, all intelligence operatives, were immediately sent to Macedonia to support the efforts of yesterday’s terrorists and today’s humanitarians. We can reliably argue that these so-called experts, until yesterday, had secretly worked very closely with yesterday’s terrorists. Now working in the open, under a new umbrella, they were doing everything possible to help the “humanitarians” reach their new target - the Ohrid Agreement. Everything had already been made public. Without any scruples the Americans were now using NATO and OSCE to do the same thing openly, which until yesterday they were doing covertly. Macedonia was blockaded and at war and these people were doing whatever they wanted, including allegedly disposing of hazardous waste materials from their helicopters into Macedonian lakes.

15. There is much evidence and from several different sources that point to U.S. involvement in the 2001 war in Macedonia. For example, basing his evidence on some secret documents leaked to the Netherlands, Christopher Deliso wrote that “...continuous telephone contact was maintained between the NLA and senior U.S. officials. Such conversations were recorded by European

Secret Service personnel. When the Americans found out they broke contact but immediately supplied the NLA with computers that had built-in telephone technology and their communication continued on.” Deliso is an American journalist who lives in Skopje and has written several books about Macedonia.

Another source is Dutch journalist and researcher Hub Jaspers. Jaspers did an interview with KFOR Commander General Klaus Reinhardt, a German officer who served in Kosovo. According to General Reinhardt, “Some of the UCK fighters left Kosovo to fight for the NLA in Macedonia.” (“Nova Makedonija”, December 10, 2012, “My story about UCK fighting for the NLA in Macedonia created fears in The Haig”). General Reinhardt also said that “...when KFOR jailed an UCK fighter for fighting for the KLA in Macedonia, the next day the Americans ordered his release. The orders always came from the highest ranking American officers in Europe!”

B. How terrorists became “humanitarians”?

16. If someone were to ask “if the Americans were truly behind the 2001 war in Macedonia, then how was it possible for NATO Secretary-General Robertson of Britain, in the beginning, to label the NLA “a terrorist organization”? Isn’t NATO under American control?

Yes, the contradiction is undeniable, but only at a first glance. In the beginning the Americans were conducting super covert operations in Kosovo (UCK) and in Macedonia (NLA) about which nobody was allowed to publicly speak, let alone support. The alliance was kept out of the loop and could not have been seen as standing behind the Albanians. There was a lot at stake in the beginning and the implementation of American classic “dirty politics” had to be hidden from everyone. Therefore, Robertson may not have known.

17. The next logical question to ask is “why the turn around?” Why did they not liberate the “Albanian lands” that they started out to liberate? Why did the NLA, in its sixth announcement, declared itself “humanitarian” and turn its military aggression to

a struggle for human rights? Was it possible that the American-Albanian partnership could have been militarily defeated in Macedonia?

The only possible explanation is that whatever they were trying to do proved unattainable! The same thing happened with the three South Serbian municipalities. Were the Americans cautious and did not want to escalate the war or did they not want to give the Albanians everything they asked for all at once? As it turned out ambitions were much greater than the possibilities of what they wanted to achieve but did not get achieved. Perhaps the failure in Macedonia was because MPRI failed to dismantle the Macedonian army? Or are the Macedonians as tough as history has proven them to be? The terrorists target was not reached despite Macedonia's non-readiness for war and despite all the spying that was done by the MPRI for the Albanian terrorists...

18. The U.S. took all necessary measures including supplying the 2001 war in Macedonia with trainers and advisory personnel. All these things were unmistakably planned by U.S. operatives, of which Robert Frowick was a part, sent to Macedonia with special status in the OSCE Mission to Skopje at the most critical time in our country's recent history. He was undoubtedly a CIA operative although he claimed to be a former American diplomat. If he was a diplomat he certainly was working for the Agency. Frowick was in Skopje before, in the early 1990s when he unscrupulously interfered in Macedonia's internal affairs, to the detriment of our long-term Macedonian interests. This time he was sent to Macedonia at exactly the time when the terrorists become "humanitarians". He came to Macedonia with instructions to a) create the right conditions so that the Ohrid Agreement can be imposed on the Macedonian people and gain their compliance and, b) to make sure the aggressors fit in the political system in our country. There was no better tool than the OSCE for the realization of this project.

18.1. Reconciling the Albanian leaders in Macedonia with the leaders of the terrorists in Kosovo was certainly one of the most difficult tasks for Frowick. While he was convincing DPA and PDP leaders of the Albanian political parties in Macedonia to

accept the NLA, Frowick in parallel was working in Prizren promoting and drafting the text for the future Ohrid Agreement. On May 22, 2001, Frowick basically dictated to Xhaferi (DPA), Imer Imeri (PDP) and Ali Ahmeti (NLA) the Prizren Declaration which was to include almost all the basic elements of the forthcoming Framework Agreement. Among other things, there were requirements in the Agreement for serious amendments to the Macedonian Constitution to create “equality between the Albanians and the Slavs in Macedonia” (the word “Slavs” was used and not Macedonians!), “performing military service in the municipalities of birth” (which practically called for federalization or division of our country!), “entry of NATO forces into the entire territory of Macedonia”, and so on.

Frowick did all that behind the backs of Macedonian authorities after he was expelled from Macedonia. Did he act on his own or did he follow someone else’s precise instructions? The readers can make up their own minds about that. All we can say with certainty is that a) his father or grandfather did not send him to Macedonia and b) the OSCE had no role in what he did. He used the OSCE to achieve his own aims.

The “Prizren Declaration” is proof that the text for the Ohrid Agreement was an American creation. There is no doubt that when Frowick was working on it he was being advised directly by Washington.

18.2. The Albanian parties in Macedonia, the DPA and PDP, had no choice but to accept the NLA because the United States stood behind it. If that were not so, they alone had no chance of drafting the “Prizren Declaration”. One can only imagine how Xhaferi and Thachi must have felt when the Declaration was rammed down their throats? They were pushed into a war in Macedonia without even being asked if they wanted to get involved and there was no way to back out of it either! Do you think that if the United States was not behind all this Xhaferi and Thachi could have been convinced to cooperate and at the same time be left on the sidelines? Do you think that Xhaferi and Thachi would have listened to some guy named Ali Ahmeti or his

uncle Fazli to get them to become involved, if not forced by the United States? We don't think so!

And if it was really an "Albanian war" why did they have to be "forced" into it?

18.3. Looking at this from another point of view, if the United States did not lead this dance and did not stand with all its authority behind Ahmeti and his uncle, could Xhaferi and Thachi, on one side, and Ahmeti and Fazliu, on the other, have started the armed confrontation in Macedonia? We don't think so! The probability of starting a confrontation between the two Albanian groups would have been higher than one starting against the Macedonians. There was a great divide between these two Albanian political groups. Most likely, while Ahmeti and Fazliu would have fought against the Macedonians, Xhaferi and Thachi would have fought for the Macedonians and would have used peaceful means to achieve their objectives. The real danger was American diplomacy, which had different aims for Macedonia. Knowing on which side of the issue Xhaferi and Thachi stood, the Americans left them out of the loop while the war was going on.

The relationship between Thachi and Xhaferi (while he was still alive) on one side and Ali Ahmeti on the other, today (2013), is still "uncooperative"!

19. Xhaferi and Thachi were faced with a serious handicap. After the Kosovo war, which gained the U.S. permanent Albanian loyalty, they could not react any differently than the other Albanians and they too had to pledge loyalty to the Americans. They had no room to manoeuvre or to ignore U.S. interests and therefore had to accept their new role, including the signing of the Ohrid Agreement for which others fought and became their rivals. Ali Ahmeti and his cohorts, on the other hand, had no room for the PDP and the DPA then and they have no room for them today. The two Albanian parties have sustained "collateral damage" from the 2001 war and are on the decline. (If we exclude the brief period after the 2006 election when the VMRO DPMNE was in coalition with the DPA)

20. Menduh Thachi, according to an article published by “Dnevnik” on December 30th, 2011, entitled “The Framework Agreement is not adequate to be a holiday”, about the 2001 war, in which he confirmed that the DPA knew nothing about it in 2001 said: “The 2001 war was a great shame for the Albanian people. It was a Marxist-Islamist war.” But it was through the Ohrid Agreement, as a result of the war, that now the undesirable and irreversible reconstruction of Macedonia is being carried out. Unfortunately Thachi could not have made this statement in 2001 or 2002, although he certainly was thinking about it. If he had said this then he would have been labeled a traitor and would have been seen as working against the Albanian cause and as an anti-American. He and his kind had no choice but to keep quiet and embrace their new American partners. And now, he can only speak on behalf of DPA, which lost its prestige and position of power, possibly forever, because of the war. But, overall, the Albanians got more than they ever dreamed of in Macedonia just like they did in Kosovo.

20.1. The same Thachi, according to Lupevka’s channel 5 TV show KOD which aired on June 26, 2011, said: “Wars are led only for territories. Human rights are acquired by different means...” He was absolutely right and publicly confirmed that the 2001 war was all about carving out parts of Macedonia as directed by the U.S.

The greatest benefactors of the war, however, were the Albanians.

21. General Griffiths, head of MPRI in Skopje, confirmed that Washington played a key role in the NLA creation and in its operations.

Frowick, through Prizren, has uncovered Washington’s intentions in regards to Macedonia and the Macedonian people.

Seventeen American military trainers were caught in Arachinovo among the NLA fighters when they were surrounded by the Macedonian Army, which proves that the U.S. was directly

involved in the 2001 war in Macedonia. This discovery was the jewel in the crown.

22. Overall, in 2001, Macedonia was put in a precarious situation. The same force (MPRI) that was managing the NLA and aggression against Macedonia was also managing the Macedonian military responsible for defending Macedonia. In other words, the Americans were right in the middle and pulling strings on both sides involved in the war. And we very well know that they were helping the Albanians at the expense of the Macedonian people. It was a classic puppet show! The Americans did whatever they wanted while Macedonia was being destroyed and people were dying. The Americans were waging a war for “rights” on behalf of the Albanians in Macedonia without even letting them know!

23. Let us not forget that the aggression in Macedonia received general and widespread condemnation. The world media supported Macedonia and saw it as a victim of Albanian irredentism. In the beginning not all Albanians were part of this aggression. Some were confused by the attacks and even condemned them. This secret American military operation left many people holding their breath. Among them was Ismail Kadare, a world famous writer and a proven Albanian nationalist. He openly condemned the war. He was afraid, like many others, that the gains the Albanians made against Milosevich would be lost and this kind of behaviour would jeopardize Albanian plans. Later, after it was discovered that the U.S. and NATO were behind the 2001 war, Kadare and others changed their opinions.

23.1. It was quite different in Kosovo where the Albanians were seen as fighting against Serbian aggression, primarily due to Milosevich’s stern policies. The world was sympathetic to the Albanians in Kosovo largely due to U.S. and NATO propaganda. The Americans and their NATO allies continued to vilify Milosevich and the Serbians while valourizing the Albanian resistance and completely ignoring and covering up repeated Albanian injustices perpetrated against the Serbian population, not to mention the irredentism that was present in Kosovo for decades. Tens of thousand of Serbians, one way or another, for

years were forced to move out of Kosovo because they were harassed, but that did not matter to the Americans. Even at the Hague there were no Albanians tried for crimes committed against humanity even though many Albanians were guilty of that. A media campaign waged against Serbia covered up all crimes and abuses committed by the Albanian side. Certainly this was a result of American involvement in the war and their support for the Albanian side. Partners do not try partners. The Haradinai case proved that.

C. General Pande Petrovski's precious "testimony"

24. In order to fully understand the American role in the 2001 war in Macedonia, you will have to read late General Pande Petrovski's book "Svedoshtva" (Testimony), (Bitola, "Kiro Dandaro", 2006). It clearly explains, in detail, America's relations with Macedonia. Petrovski was a participant in the 2001 war. We hope quotes from his book will clarify a lot of things for our readers.

24.1. On page 7 in his book Petrovski wrote: "The then Macedonian government signed an agreement with the American firm MPRI to send a team of instructors, consisting mainly of retired United States military veterans, to Macedonia to reorganize the Macedonian military. MPRI proposed its own plan for the reorganization but Army General Headquarters and the Ministry of Defense was not prepared to accept it. The MPRI plan called for Macedonia to have a single brigade army, i.e. a light infantry brigade with two light battalions and some special units with no artillery, armoured units, aviation, etc."

Without being a military expert, one can immediately conclude that what General Petrovski is telling us about the MPRI proposal is that Macedonia would actually have no army! The MPRI literally recommended that Macedonia's defense institutions get rid of their army! Why? The MPRI made this recommendation and behind the MPRI stood the United States. This proposal definitely revealed the essential elements of American strategy towards Macedonia. And so we come around full circle: prepare Macedonia from the inside for a military defeat...

24.2. Again on page 7 in his book Petrovski wrote: “Soon afterwards, in January 2000, around 500 officers were retired including all of the generals who ‘did not agree’ with the reforms. After the officers were sent into retirement the original MPRI plans was accepted and the army reorganization was launched in 2000 under full MPRI control.”

On page 8 the General explained how and why this was done: “In the beginning of 2001,” he wrote, “before the crisis had begun, the Army was in its final stages of reforms or ‘disbanding’ (3. AK, disbanded, 2. AK – bitolski being disbanded, tank and artillery units disbanded, aviation disbanded) and the border brigade was under formation...” In other words, MPRI had made everything ready for Macedonia to fail miserably if someone were to start a war against it...

24.3 General Pande Petrovski was also included in the group of retired officers. But after the war started and the Macedonian army was facing incomprehensible errors and multiple defeats, President Boris Traikovski requested that Petrovski be reactivated. Surprised by the President’s actions, Petrovski asked Traikovski not why he was being reactivated but why he had been retired in the first place when he was not ready to retire and was not of retirement age. Traikovski was honest with him when he said: “General, when I became president I did not know any of the generals. Major General Richard Griffiths of the United States, head of MPRI in Skopje, brought me a list of tasks to do included in which were which generals to retire, so I signed the list.” (p. 15).

Griffiths not only retired 500 of the most experienced officers but he staffed General Headquarters with the wrong people. As head of General Staff he appointed an engineer and quartermaster as his deputy! All these positions were filled with unqualified staff by MPRI and Griffiths, which to this day cannot be explained, except that they were direct sabotage... from the inside...

In general, this was an unprecedented, audacious American plan! The error however was ours and we are to blame for being so naïve and trusting.

25. General Petrovski's book "Svedoshtva" (Testimony) contains valuable information about the 2001 war and about the role of the main factors that participated in it. On page 160 Petrovski wrote: "On July 21, a KFOR helicopter (Z-47) landed in Shipkovitsa at 16:45 hours and unloaded equipment and people until 17:05 hours. At the same time another Z-47 helicopter landed in the village Brodets. On July 21, 2001 KFOR helicopters of the type Z-47 and Z-53 landed in the village Brodets at 13:53 hours and remained there until 14:30 hours. All these KFOR flights were carried out without informing the Macedonian authorities... In fact this is when KFOR was preparing to re-establish the NLA command base from Prizren to Shipkovitsa. During a conversation I had with General Lange of NATO Command in Macedonia, I pointed out to him that NLA command had been moved by KFOR from Prizren to Shipkovitsa. His reply to me was: 'You are right, but think of me as a professional that can't wait to go into retirement!'"

25.1. It is interesting to note what General Petrovski had to say about Peter Feith's behaviour. Peter Feith is an American and was a personal representative of the NATO Secretary-General. About him Petrovski, on page 122, wrote: "Feith was the person who primarily had direct contact with the Macedonian President and from what I observed he behaved quite arrogantly, he was brazen and constantly threw ultimatums at the President, his behaviour was very strange. During an occasion, in front of a room full of state officials I asked him: 'Mr. Feith are you the commander of the so-called NLA, why are you so sure about their concerns?' That was the time when we were working towards a ceasefire." Perhaps the general was right about Feith's role...

25.2. Another incident that deserves more attention is the part connected with the Arachinovo operation. After the Macedonian security forces penetrated deep into the village it was only a matter of time before the terrorists were cleaned out. But as the

forces moved nearer the village they found two wounded Americans (p. 107)!

Then, on June 25, when General Petrovski was meeting with Traikovski, the Macedonian President informed him that NATO was moving the terrorists out of Arachinovo. At that point the General said: “Well, we will continue to attack until the conditions are created for extraction”. “No!” yelled the President. “NATO Secretary-General Robertson told me that 30 of his people are in Arachinovo!” “I was dumbfounded as I looked at the President,” Petrovski wrote, “and I could not understand what was happening! So I asked, who are these people and how did they come to be in Arachinovo?” Traikovski looked at me and said: “I don’t know but Robertson promised me that he would give me a list of who these people are!”

25.2.1 This was an unpardonable fatal mistake on so many levels! One, the Supreme commander of the Macedonian Army telling his own troops to stop fighting so that the enemy could get away! Whose side was he on? Two, the Supreme Commander of the Macedonian Army, on his own home soil, was told that 30 NATO people, Americans, were amongst the enemy and he never bothered to ask any questions? Third, the Supreme commander of the Macedonian Army was ordered around by foreign generals and commanders, including the Secretary-General of the Alliance, to do their bidding inside his own country and does not even question that? If that was not enough then the same President and Supreme commander of the Macedonian Army took the initiative to “rescue” not only the Americans but also the NLA fighters, with guns and all, and let them go free so that they could kill more Macedonians!!! This definitely deserves a special page in history under a special heading... According to Petrovski’s testimony all the President asked was who these people were and was not even given an answer... And was that okay with him?

What does the reader think about all this? Not just about the unpardonable mistake Traikovski had made but also about what the American mercenaries were doing among the Albanian terrorists? Also, do you think that Robertson was really going to

supply Traikovski with that list? Even if he did what good would it have been after the fact?

Everything is clear; we as a nation have sunk to a new low. They played us and all that time we not only let them, but thought that they were our friends... and partners... Some of us still think they are our friends and partners...

25.2.2 Just to make things clear here, when preparations for the Arachinovo attack were being made, Traikovski told Petrovski that the Macedonian army had only two days to carry it out (p. 101). Surprised by his comment, the General questioned the President why only two days? Traikovski replied: "That's how much time Robertson gave me!"

So when we take this latest information and put it together with the previous information, of the 30 Americans in Arachinovo, then things start to become very clear. We have Robertson managing things on the Macedonian side, telling Traikovski what to do, and we have Robertson's people managing the terrorist side fighting against the Macedonian army. In other words we have Robertson managing both sides of the entire war in Arachinovo. Robertson was also involved in the second phase of this war when the NLA became a "humanitarian" organization and began to fight for people's rights, people it did not even represent! Initially, we were led to believe that Robertson was not even part of the NLA's super covert operations! Should we say anything more?

25.3. There is one more important fact noted on pages 77 and 78 in Petrovski's book. In the middle of May 2001, President Traikovski ordered General Petrovski to meet with a man named David Foley, who was in a diplomatic vehicle with two others, and take him to the village Slupchane, where he was reportedly to negotiate the extraction of civilians. Here is what Petrovski had to say about that: "I requested that David Foley go with my people and secretly enter Slupchane. The same day I received the following report: 'Three people were waiting for Foley at the entrance of the village. They were fully bearded and were

wearing UCK uniforms. All three welcomed Foley with kisses and embraces? ...”

So what else can we say about this other than that the three UCK operatives knew Foley on a personal level... They knew each other from before for sure...

25.4 There is a lot more information in General Petrovski’s book relevant to our topic. For example, on page 195 he wrote about how NATO, at the end of the 2001 war, insisted that Macedonia withdraw all its heavy weapons from the crisis regions, especially the tank battalion with T-22 tanks purchased from the Ukraine. “Knowing the Unit’s ability in combat,” wrote Petrovski, “NATO demanded that the battalion be relocated to Strumitsa, at any price. The daily pressure put on the Macedonian President by NATO was too much so he ordered the tank battalion and the entire military apparatus and officers to relocate to Strumitsa. After that any tank movements out of Strumitsa required NATO approval!”

25.5. Even though the terrorists in Macedonia could have been easily defeated militarily, “President Traikovski”, wrote Petrovski on page 98 of his book, “on June 14, 2001 sent a letter to the NATO Secretary-General asking him to help in resolving the crisis.” The Macedonian Chief of General Headquarters learned about this on July 5, 2001.

This information alone was sufficient to conclude everything that was happening and how it was happening in Macedonia in 2001.

It was like a mad fairy tale affair where Traikovski was asking his executioner to help him!

25.6 There were indications in 2001 that then Prime Minister Georgievski advocated for the proclamation of martial law and he came very close to implementing one. If that were the case then why didn’t he do it? Specifically, who opposed it? It is arguable that the U.S. and its satellites were strongly against such a measure because it would have been relatively easy to eliminate

the NLA. But, in any case, no one was allowed to eliminate it. Why?

25.6.1. Georgievski's attempts, mentioned above, were also confirmed by General Pande Petrovski but facts have shown essential differences between what Georgievski said and what he did. About this on page 136 Petrovski wrote: "Every time we started a military operation, and before it was finished, the Prime Minister would visit the command post and cancel the operation. Two classic examples of this were the military operations in Kumanovo and in Arachinovo. The Prime Minister and some others near him never publicly advocated for the crisis to be resolved by military means. After canceling the operations they never explained why they were cancelled!"

Petrovski had no doubt about the position President Traikovski had taken, who, according to Petrovski: "had always advocated for the crisis to be resolved by political means and with NATO, EU and OSCE support..." (p. 136). This was probably our biggest handicap in the war. Like the saying goes "Those who lead should not be led!"

This is valuable information for historians.

26. From what we know, President Boris Traikovski was an honest man and a patriot. Unfortunately he was too trusting and as a result became a victim of superpower Balkan intrigue. General Griffiths through MPRI, Robert Frowick through OSCE, Perdue, Feith and other "facilitators" and "experts", belonging to the ranks of the CIA and to other similar services, were there and responsible for implementing U.S. policy, which proved to be disastrous for Macedonia. Unfortunately the Macedonian leadership believed everything it was told and obeyed every command given without question, especially the Macedonian President!

26.1. Unaware of the great games that were played, Traikovski, apparently without objections, followed U.S. guidelines and was unscrupulously exploited by Washington. And exactly as General Petrovski explained, Traikovski, on trust, retired his most

experienced military officers and replaced them with inexperienced ones including his staff at General Headquarters, creating enormous and irreparable damage to his own army.

After the fact, Trakovski knew very well what he had done and under whose guidance. Could he, one day, have told about all these political abuses? Journalist Lupevska from the TV show KOD on Channel 5, on February 26, 2012, shortly before Traikovski's death, reported that Trakovski had said that he would tell all about the Kosovo caper! Did he sign his own death warrant by saying that?

26.2 On page 175 General Pande Petrovski wrote: "I am not sure who planned the military crisis in Macedonia, who controlled it and why, and who did not allow it to be resolved by military means and why. The Army was certainly not allowed to act..." Then on page 204 he said: "We were resisted in every military operation!"

27. An interesting view on the 2001 war was given by G'zim Ostreni, Chief of NLA General Headquarters as noted in the book "A critical review: The 2001 war in Macedonia", by General Mitre Arsovski, Prof. Dr. Stoian Kuzev and General Prof. Dr. Risto Damianovski, a personal edition, Skopje 2006 (ISBN 9989-2650-1-1).

27.1. On page 25 Ostreni was quoted as saying: "...UNMIK and NATO (KFOR) took strong measures to prevent members of the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC) from participating in the NLA structures." Why did Ostreni not want to reveal that all NLA preparations were done in Kosovo? If the war truly was an "uprising" in Macedonia, as Ostreni argued, then what did it have to do with UNMIK and NATO (KFOR)? These organizations were in Kosovo, not in Macedonia! Why was the NLA connected with them, if it was authentically created in Macedonia? This alone is enough proof to show that a relationship was in existence, but what kind of relationship? Something did not sit well! Here is a question: How was it possible that Ostreni, Chief

of Kosovo Protection Corps General Headquarters, paid by the UN, was allowed to transfer to the NLA and perform the same function for them in Macedonia? Where were the strong measures taken against him? Or did his actions not count?

27.2. According to what was written in the book, Ostreni does not hide the NLA's purpose in Macedonia and has repeatedly said that the NLA strove to turn Macedonia into a bi-national state. He also complained that in 1991, in Macedonia's new constitution, the Albanians "were not recognized as a constituent element in the new state" (p. 34) and this was motive to start a war. At issue is the same grievance that Kosovo had in Yugoslavia, when it strove to become a republic. Being a "republic" in the Yugoslav Federation or having become a "constituent" people in Macedonia means that the Albanians would have the right to secede. There are no differences between the two scenarios.

27.3. On page 90 Ostreni further elaborated on the fundamental causes of the war. He said: "...The parliament, the government and the political parties, including all Albanian political parties in Macedonia, could not find the strength to overcome the problem by political means, a problem created by the Macedonian Constitution since 1991, by excluding the Albanians from the right to statehood and thus discriminating against all their basic human rights and freedoms..."

Ostreni's position that failure to receive the right to "statehood" is a means of discrimination is obviously preposterous. That would only be true if Ostrani was thinking of the right to secession. And that is exactly what he was thinking and that is why it was denied. There was nothing else there. Attempting to partition Macedonia has absolutely nothing to do with human rights and freedoms, at least on an elementary level. All citizens are equal before the law. It was pure fabrication by Ostreni to show that indeed there was motive for the 2001 war. Albanian attempts to split lands from Macedonia were reliably confirmed by their own admission. The NLA released five announcements which called for the division of our country. Ostrani likes to blend the idea of partitioning Macedonia with ethnic and

collective human rights. But his intent is very clear; he wanted to break Macedonia's unitary character.

27.4. In explaining why the Macedonian security forces were defeated, Ostreni again unwittingly confirmed the NLA's role in the 2001 war: "This inability to destroy the Albanian people's desire for freedom was expressed through the NLA..." In other words, the NLA worked for "freedom" and not for any "rights". And his army was so appropriately named a "Liberation" army..." (p. 94).

27.5. In the end, Ostreni has the audacity to talk to us about morals: "The Macedonians are only Macedonians together with the Albanians," he says, "if they were with someone else they would be something else!" Here he not only asserts that Macedonia belongs to the Albanians but he also has the nerve to say that the Albanians in Macedonia, unlike the Greeks and Bulgarians in the occupied parts of Macedonia, are allowing us Macedonians to be Macedonians!!! In other words according to Ostreni, we, the Macedonians, should be grateful to the Albanians for allowing us to be Macedonians... in our own country!!!

28. It is worthwhile to note that during the 2001 war in Macedonia, the only country that helped Macedonia was the Ukraine. The Ukrainians sold us weapons and sent us pilots to assist in the flying of helicopters and airplanes that we purchased from them. It is also interesting to note that Condoleezza Rice, in her capacity as National Security Advisor to President George W. Bush, put pressure on Kiev to stop all shipments of weapons to Macedonia!

29. At this point there is a need to ask: why did it take until today (2013) to investigate and document these events so critical to our country? Why didn't anybody show any interest in examining the period that deformed the Macedonian state? Are we afraid that the United States will retaliate if we reveal its true role in the

war? Will there be anyone out there who would be willing to show that America's goal was and still is to break up Macedonia?

30. According to Petrovski, Slovenia did not accept the MPRI team sent there and Macedonia expelled it in May 2001. But, it is well known that Croatia intensively used the services of MPRI during the War. The MPRI team arrived in Croatia in the fall of 1994 and through it Croatia cooperated militarily with the United States. It is believed that MPRI had a significant role around operation "Storm" in 1995, which expelled several hundred thousand Serbs from Krajina.

31. Confirmation about the role the Americans played in the wars in Yugoslavia after the dissolution of the Yugoslav Federation was given by the first ambassador to Zagreb, Peter Galbraith. In an interview with the Serbian "weekly", according to "Dnevnik" of November 23, 2012 in the article "They achieved 'Storm' on account of Srebrenitsa" and the headline "Croatian action joint with the United States", Galbraith said: "if Bihach fell it would have been much worse than Srebrenitsa, but I must choose whether to allow another Srebrenitsa or to allow the Croats to attack Krajina"! (Let us remind you that this is how the Croatian operation "Storm" came about to expell nearly 300 thousand Serbs from Krajina!). Galbraith argued that "America would never have allowed the Croats to perform 'Storm' if Ratko Mladich had not previously ordered the massacre in Srebrenica". Nothing remained ambiguous; Galbraith explained that operation "Storm" would have gone even further if the Croats had not commtted abominable crimes in Krajina. Galbraith said: "If the Croats in Krajina had not perpetrated atrocities and if they had not killed civilians and burned their houses, maybe Banja Luka would have fallen. Perhaps they would have had our support to continue their actions"! And if Banja Luka, the capital had fallen, Republika Srpska would have most likely disappeared! Galbraith now confirmed what we originally thought!

31.1. From what we have discovered from Galbraith about America's role in the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, there

should be no doubt as to who was pulling the strings in the atrocious wars on the territory of former the Yugoslavia. Logically we followed the question; “How much American involvement was there in previous operations in Bosnia and other battlegrounds across the former Yugoslav federation?” Is it possible that the Americans sat “peacefully” on the sidelines and did nothing? Thus allowing things to proceed without their “interference?” How many times, on other occasions, and elsewhere did they “permit” certain actions to take place while they “silently” looked the other way?

31.2. Should we wait for some American involved in Macedonia to open the 2001 archives and tell us what was done here? Compared to operation “Storm” the war in Macedonia was short and controlled without too many sacrifices. The incursions from Kosovo were fully controlled. However, given the background and basis for this war, it must have been difficult to start. It must have taken the involvement of dark American figures, secret service agents and military personnel in Macedonia and not diplomats like Galbraith, who had orders to reveal certain details of their actions. But for now, facts and arguments presented in this analysis, with deep conviction, allow us to say that the Americans gave more than implied consent and permission to the aggression against Macedonia in 2001 (Arachinovo).

31.3. Those who follow world politics know that there is no mystery about the secret roles the Americans have played in the international arena, especially after World War II. The CIA and other similar American agencies have been active everywhere. They had their own part in many events that changed the history of many countries. This is common knowledge. Unfortunately it may take 30, 40, or 50 years before the archives are opened and before we find out what really happened. But, as was common in the past, when that many years have elapsed no one really gives a damn about what happened. But there is a lesson in all this... history tends to repeat itself...

According to a “Dnevnik” story published on August 21, 2013 entitled “The CIA has admitted participation in a military coup in Iran” the CIA organized a coup in Iran in 1953 when Prime

Minister Mosadek was ousted and the Shah Reza Pahlavi was put in charge of the government. The reason for the ousting; Mosadek tried to nationalize Iranian oil. Energy was and still is the main reason for odd and inconsistent policies, tolerances, alliances, coups, bombings, etc. They took down Mosadek by launching a strong propaganda campaign against him, by corrupting parliamentarians, politicians and military figures and by organizing various protests and rallies...

Do you think that the CIA has changed its methods since then and it would not use similar tactics in Macedonia today? Of course not! The CIA will do what is required of it! They don't hide the fact that the problem with "the name" is very important to them. If they can ignore the UN Charter so that they can challenge our name, if they don't respect the judgment of the Hague Court... both of which are internationally respected institutions, do you think they will respect Macedonia? I don't think so! They have created various "posts", "commitments", "views", "policies" and added "analysts", "columnists", "journalists", closed and open societies, NGO's, etc., to our country and all this was done to undermine it... The kinds of things they did to undermine Mosadek and many other like him over the years!

31.4. Mosadek certainly was not the only case. There are many others. According to an article published in "Nova Makedonija" on August 22, 2013 entitled "Dictators and democrats assassinated by the CIA", there have been seven cases of confirmed military coups carried out by the CIA. These are: Iran (1953), Guatemala (1954), Dominican Republic and Congo (1961), Vietnam (1963), Brazil (1964) and Chile (1973).

Compared to these cases, the events in Macedonia were a mild exercise.

31.5 Not so long ago the U.S. military intervened in Grenada, Panama, the Dominican Republic... the last one being an interesting case. The justification for this aggression, which took place in 1965/66, was to restore democracy in the country. About

this Henry Kissinger said: “There never was a democracy in the Dominican Republic!”

D. U.S. role in the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement

32. The Ohrid deal superbly illustrates the relationship between the U.S. and the Macedonian state and its people. In place of putting the Macedonian people as the fundamental pillar of Macedonia and building everything else around it, they did just the opposite. They marginalized the Macedonian people. In fact, through the Ohrid Agreement, the U.S. prevented the development of a civil society which would have been a foundation for the new structure. Of course, their intentions were not honourable towards the Macedonian people. Also, what took place here was certainly not by accident, Washington created a destructive system designed to develop a multiethnic confrontational society whose aims ultimately would be to split the country apart. The Albanian aim here was to take as much control of Macedonia as possible, naturally with Washington’s backing. This is a concept through which the “Greater Albania” project can be realized, crucial for the United States in its implementation of its regional interests. Just like the Fascist Italians did in the Second World War.

A civil society is not possible when a country is partisan and polarized along ethnic lines. In Macedonia’s case conditions have been set so that a unitary society will not be tolerated and Macedonia is on its way to becoming a bi-national state. If the U.S. did not impose this civil concept, then it could not have been able to manipulate the Albanians in Macedonia. There would have been no reason for the Albanians to want to separate.

32.1. As per the Ohrid Agreement, amendments were made to the Macedonian Constitution to delete the words “Macedonian people” from the preamble. Later, following a number of fierce Parliamentary debates, not all of the proposed changes to the Constitution were implemented. Under Stojan Andov’s insistence the words “Macedonian people” were put back in the preamble.

In many places the Ohrid Agreement used the words “communities which are not a majority in Macedonia” and “majority” in place of Macedonians. The United States turned the Macedonian nation in Macedonia into an “unnamed” nation called “majority”. They did their best to avoid its mention in the entire Agreement as if the Macedonian people did not exist!

32.2. The Macedonian negotiators working on the Ohrid Agreement must have agreed that Macedonia must lose some of its national character because, according to the Agreement they signed, the words “Macedonian people” had to be removed from the Macedonian Constitution. This was not the same with Macedonia’s neighbours (except for Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose future is uncertain). Greece has even proclaimed national homogeneity of its population, which is inconceivable in this region. From this we can deduce that the U.S. intentionally did not want to mention the words “Macedonian people” in any of its documents.

32.3. Our politicians and “experts” swallowed all this up without considering its consequences... I wonder how history will judge them.

32.4. At this point it is important for us to review the process of how the Preamble of the Macedonian Constitution was “restored” thus preserving the words “Macedonian people”. This hopefully will reveal, for the reader, the true intentions of the Ohrid Agreement. Stojan Andov set the conditions that if the words “Macedonian people” are removed from the preamble, the amendments to the constitution would never be passed. At that point the rest of the text was revisited and changes were made to emphasize and give minorities a higher profile. The aim of this move, and we know who was behind the whole project, was to again belittle, degrade and devalue the majority nation (the Macedonian people) and its role in the country. Thus, minorities were “promoted” as “people who are part of the Albanian people, Turkish people, Vlach people, Serbian people, Roma people, Bosniak people and others...”! The cost of “returning” the words “Macedonian people” back into the Preamble was the elevation of “minorities” to “parts of other peoples”! There is no such

solution anywhere in the world. But worse than that is the fact that neighbouring countries have been given an open door to meddle in Macedonian affairs as part of the rights “of their people”. And if at any time there is any perceived danger, these countries can intervene on the behalf of these people to “save” them and everything they share in the Macedonian state! In the meantime, Greece and Bulgaria have yet to recognize the existence of any minorities, especially Macedonians, and they have been there for ages, everyone, including the Americans, know that and yet nothing is being done!

33. From a Macedonian perspective, about the only positive thing in this Agreement was that the unitary character of the Macedonian state was left intact. There was also a major drawback on the precise definition of the Macedonian language. Also the limit of use of the Albanian language was not clearly defined. As a result, the portion of the Agreement relating to the Macedonian language was not implemented and was deliberately ignored which would inevitably lead to problems later. If a country has no state language that everyone will need to learn and understand then that country has no future? The only language in Macedonia that can fulfill a state function is the Macedonian language but in order to do that we need to take decisive measures and regulate its implementation in accordance with the spirit of the Ohrid Agreement before the unitary character of our country is jeopardized. The practice of non-acceptance of the Macedonian language by the Albanian population in Macedonia is not by coincidence but by design. It is designed to lead Macedonia away from its unitary character.

33.1. Essentially there is a fundamental need for the Macedonian language to be implemented and to serve as a unifying factor, which everyone must learn and use. It would have been the strongest guarantee for a stable future. Without a mandatory language for all to speak, there will be no survival for any federal let alone unitary state. If the unitary character of the state is not based on real and functional mechanisms then it means nothing.

33.2. Conversely to the Agreement, the Albanians, en masse, are consistently and illegally pushing and spreading the use of the

Albanian language. The Albanian Ministers in the Government internally use official letterheads printed in Albanian only. Documents for external use are printed in both Macedonian and Albanian. Besimi in the Ministry of Defense, for example, has used the Albanian language in international communications and correspondence. In meetings, the Albanian Ministers speak in the Albanian language. The Albanian Members of Parliament even talk to the Macedonian media in Albanian. The same thing happens in Parliament where the chairperson of a parliamentary committee, acting on behalf of the state, should be speaking Macedonian, speaks Albanian, thus representing only the Albanian ethnicity... Someone once said that it is the small things to which we should be paying attention. That would be true, if the abuse was not deliberate. Unfortunately the abuse here is deliberate and out of control. This is done for the sole purpose of expanding the use of the Albanian language at the expense of the Macedonian language and putting an end to it one day.

And exactly because of that, the Macedonian government, in time, must vigorously react to prevent any manipulation aimed at the albanization of part or the whole of Macedonia. Items that are outside of the Ohrid agreement should not be allowed to be implemented unless both sides agree. Everything that is outside of the Ohrid Agreement is illegitimately acquired and should be stopped. These are acts coordinated and orchestrated by the Albanian parties and backed by the U.S. which are designed to lead to the destruction of the Macedonian state.

33.3. It is crystal clear to the Albanian leaders in Macedonia that if the Macedonian language survives it will become a pillar of the unitary character of the Macedonian state. So everything possible is done, in the long term, to break it down from all sides, little by little. Based on the Ohrid Agreement, Amendment B or new Article 7, of the Macedonian Constitution says that: "In the whole territory of the Republic of Macedonia and in International Relations the official language of use is the Macedonian language and the Cyrillic alphabet". Unfortunately the Albanian leaders in Macedonia will do everything that fits into the Ohrid Agreement, anything else they will not do, even if it is enshrined in the Macedonian Constitution. So that should tell you that the

Albanians are not interested in anything Macedonian, they are interested in the “Greater Albania” project.

33.4. The consequences are already visible; Albanians are bent on avoiding learning the Macedonian language. That is a technique of ghettoization and a fait accompli. Their purpose is twofold, a) to make the Macedonian language a barrier for communication and b) to create space for two languages, which they are persistently and stubbornly doing at this moment. Such a policy not only leads to the destruction of Macedonia’s unitary character but, in particular, the character of the entire Macedonian state, leading to federalization. Everything moves along at an unprecedented level of absurdity in this country. Soon, it would appear, Macedonians will have to learn Albanian if they want to understand the Albanians and not vice versa. While it may be arguable that Macedonians living in areas where the Albanian population is a majority should need to speak Albanian, but the fact is that this is a Macedonian state and that option should be left entirely to their own choosing.

34. Another negative segment of the Agreement, which at first glance does not attract too much attention, was the requirement for new administrative divisions in the country. It may have looked like an easy job since the then 123 or so municipalities could not have survived. About fifty of them were too small and dysfunctional. According to Article 3.2 of the Ohrid Agreement “audit of municipal boundaries will be taken by local and national authorities with international participation”. Why should the change of municipal boundaries be supervised and approved by foreigners such as the U.S.A.? During the signing of the 2001 Ohrid Agreement the Macedonian side thought nothing of it. This must have looked very strange and basic to them. Their main focus was on the higher levels of structuring the Macedonian state. They never thought that behind this idea stood the formal albanization of parts of Macedonia. They obviously had no understanding of what the Americans were planning to do in the long term and how it was going to affect Macedonia...

34.1. While nothing was clear to our side, everything was clear to the “facilitators” who were preparing the groundwork for the new

administrative divisions where albanization was possible such as in Struga and Kichevo. Skopje too suddenly became bilingual and so did a good part of our country.

34.2. The process of albanizing parts of our country began with the 2013 municipal elections. That's when many Albanian candidates began to compete for mayoral positions. It was at this time that the Albanians openly called for new administrative division that would maximize their votes and open up opportunities for the realization of their dream. There is no argument that Washington was part of this because the Americans were active participants in determining the new boundaries of the municipalities in 2004. Why else would they have put this in the Ohrid Agreement if it wasn't going to be used for their advantage?

34.3. That was that and nothing more, all evidence points in that direction. Let us also remind you that a referendum was organized to prevent the country's devastating administrative division. But then, quite unexpectedly, just before its eve, Washington partially and temporarily recognized Macedonia by its constitutional name and thus undermined the referendum. This is absolute proof that the United States stood behind the entire plan. The Albanization of parts of Macedonia is so important to the Americans that they would do anything, even recognize Macedonia, to ensure its success! They obviously took the most viable strategic step that would guarantee their interests.

34.4. The moves that were made in 2001 are beginning to bear fruit today. Only now we realize why the United States recommended local and internal boundary changes to the region. After the war of 2001, after the U.S. failed to divide Macedonia by force, it took a different approach. There are many ways to affect boundary changes. One way is by war. The 2001 war was, in many ways, the last chance to change boundaries by military force. After that it became difficult because any violent attempts at changing the borders in Macedonia could inevitably lead to a bloody war that could ignite the entire region. Failing that another way was by restructuring local municipalities. So, plans were made well in advance to make that possible by peaceful

means; for Macedonia to be broken down by albanizing parts of it from the inside.

35. Another negative and political consequence of the Ohrid agreement was that, ipso facto, the Macedonians accepted a) the Macedonian state to be a Macedonian-Albanian creation, b) Macedonia's main pillar is to be agreed between Macedonians and Albanians, and c) everything can and should be negotiated...

Looking at the situation from a regional aspect, the same way Washington saw it, this gives the Albanians more maneuvering space which they not only used to the maximum but also abused over the years. They seem to continually seek concessions and surprisingly they receive them. Millimetre by millimetre they are making irreversible gains. One time even Ahmeti admitted that and said that the Albanians are not in any hurry. Of course, this was not Ahmeti's policy, he is only implementing it. If it was not like that, Albanian behaviour in Macedonia and in the wider region would have been very different.

35.1. On top of everything Thachi is making claims (2012) that the Ohrid Agreement is now dead and that a new Agreement is required, one written by Thachi. Yesterday the Albanians had the Ohrid Agreement and used it to the maximum, today Thachi has new ideas for a different solution which he will use to the maximum and tomorrow someone new will come along and do the same. This is how it has been with the Albanians in Macedonia, demand after demand after demand, with no end until the entire region becomes part of a "Greater Albania". It is a process that flows and its coordination functions flawlessly. This certainly does not mean that Washington is behind all these Albanian demands, but with Washington watching over the Albanians their demands are getting bolder, open and more frequent.

36. The fact is that the Ohrid Agreement truly opened up many opportunities for improving the Albanian situation in Macedonia. In the past, one can argue that they were exposed to many injustices, most of which were inherited from the Yugoslav Federation, which required immediate attention. However, the

Macedonians themselves at the time of the Yugoslav breakup were in a difficult situation themselves. But there was no justification for the then government not to have recognized the problem, open it up and place it on the table. This was a serious mistake. However, let us also note that a) the 2001 war in Macedonia was foreign aggression with aims at occupying parts of Macedonia and “liberating” territories from it for the Albanians, b) the 2001 war was not a “humanitarian” war, and c) the war was not started because of the unresolved status of the Albanians in Macedonia. The only reason the war was started, which is a textbook case, was because of the unwillingness of the U.S. to recognize Macedonia and, as a result, introduced serious problems for us which in time would need to be addressed to our detriment. The results speak for themselves.

37. The Ohrid Agreement a) is one sided, b) it devalues the position of the Macedonians, i.e. the majority of the population, and c) it does not promote stability in the long term for Macedonia. On the contrary, the Agreement is worded such that it could easily jeopardize the survival of the Macedonian state. Of course this was not done by accident. It was worded as such so that in time the fine details could introduce all kinds of controversial mechanisms for future Albanian requirements while neglecting the other ethnic communities in the country. On the other hand, it also places the majority of the people, i.e. the Macedonians, into uncertainty by leaving very little room for them to manoeuvre.

38. There should be no doubt in anyone’s mind that the Ohrid Agreement was one of the biggest strategic mistakes we Macedonians ever made. The Agreement was not the choice of our country’s leadership, but rather it was imposed on the Macedonian people by the United States. That is why Frowick, through the OSCE Mission, Perdue, Feith and all the other bullies, I mean “facilitators”, were sent to Macedonia. The fact that Frowick secretly, without the knowledge of the Macedonian authorities, drafted the Ohrid Agreement, through the Prizren Declaration, says it all. Our problem was twofold, one, we were under extreme American pressure to cooperate and two, we did not have the “necessary” experience to deal with the United

States which railroaded us into submission. Just to show you how green we were, diplomatically, we agreed to sign a document that removed the words “Macedonian people” from the preamble of our own Constitution, not to mention the fact that we are negotiating our own country’s name with Greece, our worst enemy, and getting nothing, absolutely nothing in return! How amateurish is that? Do we need to say more to illustrate our point?

38.1. By saying this we are not implying or advocating that the Ohrid Agreement should be ignored or disregarded. What was done was done but the Agreement needs to be implemented because we agreed to that. We cannot, however, ignore the historical errors we have made. We now must live with them and hopefully minimize the damage inflicted on us by them. Unfortunately for us, we seem to be taken advantage of because of our inexperience and pushed into making mistake after mistake. We continuously seem to be putting our trust in others who seem to take advantage our innocence and use it against us. In other words, our country is being eroded in order to satisfy someone else’s self-interests. And this seems to happen to us on a continual basis... Is this something cultural on our part... to be generous and giving... and on the part of others to take advantage of us? Or are we naïve and trusting as a people who put our faith in other people who only want to see us destroyed? These are questions that indeed require deeper thought!!! Don’t you think?

39. The above examples illustrate, or partially illustrate how we were roped and forced into making the mistake of agreeing to the Ohrid Agreement imposed on us, without us realizing its long term consequences or the fact that it was imposed on us illegitimately and with illegal use of force, i.e. the 2001 war. This was done in a subtle way and without any scruples, no doubt by the Americans. Then, while Macedonia was being slowly and progressively albanized, the Macedonian political leaders completely missed out on what was really happening and felt it was more important for them to create coalitions and hold onto power than to face the reality of our past mistakes.

40. What is even more absurd and completely out of character is the situation where we have Albanian partners in coalition with the Macedonian government who openly and persistently are working to realize their “Greater Albanian” project from the inside, especially in recent years (2010, 2011, 2012...). What is even more bizarre is the Macedonian opposition attacking and condemning the government for not being flexible enough with regards to Albanian demands! Claiming that the ruling party was holding its coalition partner (DUI) under its control! Anyone, even one with very little political knowledge can see the negative processes at play here. If this was not an unbelievable and pitiful situation it would have been very funny. The reason the opposition is acting this way is very clear; to undermine the coalition and gain power even at the expense of national interests!!!

40.1. At one point it was suggested that perhaps a higher birthrate could be stimulated in the municipalities with low birth rates in order to provide a solution to the demographic problems. But before such a policy could even be debated, because it could have proven to be too sensitive for inter-ethnic relations, one of the top opposition leaders, Shekerinska, strongly opposed it. She publicly said: “And what will the Albanians and the other ethnic communities think of such a program, that we are working to prevent demographic changes in Macedonia?” (Shekerinska: “How will the Albanians interpret a program for higher birthrates?”, “Nova Makedonija”, September 18, 2008).

Shekerinska is probably not aware or is ignoring the fact that a responsible policy of balanced demographic development is one of the most important responsibilities for a government to implement. She obviously has no concern for the changes in the Macedonian demographic structure which, for some time now, had extremely negative tendencies with unforeseeable consequences. She does not understand or refuses to admit that these changes are not random but well planned, a result of Albanian political and religious social forces working behind them. (It has long been known that religious leaders would not allow their young worshippers into their mosques unless they had five children!). It is high time these practices are ended.

Shekerinska wants to “protect” these Albanians because her political ambitions can not be achieved without their support. But obviously they are more versed in politics than she is. They had known since 1998 that the “Platform for resolving the Albanian national question” was through a high birthrate. Only through a high birthrate can they increase their numbers and achieve their political goals, especially in Macedonia. But Shekerinska either does not understand or is ignoring that fact.

40.2. What was unclear to Shekerinska was quite clear to the people from the village Dolno Sonie. Sopishte Municipality has a low birthrate and about that it was said: “Now Albanians from other places will come to the villages in our municipality, with a singular purpose to receive incentives for the many children they will bear”!

40.3. With regards to abolishing religious practices and incentives for high birthrates? Nothing happened. The Constitutional Court, for reasons only known to the judges, did nothing.

And so everything is possible in Macedonia. We have people high up in the party hierarchy who have insufficient knowledge about geo-politics or geo-strategies. The top executives of the judiciary have little knowledge of our key social problems, which require urgent attention. But worse than that is that these people think that they know everything they need to know and care only about their own careers and parties, which seem to be more important to them than the well-being of our state.

40.4. Let us at this point remind the reader that the Albanians too have achieved a lot politically in Macedonia. They are at a stage where they can block Macedonians in more senior positions than themselves. Any Macedonian who has opposed Albanian demands or stood in the way of Albanian progress has been burned and can attest to that. Thus it is easier to look the other way and say nothing than to intervene and fight for Macedonian interests. So Macedonians tend to complain a lot on the sidelines and take great care not to entangle themselves in affairs that might hurt their careers. And as such Macedonians willingly

place themselves in an inferior position and leave themselves without authority. We should all remember, for example, when they said no NLA commander will ever enter public office or be promoted to a high public position. How true was that? Many NLA commanders today are ministers in the Macedonian government. Even the one who shut down the drinking water supply to the taps from Lipkovo Lake was made minister. Instead of sending him to be tried in The Hague, he was made minister...

41. There is no doubt that the Ohrid Agreement put an end to the 2001 war in Macedonia and helped sort out a number of irregularities and injustices that the Albanians had been exposed to in Macedonia. Unfortunately this “great plan” also has a negative twist. It has laid the groundwork for accelerating the “Greater Albanian” project tendencies which, unless seriously treated now, will create grave consequences for Macedonia in the future. Even though in principle Macedonia’s unitary character has been left intact, in practice it has been attacked and very little to nothing has been done to stop or reverse its erosion. So the Agreement so far has done nothing for the Macedonian side. It could be worse because no agreement can be eternal or irrevocable. The latest proof of this is the Interim Agreement, signed with Greece in 1995, which has proven to be worthless. An agreement is as good as those backing it. The Americans stand behind the Ohrid Agreement and they are prepared to back it. When we have a super power backing an agreement made with a tiny country then we all should know what the outcome is going to be. The agreement with Greece, for example, had no clause that hindered Macedonia from joining NATO and the EU, yet here we are being hindered; and by none other than the U.S.! How do we know that the U.S. will support Macedonia’s unitary character as “guaranteed” by the Ohrid Agreement? We don’t. As we have witnessed in the past, the U.S. will follow its own interests first and will “ignore” and “bypass” everything and everyone standing in its way. What will our options be then? Take the U.S. to court in The Hague? And what if the court rules in favour of Macedonia? What will we do then? The court ruled in favour of Macedonia regarding Macedonia’s entry into NATO; has Macedonia joined NATO yet?

42. The fact is that, unlike the Macedonian side, the Albanian side, with regards to the Ohrid Agreement, also has highered foreign experts, in addition to its own, who are very helpful to their case in every respect. Our side does not have that and that responsibility weighs heavily on our top leadership. We seem to be making the same historical errors over and over again.

43. Days before the signing of the Ohrid Agreement, fierce and bloody pressure was placed on Macedonia to capitulate and accept the proposed agreement. Macedonian politicians were intimidated with threats of escalating the war on many fronts. Then shortly before August 13, the terrorists carried out several missions during which they massacred a number of Macedonian security forces. They killed 18 members of the Macedonian Army and wounded many others...

43.1. The Karpalak incident took place on August 8, 2001 when 10 Army reservists were ambushed and killed. According to General Zvonko Stoianovski, commander of the BB and PVO ("Testimony" by Pande Petrovski, p. 181): "The ambush in Karpalak took place at 9:30 am. The same day a KFOR helicopter flew over the area. At 10:00 am we flew over the Karpalak area with our helicopters where we saw two NATO vehicles (two jeeps). One vehicle drove off and escaped while the other one hid in Novo Selo..." On page 177 Petrovski wrote: "...Karpalak would not have happened if the Supreme Commander had listened to the 'advisors' before signing the Framework Agreement... Even now it is still not clear to me who ordered the withdrawal of the Karpalak police post on August 6, 2001, the Ministry of Defense and General Headquarters were not informed about that!"

The ambush took place at 9:30 am, exactly when the KFOR helicopter flew into the zone. Obviously they wanted to see for themselves if their plan was being implemented properly. Two hundred kilograms of explosives were also placed on the highway to demolish it but the presence of the Macedonian

helicopters scared off the terrorists before they had a chance to blow it up.

43.2. On August 9, 2001 five workers were kidnapped from GP “Mavrovo” and then their bodies were “ornately carved” with knives. The “Engravers” were never punished even though the authorities knew who they were.

43.3. After that it was the attack in Radusha. About that, on pages 186 and 187, Petrovski wrote: “We knew that the NLA had a ‘recruit training camp’ near the Krivenik, inside Kosovo, about one kilometre from the border... The terrorists who launched the attack, from the Kosovo side and at the same time from inside the village Radusha, were allowed to freely communicate with Krivenik even though KFOR forces were there beside them on the other side of the border.” There was a conflict in Radusha earlier but it was not as fierce as this one. The attack began on the night of August 10, 2001 with the offensive originating in Krivenik, lasting three days. According to intelligence sources, 600 terrorists were aided by volunteers from the Kosovo Protection Corps. Their goal was to occupy the water sources in Rasche, which supplied Skopje with water.

43.4. On August 10, 2001, eight Macedonian soldiers were killed and six were wounded when a mine was exploded at the entrance of the village Liuboten.

43.5. Days before the Ohrid Agreement there was news that an imminent NLA attack on Sarai was going to take place on August 13, 2001 (p. 201/202). This was psychological warfare against Macedonia to keep it in constant vigilance and wear it down with fabricated news about the number of NLA attacks that were going to take place...

43.6. If anyone believes that all this escalation, before signing the Ohrid Agreement, was the doing of the Albanians alone, they are lying to themselves. Why was there a KFOR helicopter flying over Karpalak and two NATO jeeps visiting the area at the exact time when the ambush took place? All this was organized and the doing of someone a lot more sophisticated than the Albanians.

Someone was monitoring and directing activities from the distance with sweeping strokes. Who could that possibly have been? The readers can decide for themselves.

The Ohrid Agreement was signed on August 13, 2001. The additional pressure obviously did its job. Under the circumstances even more capable negotiators than the Macedonians would have probably found themselves in a bind.

E. Events with broad and long-term consequences

44. Washington's role in the structuring of the Ohrid Agreement was a logical continuation and an important step in establishing U.S. policy towards Macedonia and the Macedonian people, which it has systematically and persistently implemented since the breakup of Yugoslavia. Slowly but surely, the space for "Macedonian-ism" narrowd as Macedonia's roots were being progressively cut. By all indications, if we continue to not resist they will continue to cut our roots until we disappear. If we continue like this, that moment is not very far.

44.1. What exactly do they want to accomplish with all these policies? Their aim is to close, once and for all, the "Macedonian Question". To them the reality of the Macedonian situation is not important. What is important is that we stand in the way of the realization of the "Greater Albania" project which is very important for their Balkan partners and for implementing American plans which will serve U.S. long-term interests in the region. And how can we say this with such certainty? More than 20 years have passed since Macedonia broke away from Yugoslavia and Washington has done nothing to help our situation and everything to push us further down the abyss. Publicly it has shown us a friendly face but behind the scenes it has played a different card. We can list incident after incident where the United States has always, without exception, worked against even the most basic Macedonian interests.

44.2. The Americans, it appears, are still not fully aware of Macedonia's vitality and of the Macedonian people's durability. They have not learned the lessons of history that Macedonians

cannot be eradicated without a great war, a war so great that it may engulf the entire world. Their planners, on the other hand, must have considered the realities on the ground and properly assessed that the Macedonian people are enormously tolerant.

However, the ball is now in their court. But if we continue to follow our proper, robust anti-action, traditional and decisive struggle to remain who we are by doing nothing... this time we may be wrong. So far our indecision, lack of coordination, lack of dedication, low level of professionalism... have done nothing to bring us desired results. In fact, the way we have acted so far has been detrimental to our people and to our country. It is high time we stand up for ourselves and tell the Americans - Enough!

45. We have never before been faced with such circumstances where we are being attacked from the inside, where a Framework Agreement has been used to recompose our state and destroy it from the inside. This is worse than the Greeks, Serbians and Bulgarians have done. They all had claims on our territory, our people, our church, etc. But now we have the United States doing even worse... and from the distance...

46. In order to overcome the current impasse Macedonia finds itself in, Macedonia must, as soon as possible, seriously examine the 2001 war. Without knowing what exactly happened, it will be hard to build a future at home in our country or beyond. We need to speak up and very loudly as to why the 2001 war took place! We must specify all reasons why we were defeated on the ground, especially when our forces came so close to winning at Arachinovo. Someone will have to bear responsibility for us losing the war and for the unacceptable restructuring of our state. Accountability will have to start from the top and work its way down to the advisors who played "Kissinger" in Ohrid. The last people to deal with the war may have had no command responsibility, but they too will have to bear the moral responsibility for their incompetence in the preparation of the Framework Agreement.

47. Documenting the recent past cannot and should not be exclusively about questioning the Albanian position. It is

undeniable that the Albanians were a contributing factor to starting the 2001 war and to drafting the Ohrid Agreement. The Agreement, after all, did resolve certain problems that were facing our fellow Albanians. Some aspects of the Agreement were fair and must be respected. But still, at the same time we must emphasize that a war was not needed to overcome these problems. But, on the other hand, we cannot tolerate any retaliation, which is present on the political scene.

48. With regards to the Albanian position in Macedonia, I believe we made some mistakes by not paying attention. Tupurkovski did call for dialog with the Albanians so that we could review their problems and come up with a permanent solution. What we don't know however, is if this was for real or a political bluff. But if we look at this from today's perspective, Tupurkovski was right, something had to be done. Indeed, in that period Macedonia was confronted with a permanent crisis, but instead of opening up the issue, we held anti-Albanian demonstrations in the park in front of the Assembly and behaved in an uncivilized and shameful manner towards the Albanians. The organizers and participants of these demonstrations should be ashamed of themselves for what they did.

The government too showed no understanding of the problem. The consequences for such immaturity and incompetence will be felt for a long time.

49. American attitudes towards Macedonia will inevitably have to be analyzed in the context with Greek politics and interests. Washington has supported Greek aspirations but only because of convenience. The near future may show that U.S. policies may be just as dangerous and harmful to Greece, as they have been for Macedonia! There are over one million Albanians currently living in Greece... Around 600 thousand are legal and the rest are illegal immigrants. They control organized crime and generate huge amounts of money... At the same time the issue of "Chamiria" is hanging in the air... which can be activated at any time, especially now that the Greek state is rapidly declining as a result of its deep economic crisis. If this problem is not solved

and continues to drag on with the same intensity, the “Albanian national question” is sure to surface there too. It is inevitable.

50. We are not making this up about Greece. During informal talks in Moscow in 2006, Teuta Arifi, then president of the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs, in confidence said: “I told Ahmeti that it was a great shame that there are no appropriate conditions placed in Greece, so we can do there what we did in Macedonia in 2001!” This is not something that Arifi made up on the fly; it is part of the Albanian political creed. Frightening isn’t it?

50.1. Albanians, so far, have demonstrated complete loyalty and have carried out Washington’s directives to the maximum. The new partnership is working well and the relationship of the two sides continues to strengthen. The crisis in Greece would eventually determine what role the Albanians will play in that country. If the state survives the crisis and restores positive energy and economic growth, the Albanian problem may be delayed. But if the chaos continues and persists, Washington will play its role with the local Albanians in Greece as it did in Macedonia.

The first victim of the new American political games in the Balkans was Serbia (Kosovo and Kraina in Croatia), the second was Macedonia (2001), but the story is not yet over. Will there be a third?

51. This is confirmation that U.S. policy is not going to always be complementary to Greece’s long-term interests. Athens had its own merit for denying the Macedonian state’s existence, for which it is walking on thin ice. At any time Washington may change its mind about supporting Greece and Greece in turn may turn out to be the biggest loser.

52. Anti American sentiments are very common in Greece. Athens kept flirting with Moscow and bought weapons from Russia even though it has been a long time member of NATO. How did Washington feel about that? Washington never liked Greece, in fact after the collapse of the USSR and the Warsaw

Pact, Turkey became the new leader in the Balkans, among other things, at the expense of Greece. Socialism is no longer a threat and therefore Greece's role as a protector from socialism is no longer required. Turkey, on the other hand, is an increasingly important global player. Its presence and influence in the region and beyond is rapidly growing thanks to its rapid economic development and growth. Turkey also plays an important role in the so-called "Turko-phonic" countries in Central Asia (Tadzhikistan...).

U.S. interest in Turkey grow as Greece remains limited and reduced.

53. Finally, it is important to remind the Americans that Albania and Albanians, after World War II, were at first Yugoslavia's best friends, then they quickly became best friends with the USSR, following that they became China's best friends. With friends like that who needs enemies? Now they have embraced the Americans but until when? When building its policies towards Macedonia and the Macedonian people, Washington should remember that alliances and partnerships are not forever...

54. If we are to objectively analyze the situation we will find that a stable, lasting and prosperous Macedonia is the best solution for everyone. Starting with Greece and going through Bulgaria, Serbia, Albania, Kosovo and all the way to Brussels and Washington. Macedonia has not disputed or threatened anyone. Tolerance and patience are its two main characteristics. This is how it has been for centuries and this is how it will remain in the future. If you look at the last two hundred years no one has suffered from Macedonian aggression because such an aggression does not exist. Rather, the Macedonians have always been victims of foreign interests and aspirations. This is how it was yesterday and this is how it is today. But someday this must end, especially in the interest of peace in the region. The quicker everyone realizes that, the better for all of us.

55. As a rule, the big and strong never admit their mistakes but continue to push their agendas to the end. For that reason we will dedicate this section of the write up to logically look at the American role in the 2001 war in Macedonia. Two Macedonians were tried in the Hague International Court for former Yugoslavia, one was convicted! The Macedonians were victims in this conflict yet they were sent to be tried! Why? Was it to justify, verify and validate that the war was indeed a “humanitarian” war? The aggressors, some of whom in fact had “carved” the human bodies of civilians for no reason at all; the aggressors who turned off the water and left people without drinking water for days; and the aggressors who blasted buildings with workers inside tied against poles... never reached the Hague. And on top of that, they were fully pardoned. Was this America’s doing? Who else has that kind of authority? You be the judge!

This, of course, was not done willfully and voluntarily by the Macedonian authorities. Even though years later former NATO Secretary-General Robertson said: “You amnestied them yourselves! Nobody forced you!” This was only partially true but it was done only because the pressure to do it was fierce. It was others, the non-Macedonians, or so called “facilitators” that alone led the dance during those times when Macedonia was being beheaded. The message given by these outsiders was crystal clear ‘do it or else!’ This would definitely not have been a solution we would have chosen, had it been entirely our choice.... But it was not...

This is exactly how it was. But had the Macedonian side had the means, understanding and proper evaluation of the situation, as well as access to experienced advisors, perhaps the situation would have turned out differently...

But it seems, the Americans were well aware of the limit of our understanding of our situation and acted hypocritically all along. This is why as victims we were prosecuted yet the aggressors enjoyed the glory of their victory! Absurdity has truly reached new heights in this scenario. We have shown to the Americans that we will do whatever they want us to do and there will be no consequences on their part... because we did it...

What the Americans did in Macedonia must be the envy of film screenwriters...

56. The Hague Court, it seems, plays more of a political than a legal role, as was confirmed by Danish judge Fredirik Harhov (“We were pushed to release Gotovina and Markach”, “Dnevnik”, June 15, 2013). Not that this was not clear, but more importantly this testimony comes from the inside. In a letter addressed to his Court colleagues and to 40 or so other people, Harhov claimed that: “The Hague Court does not deal justice, it implements policy decisions.” Harhov accused U.S. Judge Theodor Meron, President of the Court, of “pushing the other judges in the case of Gotovina and Perishich...”

According to “Dnevnik”, American journalist Chuck Sudetich who reported on the war in Yugoslavia for the “New York Times”, for the “The Economist”, said: “Hitler would probably be relieved of all responsibility for the Holocaust if he were tried by the standards now applied at the Hague.”

And now that the U.S. is mixed up in the affairs of the accused persons from Croatia and Slovenia, where the Americans were not directly involved in the wars, how do you think they will fare in comparison to those involved in the 2001 war which was under direct American control? Will the Americans abandon their partners and employees at the court? They did not abandon the Albanian criminals in Macedonia... Was this because they were fighting for “humanitarian” reasons... and the others weren’t? Time will tell...

VI – Chossudovsky’s Analysis

1. Another valuable source of information about the 2001 war in Macedonia was from Michel Chossudovsky who wrote a number of articles in 2001, all of which are available online on the internet. Chossudovsky, as we will show, has proof that the 2001 war was led by the U.S. and that Macedonia was, no doubt, a victim of America in that war. One of the most interesting texts he has written is the article: “Macedonia: Washington’s Military - Intelligence Ploy”, released on June 17, 2001.

Chossudovsky, a well-known analyst, immediately recognized that the hints given by the Americans that NATO was going to intervene to “save” Macedonia were pure propaganda! Who was NATO going to save Macedonia from? The NLA?!

Chossudovsky wrote: “It is well-documented that the NLA terrorists are directly related to the KLA who were armed and trained by Washington. So why would the United States intervene under the umbrella of NATO against the army that represents its own interests?” Chossudovsky estimated that the “U.S. used UCK fighters against the Macedonian military.” According to Chossudovsky, “even though U.S. troops in KFOR were not directly involved, MPRI, which was contracted by the Pentagon, advised the KLA and its NLA representatives in Macedonia.”

According to Chossudovsky “military personnel from the Kosovo Protection Corps had joined the NLA and so did G’zim Ostreni, the Kosovo Protection Corp’s Chief of Staff who at the time was still being paid by the UN. He was appointed ‘Second Commander’ of the NLA.” Ostreni’s UN salary was not terminated even though he left his UN job!

Chossudovsky also said that there was a deep friendship between General Richard Griffiths and KLA commander Agim Cheku.

Griffiths, who at the time was director of the MPRI program in Macedonia, according to Chossudovsky, was “the bridge between the two armies”, which gathered intelligence from the Macedonian army and passed it on to Agim Cheku and his MPRI

colleagues who then advised the KLA in Kosovo. He also informed MPRI headquarters in Virginia, which was in close contact with the Pentagon.”

Chossudovsky also acknowledged that in 2001, MPRI’s venture in Macedonia was coordinated with another operation sponsored by the CIA. The head of the OSCE Mission in Skopje was none other than Robert Frowick. Chossudovsky wrote: “Following Washington’s instructions, Frowick managed to engage the NLA directly into the political scene...”

2. Frowick’s role in Macedonia, according to Chossudovsky, was to connect with the identical role of CIA agent William Walker, who played the same role in Kosovo. Walker was head of the OSCE mission in Prishtina. It is well-known that Walker staged an absolutely fictional motive (the armed conflict between the KLA and the Serbian military was presented as a massacre against the civilian population) to justify the bombing of Yugoslavia.

Chossudovsky concluded that “It is public knowledge now in Macedonia that both the Macedonian government and the Macedonian army collaborated with the enemy, called the United States”. Whether they knew that the United States was the enemy or not, that is a different question...?

3. Chossudovsky also confirmed that Frowick was obliged to establish a connection between the Albanian political parties in Macedonia and NLA terrorists because PDP and DPA were not up to date with current events. It is confirmation that the 2001 war in Macedonia was an American project.

In an article published on August 29, 2001, Chossudovsky wrote: “The Framework Agreement had no connection with any ‘peace’! It was a document that required the surrender of a sovereign state to the enemy...” About J. Pardew, who represented himself to the foreign media as a “foreign facilitator”, Chossudovsky said: “His military intelligence mandate was to assist, through pressure, intimidation and political manipulation, in the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement.”

Chossudovsky also wrote a lot of other articles from which we have taken the following quotes:

“It is now fully documented that Washington was behind the terrorist attacks in Macedonia. While State Secretary Colin Powell reaffirmed U.S. determination to combat terrorism, U.S. military advisors were working together with the NLA terrorists.”

“Among the terrorists retreating from Arachinovo, there were 17 MPRI instructors.”

“Before the terrorists were defeated in Arachinovo they raised a white flag. In panic OSCE and NATO immediately ordered a stop to the Macedonian military action.”

“OSCE and KFOR entered Arachinovo and ‘saved’ 500 terrorists and, along with their weapons, took them to the village Radusha, where they renewed their attacks killing civilians and carrying out ethnic cleansing in several Macedonian villages...”

“Macedonian security forces claimed that 70% of the equipment the terrorists used in Arachinovo was U.S. made, including the sophisticated third generation night vision cameras...”

“NATO transported the terrorists from one place to another and re-armed them instead of taking their weapons.”

“In the middle of March 2001, the Pentagon approved the use of a few drones to monitor the Macedonian-Kosovo border. There are indications that the information gathered was sent to the U.S., which in turn was used to advise the terrorists.”

“In Tetovo Region, in villages inhabited by Macedonians, ethnic cleansing was done in the presence of American military personnel who then advised the terrorist commanders.”

“This terrible military intelligence enterprise was made possible because the Macedonian President and some of his associates were American puppets.”

“The British special forces, who trained the UCK terrorists in 1999, also arranged the handover or surrender of NLA weapons.”

“Among the NLA fighters there are Albanian volunteers from the United States who have joined the NLA with agreement from the U.S. government.”

“The International Crisis Group and Human Rights Watch are working secretly for NATO and “are an integral part of the military-intelligence enterprise” in Macedonia. “Their job is to influence public opinion in Macedonia and to turn the people against the Macedonian government but not against the U.S., NATO, or the IMF.”

If only ten percent of what Chossudovsky has written is true then there is already enough evidence to grasp the reality of the situation. It is well-known to us that everything he has said is absolutely true.

All of Chossudovsky’s articles can be found online under the heading: “Chossudovsky on Macedonia”.

VII – Why did the U.S.A. recognize Macedonia by its proper name in 2004?

1. Many among us, including many politicians, do not know what actually happened in November 2004. If you recall, a referendum was being prepared to prevent new administrative divisions from taking place. The aim of these divisions was to Albanize Struga and Kichevo and to introduce bilingualism in Skopje. If there was bilingualism in the capital then it was only a matter of time before a large part of the country became bilingual. And this is exactly what happened because the referendum was prevented from taking place. Now the Albanian language has infiltrated into state agencies, public institutions, clinics, other agencies, etc., and is working its way into the larger firms, service industries, etc.

1.2. In order to achieve the required quota of 20 percent of Albanians in the Skopje community, Skopje region was restructured unnaturally to include rural municipalities and villages that had a predominantly Albanian population. The same was done with Struga and Kichevo... Instead of “tightening up” Skopje to enable it to become rapidly urbanized as a true metropolis of our independent state, we turned it into a provincial city in the worst possible way.

2. Macedonians traditionally don’t like referendums and may have not participated in the prevention of the administrative divisions, especially since the ruling SDSM called for a boycott. The Americans, however, were concerned and did not want to take the chance of having a referendum because if it was successful it would have interfered with their plans to Albanize parts of our country. So, clearly intending to undermine the referendum, on its eve, the United States announced that it had recognized Macedonia by its constitutional name! There followed a great eruption of euphoria in Macedonia, all organized by the Macedonian government, the same government which did not want a referendum. After the people saw that America was on their side their worries subsided and they forgot about the referendum. Initially, it seems, no one knew why the U.S. recognized Macedonia and very few were even aware that the

recognition was only bilateral and to be used only in mutual communications. But over time everything came to light.

2. 1. The unexpected American recognition of Macedonia's historical and constitutional name was received with much fervour in Macedonia and was seen as a significant step forward in relations between the two countries. Unfortunately, our first impressions turned out to be completely wrong. We soon discovered that the recognition did nothing and carried no special meaning. It even turned out to be detrimental to Macedonia's long-term interests. For the Americans it was a temporary sacrifice of a chess piece for achieving their final victory. It was a calculated American move designed, in the long term, to aid the implementation of U.S. policy in Macedonia; a policy which ignores the fundamental interests of the Macedonian people. A policy that would irreversibly albanize Struga and Kichevo and inappropriately introduce broad use of the Albanian language in Macedonia, while the Macedonian people essentially got nothing in return.

3. Even though it was strictly for bilateral communication between Macedonia and the United States, Macedonia's constitutional name was recognized with much glamour by the U.S., thus joining almost all Western countries where this kind of recognition had long been a practice. The UK, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Austria and even France, had all already used our name for bilateral needs. They all did it quietly, without any fuss, probably because of the great injustice they had committed against the Macedonian people and probably to avoid objections from Greece.

4. The reason the Americans "glamourized" the recognition, even though it was meaningless, was to upset Athens. And sure enough Athens reacted furiously, which in turn made a lot of people happy in Skopje. At the time it was reported that all of Athens was in shock but as it turned out it was only a Greek ploy and some good acting! Oh wow! How dare Washington take such a step without first informing Athens? But what kind of damage did America's recognition of Macedonia bring to Greece, outside of some short propaganda? None! There were absolutely no

serious consequences of this outcome that proved to be unfavourable for Athens. Instead it led to a turnaround in U.S. policy and, through Greece, the Americans used NATO and the EU in their favour.

5. The referendum failed but the planned, permanent and irreversible albanization of those territories succeeded. The Americans realized their vision. The new administrative division was one of modern Macedonia's biggest strategic mistakes. And what did the American recognition of Macedonia bring us? Nothing! No solid benefits! After that Washington hardened its relations with Macedonia which, three years or so later, became apparent in 2008 at the NATO summit in Bucharest. Here the U.S. did a complete turnaround in its treatment of Macedonia and went fully in favour of Greece. Macedonia, at that juncture, faced another roadblock towards NATO and the EU when it was first blackmailed to change its name and then told to change the identity of its people, if it wanted to become a member of these organizations. Greece has never had the authority to pull something this big and defy the entire Western world which included the U.S.A. The only power that had such authority was, without a doubt, the U.S.A. Ask yourself this: Does the U.S.A. need Greece's permission to start a war whenever it wants? The answer to this is absolutely not! And asking such a question is absurd at best!

6. After the Bucharest episode, the United States went back to openly advocating and publicly pressuring Macedonia to change its name. Reeker, U.S. Ambassador to Skopje, made these demands even to the media! In his interview with "Dnevnik" ("No talks about the identity", June 8, 2009) he openly said: "This country needs to find a name in order to start moving further towards full integration!" In other words if we don't find a name, according to Reeker, there will be no "integration"! Is this blackmail or not? We will let the readers decide. When Reeker's colleague in Athens tried to act in Macedonia's interests, like Reeker did for Greece's interests here, he was expelled immediately and relations with the U.S., if not broken, were certainly frozen. Here in Macedonia we do nothing and thus everything is possible.

7. Another important facet in U.S. policy towards Macedonia is the fact that the Americans insist that we “need to agree” with Greece, emphasizing that if we do, the U.S. will respect our agreement. This is loud and clear and openly advocates for a name change, a name to which Greece will agree. We all know, however, that Greece will never agree to anything because it is not in its interest. Therefore we are being asked either to commit suicide or be isolated forever. This fits very well with U.S. policy towards Macedonia. While the albanization continues as planned, the U.S. can hide behind Greece. This is the reality of America’s real-policy towards Macedonia but we are too blind to see it...

8. A top U.S. diplomat from the American embassy in Skopje (2010), after he had been informed that the U.S. had recognized Macedonia, that the referendum failed and that parts of Macedonia had now been albanized, reacted positively and without any hesitation. He gave an unexpectedly direct and honest answer. He said, “Yes, then we had an argument in hand but we achieved our goal.” And then he asked: “What do we now need to do and what offers can we make for you to accept a new name?!” American pragmatism indeed has no limit. They pretend as if they care for Macedonia and the Macedonian people while, at the same time, they are doing everything to cross them! This reminds me of what Prichev once wrote, “Faces of saints, hearts of wolves!”

VIII – The Interim Accord, the NATO summit in Bucharest and The Hague verdict

A. The Interim Accord

1. The Interim Accord, signed by Macedonia and Greece on September 13, 1995, was not an obligation derived from the Security Council Resolution with which Macedonia was conditionally admitted to the UN. There is no legal connection between the Interim Agreement and the Security Council Resolution, only a functional one. Unfortunately, given the fact that there is even the slightest connection has made Macedonia's position in the dispute unfavourable. The language used in the Interim Accord unfortunately points to the language used in the UN document, which is bad for Macedonia.

Since we know that the Interim Accord was an American initiative then we should not be surprised that it was worded in such a way, so as to cause damage to Macedonian interests in the long term.

1.1. The Interim Accord was drafted with active participation from former mediator Cyrus Vance and is naturally a logical segment of the mosaic of Washington's long-term policy towards Macedonia. The Agreement was signed under the direct involvement of capable facilitator and American diplomat Holbrook. So the question is, "What was Holbrook doing there if the United States was not behind the whole name issue? Holbrook, understandably, became involved at the insistence of the UN Secretary-General. Why? Did the UN not have capable facilitators of its own?"

The way the Interim Accord was handled is proof that Washington managed both the problem and its mediation. There should also be no doubt that Athens was also involved in the preparation of the Accord.

2. The Interim Accord, there is no doubt, in broad terms, was well thought out and designed to deliver on some specific goals.

First, the Interim Accord came into being because there was a need to settle some issues between Macedonia and Greece and establish normal relations between the two countries.

Second, the Interim Accord was to be the vehicle by which issues of interest to both parties were to be resolved, even though the accord was designed to favour Greece. But we can't say it was all bad, despite the damage it inflicted, there was a small benefit that emerged from it... Macedonia was recognized...

Third, the fact that the Interim Accord officially outlined that "there was a problem with our name" had serious negative consequences for Macedonia. Macedonia had no problem with its name and yet the document was signed with our country being nameless and being referred to as "the second party". It is true that Greece was also being referred to as "the first party" but that had nothing to do with Greece's name because no one was disputing it.

Fourth, another purpose of the Interim Accord was to open new avenues for achievements that were not possible through the UN. These, of course, were not put in to benefit Macedonia. On the contrary, by signing the accord we in fact legalized the illegal procedures that challenged our country's name.

Fifth, the ratification of the Interim Accord in our Parliament was not only unnecessary but a huge strategic mistake. There was nothing in the Accord that required parliamentary approval, so Greece, and rightly so, refused to proceed. The Interim Accord went into force one month after it was signed and died right there. With its ratification, unfortunately, Macedonia gave the Accord undue importance and the problem with the name received state-wide dimensions. Officially, the higher the document went in Macedonia, the worse a problem it created for the Macedonian side in the name dispute.

Sixth, Article 5 of the Interim Accord stated: "The Parties have agreed to continue negotiations under the auspices..." That part was meaningless because something that does not exist could not possibly continue... So, there should have been no

negotiations... Unfortunately, since Macedonia decided to enter into negotiations, through the Interim Accord, it directly degraded its own position in the dispute. It accepted that indeed the name of its state was subject to negotiation when there was no such obligation in the Interim Accord or in the UN Security Council Resolution. No one had the right to impose on another party to negotiate the name of its own state. At least no sovereign state is expected to do that.

A few years later, in an interview, President Gligorov informed the public that the term “negotiations” with regards to the Interim Accord was adopted because of strong pressure and blackmail from Greece because without “negotiations”, the Greeks threatened, there would be no agreement! This certainly does not excuse us from making such mistakes, but it makes us more aware of the “games” being played. We were so far away from understanding what was happening to us, it was criminal! This is why it is so important to now investigate and understand what exactly happened during those critical times and why Holbrook was involved.

Seventh, the Interim Accord used the term “differences”, while the UN Security Council Resolution speaks of a “difference” over the country’s name. Normally “differences” means more than one thing and not singularly just the name.

Eighth, with Article 21, Macedonia abandoned even the opportunity to go to court and to seek legal justice! It obligated us not to be able to submit an application to The Hague. In other words, with Article 21 they removed our option to seek a legal resolution. By doing this they literally stopped us from going to court and exposing the illegal means by which our country had been admitted to the UN, in flagrant violation of its own Charter! That is why it is important to return to the problem in the UN by convincing Nimitz that it is fruitless to continue this process, which clearly has no end. We can then take our case to the court in The Hague a year after we withdraw from the Interim Accord!

Ninth, with Article 23 Macedonia and Greece accepted and signed the “Accord”, which placed our side in a very

unfavourable position. The drafting of the Interim Accord was most probably an American initiative to prepare the foundation for the dispute and to bring it back to bilateral waters because, by doing so, it would rob Macedonia of its manoeuvrability, especially since the Americans were well-aware that Greece would never agree to anything no matter what Macedonia proposed. With this move they tied Macedonia's hands behind its back. But, as was mentioned earlier, if Macedonia is to sign a lasting agreement with Greece, it must uncover all outstanding issues between the two countries, not just the name. If we don't uncover all outstanding issues and put them on the table, we would be making yet another strategic, unpardonable error. This means that any agreement with Greece must be regulated and must include the needs of the Macedonian people living inside Greece and the needs of the Macedonian people exiled by Greece, including their properties...

Is such a thing possible? You decide!

Tenth, the name was internationalized from the outset and it should and must be treated as such to the end. Macedonia was crippled by the UN Security Council and not by Athens. Therefore we need to go back to where the error was created in the first place and seek resolution there. Taking any other route will hurt our interests even more.

Eleventh, given that a solution must be sought from the UN Security Council, our diplomacy must start working overtime to make Russia, then China, the UK and the other permanent members of the UN Security Council aware of all the details, not only of our problems but also of our most legal aspirations. France is closely linked with Greece and we can hardly achieve anything with Paris, however, Paris too must be constantly and directly informed about our position and the moves that we are going to make. Without any doubt, the U.S. is the key to this problem and currently its manager. Therefore, the first thing we need to do is make our policies clear to the U.S., then, over time, ask for their support. They are the only ones who can reverse what has been done so far. At the moment this may seem unrealistic...

Twelfth, the vocabulary used in the Interim Accord has truly revealed America's aims in narrowing Macedonia's manoeuvrability. It is a step by step approach and a gradual process of deconstructing everything that is Macedonian, continuously implemented since the early 1990's.

3. Thesis, timing and motives for drafting the Interim Accord.

3.1. The first and most realistic assumption was that such an agreement never existed and was not needed while the Greek embargo was ongoing. They (Greece and the U.S.) were waiting for the Greek border blockade to exhaust Macedonia's economy and for Macedonia to collapse. There were clear indicators that the U.S. also, not only Samaras from Greece, expected Macedonia would not survive. Why else blockade Macedonia's border from the south when the border from the north (because of sanctions against Serbia) was already blockaded. They were attempting to choke Macedonia to death! Why did the U.S. and everyone else tolerate the daily havoc on Macedonia's economy without even making a peep? Could Greece have kept its border shut if the U.S. were to protest? Where was the propaganda campaign against the blockade? Here is an even better question: Why did the U.S. delay its recognition of Macedonia for years? Was Washington expecting Macedonia to implode from the inside? Much time passed and four years after the Yugoslav dissolution, Macedonia's durability was still questioned. Why? Because the U.S. was certain Macedonia was going to collapse and then when it didn't the U.S. took new measures to make it collapse? The first step it took was the Interim Accord.

3.2. The second assumption was that, without a "bilateral agreement", relations between the two countries would be constantly strained and without even minimal dialogue or cooperation. The border would remain blocked, Greece would not recognize Macedonia and the dispute would escalate... And if this were to happen, the entire region might become a security risk, which would require urgent attention. That, in itself, would jeopardize U.S. aims at quickly closing the "Macedonian question". In such a situation and due to the wars in the

neighborhood having just finished, there was no real requirement for Macedonia to be “immediately partitioned”, not even to be renamed by force. Thus, the likely conclusion was that the Macedonians had proved themselves to be tougher than anticipated and thus the U.S. would have to use different means to achieve its aims. But before it could do that it had to first create favourable conditions in order to succeed in the name game campaign.

The steps that follow will confirm this. It is within this framework that we see: a) the 1999 declaration of friendship and cooperation between Bulgaria and Macedonia (when with American involvement and with our consent the Macedonian language was challenged), b) the 2001 War in Macedonia (when attempts were made to fragment our state by force and after those attempts failed, our state was reconfigured by fraudulent means), c) United States recognizing Macedonia in 2004 by its constitutional name (in order to successfully albanize parts of our country), d) Macedonia’s membership into NATO in Bucharest being blockaded (when Macedonia was blackmailed to officially change its name if it wanted membership in NATO)...

4. Drafting of the Interim Accord was an American initiative. The final text was, more or less, three times more in favour of Greece than it was for Macedonia. On top of that there were many negative implications for Macedonia imbedded in it. Articles 5, 6, 7, 21 and 23 were entirely in support of Greek interests while only Articles 1 and 11 were in support of Macedonia. Every other Article was, more or less, in support of both sides, although there were more pro-Greek tangible benefits imbedded in it. Key benefits for Macedonia were: a) Greek recognition of Macedonia (Article 1), and b) Greece was obligated not to block Macedonia’s integration into international processes (Article 11). Unfortunately Athens did not get the memo regarding this and continued to block Macedonia’s integration... It is important to also mention that the Interim Accord put an end to the two-year long illegal blockade of the border. In fact, ending the blockade was America’s strongest argument in squeezing Macedonia to sign the Accord. It is clear that the blockade was introduced and lasted as long as it did in order to force Macedonia to sign the

Accord. Macedonia suffered enormous damages as a result of the blockade which, no doubt, was implemented to weaken Macedonia to a breaking point...

4.1. It should also be emphasized that, thanks to the Interim Accord, today we have a favourable judgment by The Hague, which has been one of the strongest arguments in our favour regarding the dispute.

5. Our biggest advantage has been the fact that after the Accord was signed we somehow were left alone and in peace for several years, which worked well for Macedonia. We have received a number of recognitions under our country's constitutional and historical name and our country's international position has continued to strengthen. Nearly two-thirds of the world's countries have recognized Macedonia. According to the number of people, probably four-fifths of the people in our world have recognized our country. Greece and its partners in the meantime have lost some ground.

5.1. In time Macedonia began to slowly recover and become more stable and prosperous. But, it seems, some international factors are still not happy. Why? Why were they not happy that Macedonia had done everything in its power to "peacefully" separate from Yugoslavia? It seems some prefer violence over peace? Instead of being rewarded for taking the road of peace, Macedonia was definitely punished...

5.2. Given Macedonia's past situation, today (2013) we can say with certainty that the 2001 war, in addition to accelerating the "Greater Albania" project, also put the brakes on Macedonia's ability to become a peaceful and stable country. Since U.S. plans were not completely realized through the 2001 war in Macedonia, it was normal for them to take different measures and realize them by different means. Macedonia must have seemed like an innocent lamb that could easily be sacrificed for the greater American good so the U.S. sponsored the 2001 war with armed aggression from Kosovo. When that did not work out the next blow took place in 2008 at the NATO summit in Bucharest. The

goal in 2008 was to give Macedonia a punch in the nose and let it know that American interests cannot just be ignored.

5.3. The U.S. not only stopped Macedonia's progress but pushed it back in time. Without being directly at fault, Macedonia sustained massive damage in all aspects of life, in politics, in the economy, in ethnic relations... The Americans did not want Macedonia to join NATO because they figured Macedonia's position could only strengthen and it would have been even more difficult to push it around and force it to change its name and rename its people. If Macedonia was inside NATO then the Americans could not treat it the way they do now...

5.4. In other words, if Greece no longer has an obligation to block Macedonia in joining NATO, etc., then the Americans will no longer have a hold on Macedonia, which would be detrimental to their long-term plans in Macedonia and in the wider region. The only way out of this bind was for Greece to ignore (that part of) the Interim Accord and, as we have seen, without any consequences. And that is exactly what is happening.

6. The fact that Washington and not Athens made these arrangements was confirmed by Nimitz in an interview given for Voice of America ("Dnevnik", March 3, 2008, "The Accord is over, now we need a new Accord"). In the interview Nimitz said: "Compromises were made at that time but the Interim Accord has ended. We are now talking about a new deal and people need to look at what can be done now..." In other words, only a month before the Bucharest Summit, Nimitz announced that the Interim Accord was no longer valid and therefore Greece no longer had obligations as per the Accord! So the stage was set to block Macedonia's accession into NATO.

6.1. For the first time Nimitz publicly, in this interview, put the "name" in historical context. He said: "The 'Macedonian question' may be present for hundreds of years...!" There is a strong impression that he may have done this inadvertently or perhaps on purpose, and uncovered both the essence of the problem and his ultimate goal. In other words Nimitz connected Macedonia's name with the "Macedonian question" and told us

that he was actually working with aims to close it! The key to closing the “Macedonian question” rests with Macedonia’s name! We change our name and we disappear from the face of the earth forever! It’s that simple!!!

6.2. There is no better proof than this to show that this whole mess we are in is about “the Macedonian people” and not about the name “Macedonia”? Otherwise, why mention the “Macedonian Question” which is much older than the “name dispute” over our country’s name? The Macedonian people were always a “nation” even when they did not have a country officially called “Macedonia” The functional relationship made between the “Macedonian Question” and the “name of our state” was strictly done in order to deny the existence of a separate Macedonian nation.

6.3. From whom, if not from Washington, was Nimitz obliged to send us the message mentioned earlier? This statement too is confirmation that Nimitz works for the State Department and not for the UN. Why else would he come out with news that the Interim Accord was no longer valid? The Interim Accord is a bilateral agreement between Macedonia and Greece and has nothing to do with the UN. Why would the UN, much less mediator Nimitz, have an interest in ending its importance? Nimitz, according to his mandate, has no connection with the Interim Accord, which means that he is not authorized to make such judgments. His role is to mediate, not make crucial decisions... (In fact, the “abolishment” of the Interim Accord, no doubt would strain ties between Macedonia and Greece because there are no conditions for a new agreement. Thus, the search for a solution would become more difficult. It would also be to Nimitz’s detriment because his function on behalf of the UN would end).

6.4. We should be grateful to Nimitz because he has been a valuable source of information, although slightly encrypted, regarding the essence and background of U.S. relations with Macedonia. Events that follow will uncover more of this. He made the statement for someone’s needs. But for whose needs?! It is clear that he made this statement for our needs. Besides the

U.S., there is no other candidate more interested than us. According to the old mosaic of American policies, the U.S. has special interests in Macedonia and thus will not allow Macedonia to join NATO before it resolves the name issue.

6.5. Except for the statement made by Nimitz about Macedonia and its people, the U.S. has been relatively silent on the subject and has stood behind Greece as if all this doing was a Greek idea. But, since the 2008 Bucharest fiasco, while Greece has been sitting on the sidelines, the U.S. has been the main advocate pushing Macedonia to change its name. It has openly made it clear that it wants Macedonia to change its name and accept a new name which is also agreeable to Greece. The U.S. will then begin using the new name!

B. The NATO Summit in Bucharest

7. Macedonia should have been admitted into NATO under its current “reference” during the Bucharest Summit held from April 2 to 4, 2008. It was normal to expect the admission because one, all NATO members had confirmed that Macedonia had met all the necessary criteria for admission and two, the Interim Accord “guaranteed” that Greece would not veto its attempt.

7.1. But unexpectedly Macedonia was not admitted. Why? Because of a Greek veto?! So it was said! But since when does Greece have that kind of clout to defy the wishes of all NATO members including the U.S. and for what reasons? The so-called “name dispute” is a bilateral issue and has nothing to do with NATO! Greece does not have that kind of clout, but the U.S. does; it practically runs NATO. And who do you suppose, outside of the U.S., would have even the courage to pull such a stunt? No one! Greece did what it was asked to do by Washington and that is the only reason why Greece did not get punished for what it did! Remember what Nimitz said in the interview with Voice of America. And as such, Macedonia has been again blackmailed to first change its name then... maybe... doors will be opened in NATO, the EU and so on...

7.2. During the Bucharest Summit, Greece deliberately violated the Interim Accord and hindered Macedonia's accession into NATO. But by now we should know that Greece could not have done this alone. Greece, without support from its allies, could not have so easily ignored the Interim Accord and got away with it without consequences. This act alone disgraced NATO, its leaders and all member states without exception. Macedonia sustained collateral damage and paid for the consequences resulting from hidden interests, manipulation, double standards, unprincipled acts and inconsistencies... not to mention bullying and violations of international law. Law and justice were grossly violated at the Summit. If this is democracy, then what isn't?

Even though Greece may have profited from this the most, for the moment, we will see what will happen in the future.

8. Like all other members of the Alliance, Greece can play solidarity, use procedural opportunities, seek support, or use its veto power. But it is unrealistic for a small and insignificant country like Greece to make major decisions and impose its will on important matters... If this were true, NATO would have been dysfunctional a long time ago. Greece and any other NATO member alone, outside of the U.S., does not have the authority to dictate new policies for NATO. Realistically, NATO is not there to serve Greek interests. The solidarity offered is a matter of principle and limited at best. In practice it does not work the way we are led to believe. Members may have the power to enforce existing policies and make exceptions, but never to create new policies and, to everyone's surprise, implement them on the fly without anyone knowing. It is foolish to believe that Greece acted alone in Bucharest...

9. If in Bucharest, for example, Greece was really the main obstacle to Macedonia's admission to NATO, at least, there would not have been a change of policy in the Alliance; i.e. to impose a permanent blockade plus the blackmail for Macedonia to change its name. There would be no conditions where ultimatums are formulated, i.e. "change the name first, then membership..." Greece's doing alone could not have resulted in Macedonia's rejection without massive consequences for Greece.

As much as Athens likes to do all this and brags that it did it, it was not possible without the alliance's authorization. There was no veto in Bucharest, we were told, but in order to avoid a direct Greek blockade, everyone lined up behind this "new" policy. What a bunch of...

Greece, no doubt, violated the Interim Accord but it did it because it was part of the consensus. Without it, it was not possible to reject Macedonia's entry into NATO and Macedonia would have been free to join. Athens, however, indirectly hindered that...

10. Like it was mentioned earlier, there is no other country in the NATO alliance, outside of the U.S. that has the authority to dictate new policies. If Washington, for example, had the slightest doubt that this new policy was inadequate and bad for Macedonia... it would have had no chance of being implemented. Also, if the U.S. had a different attitude towards Macedonia, than the one described above, then it would have intervened on Macedonia's behalf and the result would have been quite different. If Washington thought that Macedonia should have joined NATO under its reference, i.e. if the U.S. was in support of the Interim Accord, the new policy would not have been implemented and Macedonia would have been a NATO member by now. In fact, generally speaking, the Americans take responsibility for at least 30% of all alliance decisions. In this particular case, however, the Americans undoubtedly took a more dominant role... nearly one hundred percent. No doubt the U.S. also had support from France, Germany... and so on; a kind of support that should not be underestimated.

11. After the Bucharest Summit, the dealings with the name issue were moved from New York to Brussels. But the main bridge between these two major world centres remained Washington. With its new policy towards Macedonia, NATO has exceeded its authority and illegally interfered as a World Organization. NATO established new norms, beyond the ones described by the UN Security Council which corresponded with Macedonia's obligations to enter the UN in which, for example, there was no explicit requirement for Macedonia to change its name. So, who

gave NATO the right to demand that Macedonia change its name?

11.1. Nimitz also got his new role in Bucharest. Since then he has been working for Brussels but as directed from Washington. It was especially apparent before the end of 2012 and during the beginning of 2013, when talks of a date for negating Macedonia's membership in the EU were being discussed. After a long break Nimitz was "reactivated" for the needs of the European Union. This tells us that Nimitz never worked for the UN and his most recent involvement, yet again, proves that Nimitz always worked for U.S. interests...

11.2. The transfer from New York to Brussels, no doubt, was made for pragmatic reasons. While Nimitz from the UN side had no tools to pressure Macedonia, NATO and the EU not only had the right tools but also used them. They started using force and blockade ultimatums while in parallel pressuring Macedonia to change its name if it wanted to join them thus usurping its universal right to use whatever name it wanted. Nobody has the right to force a sovereign state to change its name in order to be admitted into an institution, except for Macedonia, of course. Macedonia became a candidate for public humiliation.

12. There were strong indicators that the NATO Summit in Bucharest was the beginning of the final stage of closing the "Macedonian Question". In fact, from what Nimitz had told "Voice of America" a new agreement with Greece would be unattainable. The pressure is on for Macedonia to capitulate...

13. There is one more point which deserves our attention because it fits perfectly with America's long-term attitude towards Macedonia. At a press conference, just at the end of the Bucharest Summit on April 8, 2008, Daniel Fried, Assistant Secretary of State, during a provocation from a Greek journalist ("Macedonians are a fact for the United States", "Dnevnik", April 9, 2008), said: "I do not think that the Macedonian language is called as such. The Macedonian language exists. Macedonians exist. As you know, the Macedonian language has been studied by the State Department!" He also said: "There is

certainly a historic Macedonian province, which is something different from the state... It is clear that the Government of Macedonia has no pretensions. We recognize the difference between the historic territory of Macedonia, which is certainly larger than the state...”

13.1. The Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs reacted immediately. Bakoyannis from Athens said that, “Such statements do not help to resolve the disputed issues between Athens and Skopje.” She then said: “Athens will not be drawn into such discussions...”

13.2. Unfortunately Macedonia still remained deaf to Washington’s official position and did not take advantage of the comments made and use them to Macedonia’s advantage. Even since then, not a single statement has been made by the Americans in support of Macedonia, the Macedonian people, or the Macedonian language... All that followed from the U.S. side since then were promises that the name and not the identity of the people are under discussion...! More and more lies.

The Americans have repeatedly said that they supported Macedonia’s NATO membership but at the same time emphasize that it had to be done under “acceptable” conditions... “first change your name then you can join...”

Our politicians not only remained silent on this but publicly thanked the Americans for their support!? Reporters did the same and no one asked the American officials: “Under what conditions are you supporting us?”

13.3. Fried’s advice has been immortalized. Fried was a long serving diplomat since 1977 who served in senior positions with the State Department until May 15, 2009, just a few months after President Barak Obama’s inauguration. It remains for us to understand what possible reasons there could have been for him to tell us to presume that the abandonment of our diplomacy was perhaps tied with them (U.S.)?? So, it would appear that the U.S. had formulated a policy towards Macedonia a long time ago...

C. Why President Bush's support was not enough?

14. At this point we need to explain President Bush's involvement in the Summit so that we leave no doubts about the reality of the Macedonian situation. Bush had some personal ambitions as to what was going to happen at the Bucharest Summit, which included a personal and ambitious mandate to stabilize the southern flank of NATO by adding Albania, Macedonia and Croatia to it. He had made this statement earlier but was overridden less than 24 hours before the Summit took place. Nothing like that had ever happened to another American president! Obviously, the administration did not share Bush's personal interests and bumped Macedonia right out of his plans. Well, what can we do? While Bush went into history, the American bureaucracy that did this to us is still alive and well and continues to make life hard for us. In any case, Bush deserves our respect for trying...

15. According to unconfirmed reports from Turkish sources, the night before the summit Bush met with Turkish President Gul who he asked not to set any conditions; all three together as a group to join NATO, or none. It was speculated that Turkey could support Macedonia but Bush did not want to risk the summit to experience a total failure without admitting any new members. Ankara, despite its undeniable commitment to Macedonia's membership, apparently was not ready to confront the sole superpower. And who was?

16. The fact that Turkey did not voice its support for Macedonia in Bucharest, also confirms that the U.S. stood behind Macedonia's rejection; not just Greece. If Athens was the bearer of this blockade and the architect of the new policy, Ankara would have certainly and vehemently opposed it and would have done everything in its power to help Macedonia join NATO. But because the United States was behind the rejection, Turkey had some grave concerns.... The bite would have been too much for Turkey.

16.1. According to information received from reliable sources, Macedonia also officially requested that Turkey play the three

card hand; all three candidates together or none. If that was true then there was a serious error made. If Ankara was prepared to take such a step it would have been because of its own decision. Whether it was going to succeed or not, would have been another matter. Our initiative, of course, was to engage Turkey to act in our favour.

17. In Macedonia there was speculation that the government, in collusion with President Tsrvenkovski, did not play well in Bucharest. Bush was left in the lurch, by not giving him a chance to help us because our people did not come out with a clear position on Nimitz's latest proposal ("Republic of Macedonia – Skopje"). Unfortunately, all these accusations are baseless because Macedonia had no role in the "high politics" played in Bucharest. It was a play for foreign ideas, plans and interests. So, no matter how the play went and who said what, the outcome would have been the same... Nimitz's proposal was unacceptable to Athens and the U.S. would not permit Macedonia's entry into NATO with the reference. Our officials were powerless to change anything and the decisions they had previously made were useless, irrespective of what they were...

17.1. A higher level of manipulation was in fact staged in Bucharest to prevent Macedonia's full integration into the international community. After the UN received Macedonia's application it illegally suspended Macedonia's name and Macedonia was forced to join the UN with a reference. There is only one reason this was done; to rename the Macedonian state and the Macedonian people. Since attempts to change Macedonia's name at the UN failed, the next logical step was to remind Macedonia that unless it changed its name it would never enter any international institutions. This of course was demonstrated in Bucharest, the second time Macedonia took a serious step in joining another international institution, this time NATO. Macedonia's failure to join the UN, of course, caused it great harm and so did its failure to join NATO. Both times Macedonia was a victim of political intrigue... This should be a wake up call for the Macedonian people that "no one can be trusted", least of all these so-called "democratic" states under the umbrella of Washington and Brussels who would not hesitate, in

the least, to ignore relevant international documents, principles, procedures, rules... for selfish interests...

The first time international rules were ignored, with regard to Macedonia, was in 1993 in New York. The first “victim” of abuse was the UN Charter of Rights. The Charter of Rights was ignored in order to “depersonalize” Macedonia.

The second time international rules were ignored, with regard to Macedonia, was in 2008 in Bucharest, at the NATO summit. The second “victim” of abuse was the Interim Accord. The Accord was ignored in order to again “depersonalize” Macedonia. It was they (the U.S. included) who drafted the Accord and it was the same they who ignored it because in the most bizarre way it turned out to be favourable for Macedonia. In other words it would have allowed Macedonia to join NATO under its reference. So, the aim here was and still is to permanently settle the “Macedonian Question” before Macedonia can enter any international institution, even under its reference!

17.2. Aside from Macedonia, another victim of collateral damage in Bucharest was President Bush, who fought to the end to correct the injustice perpetrated against Macedonia but without success. Bush later invited Tsrvenkovski and Gruevski to Zagreb for a post-Summit chat. After that he introduced a Memorandum of Security and Cooperation, which later was signed by Washington. This is also proof that our leaders did not make any wrong moves. Even though these were mere gestures, they were top honours for Macedonia.

D. The Hague verdict

18. After the Interim Accord was violated at the Bucharest Summit, Macedonia took its case before the court in The Hague and filed charges against Greece. Macedonia needed to take this case to court, not only to test if its rights were violated but also to prove to Greece and others, that it wasn't going to sit idle and be bullied. From past experience and knowing how things had been done, Macedonia was quite surprised that the Court ruled it its favour. The Court clearly specified that Greece was in breach of

the Accord and had interfered in Macedonia's attempt to join NATO.

18.1. Unfortunately the judgment against Greece changed nothing. At first both Washington and Brussels complained about Macedonia having launched a lawsuit, then they vehemently opposed it during its proceedings and later completely ignored it after the Court ruled. That, however, did not diminish its importance. The Court ruling is the strongest weapon in the so-called Greek-Macedonian "name dispute" and should weigh heavily on Washington and Brussels, even though they refuse to acknowledge it. If they do this again the world is sure to notice. First they compromised the UN Charter of Rights, then they grossly violated an international agreement... without consequences... But how long can this go on without someone complaining?

18.2. There was an article in "Dnevnik", published on April 10, 2013, under the heading "Serbian or not Serbian" in which the following was written: "Gruevski spoke of having major disagreements and a fight with an 'important ambassador' who was angry because the Prime Minister did not accept his recommendation not to file a lawsuit at The Hague." We are absolutely certain that that "important ambassador" was none other than Philip Reeker, American Ambassador to Macedonia. There should also be no doubt that the fight was about more than just the "recommendation" that he made. Reeker did not take well to anyone going against his wishes and was known to get into fits of uncontrolled rage.

18.3. Washington finally tipped its hand when Macedonia said it was going to take the Greek veto to the courts and ask for a ruling. Initially Washington was vehemently against Macedonia taking this matter to the courts! Why? If this had nothing to do with "American interests" why complain? After the Court's ruling Washington not only ignored the verdict but it became extremely hostile towards Macedonia. We could see from its reaction that Washington - a) had hidden intentions towards Macedonia, b) would not accept anything that did not fit with its plans, and c) not only managed but also fully controlled the so-

called “name dispute”. We can clearly see that there is firm American determination to achieve goals, even at the expense of the Macedonian nation. Washington would not hesitate to erase Macedonians from the map if that’s what it takes to achieve its aims. Let us remind you that they violated the UN Charter of Rights and ignored The Hague ruling! These are two of the world’s highest legal institutions and they are not something with which one can trifle! They also violated Article 11 of the Interim Accord which they drafted in the first place! If this was not a violation then why did The Hague rule in our favour?

18.4. Looking at this from another angle. One, why would the United States not want Macedonia to take Greece to The Hague? Two, why would the United States ignore the Court’s verdict if it was only about Greece and not about its own interests? Why are the Americans and not the Greeks telling us that we need to solve our problems through dialogue? Why are the Americans telling us not to take our problems to the courts and insist that we solve them through dialogue with Greece when in fact dialogue is not possible with Greece? How can we have dialogue with Greece, a country that does not respect our right to exist and for centuries has done everything it can to extinguish our existence? In fact, how can such a dialogue even be possible with someone who does not respect its contractual obligations even after it was tried in court?

19. If the United States had no ulterior motives and was serious about helping Macedonia, it would have abided by international law. Unfortunately, as much as the United States likes to hide its true intentions, they are still calculatingly hostile and diametrically opposed to Macedonia’s interests. If American intentions were positive towards Macedonia, the United States would have had no logical reason to oppose the Hague verdict. And if the problem was caused by Greece alone then The Hague would have recommended that the decision of the court of justice be respected.

20. Why do you think that the United States, and all the other countries standing behind it, “politicized” this problem and made it everyone’s business? After all it is only a bilateral issue

between Macedonia and Greece? Right? What does it have to do with the United States, France...? The problem was raised to international status and received “political” dimensions because someone wanted to be able to put a lot of pressure on Macedonia... until it capitulated. There is also the fact that “political problems” tend to be resolved by force, military or otherwise, through a revolution, through a dictatorship, through a coup... In other words, when a problem is “politicized” there are many options open to solving it. Let us not fool ourselves, the world has always been ruled through power, which is also true today. Democracy, diplomacy, etc., are devices designed to keep the naïve busy and working as long as they serve the powerful. The moment a ruling did not serve their purpose it is no longer valid; including The Hague verdict! If you think we are all equal under the law and there is justice for everyone, think again. The strong and wealthy are “more equal” than the rest of us. This was well-demonstrated to us in the last couple of decades or so! This is how it was 100 years ago, this is how it is today and this is how it is going to be for a long, long time. There is no difference in what kind of society you live; Orthodox, Catholic, socialist, capitalist... It is the same everywhere. The ordinary citizen was, is and always will be “less equal”.

21. NATO ignoring the Hague verdict has given us further evidence that Washington, and not Brussels and Athens, was behind the Alliance’s negative attitude towards Macedonia. This was confirmed by NATO Secretary General, Rasmussen, who rejected the verdict just a few hours after it was released. He said it does not apply to NATO and this does not implicate NATO.

The Secretary-General had no mandate to decide on his own what to say. His reaction was possible because he must have been briefed well in advance and instructed on what to say. Or he was instructed on the fly just as the verdict came out. And who, outside of Washington, had such authority to decide on its own? No one! The Alliance could not have decided because there was not enough time to consult with everyone and get a consensus! There was not even time to consult with the various embassies! And even if an Alliance meeting was held, there would have been members like Turkey for example, who would have needed extra

time to consider options. There was also the matter of consensus. Would there have been consensus among all the members? Our opinion is that no one was consulted. Washington wanted no controversy surrounding this issue and made a decision on its own. So in order to avoid any complications, Rasmussen was authorized to distance NATO from the verdict. The job was done and there was nothing more for the member states to say or do. Yet another stab with a knife at democracy...

22. In order to avoid any misunderstandings, allow us to explain. Formally the Hague court has no authority over the NATO Alliance. Its judgments is not binding. NATO is an international organization outside of the UN system and is not under the Court's jurisdiction. The judgment holds only in principle. But, even though NATO acts independently and has its own role outside of the international legal order, it still must respect international institutions, international agreements and abide by codes of conduct, rules, principles and procedures... All these also apply to NATO because the Alliance is part of this same world.

22.1. It is important to mention the fact that all NATO member countries are also UN members who are bound by UN rules and must respect the UN Charter of Rights. No country can be admitted to the UN if it refuses to abide by the UN Charter of Rights. UN member states and all UN organs, except for the Security Council, are also bound by the ruling of the International Court of Justice in The Hague. Greece is among 60 or so countries which has committed itself in writing to respect the Court's verdicts.

22.2. NATO is nothing without its members. In other words, there would be no NATO as a stand-alone entity without the Alliance. At the same time, the Alliance consists of countries that are also members of the UN and everything that comes with it. Therefore there can be no double standards or means by which these countries can avoid their UN commitments, responsibilities and obligations because they are also NATO members. Countries cannot break UN rules and ignore UN Court verdicts just because they happen to also be NATO members. This behaviour is simply

unacceptable. It is a disregard of international law; a practice adhered to by terrorist organizations.

22.3. In other words, there is no logical reason for NATO alliance countries to be excused from their obligations to the UN and to other international organizations associated with the UN. Therefore, if these countries do not want to be seen as operating outside of international law, like terrorist organizations, they are obligated to abide by international rulings and international agreements. If this is not done then what is the point of having all these international institutions and their functions, let alone all the rules like the ones enshrined in the UN Charter of Rights?

22.4. It would have been different had the Court declared that there was some irregularity with Macedonia's name at the Bucharest Summit. Then both Washington and Brussels would have been right, The Hague could not have judged NATO's actions because it wouldn't have had jurisdiction. However Macedonia never asked for a ruling on its name and the Court did not follow that path. The Court did what it was asked to do and found Greece guilty of breaching the Accord. At that point NATO could have stepped in and accepted Macedonia's entry, thus overruling Greece because it breached the Accord, an international agreement. But NATO didn't.

22.5. NATO and Washington must not avoid their obligations and must respect the Court's judgment even if it does not apply directly to them. It would appear that the Court's judgment is indeed important to NATO and Washington. Why else would they try to deter Macedonia from initiating proceedings in The Hague? If the Court's judgment had nothing to do with the NATO Alliance and with the EU, then why did they engage themselves in preventing it? NATO needs to build its policies by respecting the international obligations of its member states otherwise the Alliance would be working outside of the law.

22.6. Therefore NATO is obliged to abide by the Interim Accord, which Greece had signed and which guaranteed that Greece would not prevent Macedonia from joining NATO, especially after The Hague ruling. International obligations should

supercede personal and selfish acts. Let us look at an example: A soccer player for the team “Peniarol” in Uruguay was penalized by the Uruguay Football Federation because of some infraction and he was banned from playing for a year. The same player then went to Athens and became a member of “Olympiakos”, a local Greek team. The question here is: should he have been allowed to join another team and immediately start playing while being banned in Uruguay before his sentence had expired?

Of course the soccer Federation of Uruguay, or of any other country, had no authority over the Greek Federation. However, according to federation rules, the player, let’s call him Pedro Rodriguez, should have been made to wait out his sentence. The Soccer Federation in Greece, however, did not respect the Federation of Uruguay or the international legal code of conduct when it drafted Pedro. It should have, otherwise the World Soccer Federation would be thrown into chaos.

22.6.1. Here is another example: Could a Greek man who was married in Greece and moved, say to Germany, Russia, China, or Zimbabwe, marry someone in the new country before he had divorced his spouse in Greece?

Marriage has separate regulations in different countries and no legislation in one country has impact on another country, yet Vassilakis, let’s call him, would commit fraud if he were to ignore his first wife and re-married. And this would be a punishable offense in both countries.

So, on an individual level, no matter where Vassilakis is, he is obliged to honour the contractual obligations of his marriage. Now, how can a country, a member of a serious international organization such as NATO, not be obliged to honour its contractual obligations?

22.6.2. Both examples given have shown that obligations undertaken in one place cannot be ignored in another. Their importance is valid everywhere, unless one happens to be living in a lawless and otherwise unregulated society. Refusal to assume responsibility is not only unacceptable, it is considered criminal

behaviour. This also must apply, by all means, to Greece and to NATO... That is why Greece was found guilty by the Hague court. And let us not forget that the examples given here also illustrate how Athens, Brussels and Washington behaved towards the Interim Accord before The Hague judgment. It has been proven by the verdict delivered that their behaviour was indeed illegal... which should have been an embracing slap on their faces. Unfortunately they continued to function as if nothing had happened and it was business as usual for them.

23. NATO's consensus regarding Macedonia was again reaffirmed during the Chicago Summit in 2012, at a time when the entire Alliance was well-aware of the Hague verdict and Greece's condemnation by it. On what legal grounds was this consensus reached for the entire Alliance to refuse Macedonia, yet again, from joining NATO? Nobody seems to know! Was there not a single member that had any objections or reservations? Or, as usual, was this another exercise of bullying the entire Alliance to see things only through American eyes? This is more confirmation of how dysfunctional NATO is and how it operates... Chicago confirmed yet again that the Americans care only for their own narrow interests.

24. It is important at this point for us to mention that we all should be happy that Macedonia did not succumb to American pressure and that it did take Greece before The Hague. Even though pressure was fierce from both Washington and Brussels, Macedonia was not dissuaded from filing the lawsuit. It is also important to mention here that internally, from inside Macedonia, including from President Tsrvenkovski, there was pressure not to take our case to The Hague. What is interesting about this is that after the Hague verdict was announced the same people inside Macedonia ignored the judgment just like the Americans did (Andov - decision, or something else). It is not realistic or logical to assume that Macedonians inside Macedonia did this voluntarily, without foreign influence. Whether it was politically motivated or purely lucrative, time will tell. But is there anyone who can explain why they were against seeking justice for their own country after it had been exposed to so much injustice? Who were they vying for?

E. What comes after the Interim Accord and Nimitz's mediation?

25. Athens became a victim of the Interim Accord by being condemned by the International Court of Justice in The Hague for its breach. The Interim Accord, if we recall, was a document drafted by the United States and imposed on Macedonia through blackmail and by hanging the crippling embargo over its head. So if the United States stood behind the "creation" and "execution" of the Interim Accord, then it surely is just as guilty as Greece for its breach? Allow us to ask some questions: Why, for example, did American planners not foresee that the Interim Accord would not only become a bottleneck that would bring Greece international shame, but it would hurt American interests? To what extent were the Americans willing to go to "overlook" international breaches to bring about a quick end to the "Macedonian issue"? If the U.S. had achieved its objectives the Interim Accord would by now have been part of history and quickly forgotten with no consequences for Athens. Fortunately for us, all measures taken to force Macedonia to capitulate, so far, have proved to be insufficient and unsuccessful. Athens will have to pay the price for that in the future!

26. The U.S. usually does not leave its allies in the lurch. Greece was well-compensated and received full satisfaction at the NATO Summit in Bucharest when the United States publicly reversed its policy towards Macedonia. At the Summit the United States, a) blocked Macedonia's membership to NATO and imposed a new condition calling for Macedonia to change its name first before it could enter NATO and the EU, and b) passed the responsibility for enforcing the name change to Brussels and thus released Greece from its obligations... of being an obstacle for Macedonia.

This way Athens no longer is directly exposed to Macedonia and its commitment to the Interim Accord can still remain in force.

27. By adapting this new attitude towards Macedonia in Bucharest, Washington was hoping to reward Greece for the “trauma” it suffered by America’s recognition of Macedonia by its constitutional name in November 2004. A recognition which did no damage to Greece, except for the short-lasting negative propaganda, of course. Washington’s reversal in Bucharest was another great victory for Greece.

28. We should not be expecting Greece to abandon the Interim Accord anytime soon. Even though Greece made a couple of announcements to that effect, they were not genuine. Such a move will have negative consequences for Greece because neither Washington nor Brussels would allow it. It will also show that the problem was with Greece. Clearly the Article in the Interim Accord that “guarantees” Macedonia entry into international institutions is as much of a problem for Washington as it is for Athens. And because of that single Article, Athens delegated the problem to the United States to solve.

29. It should be noted that, even though NATO and the EU changed their policies towards Macedonia, as mentioned earlier, Athens is still not completely off the hook from being asked to continue to impede Macedonia. Even though Brussels is now formally leading the dance and Greece is not directly involved, Greek participation in NATO and EU membership consensus against Macedonia will still be required. This means that Greece will have to vote “no”, which means that Greece will again be in violation of the Interim Accord. And if Greece decides to distance itself from making such decisions, which the Interim Accord requires, then there will be no consensus and Macedonia can join NATO. Blocking Macedonia from NATO is not possible without a consensus. And a consensus is not possible without Greece violating the Accord!

30. Macedonia’s efforts would be counterproductive if it now withdrew from the mediation process led by Nimitz or from the Interim Accord. Such unilateral steps would cause serious damage to Macedonia’s interests. Macedonia will gain absolutely nothing by it but it may lose much. Needless to say it would first be confronted by the United States, then by NATO and then by

the EU; no doubt to Athen's delight. By pulling out we would also show that we don't know what we want or what we are doing!

Article 11 of the Interim Accord is extremely important for Macedonia and it must continue to exist because there will be an Accord violation each time a consensus is reached to not allow Macedonia into NATO or the EU. Each time Greece votes against Macedonia and blockades its entry into an international institution, it violates international law for which it could be sued in the international court of law, i.e. The Hague. This is where we have support from the law and we must strive not to lose it. If Macedonia does not get a starting date for EU membership talks by the end of 2013, which is very likely, then we should immediately, and without hesitation, open new proceedings at The Hague. Justice must be served... at least in principle... We must constantly challenge and marginalize the "political character" of this dispute in legal waters. There lies our opportunity. Thus, we will have a verdict despite NATO and EU interference. In time our arguments and our position will be strengthened.

And even if all rulings are ignored by the major powers, the burden to carry disregard for international law will be with them and it will accumulate. To this end we need to have a strong and tested team and money must be no object, at stake is the fate of our state and our people.

30.1. Both the mediation process and the Interim Accord need to survive because they are important to resolving the name issue. We should only be canceling them after we develop a new strategy to seek justice. We must also recognize that our main opponent in this fight is the United States, which has the support of the most important international factors in this world.

30.2. Getting out of the mediation process and the Interim Accord are not currently as desirable as it may seem. There is nothing else to replace them, except for isolation. However, given the predicament we are in, we must be very careful of the steps we

take and watch how we are played. We can not afford to make mistakes...

30.3. We must not waver, in the situation in which we find ourselves, during the mediation process or while executing segments of the Interim Accord. We should also be thinking of new strategies that we can implement to help our case. We should always keep in mind that Article 21, paragraph 2 of the Interim Accord allows us to initiate an application before the court in The Hague against the Security Council for the irregularities it adopted in its resolution during our entry into the UN, which literally forced us into the dreaded “name dispute”. If we abandon the Interim Accord we will have to wait an entire year before we can initiate new proceedings, including a review of our illegal admission into the UN.

30.4. Going to court and challenging the Security Council is not going to be easy and will mean there will be difficult times ahead. In a difficult situation like this we will need to build a) domestic harmony and consensus about our name, even at the lowest level. Today (January 2013) a prospect like this may look unreachable but we will be sunk without one, and b) we need stronger and more concrete support for such a strategy from important countries like Russia, China, Turkey... to stand behind us.

31. Now to say a few words about the announced referendum on the name, also backed by the opposition.

In principle, such a referendum is essentially unacceptable because it is about fundamental issues relating to universally guaranteed rights, such as the identity of a people and the name of a country which require no further decision. The argument was that no one in today’s generation of Macedonians has the right or is authorized to test his or her own identity and the identity of their ancestors and all past generations. There are some who said that a referendum carries some risks and they are right. This is especially true for us today having been put under extreme pressure with blockades, blackmail and threats of usurpation... which, for the last 20 years, have placed us under extreme stress.

31.1. Every problem must be looked at and a solution sought through the circumstances in which it was introduced. Not from a theoretical point of view or from some historical and distant point of view. Today, as it has been for the last 20 years, Macedonia is being confronted by arrogant and non-caring international factors who do not hesitate to use force and blackmail to get their way. They don't care how they achieve their goals and will unscrupulously ignore everything that stands in their way. On the other hand, any support Macedonia receives from them is small, incomplete, occasional, conditional and in many ways not enough. This has been going on for more than 20 years with no end in sight. In fact it has been getting worse. Instead of getting some relief we are continually being put in new situations, in different complexities and under the scrutiny of new factors that work against our country. In December 2012, Bulgaria too came out and firmly stood against Macedonia. Slowly but surely the Albanians are also heading in the same direction, all orchestrated by Washington no doubt. The maneuvering space of our country, instead of widening, is slowly narrowing...

“Indecent” proposals are mounting. Pressure is increasing in geometric proportion. It should be obvious to everyone that our current strategy is not yielding desired results and needs to be changed. A referendum can be used to save us but only as a last resort. A referendum must be the last tool to use because it is very risky. A referendum will definitely show Washington, Brussels, Athens... that the Macedonian people do not want to change their name. No one will have the right to go against the people's wishes expressed through a referendum. But a referendum can go either way so we need to be very careful to obtain positive results and use care in what we do with those results in relation to our enemies and international opposition. In other words we need to have a strategy that will get us out of this mess so that we can be left alone and in peace without constant outside interference.

31.1.1. Greece calling for a referendum of its own against our name is an empty threat or a bluff at best. Greece has no jurisdiction over our name and cannot change something that

does not belong to it. Can Macedonia call a referendum to decide whether Britain should remain a monarchy or become a republic? Of course not! The whole notion is absurd!

However, if we do, by some chance, arrive at a bilateral agreement with Greece, which the U.S. insists that we do, then Athens can put the proposed agreement to a referendum. Not our name. This is another strong argument why, at all costs, we must avoid arriving at a bilateral resolution with Greece.

31.2. In 1992, 1993 I proposed to the Macedonian government that we conduct a referendum with a simple question: “Do you agree to change our country’s name?” If people voted “no” then it was going to be a done deal. The same tool can be used today. There should be no doubt that a huge percentage of Macedonians will turn out and vote just like they did in the September 8, 1991 referendum, just to end this indignant humiliation that they are being put through on a daily basis. We should not fear our own people and trust that they will do the right thing... after a properly conducted campaign, of course... I am sure many Albanians will also give their fellow Macedonians their support, if approached properly...

31.3. Our position, regarding a referendum, must be made very clear: Yes we will hold a referendum but only as a last resort and its outcome must be binding. We must not allow outside interference, pressure and methods by which to achieve the referendum. We must avoid conditions put on it, blackmail, threats of isolation, threats of punishment and all that. Such a situation may be hardly imaginable but it should not be ruled out. We must be prepared for all possibilities.

It is also extremely important that the political opposition stand behind such a plan because it is in the interest of the state and the people.

31.4. During a conversation I had with a senior U.S. diplomat in the American Embassy in Skopje, sometime in 2011, I asked him what he thought of us having a referendum. To my surprise he responded in an extremely negative way. He said that it was not a

good idea because it would be bad for our country regardless of whether the results were positive or negative. He intimated that the very act of having a referendum would put the people in an extremely difficult situation, from every respect. In particular, one cannot go back from such a move once it is made, he said. The very fabric of the state will be torn apart even along ethnic lines. The earth will boil. There will be division between the various political parties that would immensely and irreversibly deepen, he said. There will inevitably be extreme behaviour that would not be good for the country or for the region. It won't be too difficult to return to revolutionary days... he said.

You will quickly find yourselves at the beginning of the 20th century... he added.

The diplomat made sure that we listened well and hopefully got the message. His superior agreed. In other words, the Americans were not only against the idea but they made it obvious that it would be “very bad” for us should we decide to follow that path...

31.5. It is interesting that in 2003 a book was published in Greece by the publisher Papazisis, entitled “Athens-Skopje, the seven-year agreement (1995-2002)”. It was a joint collaboration between a group of scholars from Northern Greece mentored by professors Evangelos Kofos and Vlasis Vlasidis. (“To Vima”, December 24, 2003). In part the book reads:

“In those seven years, regulating the name was not part the strategic priorities of the Greek side;

Greek diplomacy is content by the fact that it managed to keep “de jure” the name “FYROM” locked in major international organizations for seven years;

After seven years of futile practice, it is completely understandable if Greece decides to use the EU accession process to bring a lasting solution to the problem...”

F. Replacing the reference with a name for use outside of Macedonia is a fatal solution

32. Attempts to replace the reference with a permanent name for external use, as part of one of the options for Macedonia, would be an irreparable mistake.

32.1. According to a telegram sent from Athens to the State Department by the American ambassador to Athens, as leaked by WikiLeaks, the new name must be well within the range of American movement. This kind of “encouragement” from Washington is what is convincing political parties, journalists, analysts, experts... in Macedonia to unwittingly commit suicide! It is clear that the best solution for Macedonia is to stay with its current name “Republic of Macedonia”! So one would have to ask, why is the U.S. looking for alternative solutions? Is it because they are more favourable than “Republic of Macedonia” for Macedonia? Of course not! The U.S. is looking for a solution which is favourable for the U.S.; a kind of solution that would push Macedonia into the abyss.

33. Unfortunately nothing is clear and there are many lies in evidence. The best evidence of a great lie is the so-called Greek “red line” which is nothing more than a pure bluff and unscrupulous manipulation. Athens has taken the most extreme stand followed by Washington where they don’t think that their erga omnes can pass. Is there anyone who thinks that they can change our name at home? That they will re-write our Constitution and call our country “Upper Macedonia” or “Slavo-Macedonia”? They cannot do that even if they occupy us. The Serbians tried for some 30 years... for nothing...

33.1. Their insistence on the impossible is hiding a dangerous trap. Through what they call a “compromise” they are planting the seeds for Macedonia’s destruction to be achieved in some sort of “humane” way. What purpose could replacing the “reference” with a name for external use possibly serve? What are we going to gain, outside of confusion, by adding yet another name to our country? This is another American ploy to dupe us into

sacrificing our name, ingenious, but very dangerous because the result will be absolutely the same: we will be sacrificing our identity, the identity of the Macedonian people... perhaps not immediately, but in stages. This is yet another way of attempting to deface us. There is nothing that they would not try no matter how ridiculous it looks or sounds until they convince us to bite and then wham, we are dead! Greece is not alone in this! Greece is being used to frighten us into doing something stupid to set the stage for “the fatal solution”, what better ploy than using the “red line” which Greece will never cross? What does this have to do with Greece? Greece is not being asked to do anything! So, why does it need a red line?

34. Replacing the reference with a new, permanent name for our country, regardless of how it is used, will undoubtedly mean that the Macedonian national identity will be at risk and may be deleted in the future. From the moment we change our name we will no longer be seen as Macedonians by the world, but rather by the derivative of the new name. In other words, we will become something else, something... not Macedonian. Then Greece will have full international monopoly on the name, the concept, the brand... “Macedonia” with all its adjectives, nouns, verbs... from people, language, history, culture... to products... will all belong to Greece. The fictional 2.5 million Christian Turkish settlers in Greek occupied Macedonia will be the only true genuine “Macedonians” in the world. There will be Macedonian wines, tomatoes, lemons... all products of Greece. There will be nothing for us left that we can possibly offer the world under that brand. Nimitz will make sure that we are contractually obligated to never again use the name “Macedonia” and “Macedonian” and anything associated with it.

34.1. From the moment we agree to change our name, all our documents intended for foreign use will have to bear the new name; from passports, to customs declarations, certificates, personal statements... They will all have to be tailored for external use whether we like it or not... it would be expected of us. Otherwise we will have no cooperation from anyone outside of our country. And if we want to keep our name alive, inside our country, then we will have two names. At home we will be called

“Makedontsi” and our country “Makedonija” and outside we will be called... well... something else. At home too, some things will have to be changed to make use of the new name such as how we register in sports federations, for example, we are now registered under the reference because of how we were registered at the UN, by default, without our consent. But should we choose to change our name then we will certainly be obliged to use our new name whether we like it or not; this time with our consent.

34.2. Let’s also not forget that the reference is not a name or a denomination of our country, but an interim code for addressing our country! If we are to change that then everything... conferences, summits, Olympics... and all other international events organized not only outside but also inside our country... will bear our new name. Even at home, in the halls of Skopje, in Ohrid... when we host foreigners we will have to play host under our new name. But outside of all that we will still be Makedontsi!

And as such we will go from one absurdity to another...

35. If by any chance someone in authority was convinced, paid for, or politically motivated to agree to change the name of our country, then be aware that this person would be making a big mistake that would amount to a serious crime. Doing this would undoubtedly lead to a shameful situation for which we all will have to bear the cross.

36. In order for Washington, Brussels and Athens to achieve their aims they will have to face the problem of having to permanently change the reference but it cannot be done without our consent. Specifically, we cannot capitulate without our own consent. This is why they have resorted to lies, blackmail and manipulation to trick us into making a grave error on which they then could capitalize and achieve their aims. (First change your name, then membership)...

36.1. It should be crystal clear to us that nothing can be changed without our consent and this is our most precious asset that we must not squander. If, however, for some reason we agree to drop the reference in exchange for a “new name” then we must be

fully aware that we will actually legalize the irregular admission of our country into the United Nations. In other words we will allow the UN to get away with flagrant violation of the UN Charter of Rights and we would have given up the possibility of one day challenging this violation. Under the current conditions, this may be our last bargaining chip to save our people and our state. Looking at it another way, why should we now, after suffering tremendous damages over so many years, accept to change the reference that was illegally imposed on us by force? What would we gain by it? Or, how can we change something that is not ours and is working against our interests... for something worse?

36.2. It would be a strategic, fundamental and historical error for us to change the reference for a permanent name of our state that is not “Republic of Macedonia”. The reference for us is not valid and it should not exist. If we accept a permanent name other than Republic of Macedonia we will face many obstacles and it will be the beginning of another traumatic experience for our people. It will be the first step in the final extinction of the Macedonian nation. We will be opening the door for our enemies to do as they please with us. We will prove to them that nothing of ours is sacred. We will be making it unequivocally clear to them that interfering in Macedonian affairs is not a problem. By accepting a permanent name other than Republic of Macedonia, we will be opening the door for a segment of the Turkish settler population in Greek occupied Macedonia to become “the legitimate Macedonians”.

36.3. Our goal should be for the reference to depart from diplomacy as soon as possible and enter the halls of history as proof of the abuses, illegal policies and unscrupulous games international factors played with us for many years, inflicting incalculable, massive damage on Macedonia.

37. And we, instead of speculating of this and that, need to only to ask ourselves a simple question: “What is our name for, if not to be recognized in the international arena?” So, what kind of name should we be recognized by? Our true name is our heritage which our ancestors gave us and which defines who we are. Do

we want some kind of fake name we were pressured to accept that will erase us from the face of the earth? No! And what possibly could anyone offer us to voluntarily “erase” ourselves from the face of the earth?

If anyone, however remote, accepts to change our name, even for external use, history will vehemently condemn them as the biggest traitor guilty of the extermination of the centuries old Macedonian nation... which inevitably will follow.

38. We should be grateful that we have lasted this long and have survived the many crises we experienced and thus avoided the disintegration of our country. We should be happy for doing what we did. Having to agree to a reference did put Greece at bay. Unfortunately Greece is not alone in this. We have Washington and Brussels to contend with, both of which are prohibiting us from joining international organizations, like NATO and the EU, and impeding us from gaining ground in the international arena. While there is no way out of this and no solution to the problem people have with our name and with us, we cannot and must not give up our fight. We are in the right and international law is on our side and we must follow that course and persist. At any moment and in any situation, Washington and Brussels can trigger a host of “arguments” which we will need to be able to counter.

G. U.S. and Bucharest in 2008, The Hague in 2011...

39. As always, all moves made by Washington start and end with U.S. interests. Others, including the Greeks, are playing a small role. All steps that the United States has taken with regards to Macedonia and its name in the last 20 years are a result of U.S. needs and plans and nobody else's. U.S. policies are never ad hoc but well-designed and long term. It is also possible for them to be wrong. Our case is a striking example which would be neither the first nor the last. Or is it that we have false expectations?

Madeleine Albright, U.S. Secretary of State, one time said that U.S. policy towards Latin America, for many years, was wrong. I would not be surprised that after 20 years, one day someone new

will come along and re-evaluate the current American policy towards Macedonia and come up with a different, positive policy. We just need to persist and survive.

40. The event in Bucharest in 2008, of course, was a result of discontent from Washington for America's failure of U.S. foreign policy in Macedonia. Fifteen years have passed and the American's still have not achieved their goals in Macedonia. Macedonia has not collapsed and Nimitz has solved nothing. There is no sign of capitulation in Skopje. The opposition, which is prepared to bend its spine, will likely not come to power anytime soon. Probably because of its own policies! This of course has prompted Washington to change its approach towards Gruevski's government. While before they completely ignored him and left him in the street in Washington to improvise a press conference, now in a serious parliamentary and political crisis, caused by the opposition at the beginning of 2013, they openly sided with him. A few years ago, the United States supported SDSM's boycott of Parliament, even though such an act is unthinkable in a western democracy. But nothing happened so now they are playing the other card. Now they are trying to appease Prime Minister Gruevski and the VMRO-DPMNE, probably hoping to get them to give in a little and change the name of our state and people. It can be argued that this kind of relationship would only bring new failures.

41. Based on the information we have given here, we can conclude that another dilemma is inevitable. Removing Macedonia and the Macedonian people from the scene appears to be very important to the United States. So far the Americans have gone through a lot of challenges, including risking their own reputation and that of the international community by defying international law and by ignoring international court rulings. One would have to ask not only why but how is that even possible and at what cost? It is unimaginable to think that the United States, backed by NATO and the EU, is doing everything in its power, including breaking international law, to remove Macedonia and the Macedonian people from the scene! Why? What do they have to gain? What is so important that they are willing to risk so much? What are they attempting to achieve? Why are they acting

like terrorists towards peaceful little Macedonia who is threatening no one? And in the end, why are we so much in their way? If The Hague, the highest international court in the land, ruling in favour of Macedonia is not good enough then what is? What choices are there for the Macedonian people by which they can achieve their universal aspirations?

For now, there are no answers to these questions.

41.1. The greatest American ambition in the Balkans today is to make the Albanians a major factor in the region. The Americans estimated this should be an easy task in Macedonia, but so far their efforts have proven counterproductive. The means by which the Americans have chosen to bring about the “Greater Albania” project will bring them constant and lasting headaches. There will be problems inside, between the Albanians, and outside in the three municipalities in southern Serbia, the four municipalities in Montenegro, in Chamiria, etc. The pan-Albanian plan has no chance of reaching consensus on any issue except on the Albanian national issue. When that is completed, and it is on its way now, then fierce fighting between political leaders will begin, significantly more serious than it is right now. There will be internal political rivalry and a struggle for power. We have Albania (Berisha-Rama), Macedonia (Ahmeti-M. Thachi), Kosovo (Thachi H-Haradinai)... And then the pie will be much larger and so will the appetite for it... It will be impossible to prevent confrontations and the region will explode, with lasting consequences.

41.1.1. Another thing we should not forget is that the Albanian mafia is growing in these Albanian lands, not just in Western European countries. It generates a lot of money and it knows how to channel it where it is needed. If we add all these ambitions together, including Albanian political ambitions, which would normally grow over time, then the question will be: “Will Washington be able to maintain control of this situation?” Will Washington have the ability to “direct the Albanian factor in the realization of U.S. interests?”

It would be mission impossible...

Will history also repeat itself? Will the Albanians remain America's friends or will they do like they did after WWII when they initially were Yugoslavia's best friends, then the USSR's and China's after that. And when they were friends with China they became great enemies of Yugoslavia and the USSR.

Since then the Balkans became known as the "European minefield" where one must take great care with every step taken...

41.2. The largest part of the "Greater Albania" project lies in Kosovo. That part of the project was reliably realized through war. And from what we have seen so far, Macedonia is not likely to "disintegrate" without a war. Therefore we must take great care to prevent this from happening. A controlled war will not work in Macedonia. This was proved in 2001. Need we say any more. No one should be allowed to unnecessarily play with fire in Macedonia.

42. Washington has repeatedly called for countries and people to obey the law. In Macedonia it has criticized the Macedonian judiciary of being dysfunctional; there is nothing wrong with its criticism. What Washington is not telling us is "don't do as I do, just do as I say". In other words, Macedonians are obliged to obey the law at all times but the Americans are required to obey it only when it suits them! This means that the Americans can ignore judgments that do not respect their interests. Judgments like that simply do not even exist for them. Unfortunately this is nothing new and the Americans continue to act like terrorists.

H. Who obstructed Macedonia from joining NATO? The U.S. or Greece?

43. Before summarizing this section we need to emphasize that if we assume that only Greece was behind blockading Macedonia from joining NATO and the EU, we would be making a big mistake. There is no doubt that Athens played its role, but the question is who was behind Athens pulling the strings? Who had

the clout to blockade Macedonia and prevent it from joining NATO (and the EU), which of course was demonstrated in Bucharest in 2008, and get away with it? Athens alone carried no such authority.

43.1. Greece never was in a position to set up blockades and blackmail Macedonia, especially on behalf of Brussels. No member of NATO or the EU has that much authority or is able to impose its own policies without consequences. It is theoretically impossible.

44. The only exception that can do that is the U.S. and its role in NATO. The U.S. is the only NATO member that can pull off something like that. No one else...

The U.S. is a major NATO financier and has an important role in ensuring Europe's safety. Not one of America's main NATO partners in Europe today has the clout or the nerve to challenge the U.S. or to oppose U.S. policies regarding NATO. So, everything that happens in NATO, one way or another, depends entirely on Washington. Of course the United States looks after the fundamental interests of its partners, protects them from confrontation as well as has excellent diplomatic relations with them.

45. Macedonia's approach has been first to join NATO and then the EU. Thus we must first pass through the sieve set by Washington before we can even attempt to join the EU. Had it been the other way around or if NATO was not there, it would have been less of an ordeal. Washington has the ability to put a lot of pressure and greatly dominate NATO. When Washington develops a policy for NATO it is a done deal, the other members are not given much of a choice other than to rubber stamp it. These countries are also members of the EU and, in practice, whatever is adopted in NATO is also adopted in the EU. And this is the kind of solidarity that keeps the peace and makes things work.

46. So that we have no doubt about who is behind Macedonia's misery let us say, once again, with emphasis, that "if the U.S. is

not behind Greece and does not share Greek sentiments regarding Macedonia and the Macedonian people, then it would have never passed such policies”. According to the standards by which the Alliance operates, there is no chance of such a thing ever happening without U.S. approval. So, are we here to assume that what is happening with Greece is only a coincidence? And is Greece working against American wishes? If Washington was not behind the whole project it would have been absolutely impossible to maintain peace and stability in the region, which is still extremely vulnerable.

46.1. Let us ask the question a little differently: “If the United States firmly believed and worked for Macedonia to join NATO in Bucharest in 2008, could Greece (or any other country) have prevented it? The answer is simple: “Absolutely not!” This shows that, even in the least, the U.S. was not interested in Macedonia joining NATO. If it really were, then it would have bulldozed everyone out of its way and got what it wanted!

I. Will membership in NATO deliver a better security system to Macedonia?

47. At the end of this segment we will try to determine whether joining NATO would improve Macedonia’s situation or not? There is no doubt that belonging to NATO in principle, and from a ceremonial point of view, is a plus for Macedonia. Membership in NATO would also imply stability and security. But for us, given the irregularities and obstacles placed before us, we need to ask: “Will membership in NATO bring us the kind of stability and security we are looking for?”

It is known that NATO guarantees security for its members from outside threats (an attack against one member state is an attack against all member states). However, it does not guarantee internal threats which are common inside Macedonia. Internal security remains the responsibility of each member state. If that is the case then: “Are there any threats made against Macedonia from the outside? Or, more accurately, who is threatening Macedonia from the outside? A neighbour perhaps?!

47.1. Given that Bulgaria, Greece and Albania are NATO members themselves, we can assume that they will not invade Macedonia without agreement from the NATO Alliance. In other words, there is no conceivable threat unless approved by Washington or perhaps Brussels. This is similar to what happened to Serbia in 1999.

47.2. The only other countries that remain which may want to invade Macedonia are Kosovo and Serbia.

47.2.1. We were attacked from Kosovo once but those attacks were with the agreement and cooperation of NATO and the U.S. If they attacked us before, there is no reason they won't do it again if it serves their interests. This could happen even if Macedonia joined NATO. Who will guarantee the 2001 scenario won't be repeated again if the Americans will it? Will the Alliance come to our rescue? To rescue us from who, from themselves? It is irrelevant that we were attacked from Kosovo or the fact that it was done for the Albanians, particularly for the Albanians in Macedonia. What matters is who will be behind this attack? Will it be Washington as it was in 2001? Of course it will and it will be again in the name of "human rights", just like it was the last time.

47.2.2. The biggest danger to Macedonia is the repetition of the Serbian scenario, when Kosovo was separated. Fortunately for us the differences between Macedonia and Kosovo are huge. The conflict in Kosovo was maintained within its border. That will not work in Macedonia. If a war is started to fragment Macedonia it will become a regional war. Macedonia managed to avoid war after the Yugoslav breakup because the "powers" did not want a regional and out of control war. The U.S. did not want an escalation of war that would include Macedonia, especially after the breakup of Yugoslavia. And this is why the U.S. has taken the slow and peaceful way of attempting to break up Macedonia from the inside. So, the only countries that still have aspirations for Macedonia are Bulgaria and Greece. But because the U.S. intends to break up Macedonia from the inside by peaceful means, there is nothing Greece and Bulgaria can do. And that is why the U.S.

has chosen to “albanize” Macedonia from the inside. But I believe this process will not work because the Macedonian people are tolerant and patient, but they will explode if pushed too far. And this time it looks like they are being pushed too far.

From what we have already said above it is clear that the situation in and around Macedonia will not be stabilized anytime soon and therefore, for us, it is crucial that we understand in depth what is going on and monitor and analyze the situation so that we are not again surprised by what is logically to follow.

47.2.3. Our other neighbour, Serbia, has no intention of joining NATO anytime soon. But that should not matter to us, for now, because the U.S. will never allow Serbia to march in and invade Macedonia. As we saw at the end of 1992, UNPREDEP, including several hundred American soldiers, were sent to Macedonia to make sure Serbia did not make a move on us.

For now the U.S. is continuing to play the card that dismisses any threat from the north. How long that will last is entirely another matter.

The aspirations of the Serbian Orthodox Church towards the Macedonian Orthodox Church are still there and remain current. They are objectively there to make room for Serbia should it one day want to further its political ambitions towards Macedonia.

47. 2.4. Albanizing parts of Macedonia is obviously a project supported by the U.S. It is a serious step in finalizing the “Greater Albania” project. Should Washington decide to formalize the existence of “free Albanian territories” tomorrow, first through federalization and then by tearing out Macedonian territories, besides Bulgaria and Greece, there will be no portion of “cake” given to Serbia without perhaps a prior agreement.

Yes, all this sounds good but it cannot be achieved without a war. Let’s not forget that the Allies occupied Macedonia during the First Balkan War in 1912 but then fought each other over Macedonia in the Second Balkan War in 1913. What makes one

think this will not happen again? History has a tendency to repeat itself.

47.3. This, of course, is only a hypotheses, but nonetheless a realistic scenario. Who expected the USSR and Yugoslavia to break apart, let alone Kosovo break away from Serbia? No one planned these... they just happened.

47.4. In other words, we can objectively conclude that, for now, there is no immediate and real threat to Macedonia from the outside. So in general we can say that there are no major security gains for Macedonia from becoming a NATO member. From what we said earlier, it should be clear that Macedonia's territorial integrity is not under any direct external threat. Or rather, there is no direct external threat without NATO or American participation. In other words, any threat to Macedonia would have to be approved by NATO and behind NATO stands the U.S.

U.S. dominance in the region is conducted in partnership with the Albanians who can generate but also can control hazards in Macedonia. Of course this is done in accordance with American interests. So for now the only generator of threats in Macedonia is the U.S.

47.4.1. It is a fact that current trends are negative for Macedonia. Washington so far has worked against Macedonian interests. Fortunately their plans are unrealistic and dangerous for the region. It is a matter of time before they will have to be reassessed. Our goal, therefore, should be to "convince" the United States to come to this conclusion as soon as possible.

47.4.2. If we agree that the territorial integrity of our country, for now, is not threatened from the outside, then the key security elements for Macedonia are its constitution and its unitary character and their guarantor, over the Ohrid Agreement, is the U.S.

If the Americans are true to their word then our country's future is guaranteed. If not...

Past experience, based primarily on the Interim Accord, have shown not to be very promising.

47.5. On the other hand, dormant dangers are a reality for Macedonia's security. We are witness to many roundabout steps that clearly question Macedonia's existence and threaten Macedonia's survival. Today all these activities are supported by the U.S. Some come from the outside but most come from the inside. The only guarantor we have is the unitary character of our state, which so far is the main guarantor of our territorial integrity. But that too is threatened by Albanian desires to federalize our country (Musa Xhaferi for federalization; albanizing municipalities...)

47. 6. If we started this section with a hypotheses then let's finish it with a hypothesis. So the question is: "Did the U.S. hinder Macedonia's accession into NATO in order to have a free hand in restructuring the future of our country and the region as the final outcome to the post-Yugoslav crisis?"

The answer to that question is: "There are many elements that point in that direction."

For now, the only certain thing is that: "Washington is the key to Macedonia's future."

IX – Washington’s role in relations between Skopje and Sofia

In order for us to fully clarify America’s policy towards Macedonia, we need to look at one more important incident.

1. On January 15, 1992 Bulgaria was the first to recognize independent Macedonia. It was an extremely important move for us, especially since we knew that Sofia would not accept the existence of a Macedonian nation, language... From Bulgaria’s point of view however, what Bulgaria in fact was recognizing was probably a second Bulgarian state populated by Bulgarians who had not yet learned that they were Bulgarians. Diplomatic relations were not immediately established because Sofia suddenly got cold feet. From then on Bulgaria took the wait and see what happens next attitude.

2. Because Sofia had taken the position that there was no Macedonian language and that the Macedonian language was a Bulgarian dialect, relations between the two countries has long stagnated. There were 22 agreements drafted and waiting because bilaterally they are written and signed in both languages. But since the Macedonian language was unacceptable to Bulgaria, i.e. it was non-existent, the agreements just lay there in wait.

Years passed without any movement.

3. Finally there was a breakthrough in 1999. The stalemate was broken only because of American “interference” forcing Macedonia to concede on a very important strategic issue. This happened under the watchful eyes of famous American diplomat, Stroub Talbot, who then was Deputy Secretary. This was when Sofia and Skopje signed the famous 1999 “Declaration of Friendship and Cooperation”. In a statement given to Bulgarian television, Talbot “revealed” that he was helping the U.S. Ambassador (Christopher Hill) in Skopje and the U.S. Ambassador (Avis Bolin) in Sofia.

4. By looking at the Declaration we can see that, without any doubt, we have allowed our language to be devalued and to be treated as if it were invented. Talbot’s participation in this matter

“proves” that the devaluation of the Macedonian language was done with American assistance and with strong U.S. pressure. According to the formulation used, the Declaration was signed under the words “relevant official languages of the two countries, in accordance with the terms used in the Bulgarian Constitution for Bulgaria and the terms used in the Macedonian Constitution for the Republic of Macedonia”! The Bulgarian language has no bearing because it is not in dispute. For the Macedonian language this meant that the language was not timeless and indigenous but belongs to a constitutional category and as we all know constitutions can be changed.

5. The second, completely unnecessary Macedonian concession made refers to the section in the Declaration that says: “Nothing in the Macedonian constitution could be interpreted as grounds for interference in Bulgarian internal affairs, in terms of defending the status of people in Bulgaria who are not citizens of the Republic of Macedonia.”

6. According to famous Bulgarian analyst, Kamen Minchev, Macedonia, with this Declaration, has made two concessions and Bulgaria has made only one. (“Relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia following their joint declaration signed on February 22, 1999”, from the Weekly Commentary, March 1-5, 1999). According to Minchev, Sofia “recognized” that the Macedonian language was used on the Macedonian territory but not on Bulgarian territory, as determined by Bulgaria. However, so that there is no confusion, Minchev concluded that: “With this, Bulgaria does not recognize the Macedonian language or the Macedonian people.”

According to Minchev the second concession made was: “Macedonia declares that it has no longer the right to say that a Macedonian minority exists in Bulgaria and to insist that it is granted certain rights and freedoms.” Minchev immediately recalled that this was contrary to Article 49 of the Macedonian Constitution, with which Macedonia was obliged to look after the rights of the Macedonian minority in Greece and Bulgaria. In the end, Minchev cited Marin Raikov, current interim Bulgarian Prime Minister (starting in 2013), then Deputy Foreign Minister,

who led the Bulgarian delegation in the Declaration negotiations and said: “We have achieved more than we expected.”

If he was honest to the end he would have cried like the Croatians: “Thank you, Talbot! Thank you, USA!

7. We should be comforted that no matter what we sign, the Macedonians in Bulgaria cannot just be erased; they are a reality that cannot be ignored. For now and for the sake of the ones who have survived.

However, it is never that easy.

When their country of origin gives them up because they live in another country, their chances of survival are reduced to practically zero. The process of erasing the Macedonians in Bulgaria has been ongoing for a long time and without us formally renouncing them. From the hundreds of thousands who existed in the past, it remains to be seen if tens of thousands still remain Macedonian today?

However, the fact is that regardless of its constitutional obligation, Macedonia up to now has done nothing for the Macedonians in Bulgaria. Macedonia did nothing for them before, during and after the Yugoslav Federation. And lately, given that it made these concessions when it signed the Declaration with Bulgaria, we can say it is covering up for its irresponsible policies that have brought disastrous historical consequences for the Macedonian people because (maybe without knowing) it has allowed the destruction of part of the Macedonian national fabric.

8. Both concessions made in the Declaration have strategic consequences for Macedonia. The “credit” for devaluing the legitimacy of the Macedonian language and for giving up on the Macedonians in Bulgaria, without a doubt, completely belongs to the U.S. The guilt for doing it belongs to us. The U.S. gave Sofia more than it would have ever dreamed of getting (according to Raikov) at the expense of the Macedonian people and with our consent.

9. With the formulation used, the Macedonian language was put in an inferior position to all other languages. It made it look like it was not real and is defined only by our Constitution. By signing the Declaration, Macedonia, in fact, has accepted grounds for the Macedonian language to be disputed. Unfortunately, this precedent carries severe consequences. Through it, Bulgaria will never allow the Macedonian language to be registered as a language during Macedonia's EU accession, if that ever happens. The Bulgarians will insist on the use of the wording as specified in the signed Declaration. After all, we have given them our consent. Thus, in the EU nomenclature we will find languages registered as French, Croatian, English, Bulgarian... and in place of "Macedonian" we will find "in accordance with the terminology of the state's Constitution". Meaning fictional and artificial...

10. In the Interim Accord with Greece, we signed declaring that the name of our state is a problem! In the Declaration with Bulgaria we signed declaring that the language of our state is a problem... We entered the UN without a name. In the EU they are judging us by everything and will only accept us if we change our name and give up our identity and language... Where does it all end? All that is missing now is for someone to sign a declaration declaring that the Macedonian people were invented by Tito... then we can declare that we erased ourselves... and end of story... for everything Macedonian...

11. One thing however is clear: The common denominator is all this has been the United States. Time after time the U.S. has studiously and persistently clipped Macedonia's wings and, one by one, cut Macedonia's roots. The days before Macedonia can no longer fly, will dry up and wither are not far off. Of course it has taken us a long time for us to wake up but how much longer will it take us to say "ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!"

12. If Washington was a "partner" and a "friend" as many Macedonians still claim it to be to this day, then why did it force us into this position knowing very well Bulgaria's attitude towards Macedonia? Looking at the problem from another angle,

the U.S. has insistently and persistently put Macedonia in a lose-lose situation, wearing it down until it capitulates and then what? Is the U.S. doing this to save or destroy Macedonia? So far the U.S. has done everything in its power to destroy Macedonia... its policy has been nothing but consistent... Pressuring Macedonia to sign the Declaration of Friendship and Cooperation with Bulgaria in 1999 was part of the same goal... to weaken Macedonia by all means possible... This time by attacking its language!

It would not be a “random coincidence” if we are blackmailed into having to use “a different name for our language” for use outside of Macedonia and “Makedonski” for inside. They wanted us to do this with our name, now they will want us to do it with our language! What great coordination! Do you still think these are “random coincidences”, or are there powerful forces at work, in parallel, behind all these issues? How many times do we need to be shot before we are mortally wounded?

What more validation and evidence would you need, to not see the same scenario repeated again and again under different circumstances?

13. Nowadays (late 2012) the 1999 Declaration has again resurfaced. Bulgaria, with permission of course, wanted to raise the Declaration to a level of an Agreement and call it the “Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation”. “Declarations” and “agreements” however are completely different documents. It’s like comparing Mercedes to Ficho. Both are cars, but... one cannot put them in the same basket. One cannot be replaced with the other... just like that. It has to be a negotiated document between two countries. An agreement as such cannot be signed unless all open issues between the two states are raised. And between Macedonia and Bulgaria there are many unresolved issues. So the question here is: “Why is Sofia insisting on signing such a document? Is everything fine between the two countries? In other words, does Sofia want us to agree that we are “Bulgarians” because Sofia wants us to be Bulgarians?

13.1. There must be another reason for attempting to impose such an agreement. Are we to assume that Sofia is “concerned” about the “Declaration” because it is not a strong enough document for Brussels to deny us the registration of our language in accordance with the formulas used today? Even though, according to current diplomatic practices, a language should not be disputed. So to be sure that our language will be “disputable” Bulgaria wants an iron clad “agreement”, not just a simple “declaration”... Bulgaria wants a “guarantee” which only comes with an “agreement” and not by waving any old declaration in Brussels’s face...

14. The 1999 Declaration was not subject to parliamentary ratification. A Cooperation Agreement, on the other hand, must pass parliamentary procedure, otherwise it cannot be enforced. And if we do that then we will grant Bulgaria all the embedded strategic concessions we made in 1999. It will then mean that the Macedonian state will have officially abandoned its language and the Macedonians living in Bulgaria. Let us also be clear that Sofia will not sign the Agreement if the wording it wants to see in it is absent. So here we are back to square one...

If, however, we accept, sign and ratify such a text, we will definitely show the world that we are incapable of holding our own and of managing our Macedonian state.

Where to from here?

15. Sofia is dissatisfied because Macedonia has not implemented the 1999 Declaration. It is our duty to constantly remind ourselves that everything that was imposed on us by force, everything that was dishonestly, unfairly and abnormally forced upon us... must not be allowed to succeed. We have to stress that even, God forbid, through blackmail, blockades, etc., we are forced to accept something, it must not succeed... we will have to treat it as unacceptable and non-reciprocal... The Agreement of Friendship must also remain as only text on paper. Unfortunately this document will leave deep traces in the Macedonian people and our ability to develop relationships will slide down. It’s pure physics. Macedonians will be angry about the Bulgarian lies and they will not be forgiving.

Sofia is wasting its time. The Bulgarians are needlessly making fools of themselves, asking for the impossible. Even if they are healing their hang-ups with it, they are wrong. They cannot take what is ours. Even if they take it, it will never be theirs. Neither the people nor the language... They are creating enemies unnecessarily...

Both nations are close in so many ways. Languages, traditions... History also connects us in so many ways. When many Macedonians did not have their own country, they lived and worked in Bulgaria. A large number of the top Macedonian revolutionaries and activists studied, lived and worked in Sofia and throughout Bulgaria. There are dozens of events that we celebrate together but as two separate nations. We are not, nor have we ever been Bulgarians. We are Macedonians and speak the Macedonian language.

In the past many people declared themselves Bulgarians, Serbs, Greeks, Muslims, Turks... because they had no other choice. No one officially accepted them as Macedonians. Everyone accepted them as their own people; Greeks in Greece, Serbians in Serbia, Bulgarians in Bulgaria, Albanians in Albania... Old man Itso Pope, in Resen, during the Serbian occupation, at a census taking was asked: "What nationality are you?" He replied: "Macedonian!" They told him there was no such thing. He then said: "Then write down whatever you want my nationality to be!" The same thing happened in Bulgaria and Greece.

After Bulgaria takes all this, along with its historic syndromes, and dumps them onto the compost heap, then perhaps it will be time for new horizons to open between our two countries and our two peoples. Until then... Sofia will be on the move.

X – Testimonials

1. Jan de Hoop Scheffer, NATO Secretary General (“Utrinski Vesnik”, July 16, 2008), said:

“You have to realize that our friends in Skopje want to join NATO, and not vice versa. You know, Greece is inside and Skopje is not. In other words, flexibility is needed from everyone but it should not be forgotten that the country aspires to join NATO. And in that lies the question.”

At one time the same rule applied to the blacks. The issue, according to Scheffer, was that there was no other reason other than that they were black and nothing else, which was pure racism!

2. Dean Pitman, assistant to Secretary of State John Kerry (“Republika”, September 27, 2013), said:

“The name issue falls into the category of frozen conflicts, the same as the territorial dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan.”
“...I know this is not a small matter because if it was it would have been resolved by now.”

This statement was made during a briefing before the UN General Assembly. Pitman actually verified (for us) that a quick solution to our problem is not possible! From what it looks like, he has given away Washington’s true intentions. So here we are left to wonder... why Reeker, Wohlers... constantly pushed for the dispute to be resolved quickly?

3. Anders Fogh Rasmussen, NATO Secretary General (“Dnevnik”, February 17, 2012), said:

“First a solution to the name, then membership!”

This message was sent from Athens. Rasmussen, on one hand, made overtures to “court” us and on the other spelled out his organization’s anti-Macedonian (NATO Alliance) policies towards us. “I love you but you must die!!!!”

4. Soon after that (“Nova Makedonija”, March 1, 2012) both Ambassador Wohlers and Rasmussen, in a coordinated response, informed us that we should not expect anything from the NATO summit in Chicago in May, 2012. The pretext was the same; “First change your name then membership!” According to Rasmussen, “The decision that was made in Bucharest in 2008 still applies...!”

These statements confirm and make it crystal clear that the blockades were not Greek but originated from NATO and the EU.

5. German Chancellor Angela Merkel (“Nova Makedonija”, February 15, 2012) said:

“The name issue must be resolved... because without a solution it would be difficult to achieve consensus on the country’s entry into NATO and start negotiations with the EU.” Merkel also said: “The Hague verdict is an undeniable success for the Macedonian Government.” And added that: “The verdict should be recognized because obligations for Greece will arise from it?!”

This statement was made after Merkel’s talks with Prime Minister Gruevski, which was confusing because, on one hand, Merkel calls for consensus and on the other she calls for the Court judgment to be recognized... on top of that by Greece. But if that happens there will be no consensus! She also did not say why Germany tolerates Greece ignoring and not implementing The Hague judgement. She is also responsible for that. Merkel just showed us that the Court’s judgement for Macedonia is weighing heavily on everyone. When the Hague verdict is mentioned they don’t know where to look or what to say.

6. Jose Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission (“Dnevnik”, October 29, 2010), said:

“The time has come for Macedonia to not miss this historic opportunity. Identity issues are certainly important, but more important is for the past to not hold the future hostage.”

After that statement, who now can truly say that this problem is “only” about Macedonia’s name and nothing else? Barroso spoke on behalf of the European Union and, in fact, called on our people to change their own identity... for the sake of the future, right?

7. Victoria Nuland, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States responsible for Europe, and former ambassador to NATO (“Nova Makedonija”, November 15, 2013), said:

“I, myself in the past, especially in 2008 at the NATO Summit in Bucharest, personally rolled up my sleeves on behalf of Macedonia. I remember meeting with Prime Minister Gruevski and with the Greek leaders in my living room where we were trying to resolve the dispute. I believe that there are two or more formulations which should be acceptable to both sides. We are working to bring dialogue, leadership and make choices for the two parties to choose from.”

Well now, who are we to believe? While Reeker, Wohlers and others have repeatedly assured us that the U.S. will not interfere in the dispute and that this is a job for the two countries to work out, Vicky here has assured us to the contrary; that she personally rolled up her sleeves to help us out!? And the “two or more formulations” that should be “acceptable to both sides”, you can be sure are not Greek but American solutions to the problem. In any case, the fact is that among the U.S. and Greece there are “differences” which are not strategic, but only planned. Greece, for example, wants to “finish” us through *erga omnes* while the U.S. is more committed to our gradual annihilation. In stages that may take several years, through replacing the reference with a permanent name for international use! They insist that this process will be “less painful” and easier for us to cross the torrent.

8. Ivo Dalder, U.S. Ambassador to NATO (“Nova Makedonija”, June 19, 2013), said:

“The U.S. has a big task and is investing a lot of diplomatic effort, including people at the highest levels, to find a solution together with the Greek and Macedonian governments. One can only guess as to why this has not already happened.”

This must be a revelation for those handling this case: The U.S. with all its bulldozers at the “highest level” has failed to wipe out little Macedonia!

9. James Steinberg, Deputy Secretary of State (“Nova Makedonija”, June 10, 2010), said:

“We understand that Prime Minister Gruevski has to make a heavy decision which is always difficult in situations like this. But I think it is important for the Macedonian leadership to focus on going forward with a solid future in NATO and the EU, which is tempting!?”

There is no ambiguity in the American position; they are openly asking for our capitulation. There is no bilateral agreement with Greece and no mediation... Macedonia must die... everything else is for show.

10. Hillary Clinton (“Dnevnik”, July 10, 2011), said:

“The government in Skopje needs to know that it will not be able to make progress in its European integration until it resolves the name issue and, on the other hand, it is obvious that Greece must be ready to accept that solution!”

It cannot be said any clearer: a) in the name of the United States, Mrs. Clinton has told us point blank, “no NATO and EU” for us as Macedonia!, b) In parallel she also told us that Greece must accept the solution! Of course when the time comes, if it ever comes, why should we talk to Athens and not directly to its manager, the U.S., who set the conditions in the first place?

11. WikiLeaks: “U.S. supports an international name with a geographic qualifier” (“Dnevnik”, March 30, 2011). According to a telegram sent from U.S. Ambassador to Athens, Daniel

Speckhard, the Obama administration believes that the main element in deciding on the name is using “a name with a geographic determinant for general use internationally without having to tamper with the identity (and the identity is not to be mentioned in certain stages of the EU integration process)!”

Thanks to WikiLeaks the American game and trap have been revealed. Trap us and annihilate us step by step. First change our name for international use. Then change our identity. Of course, in “stages” and no hurry.

12. Lawrence Eagleburger, former U.S. Secretary of State, said to MRTV:

“If Macedonia decides to keep its constitutional name there is no power which can force it to change it. It is up to you to decide whether you want to change your name or not!”

This is the strongest card in Macedonia’s hand. No one can change our country’s name without our consent. As a Macedonian people, only we have that right and no one else...

13. Hillary Clinton, in the capacity of Secretary of State, for the 20th anniversary of Macedonia’s independence on September 8, 2011, decided not to send her congratulations. It is common practice to send congratulations through the embassies of countries. Ignoring the Macedonian leadership, she sent her greetings directly to the Macedonian citizens through the State Department web page! This was not only unprecedented but an insult to the Macedonian leadership, illustrating American displeasure with Macedonia’s unwillingness to capitulate.

This was during the period when Washington was openly boycotting Gruevski’s government. In February 2011, while visiting the U.S. and in meetings with the State Department, Gruevski was forced to organize a press conference on the street...

13.1. U.S. hostility towards Macedonia’s government peaked when Reeker (“Gruevski ignores messages from Washington”),

“Dnevnik”, March 4, 2011) said: “The situation in Macedonia has not changed even though we voiced our concerns to the Prime Minister at a meeting in Washington. On the contrary, after February 16 U.S. concerns have spiked!”

14. Thomas Countryman, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, during his visit to Skopje (“Dnevnik”, October 27, 2010), said: “Washington is still interested in Macedonia’s membership in NATO. With all this waiting it is Macedonia who is losing and not Greece. There is no long-term damage from failure to resolve the dispute for Athens.”

What more can we say?

15. Philip Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, in an address to the Foreign Affairs Senate Subcommittee, talking about the prospects of Balkan countries for NATO membership (“Nova Makedonija”, May 20, 2011), said: “Macedonia will join after the name issue is resolved.”

If U.S. policy was not clear (first change your name, then membership), Gordon would not have been so proud to explain to the Senate that the lack of consensus was due to interference...

16. Daniel Fried, Assistant Secretary of State (“Dnevnik”, October 28, 2008), said: “Take Nimetz’s latest proposal and make a bright future for your children. They will be grateful for it. After Macedonia accepts the name change, the EU will pressure Greece to respond positively!”

Regarding Macedonia’s insistence to preserve its identity, Fried said: “Success of the country is its best proof of identity!?” He also added: “I would rather be a hero 100 years later than be a hero now!?”

This is the most beautiful anatomy of American politics yet: a) you accept first and then we will force Greece to accept! And if Greece does not accept, then what? Greece is not likely to accept anything outside of our permanent demise! Once we have accepted then, irrespective of what Greece does, we enter the

next phase... a starting point for new concessions. That's the way we see it! Very logical, right? b) How can the United States claim that by our acceptance, the "EU will push Greece ...?" How do we know that the EU will push Greece? Of course this is more confirmation that Washington is indeed managing this dispute! c) Is there anyone born today who would like to be a hero, not today, but 100 years from now?... Need we say any more????

17. Sean Makormark, spokesman for the U.S. State Department ("Utrinski" September 11, 2008), said: "Macedonia has said that it wants to be called Macedonia and we recognized that name. If Macedonia tells the international community that it wants to be called by a different name, which will be fully supported by the Macedonian people and the government, then I do not believe that the U.S. would oppose it."

He said that the U.S. did not suggest any solutions but has participated in finding a solution. How? Are they waiting for someone else to make suggestions?

This is indeed more confirmation that without our consent there can be no name change. The spokesman, it seems, did not understand that Macedonia does not want to change its name. If it did it would have happened a long time ago.

18. Philip Gordon, Assistant Secretary of State ("Nova Makedonija", July 11, 2012), said:

"In Macedonia's case, NATO members have made it clear that an invitation will only be offered after the name issue is resolved."

What more do we need to say? Our NATO membership is definitely not decided by Greece alone. Greece may bear responsibility for Macedonia's predicament but there are others lined up behind it...

19. According to "Nova Makedonija" ("Wishes one, sincerity another", February 24, 2012), James Steinberg, a high level State Department employee, in 2009 said: "To simplify the matter, the

agreement will be whatever is accepted by UN resolution. This will apply to everyone in the international community.”

With whom can we agree? The problem is with Greece? Everything else is simple. That is why we are always sent back to Greece.

20. Aivo Orav, Head (Ambassador) to the EU Mission in Macedonia, speaking about the Ohrid Agreement to the European Parliament (“Dnevnik”, November 17, 2012), said: “This agreement is very important for the government coalition between the ethnic Albanians and the Slav Macedonians, even though the ethnic communities may understand it differently.”

He used the term “Slav Macedonians” a few times. What do you think, the idea of renaming us to “Slav Macedonians” was ordered by Brussels? We can guarantee that use of this term was not his personal choice! So do you still think our identity is not an issue? And what the hell is a “Slav Macedonia” anyway? Is there such an ethnic identity? Friends, it is always about our ethnic identity and language...

21. Philip Reeker, first as ambassador to Macedonia (2008-2011) and then as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs in Washington, said:

21.1 “This is a young country; it became independent for the first time only 18 years ago. There is evidence of this in the UN and around the world. What needs to be addressed here is what is referred to as “the name dispute”. Your country needs to find a name with which to start moving further towards full integration. Your identity is yours, with every individual and with every group. This is something that cannot be negotiated.”

(Prior to that, from 1997 to 1999, Reeker was a diplomat in Skopje and spokesman for Ambassador Hill, who was special envoy to President Clinton on Kosovo. Through Hill, Reeker was directly involved in the various wars of the time. Both Hill and Reeker attended the Rambouillet Conference where Reeker acted as spokesman. There he was involved with the Serbians in an

attempt to reject the offensive and unacceptable agreement in order to make way for bombing Serbia, including Belgrade. So we can conclude that Reeker has been directly involved in the “Greater Albania” project since the late 1990’s).

Reeker said: “Something can be found that will strengthen Macedonia’s European identity and will resolve the name issue so that the country can join institutions and become a true member of the Euro-Atlantic community.”

Reeker said: “For us Americans, being bilingual or multilingual is an asset, something that the people of this country can benefit from. It should be borne in mind that diversity can also bring benefits here and you will be more secure if you accept the other languages and cultures that exist in Macedonia.”

The quotes shown here were taken from an interview with U.S. Ambassador Reeker entitled “The identity is not negotiable” given for “Dnevnik” on June 8, 2009.

Reeker told us almost everything; that our country is only 18 years old; that our country is not recognized; that we should change the name of our country; that our identity is not and cannot be negotiable, which is absolutely true. But what he did not tell us is that concealed in the name change it an automatic identity change. He also told us that we need to build a European identity (something that Wohlers mentioned in December 2013 in Tetovo?); and that Macedonians should learn Albanian (for personal benefit!)... and that no Albanian needs to learn Macedonian! The Albanians have no need to become more “secure”, as per Reeker’s advice to the Macedonians. They are, of course, protected by the Americans...

You can say that this interview served as a kind of summary of American policy implemented in Macedonia in 2008.

21.2. Reeker said: “I believe it is possible to have a solution relatively quickly ... focus on what needs to be done and that is finding A NAME FOR INTERNATIONAL USE, to which both sides would agree.” (“Nova Makedonija”, January 18, 2010).

This is the biggest scam, trap and hook for Macedonia. ...At home one name, erga omnes for outside use. They cannot, however, change our name without our consent. But if it is done with our consent and we do agree to change our name for external use, it will not be long before it becomes erga omnes! We know very well from what Reeker has told us, on behalf of the USA that the Americans want us to choose a name for international use to which Greece will agree!? And why is Greece given such honours to hold Macedonia hostage?

21.3. Reeker said: “This is a very important spring for Macedonia; the name issue should be resolved in the next few months.” (“Nova Makedonija”, March 4, 2010).

No pressure here!

21.4. According to “Dnevnik” (“Public to help government with the name issue”, August 30, 2010) Reeker said: “I think the public should stand up and take responsibility and become interested in the issues, listen to what people have to say.”

This was probably said in order to plant the idea in people that the name issue should be publicly debated, which actually did happen in the summer of 2013. The idea here was to create more confusion and bring Macedonia closer to capitulation. Reeker took over three years to turn this into a project.

21.5. Reeker said: “I hope you don’t have to spend another two and a half years to come up with a solution to the name issue, which is a condition for receiving your invitation for NATO membership. Macedonia has met the criteria and the country will be given an invitation as soon as the name issue with Greece is resolved. We are disappointed that it is still not resolved. However, the responsibility to find a final solution lies with your leaders and with the people of Macedonia.” (“Nova Makedonija”, November 23, 2010)

No doubt everything depends on us! Reeker holds the cards, Greece has no role here! No responsibility and no solution! The manager (U.S) knows who needs to capitulate...

21.6. In an interview with “Nova Makedonija” (“If it was up to the United States, the name would have been resolved,” March 26, 2011), Reeker said:

“It is not important to think about the past or the present, but to think of forming a strategy for the future.”

“We have not seen any real discussion taking place about what is acceptable to you, we have heard more about what is not.”

The first quote is part of the constant American deception and fog about the future which requires us to sacrifice our past and present. The second quote is true, but why is it Reeker’s responsibility that we come closer to a solution? When we are offered a solution that is acceptable to us we will take it. But pressuring us to seek any solution, which obviously will not be acceptable to us, will be Reeker’s first step to seeking new concessions from us. Again, Reeker insists on “discussion” about our name! We like our historic name and we don’t want to change it! Period!

21.7. Reeker said: “Not to prejudge the decision of the International Court of Justice but the basic situation with NATO is still the same: NATO very clearly stated on numerous occasions and repeatedly that Macedonia will only receive an invitation to join NATO unless it resolves the name issue!” (“Dnevnik”, December 3, 2011)

And some “experts” constantly claim that it is the Greeks who are blockading us, blackmailing us and giving NATO ultimatums!?

21.8. Reeker said: “The International Court of Justice has delivered its opinion concerning the dispute between Greece and Macedonia. We hope that both sides take this opinion and resolve the problem. NATO’s position has not changed, which means

that after you solve the name dispute, regardless of how you decide to settle it, Macedonia will advance into NATO!”

Reeker said: “We can help, but we cannot make the difficult decisions on your behalf. These are the very things that you have to do!” (“Nova Makedonija”, January 10, 2012)

Our journalists (let alone politicians) never asked Reeker “since when do courts deliver opinions and not judgments?” Second, he is clearly telling us that the NATO alliance is blockading us! Third, the qualification that “it is us that needs to make the hard decisions” has revealed his intentions. Yes, of course, they would be tough decisions especially when something sacred is being sacrificed...

21.9. Reeker said: “We have offered ideas and the UN is leading a process and would like to come to a solution. If you truly want to go back in history, THE MACEDONIAN QUESTION HAS PLAGUED NOT ONLY THE PEOPLE IN THE REGION BUT ALSO WIDER EUROPE. We believe we have the answer to that question, the current structure and existing boundaries; that is the answer.” (“Dnevnik”, March 29, 2012)

This is an extremely important statement. It is crucial that we pay attention. Reeker, perhaps for the first time, has associated the “name dispute” with the “Macedonian Question”. If it is truly troubling both the people in the region and Europe, then there is justification for the Americans to shut us down, to erase us from the face of the earth! Right? Is Reeker accidentally spilling the beans about what this fake name dispute is truly all about? What to do with the Macedonians? Just like what they did with the Macedonians in 1913 when Macedonia was partitioned and the Macedonian people were declared extinct? Why are they constantly pushing us to “agree” with Greece? Does Greece have all the answers? Like it did in 1913 and in 1949 when it cleansed Greek occupied Macedonia of its Macedonian population? Is this what they are trying to tell us in a round about way... and fooling us into doing it to ourselves? SHAME!!! GREAT SHAME!!! And they call themselves civilized!

21.10. Reeker said: “Reconciliation is never easy.” (“Dnevnik”, August 23, 2012)

This is how Reeker justified Defence Minister Fatmir Besimi’s unauthorized visit to an NLA monument in Slupchane, where he paid his respects to the fallen terrorists who fought against the very army and people he is currently serving. How is that for hypocrisy... both Albanian and American...?

22. Paul Wohlers, current U.S. ambassador to Skopje (2011 -), is not as aggressive as his predecessor Reeker and gives the impression that he is more sincere and restrained. Wohlers said:

22.1 “This is an issue which goes beyond the name, it is about identity.” (“Nova Makedonija”, July 20, 2011)

Wohlers said this while being questioned in Congress, during the confirmation of his nomination as ambassador to Macedonia. And he was right. But what can we do, when Reeker and the others are trying to convince us otherwise?

22.2. Wohlers said: “Greece is going through major political and economic changes and until that process is over it will complicate the progress of other processes, not just the name issue.” (“Dnevnik”, November 9, 2011)

If that is the case why then is the United States insisting on a quick solution agreeable to Greece? Is this not more manipulation and lies?

22.3. Wohlers said: “No institution has the right to tell NATO who to accept and who not to when it comes to membership.” Wohlers, according to “Nova Makedonija” of March 19, 2012, was angry when he said this.

This says it all: NATO is its own boss and no one, especially not Greece, can tell it who to accept and who not to! If Greece did not block Macedonia from joining NATO then who did?

22.4. Wohlers said: “You, as citizens of Macedonia, have to decide how to define yourselves and based on what values. You can not be defined by ethnicity, which is different, nor by faith, which also differs, or by culture, which is similar but not the same.” Wohlers then said: “Some people are trying to create an identity by returning far back in history, but as I said in my speech, it is a dangerous way to create an identity that way because some people may be left out. I think many people in this country feel left out by taking this path. This is why shared values are much better and more important for the future and we should all participate in that debate!?” (“Dnevnik”, November 27, 2013).

At a lecture in Tetovo at the then “Stoel” University, Wohlers fully exposed his cards regarding U.S. policy towards Macedonia. He treated the Macedonian people like they were an object which needed renaming. He wanted to “debate” Macedonia and the Macedonian people’s erasure. There can be no more direct appeal to annihilate the Macedonian people. Such a policy is beyond the scope of imagination! Over 20 years have passed and the United States is still leading deadly policies towards Macedonia.

23. Analyzing statements made by Reeker and comparing them with those of his predecessors in Skopje, ambassadors Aenik, Butler and Milovanovic, we find a striking difference; Reeker’s predecessors never publicly mentioned any problems with our country’s name. There are no incidents of them asking the Macedonian people to change their country’s name. There were no “appeals” made to our leadership to accept capitulation. There was not a single attempt to change our identity, language, or the name of our country...

Based on our findings we can conclude that America’s true policy towards Macedonia became public at the NATO summit in Bucharest in 2008. We don’t know for certain if this policy was there before the Summit and was kept secret, or if this was a total reversal in policy... We suspect it was always there but

well-hidden. All we can say is that the blockade, the closing of doors to NATO (and the EU) happened in parallel with the blackmails and ultimatums... “First change your name, then membership!”

It was exactly at the same time, in 2008, when Ambassador Reeker came to Skopje that the persistent U.S. anti-Macedonian policy was publicly implemented. This was a time when extreme aggressive pressure was put on the Macedonian leadership to come up with a solution... to self-destruct...

After Bucharest in 2008, all U.S. officials began to sing the same old song... “First change your name, then membership!”

If Greece was truly responsible for NATO’s (and the EU’s) policy turnaround in 2008, then why were U.S. officials, as quoted above, in such need for us to change our country’s name... make all the “tough” decisions, be “brave” and “quickly” solve the name problem...?

Did they do all these things to make Greece happy? Please... let us not be so naïve...

23.1. Having experienced stagnation and defeat over this issue for the past 15 years, Washington, at Bucharest in 2008, decided to grab all the strings in its own hands and take control of the entire situation in order to bring a quick solution to the “Macedonian Question”. Once and for all...!!!

24. And finally we would like to bring forth some relevant information that shows interference in Macedonian affairs by foreign diplomats (mostly by Ambassadors):

24.1. Zhernovski, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party (“Publika”, contributing to “Dnevnik”, March 24, 2012), said:

“Perhaps I should be brave about this and say what needs to be said, but the first time I heard the idea of a wider joint front

against this government was from the international representatives.”

24.2. According to “Nova Makedonija” on June 3, 2010, “The Albanian parties cannot unite, even though foreign diplomats have suggested to them to form a common platform.” The article also said that Selmani, former leader of New Democracy, had written invitations to DUI and DPA leaders to “unite” in order to resolve outstanding Albanian issues!

Against whom were these Albanians leaders expected to “unite”?

24.3. Vladimir Milchin, executive director of the Soros “Open Society Institute” Foundation, according to “Dnevnik” on August 30, 2010, said that foreign diplomats had tested the option of having a referendum without support from the government!

Our guess is that the same diplomats who suggested a common platform or a wider Albanian front against the Macedonian government, also promoted the idea of a referendum... And who might they be? Diplomats from Malta or Senegal... What do you think? Who else would have the interest and would dare to unscrupulously interfere in our affairs?

At the end, a little “song”: “Dnevnik” on October 25, 2012, wrote about the case of the American lady named Candy Dunlap, who was arrested at the airport in Petrovac on September 28, 2012. Found on her were about 256 ancient coins, two pendants of lead and bronze and a few other items of archaeological value, all priceless. She stayed in Macedonia for only six days and her visit was “humanitarian” in nature, or more precisely, she was here on a “medical” mission. At her trial she claimed that the villagers of Krivolak, Seltse and Lozovo in Shtip Region, in appreciation for her “medical services” gave her the items and that they were only souvenirs!? She thought the coins were buttons!? The court found that she had no permission to provide “medical services” and no written documentation that showed that she was with a humanitarian mission...

So the question is, was she lying? We know she was lying. She must have belonged to an organized smuggling ring, stealing our cultural heritage.

What do you think of this, dear readers? How many years of jail should Candy be given?

Candy received no time in jail! All she got was a suspended sentence of two years and banishment! So she was found not guilty for her responsibility in this caper, like it was some sort of joke. Due to “mitigating circumstances” i.e. being a stranger in our country, a family woman, a mother of six children who has an obligation to take care of them, she was set free to go...!? What kind of message did we send to would be thieves? No problem if you steal!? No problem if you steal and get caught in Macedonia!? We will just apologize to you for the inconvenience and send you back home!

Candy was caught, but how many Americans (and others!) here on “humanitarian” missions have gotten away and how many of our treasures have been stolen? And with this suspended sentence... how many more will come to rob us knowing full well “nothing” is going to happen to them, even if they get caught! Dear reader, you can see how we “create” our own problems... We run our courts the same way we conduct our diplomacy!

And let us be objective here: how are our kindness, good nature and generosity interpreted by these culprits? Can't the Macedonian court see or have insight into what is happening here? Need we say more? What if an American decides to start murdering Macedonians? What will our courts do then? Give them medals? It is time to wake up people...

As we can clearly see, it is entirely our fault. People steal everywhere... and punishment fits the crime... Take a look at how other countries punish robbers of archeological artifacts. It seems that the world has found a bunch of sheep in Macedonia and can't wait to fleece them...

What is the penalty for a similar crime in the U.S.? If a Macedonian did that in the U.S. would they be let go or made to sit on the electric chair? Legally...

XI - Closing Remarks

1. It is truly sad that, 20 years later, we still don't know why the U.S. is behaving the way it is towards Macedonia and what its policy is towards our country? Why has the "Macedonian Question" been reopened after so many years? Why was there nothing done to stop the illegal Greek blockade of our border that lasted almost 2 years and nearly destroyed Macedonia? Why is there so much silence? Why didn't Washington intervene when the European Commission ignored the so-called "Badinter Commission's" recommendation for Macedonia's recognition? Why was Bosnia and Herzegovina recognized even though it did not meet the conditions for recognition? And why was the 1992 EC's Lisbon Declaration, prohibiting Macedonia from using its historic name, tolerated?

For now all we can conclude is that the United States, in its strategic plans, all these years has done nothing positive or in favour of Macedonia except, perhaps, in the beginning of the 1990's when it sent UNPREDEP troops. Unfortunately that too, again and above all, was done for its own (and Albanian) interests. The aim then was to prevent Milosevich from invading and occupying Macedonia; not to strengthen the security of our country.

1.1. A survey of U.S. policy towards Macedonia could have been taken a long time ago. It made no sense to have left Macedonia in the lurch after it had done everything in its power to secede from Yugoslavia peacefully. Why was Macedonia not helped politically and economically after it peacefully separated from Yugoslavia? Isn't that what was wanted? There were indications that this is exactly what the entire world wanted. Then, in 2008 in Bucharest, after Macedonia was told that it had met every condition for entry into NATO it was not only rejected but blackmailed and given ultimatums to change its name! What was that all about?

1.2. Let us ask the question in a different way: "What mistakes did Macedonia make, and when, that helped shape this kind of U.S. policy towards it? In Serbia's case Milosevich, no doubt,

brought U.S. wrath upon himself for the way he behaved in the region. But what did Macedonia do? The answer is simple: No matter what Macedonia did or would have done any differently, nothing would have mattered. The outcome would have been the same because the United States had made up its mind a long time ago about what to do in the region and how it went about achieving its goals. Unfortunately for us, Macedonia and the Macedonian people stood in America's way and they needed to be removed. At issue here is not what Macedonia did or did not do, but the U.S. regional geopolitical interests.

2. It is never too late, despite the long time lapse. We are finally getting a glimpse of American policies implemented in Macedonia since the breakup of Yugoslavia. The idea behind this write-up is to inspire others to do a more in-depth analysis of our situation in order to pinpoint the mistakes made in drafting the current U.S. Balkan policy. Were these mistakes made at the State Department or at other relevant institutions? Wherever they were made they need to be reviewed and revised. Macedonia has never been a threat to anyone, let alone to U.S. interests in the region. The Americans need to see this and understand it. It is, in fact, in their interest to understand us better. Pragmatism, which was and remains their strong suit, must prevail in this situation.

3. The findings presented, conclusions reached and opinions given in this write-up are all based on research and facts, but we have to admit that further research is required for a final conclusion. This needs to be done in order to put all the pieces of the puzzle together and uncover the entire U.S. strategy and policy towards Macedonia and the wider region. It is always possible to make mistakes in politics if you don't have a long and accurate view of the problem. Sometimes there are hidden goals that cannot be easily detected and lack of such knowledge can lead to wrong conclusions. And our study here is not excluded. The more we understand the problem, the easier it will be to solve.

4. We have already explained that U.S. policy toward Macedonia is part of American interests in the Balkans, which are to be realized through the Albanian factor. This inevitably puts into

question Macedonia's territorial integrity. Serbia's territorial integrity was compromised when Kosovo was separated and made into an Albanian state. Albanian appetites, for those Albanians who openly stand behind the United States, however cannot be satisfied without carving territory out of Macedonia. This has been the process by which Albanian aspirations are being achieved, which started years ago and in many ways is an irreversible process.

4.1. Because the Americans do not trust the so-called "Slavs" in the Balkans, they decided to build a partnership with the Albanians. So if they are building a partnership with the Albanians it means that they don't consider the Macedonians a good partner to guarantee stability and prosperity in their own country and in the wider region. This is perhaps because Macedonians are divided on many issues and have issues between themselves. Plus there is also the Albanian factor in Macedonia which has its own intentions, which is continuously undermining our country. There is also the fact that all Albanians have shown loyalty to the U.S. and a willingness to meet all their requirements to the maximum if they are given the opportunity to decisively solve their own national question.

4.1.1. On the other hand, there are also all those neighbours of ours who have problems with Macedonia and with the Macedonian people! And not vice versa! This may seem strange, even to speak of, but the fault lies with Macedonia's neighbours and not with the Macedonian people. Except maybe for the fact that we existed as a nation before we had a country, we know who we are and we refuse to be assimilated by them. We have shown no ill will towards our neighbours! Plus, outside of defending ourselves from outside aggression and from foreign aspirations, we have not committed any acts of aggression towards anyone. On top of that we are a patient and tolerant people... traits of our heritage. Macedonia has strived to build friendly relations with its neighbours but has not always been successful... but through no fault of its own. Macedonia over the years has developed a bit of a "defensive instinct" because it has often been the victim of foreign intrigues. How can we not be on the defensive when even today our existence is being disputed?

The reason for the situation that Macedonia is in may be summarized by the words of former Serbian Prime Minister Nikola Pasich who, according to Iambev Mikhail Leonidovich (“The armed conflict in Macedonia in 2001 and the development of the political situation in the country”), said: “History has shown that he who had Macedonia was always first in the Balkans.”

4.2. From what we have seen, the Albanian leaders in Macedonia have a serious role in the implementation of U.S. policy in the Balkans. Everything started with the 2001 war in Macedonia when, by force of arms, the Albanian leaders were radicalized. It is a fact that Ahmeti and his people were American trainees during the war and were engaged in the implementation of American regional interests. If that was not a fact, the Albanians would have behaved differently today. Why have the Albanians not ignored American aspirations in our country and the surrounding region? Could Ahmeti and the other Albanian commanders turn their backs on the U.S. today after all that the Americans have done for them? Including bringing Ahmeti to power in Macedonia? How can they forget their patrons who conceived and organized the 2001 war (also because of their own interests) in favour of the Albanian cause, through which the Albanians made a lot of gains? There is no objective reason to do so. On the contrary!

4.3. There should be no doubt that the cooperation and coordination that was started in 2001 has continued at its full capacity in all kinds of circumstances to this day. So we openly need to ask: “Is it possible that the evident lack of loyalty towards Macedonia, so often manifested in the Albanian leaders in our country, even openly lately, is not done with American blessing? Or are they stimulated to play the role of a Trojan horse, on account of the Macedonians?” The answer is clear.

4.4. They need to act in accordance with their interests in order to finalize their plans of creating a “Greater Albania”, part of which is Macedonia; a project started in Kosovo in 1999 and continued in Macedonia in 2001.

Now let us have a look at the latest examples that confirm the above:

- Defense Minister Fatmir Besimi, accompanied by several uniformed officers from his office, along with the Deputy Prime Minister and a number of government and party people including some DUI functionaries, attended an unauthorized and illegal function where they stood before a monument in Slupchane and paid tribute to the dead NLA fighters who fought and died fighting against Macedonia and against the army Besini represented. Besini claimed that it was an act of reconciliation. U.S. Ambassador Paul Wohlers later publicly backed the minister and used the same words, thus justifying the incident. The same was repeated by Reecker who said he “welcomed Besimi’s message of reconciliation which was not easy to do”;

- In the beginning of the 2012 school year, the Albanian national anthem, instead of the Macedonian, was played in several elementary schools and at the Tetovo University. (“The prosecutor threatened but the anthem echoed on”, “Dnevnik”, September 21, 2012). Wohlers was unresponsive despite the deep dissatisfaction reported by the media;

- Musa Xhaferi gave a speech at the “John Hopkins” University in the United States about Macedonia being federalized in the future (“Integrating the Shadow of Federalism”, “Gragianski”, October 13, 2012). There was not a word from the U.S. even though Xhaferi had been invited by the Americans to make the speech. And here we thought that the United States had guaranteed our state’s unitary character through the Ohrid Agreement. Does that mean that the Ohrid Agreement is going to go by the way of the Interim Accord which guaranteed that Greece would not impede our way into NATO and the EU? The Ohrid Agreement was “prepared” in the same manner as the Interim Accord. Its treatment shows that the U.S. cares about no agreements that are not in favour of its interests. When the Ohrid Agreement becomes “favourable” for Macedonia then it will be ignored just as the Interim Accord was. Why should we believe that it is any different?

- Musa Xhaferi initiated “a National Congress of Albanian Mayors from Macedonia, Albania, Kosovo and Montenegro”!? (“Musa Xhaferi gathers Balkan Albanian mayors”, “Nova Makedonija”, January 30, 2012);
- The Chair Municipality illegally renamed all Chair schools. Wohlers, of course, said nothing and did nothing. Albanization of Macedonian territories started with plan “B”. First the referendum to stop the municipal divisions was thwarted by the U.S. recognizing Macedonia by its constitutional name. Then the new administrative divisions were implemented in favour of the Albanians, which was the plan all along;
- Former Ambassador Reeker along with a number of top Albanian politicians were present during an Albanian nationalist rampage which was carried out by a large number of out of control fans during a basketball game. There was no reaction from anyone. And no one did anything to stop it;
- During a ceremony at the Military Academy, Defense Minister Besimi addressed the cadets in Albanian even though Chief of Staff Koteski warned him that the official language in Macedonia was Macedonian. (“Besimi spoke to the cadets in Albanian”, “Nova Makedonija”, October 2, 2012);
- Bekim Fazliu, DPA Albanian party candidate for mayor of Skopje, said: “After our victory we will not allow the song ‘Makedonsko Devoiche’ to be sung in Albanian settlements” inside Macedonia! (“Republika”, December 7, 2012);
- Ziadin Zela, DPA Albanian party candidate for mayor of Struga said: “Vote en masse to show that Struga is in fact Albanian!” (“Republika”, April 12, 2013);
- Here are a few statements made by DPA leader Thachi: “Macedonia is an artificial country, a ‘state experiment’, and it would be good if all Albanians lived in one country!” (“Ours and Kosovo’s Thachi are in line for a Greater Albania”, “Dnevnik”, March 19, 2012); Thachi called on “Albania and Kosovo to stop

the violence against the Albanians in Macedonia.” (“Thachi seeks international intervention”, “Dnevnik”, March 10, 2012); In an interview for “Dnevnik” (“The Tetovo Albanians are traitors because they voted for Ahmeti”, May 17, 2013) Thachi said: “Let’s be honest. We do not want to live in Macedonia; we want to live in another country. But they openly told us that there is no such dream!” (This may seem contradictory but it is not. First, who do you think told them that? Iceland or Norway?! Second, from our analysis it is clear that Washington’s aim is to break up Macedonia from the inside. So the dream remains alive, but it may take slightly longer than expected to achieve it. However, the plan will be achieved in different ways than we imagined in 2001);

- During Albania’s 100th anniversary celebration, a monument of Adem Jashari was uncovered in Radusha. Adem Jashari was a member of the KLA in Kosovo and had nothing to do with Macedonia (“Adem Jashari rose in Radusha”, “Dnevnik”, November 19, 2012)

- Berisha initiated the formation of a national soccer league of Albanian clubs in the Balkan countries, which supported a “civil” movement called “awaken”. (“Albanian soccer league is marketing propaganda for Berisha”, “Dnevnik”, January 8, 2013)

The above examples have shown the face of American politics in relation to local politicians. They support all steps taken by the Albanians to undermine and violate our country... In turn they have signed documents in which the Macedonian language is declared a state language...

There are too many “incidents” and “coincidences” to be ignored and for us to continue to remain naïve and blind.

4.5. When world renowned Albanian writer Ismail Kadare was accused by the press of being a willing anti-Vlach and even a racist, he immediately reacted with a response in the “Shekulli”, published on November 10, 2003, in which he deemed this to be a “vulgar provocation” and reminded everyone to respect all ethnic minorities in accordance with basic European principles.

He also stressed that “loyalty to the country where minorities live is necessary and, if it is absent, people need to ring the alarm bells.”

Unfortunately in Macedonia no one has taken Kadare’s “advice” to heart.

5. On the other hand, in addition to supporting the Albanians against Macedonia, Washington is aggressively looking to us for a negotiated name solution with Greece, but has not specified what constitutes an acceptable solution. Washington should know and does know that Greece doesn’t care about the name. The name is just a cover for Greece’s real purpose, the elimination of the Macedonian nation. If the Americans already know that then why are they formally working on a “name” solution which is obviously unimportant and has nothing to do with the reality of the situation? Why are they not working to save the Macedonian nation? Why are they not working to ensure our survival as a Macedonian people? The Americans have never made it clear to us why they stand behind Greece and support “the Greek line”, which has nothing to do with the reality of our problem? In all their moves, the Americans have completely and consistently supported Greece without giving even the simplest explanation... Why? While setting ultimatums for Macedonia, so far Washington has done nothing to set any conditions for Athens which will lead to a realistic solution. If Washington is truly seeking a solution why has it not made it clear to Greece that it must not demand the impossible from Macedonia.

The Americans have asked nothing of Greece yet they are looking to us to voluntarily do the impossible... change our own country’s name.... and for what? What will that do for them?

5.1. The U.S. is aggressive, insisting that we negotiate with Greece, especially in recent years, but has not specified what it is looking for as a desired result. The simplest conclusion we can reach from this is that the U.S. is exercising its policy towards Macedonia. Washington is undoubtedly also aware that, while Greece is out of balance and trying to survive a deep crisis, no agreement is possible. This was also admitted by Ambassador

Wohlers in Skopje when he said: “Greece is now going through some major political and economic changes and while it is still in that process, it complicates the progress of other processes, not just the name issue.” (“Wohlers: crisis complicates name negotiations!”, “Dnevnik”, November 9, 2011)

If there is no space for a solution that would be minimally acceptable to Macedonia, and there will not be, then there can be only one purpose why the United States is doing what it is doing: “Force Macedonia to capitulate!” If someone forces you to take poison, surely they are not wishing you good health.

5.2. Washington knows that the problem is completely asymmetric. At the core of it stands Greece (and the U.S.!), but Macedonia must face the consequences. Here, perhaps, lies our greatest handicap. No matter what we do, we pay the price. Everything falls on Macedonia’s shoulders. Because no one will understand the problem, they will always blame Macedonia for it.

However, in the end, if there is any justice left in the world, if there is any political accountability and fairness, if there are any principles left and if democracy works... the solution to this problem must also be asymmetrical. That is the only way that Macedonia can be saved. This kind of solution can be permanent and lasting. Abraham Lincoln once said: “Nothing is completely finished if not resolved fairly!”

5.2.1. Creating the “name problem” did not reflect negatively on Greece, or anyone else for that matter, outside of Macedonia, even though it was bogus and used against the fundamental interests of the Macedonian people and their state (UN, NATO, EU...). Thanks to the “name dispute”, Macedonia was left without a full and proper international identity; its efforts to integrate itself were blocked... thus causing our people economic, social and political suffering and further undermining our inter-ethnic relations... without which we were already vulnerable enough...

At the same time, given what has happened, even if Macedonia manages to integrate itself internationally with its historical and

constitutional name intact, there will be no consequences for Greece. In other words, Athens has nothing to lose apart from the fact that it unnecessarily wasted a lot of energy and money in the last 20 years or so... something that deserves some investigation.

5.2.2. Greece's initial accusations (1991/1992/1993) that the name "Macedonia" implied irredentism and threatened Greece's territorial integrity proved to be completely wrong and unsustainable as an argument. Here we are, over 20 years later and nothing has happened. And these were not just ordinary years. All these years Macedonia had been a victim of Greek psychological torment, cold and calculating roadblocks and an endless anti-Macedonian propaganda war; Greek aggression that brought the Macedonian people immeasurable harm. And yet, Macedonia did not retaliate, not even in the least! If Macedonia showed any aggression towards Greece, such as irredentism or retaliation by any means, please point it out! ...There was none! So if Macedonia did "nothing" to Greece during these 20 or so turbulent years, when will it do it?

Let us one more time mention the EC's "Badinter Commission", mentioned a few times earlier in this write-up, which accepted our "historic name" and concluded that it "in no way threatened Greece".

6. So that there is no confusion, please remember that publicly and verbally the Americans were strongly in support of Macedonia's membership in NATO (and the EU). Unfortunately this massively strong public verbal support turned out to be empty, useless and worthless words because their support had conditions attached to it. The fact is that the U.S. wants to see Macedonia in NATO but with a different name! And the U.S. does not hide that fact. At the same time our response should be loud and clear; NO THANK YOU!!! Please, we beg you; don't give us your support under such conditions. We don't want to commit suicide; it is not an option for us. The price set for joining your organizations is too high for the Macedonian people and we cannot accept. Hilary Clinton, according to the magazine "Republika", November 9, 2012, said: "Everyone wants to see you in NATO as soon as possible and we sincerely hope that the

obstacle will be removed (the obstacle for Mrs. Clinton is that we are Macedonians) as soon as possible and a practical and fair solution (she was probably thinking in accordance with the Greek red line!?) for the name can be found. We are ready to help” (surely with a list of possible new names!)

According to a friend, Mrs. Clinton is telling us “if my grandmother was the British Queen, I would be a princess”. But then she concludes that “the trouble is that I am not!”

7. The Americans have insisted that we change our country’s name, arguing that it will not compromise the national identity of our people. However, Ambassador Wohlers, before taking office in Skopje, during a talk with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (professionally called “crosstalk” ahead of confirming an office), said: “This is more than a name. This is a question of identity!” (“Wohlers: Dispute and the question of identity”, “Nova Makedonija”, July 15, 2011.)

Wohlers was absolutely right: there is no identity without a name!

7.1. The brilliant American analyst and journalist Jason Miko wrote about this American “hypocrisy” in his column entitled “Esoteric concepts of identity” (“Dnevnik”, October 25, 2012). He quoted Ambassador Philip Reeker who, when asked a question on October 19, 2012 at the State Department, replied: “...‘compromise’ is not a bad word and does not include ‘esoteric’ concepts such as identity or anything else...”

Miko said and proved that the expression “esoteric” is senseless and “when someone tells you that your identity is ‘esoteric’ it is an insult”.

Miko also provided his comment regarding a statement made by U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Philip Gordon, for “Al Jazeera” in July 2012, when he said that once the problem with the name is solved: “The people will stop being obsessed with it...” Miko said the word “obsessed” is a strong word and “Gordon is trying

to belittle the Macedonian people, while his name and identity are sacred...”

8. From what we have presented in this write-up we can conclude that the U.S. is leading a long-term accurate, consistent and resolute regional policy in the Balkans which, so far, has worked against Macedonian interests and has threatened Macedonia and the Macedonian people’s existence. There is no real basis to lead us to believe that this policy will end anytime soon and something positive will happen that will surprise Macedonia. It would be naïve to have such expectations. Let us not forget that the U.S. unleashed a real war against our country in 2001. What do you think that war was all about? The U.S. started a controlled war in Macedonia in order to achieve certain parts of its objectives. Did it achieve them? If their objectives were to destabilize Macedonia, break it up and give chunks of it to the Albanians, then they did not achieve them. Have they given up and abandoned their plans? Of course not! Since then they have gone to plan “B” to Albanize parts of Macedonia peacefully and break it up without a war. They are not in a hurry; they are patiently waiting for opportunities to open up and are adapting their tactics as they go along.

What the Americans are doing in Macedonia is an integral part of their regional policy that relies on the implementation of the “Greater Albania” project, which is being slowly implemented.

9. America’s treatment of Macedonia, during the toughest years of its history, has been nothing less than horrible. In no way can this qualify as being called “friendly”! To also call the U.S. “our partner” or as some say “our strategic partner” is absolutely wrong, inappropriate and far from the truth! Even if there was such a “partnership” it would prove harmful to our country in the long term. A positive partnership like the kind we delude ourselves of having, is contrary to American interests and in the long term will prove to be detrimental to our interests. America’s overall long-term policy is to sacrifice Macedonia for America’s greater good!

10. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that the U.S. is a dominant factor in world politics and will remain as such in the foreseeable future. The U.S. is the chief arbiter in the Balkans. At the same time it can be said, without doubt, that pulling the strings of Macedonia's future is Washington's doing. Washington is responsible for everything that happens to Macedonia and therefore Washington is the key that can also open different perspectives for Macedonia. But so far no "better" perspectives have been offered and the problem with our name symbolizes exactly how Washington feels about Macedonia.

11. It clearly shows that without the smallest respect from America towards Macedonian aspirations, it will be very difficult for us to succeed. So we need to do everything we can to gain that respect because all roads for us lead through Washington. We must also not leave out Moscow, Beijing, London, Berlin, Paris and Rome when seeking support for the survival of Macedonia and of the Macedonian people. A possible positive reaction from any one of these capitals can and will strongly influence Washington into becoming a bit more flexible towards us. Athens plays no important role in all this; the sooner we all realize that the better off we will be.

We have lost a lot of time and made some serious mistakes but there are still opportunities open to us to prevent us from falling into the abyss. But there is no doubt that we need to wise up and start defending ourselves. If we continue like before we will fall into the abyss.

12. There is still room to seek ways and opportunities that would lead to change in the current U.S. policy towards Macedonia; at least in the part that relates to the survival of the Macedonian people and our country. We must keep trying, either through direct dialogue or through other channels, to convince the Americans to show all their cards. Let us figure out exactly what they want from us. This should be delegated as the first and main task of our Embassy in Washington. But before we do that we need to ask: "How prepared and qualified is our Embassy to be able to pull this off?"

Otherwise, if we continue with business as usual and close our eyes and think that everything is fine, we will fail!

12.1. The very first move that we need to make must be made at home. It is high time that we re-energize our relations with the United States by using correct terms. Without taking proper steps we will end up going around in circles, with no prospects for progress. The question for us is “to be or not to be” which requires some serious thinking and immediate action. Therefore it is imperative to figure out exactly what the American interests are in and around our country. “Stop torturing us and tell us exactly what you want from us... and please be reasonable...” should be our motto...

12.2. The most efficient way to accomplish this is to formulate a memo which will crystallize America’s positions on many issues of concern relating to Macedonia, even those that have an air of interference in our internal affairs. There should be no problem because the U.S. is already deeply involved in that particular segment of our affairs through the Ohrid Agreement. We need to survey the U.S. and get some straight answers as to what exactly they are looking for with regards to: a) the name of our country, b) the identity of our people c) the Macedonian language and its role in our country, d) the unitary character of our country e) the Albanian position in our country and the extent of use of the Albanian language..., f) our entry into NATO and the EU (a realistic answer), g) Greek aspirations towards Macedonia, h) Bulgarian aspirations towards our language and people, h) The “Greater Albania” project... to name a few.

This should be a starting point. Let us figure out exactly what they want from us and take it from there. Naturally, under no circumstances can we give in to some issues like our name, identity and language and we should make that perfectly clear up front, in person and with no hesitation...

We need to draft such a document as soon as possible, without delay, get a meeting scheduled and present it to Washington in person. Or such a document can be jointly drafted in Skopje at the American Embassy. What do we have to lose...

As we can easily guess, their initial response might be negative but we must not give up and think that we have done our part. It is we who need them... not the other way around... Persist and we will prevail. For us it is crucial to open a dialogue if we want Macedonia to survive and it can... if we are willing to remove our heads from the sand.

12.3. If we fail then we will have no other choice but to be tormented until... We need to approach this problem logically and reasonably and argue our points in public with facts and arguments. If we don't show them that we are serious they will run us around in circles like they have done in the past and wait for us to make more mistakes and bury ourselves deeper and deeper in the abyss. Remember what happened in Vietnam. A weaker but dedicated people won.

The wise Confucius (551-479 BC) once said: "You cannot make joint plans with people who aspire to different aims (of course this also applies to countries)."

12.4. Once they reveal their true intentions we will be able to reason with them as well as seek broader international support for our universally recognized rights.

By knowing exactly what they want from us we can then formulate appropriate policies to deal with the situation realistically and look for ways to get us out of this impasse. By knowing exactly what they want from us, we can go on the offensive and fight to defend the legitimate rights of the Macedonian people. But until we face the real American plans and goals, we have no idea what we are fighting for. We have no idea and we can only speculate why the U.S. wants our name changed? Once we come face to face with the actual American interests, and we will, then we will try to deal with them accordingly and fit them with our own aspirations. But before we do anything... we need to know what they are!

13. We have enough arguments but they are worthless unless we know exactly what we are arguing about... and there is a right

place for such arguments... With much hard work our final aim should be to obtain American support of our views. This is possible...

14. The final outcome of the post Yugoslav crisis is still ahead of us and it is not going to be easy to deal with, but by God we must not let Macedonia be its victim.

There are no objective prospects and no sight for a stable Bosnia and Herzegovina. The survival of this federal state is seriously challenged.

Kosovo too, as the new Albanian state, is not likely to sail in calmer waters in the near future and fully establish itself on the international stage. Joining the UN seems unattainable and thus the story remains untold. The fact that five EU member states are not willing to recognize Kosovo means that its EU accession will be limited at best. There are serious challenges for Kosovo, one of which is Serbia's refusal to recognize it, which does not bode well for its future. The agreement between Dachich and Tachi (2013) is a significant step that will somewhat ease tensions between Belgrade and Pristina but will not solve their problems.

It would be difficult for Kosovo to join the UN, if not impossible, because both Moscow and Beijing are opposing it and have veto power in the Security Council.

At the same time, Kosovo will probably get a Stabilization and Association Agreement with the EU without membership. U.S. aid will undoubtedly continue but the question is whether it will be enough for its sustainable development? Status-quo can last for decades, which could lead to increased crime, which will have consequences for the entire region including Macedonia.

15. One more thesis deserves exploring. Do you really think that the U.S. wants to fully settle all the problems in the Balkans? If that happens Washington will lose its role and its services will become unnecessary. The EU, with its economic programs, will become the major factor in the region. There is no argument that this is unacceptable to the United States. Especially when we

know that there is serious speculation that Russia too will become involved in the Balkans. This is without a doubt unacceptable to Washington and Washington will do whatever is necessary to maintain and reaffirm its interest in the region.

15.1. The Americans invested quite a bit in the Balkans, in creating the Kosovo state, building the Bonsteel military base, building a huge embassy in Skopje... A period has passed when the region was at the top of American political commitment, I would guess because of the wars that were under way. What is good for everyone is that there is no indication that that will be happening again, which should make us happy. Today the Americans are concentrating on problems in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Egypt... In spite of that, however, the Americans remain firmly in control of the Balkans. Their interest and presence in the region is permanent. This is especially true in Macedonia.

So whoever thinks that the U.S. is losing interest in the Balkans and is withdrawing is just speculating... It is not happening...

16. America's policy towards Macedonia in the last 20-odd years has been deeply wrong and barely conforming. Even though the U.S. has inflicted enormous and immeasurable damage on Macedonia, it has not achieved the desired results. The problem has been that the U.S. is in support of the "Greater Albania" project which is not in Macedonia's interests and neither are American attempts to destroy Macedonia. If the Americans paid even minute attention to Macedonian's aspirations: a) There would not have been all these attempts to change Macedonia's name, b) the Albanians received more than enough from separating Kosovo from Serbia and did not need any more, c) they would not have underestimated the far-reaching negative effects of placing much too much emphasis on the Albanian factor as the key factor in the region... and much, much more.

Giving the Albanians Macedonia will not satisfy their ambitions for expansion and if left unchecked they will continue to expand and attack Greece next. There are over a million Albanians living

in Greece and that particular Albanian factor is becoming increasingly more important over time. There too the Albanian Mafia will gain a foothold and in turn will generate huge amounts of money which tomorrow will be used for political purposes, especially if the economic crisis continues to persist.

When Washington begins to pay attention to Macedonian interests and starts helping Macedonia in earnest, it will experience considerable success in stabilizing the Balkans, despite the “Greater Albania” project.

17. We believe that the Americans made a mistake by taking the current direction towards the Macedonians. If Macedonians were not a hard nut to crack, they would have disappeared a long time ago. They survived the Roman occupation and partition, they survived the Byzantine and Ottoman occupations, they survived the 1913 partition and Greek, Serbian and Bulgarian attempts at denationalization and assimilation, they survived the Bucharest and Versailles Treaties of the early 20th century, they survived the crippling Greek embargo, they survived the Bucharest fiasco of 2008 and the Chicago fiasco of 2012... Well, what else can we say? We are sure that the Macedonians will survive the EU and other manipulations... Macedonians have suffered immensely from these ordeals, including many genocides... and they have survived... why should they give up today... It is time that the Americans learn that...

18. In the end let us conclude that if someone today tries to separate and appropriate Macedonian territory, due to the process of albanization that is aggressively taking place, things will definitely unfold completely differently. Things like this cannot go on forever without consequences. Do not think for a minute that “everyone” is going to stand around while their ancestral homeland is being invaded and expropriated with them doing nothing... and when they do something who can predict the outcome... And if that were to happen where will the Americans be... More importantly where will the Albanians be? And where will they go?

We have a deep division among Macedonians which will probably not be easy to overcome but, in certain situations when our existence is at stake, our differences will have to be put to the side. This is what we have done over the centuries and this is what we will need to do today. Macedonia must not allow its enemies to make it their target regardless of who they are and where they are. Macedonians have always endured. We need to stand together or we will pay the ultimate price.

No matter how Macedonia is today, it is still the best solution for the region. Destroying it will introduce many new risks...

The sooner Washington realizes that the better it will be for all of us.

A person with whom I once worked at the large OHIS chemical plant, in a random encounter at the market once said: "Americans are hypocritical. They would say go, do not worry, we are with you. But once we started going they would immediately release the dogs on us and order them to come after us!"

Churchill perhaps left us a message for us when he said: "For as long as you are going through hell, then keep going!"

We have no other choice but to keep going... Perhaps this experience will unite us... which is something... Our plight and suffering has brought out the best quality in us as it has in other people who have suffered like us.