During our last collective descent into barbarism and over the long period that we resided in it, many people suffered, many innocent people were killed and terrible crimes were committed. This is why now it takes so much conscious effort to return a sense of security, self-respect and compassion to the people.

It is necessary, however, to establish the political responsibility for this descent into barbarism. It is high time to establish individual criminal responsibility for all crimes. But it is no less necessary to tell the true story of our barbarism.

And not just any story, but the one whose structure will be composed of irrefutable facts rather than the impressions of heated emotions, unintentional and intentional lies, old and newly emerging legends and myths.

In this true story, victims should be the focus, because highlighting barbarity through the suffering and the fate of victims will help communities to experience more intensely the dark historical period through which they lived, and it will help them make quicker progress towards a rediscovery of humanity and self-healing.

Those who decided how the former Yugoslavia was to fall apart are responsible, in many different ways, for having turned the collapse into a descent into barbarism. Those who are now in a position to make decisions in the independent states, the successors to the former country, are obliged to work on the process of de-barbarization by restoring the civilized order of law, justice and ethics in their own societies, but also in the relationships between their societies and others.

Restoring this order, and the time that it will take, will depend on the way the story of barbarism is told. It is therefore important that decision-makers in the countries of the former Yugoslavia take the offer of their support for the idea of creating an independent
commission (RECOM), whose task will be to collect the facts for the story of our common fall into barbarism this task, not primarily as a political duty, but as their human duty,

Modern peacekeepers recall with sorrow the spark of hope that appeared at one point at the beginning of the bloody 1990s. There was hope that “brotherhood and unity of Yugoslav nations and nationalities” would not end in slaughter in the darkness of an un-brotherly Balkan tavern. That spark of hope, which remained just that – a spark – appeared in Montenegro, whose then political leadership briefly supported the idea of peaceful break-up and so delegitimized the idea of a “truncated Yugoslavhood.”

The present, free Montenegro can atone for what the then ‘trapped’ Montenegro could not do. Although various institutions and political agents, from ‘Triglav to Djevdjelija,’ have given their support, with more or less enthusiasm, to the idea of establishing RECOM, in Montenegro everyone has supported it eagerly. This fact alone allows Podgorica, without having to explain anything to anyone at home, to step forward and fire up that spark of hope from the early 1990s, and assume the role of the initiator and facilitator of the process of regional, inter-governmental discussions on the establishment of RECOM, in the way proposed by the individuals and organizations gathered around the Coalition for RECOM, and supported by more than half a million people from the former Yugoslav states.

Montenegro’s President, Filip Vujanovic, recognized that his country could play this role, and made that clear to a delegation of the Regional Team of Public Advocates for RECOM, with whom he spoke late last year.

Let us hope together that we will not have to wait too long to hear the good news, because this work must not be delayed any further.

*Dragoljub Dusko Vukovic*, journalist, Montenegro, member of the Regional Team of Advocates for the Initiative for RECOM
A meeting of the Team of Regional Advocates of the Initiative for RECOM was held in Belgrade on February 24, 2012, where participants discussed the prospects of institutionalizing the Initiative for RECOM, as well as the current political situation and the impact that it may have on the process of advocating for the establishment of RECOM. The discussion revolved around successes, suggestions, recommendations and activities to strengthen the support for the establishment of RECOM.

The task of public advocacy is to persuade the politicians in the region that peace-building and reconciliation are possible only if the facts about war crimes and serious violations of human rights are established and only if a list of all victims is compiled. To that end, the meeting particularly emphasized the importance of public hearings of victims and perpetrators. The Regional Advocates will be active in strengthening international support for the Initiative for the establishment of RECOM.
A meeting of the Coalition for RECOM was held on February 25, 2012 in Belgrade, which brought together 65 members of the Coalition. The meeting was presented with the results of the research on the state of transitional justice in post-Yugoslav countries, after which the members of the Coalition for RECOM spent the rest of the day discussing the process of institutionalization of the Initiative for RECOM. In addition, participants discussed the so-called ‘hard core’ of RECOM’s Draft Statute as a binding minimum in political advocacy initiatives to create the Commission, and proposed new activities to strengthen public support for the establishment of RECOM on a local, national and regional level.

At the beginning of the meeting, researchers and research team leader Jelena Grujic presented the main findings of their research titled 'The State of Transitional Justice
in Post-Yugoslav Countries. Mario Mazic from the Youth Initiative for Human Rights in Croatia, reported on the public reaction to the ICTY verdict in the trial of the three Croatian generals, Gotovina, Cermak and Markac, as being “fairly uniform” with the media coverage of the verdict having “no place for the victims”: the families of the three generals were interviewed but not the families of victims. Bekim Blakaj, from the Humanitarian Law Center in Kosovo, spoke about the problem of missing persons in Kosovo. Before the publication of the report of the International Committee of the Red Cross, there were more than 2,000 missing persons; today, about 1,800 of them are still recorded as missing, although in the meantime the remains of another 400 have been found. Unfortunately, the identification process has been halted for four years. A decision made in June 1999, which made exhumations legal even if government officials were absent, led to a number of identification errors being made.

Edina Djurkovic from the association “Transitional Justice, Responsibility and Memory in Bosnia and Herzegovina” reported on the decision of the BH War Crimes Prosecution, which will see priority war crimes cases in the Federation processed within 7 years, and the rest within 15. Dragan Jerkovic from the Center for Democracy and Transitional Justice, said that many victims claimed their rights through the courts by suing Republika Srpska. Because of that, Republika Srpska had passed a law on internal debt, which established the payment of compensation with bonds. The Union of Civilian Victims of War from the Sarajevo Canton filed a lawsuit on behalf of 4,200 victims. Republika Srpska is trying to have the claim dismissed on the basis of the statute of limitations. Lidija Franovic, a journalist from Montenegro, stressed that trials in the case of the expulsion of Muslims from Bukovica and the deportation of Muslim refugees had ended in acquittal. Jelena Grujic pointed out that in Serbia there were no indictments against senior officers, and that the law prohibited critical opinions ‘on matters of public interest’, which includes a ban on commenting on ongoing judicial proceedings and first instance rulings. Igor Mekina, from the Slovenian Civic Link, talked about the problem of 25,671 ‘erased’ citizens in Slovenia, which is still ongoing. He warned that over the past decade government bodies had come up with differing numbers for the ‘erased’: initially, the government talked about 18,305 people, but in 2009 a new number was confirmed – 25,671. Mekina emphasized that Slovenian state authorities had not yet done anything to identify the causes and consequences of ‘erasing’ these people, exactly 20 years ago, nor had they done anything to eliminate the serious consequences of this massive human rights violations.

At the second session, dedicated to the institutionalization of RECOM, Daliborka Uljarevic from the Montenegrin Center for Civic Education, concluded that the issue of dealing with the past in Montenegro had been launched thanks to the Initiative for RECOM. In the discussion that followed, Natasa Kandic reminded the participants that “institutionalization of RECOM is a real challenge, because no ready-made solutions exist.” There was, she
said, no similar example of such a consultative process anywhere in the world, nor one of cooperation and coordination of civil society on a regional level. “Adoption of the Draft Statute was a great lesson on how to work in post-conflict times,” said Natasa Kandic. But now the question was how to exert pressure, through public activities, on the governments in the region in order to make them take over the RECOM process, because “we cannot replace the State.”

Answering the question: Will the Coalition for RECOM live up to the task of its institutionalization? Kandic said “We started with fear, fear that we were not mature enough to organize regional coalitions and consultative processes, but in the process itself we realized that it is in the interest of all to make the states establish RECOM. And it is not only in the interest of those of us who are members of the Coalition. The question of victims and war crimes is becoming a world question. This question should not be reduced to its humanitarian element, because at stake are victims and injustice. We must guard against any involvement in petty daily politics.”

Dimitar Anakiev, director and representative of the organization The Erased, from Slovenia joined the discussion and noted that in Slovenia ‘the erased’ constituted a real problem “in that it was not a dead issue.” On the contrary, ‘the erased’ have been part of the political agenda since 1990, when the public was told that “Slovenians have to behave in anti-Yugoslav manner.” Slovenia is still ruled by a party that actively advocates an anti-Yugoslav policy. Aleksandar Todorovic from the Civil Initiative of Activists for the Erased suggested the following: “Perhaps the Coalition should create a body composed of people who are not recognized as human rights activists who upset the authorities.” Igor Mekina offered a more optimistic view noting that there were people in political parties who fought for human rights too. “We have not received a single official response that would be bad for us, and so we should do all we can to avoid the possibility of such a response it in the future,” Mekina concluded.

Alexandar Sasa Zekovic, a human rights researcher from Montenegro, noted that “Podgorica is open to the process of dealing with the past, because neither victory nor defeat in the elections depends on these issues.” His suggestion was to approach individuals and structures that have a popular public profile, such as athletes, musicians or actors. Dragan Pjevac from the Association of the Killed and Missing – Tear, spoke as a victim and once again complimented all involved in the RECOM process. “I want us to go on,” he said. “We have no right to back away now, because the process has only just begun.” He added that “Positive discontent” must be created within the Coalition.
Kushtrim Koliqi, from Integra, said that the Coalition was currently in “the most dangerous phase of the project” because “if the process of institutionalization of RECOM does not happen soon, our dream will come to nothing. We are slowed down by the realization that institutionalization of RECOM is really the most difficult of all tasks that we are to undertake. This can be overcome by making a precise plan of action, a sort of ‘strategy’. In Kosovo, unfortunately, nothing has been heard about RECOM in three or four months,” warned Koliqi.

Veljko Vicevic, a veteran from Croatia, expressed dissatisfaction with the existing activities of the Coalition for RECOM because, he said, they “suspended the Statute of the Coalition” and the work of the bodies in charge of the Coalition for RECOM. “These bodies would have to take over this phase of the process,” he said. Sudbin Music from the Prijedor ‘92 Association of Inmates, recalled that it was precisely this network, or the “Yugoslav spirit,” as he called it, that inspired him to join the Coalition and called on all members of the Coalition to offer their ideas of how to proceed, but also to independently apply for funds. Andjelko Kvesic, from the Association of Inmates of the Central Bosnian Canton, said he wished the regional team of advocates to be much more active, and urged the members to be more visible in public. Some progress toward the institutionalization of RECOM must be made as soon as possible, because the majority of witnesses will be either deceased or too old to testify by 2020.

Speaking of possible activities to strengthen public support for RECOM at local, national and regional levels, Natasa Kandic appealed to partner organizations to organize local activities. She also informed the members that coverage in the Coalition Newsletter Voice would be expanded to cover other instruments of transitional justice such as, for example, criminal trials for war crimes. In this way, Voice would become a unique platform for gathering information and for the dissemination of theory and practice of transitional justice.

Zoran Kosic from the Association of Veterans of the Wars of the 1990s from the Municipality of Kikinda, informed the participants of a project proposal that he had submitted to the Ministry of Labor and Veterans of the Republic of Serbia, which aims to raise awareness in Vojvodina about marginalized groups such as Roma, Jews, Danube Swabians, and people with disabilities. These groups can provide great support for RECOM, he added, and some Roma organizations would join RECOM.

Marinko Djuric from the Association of Families of the Kidnapped and Murdered in Kosovo and Metohija was of the opinion that the topic of public testimony had been exhausted, or that it had “lost its edge.” His association had difficulty convincing survivors to testify: many of them fear the consequences of this public act. According to his information, about 40 people who were potential witnesses had been killed. Accordingly, he said, one of
the important topics of the Regional Team of Advocates should be witness protection.

**Goran Taleski** from the organization, Peace Action, suggested that his organization organize a regional meeting of the Coalition, and promised to come up with a concrete plan on how to set it up by the end of March.

**Mevludin Lupic** from the Association of Families of Detained and Missing Persons of Zvornik, suggested that a meeting be organized between the Coalition for RECOM and the recently formed Committee for the Regional Coordination of Victims and Victims’ Families from the region.

**Eugen Jakovcic** from Documenta said that the burning issue his non-governmental organization faced was how to write-off the cost of civil trials based on claims of the victims of war crimes against the Republic of Croatia for compensation. The process of advocacy in Croatia would be very difficult, he said, because during the election campaign the current Croatian government had demonstrated indifference to the RECOM Initiative. **Mario Mazic** introduced participants to the plan of activities of the Youth Initiative for Human Rights in Serbia and Croatia for the increase of public support to the RECOM process. He spoke of public actions that young people from the region would take part, in as many as 10 cities in the region, on important dates, before meetings of politicians from the region, in order to attract media attention, but also to draw the attention of politicians to the RECOM process.

When discussing the ‘hard core’ of RECOM’s Draft Statute, the participants agreed with the proposal of Professor Zarko Puhovski, which was that the Draft Statute of RECOM adopted by the Coalition for RECOM on March 26, 2012, should serve as the platform for political advocacy of the Initiative for RECOM.

At the fourth session of the meeting, **Marijana Toma** informed the Coalition of the new truth commission established in Brazil. In 1995, the then President of Brazil sent an apology to victims of terror, but failed to form a commission. Until recently documentation concerning human rights violations in Brazil was marked as “strictly confidential.” Only with the new president **Dilma Rousseff**, herself a victim of torture have the Law on Free Access to the Information and the Law on the Establishment of the Truth Commission been signed into law. The **Comissão Nacional da Verdade** is currently in the process of being founded and will have the structure of all previous Latin American Commissions. One of the goals of this new commission will be “to promote the reconstruction of history,” which is a painful issue in Brazil, where history is silenced even in textbooks.
Leaders of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, Boris Tadic, Ivo Josipovic, Zeljko Komsic, Nebojsa Radmanovic and Bakir Izetbegovic, held a second informal meeting in Jahorina on February 3, 2012.

The leaders of Serbia and Croatia pledged to try war criminals according to their country of residence, while members of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina did not agree on this point. Josipovic also proposed that the prosecution of those responsible for war crimes be facilitated by an international agreement, and stressed that it was the common desire of all to prosecute war crimes more efficiently and without politicization. He added that in his view, the law on the invalidity of Serbian indictments for war crimes against Croatian nationals was unconstitutional, and an international agreement would much more efficiently solve problems of this kind. “President Tadic and I will encourage our governments to sign a bilateral agreement,” said Josipovic, adding that in this way “the issues concerning armed conflicts, and more specifically the problem of missing persons, will be resolved more quickly.”

The Office of President Josipovic gave three reasons for this initiative. The first is to legally strengthen, with a binding agreement, current technical cooperation in the prosecution of war crimes, which had been established by state prosecutors in the region, meaning that the prosecution of war criminals, therefore, no longer depends on the good will of prosecutors. Second, indictments would have transnational force because they would supersede the rights of individual states. Finally, the agreement would formally establish the jurisdictions of the State whose member has committed a war crime, and the State in which an indictee resides – and trials would be conducted in the state of residence of the accused. In practice, such an agreement would prevent a case like that of Tihomir Purda – a Croatian citizen suspected of having committed war crimes in Serbia and Bosnia would be tried only in Croatia, whilst all necessary documents and evidence would immediately have to be submitted to the Croatian judiciary.
Vesna Terselic, director of Documenta, said the initiative had been targeted in the right direction: “It is yet to be determined how much political will there is for this problem, but it is high time that crimes committed 20 years ago are finally prosecuted.” Dzenana Karup Drusko said that the proposal of the Croatian President, Ivo Josipovic, for an international agreement to try war criminals in the countries of their residence was nothing new, since it was current practice for every state to try its own citizens anyway – and this for the simple reason that the constitution of every country protects its citizens and does not allow their extradition. “In that respect, this proposal does nothing new and I really don’t understand all the media excitement about it. It would be quite another thing if these agreements included suspected war criminals who flee to another country which then protects them even though they are not nationals. But, as far as I understand, this is not part of President Josipovic’s proposal. We must welcome and support any initiative that concerns war crimes and goes in the direction of transnational cooperation, as this is necessary for the progress in the region, but in this case I do not see anything new that would bring progress. It would be important to reach agreements on the exchange of documentation and evidence, and on giving up parallel investigations and prosecutions that have political connotations. Unfortunately, judging by the practice in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, we are still far from that,” explained Dzenana Karup Drusko.

A forum organized by Civic Action and entitled The Culture of Memory against Forgetting was held in Pancevo on February 6, 2012. Five Years On – The Past for the Future, a film by Marko Cvejic and Mark Lazar Stojanovic, and An Artist’s Look on the Past by Dino Mustafic
were screened as part of the forum. Attendees exchanged views with Marijana Toma, an expert in transitional justice, Lazar Stojanovic, a film and theater director from Pancevo and Filip Milenkovic and Ljilja Spasic from Civic Action.

After the screening, **Marijana Toma** spoke of what she called the non-existent culture of memory in the former Yugoslavia: no one found it necessary to compile a definitive and objective list of victims following the conflicts in the region.

Reflecting on the ruling ideology in Serbia, **Lazar Stojanovic** explained how the elite in affluent societies were more resistant to political change, because the wealthy do not have to follow official state programs.

**Philip Milenkovic** shared with the audience his thoughts following a visit to Vukovar last December, organized by the Coalition for RECOM. A victim looks different when you look her in the eye or when you learn her name, he said. **Ljilja Spasic** focused on a personal and individual need, which she said all those present would understand, to become part of RECOM. It is a pity that this need for dealing with the past has not yet been fully recognized by the political elite, because this leads to a situation “in which life has been just a simulation in this region for twenty years,” she noted.

“I often console myself by thinking of Germany” said Marijana Toma. Dealing with the past in that country was a painful and long process, and it often regressed. After Goering’s verdict, the support for Nazism in West Germany rose to 60 percent, despite all the horrors, post-war de-nazification efforts yielded little real progress, while Adenauer’s reparations plan for Israel, was ignored by the public. Especially painful were the trials of camp commanders in the 1960, where the accused entered through the main courthouse entrance, while a victim who testified had to be ushered in through the back door. Only in the 1980s, thanks to the support of the media, was an open public discussion about the past launched: when West German TV stations began broadcasting programs about the Holocaust, in prime time, around 8 p.m.
At a handball match, held on February 11 in Maribor, Slovenia between Gradacac from Bosnia and Herzegovina and the home team Branik, an unprecedented incident occurred when a group of Slovenian fans cheered their team and abused their opponents by shouting “Knife, Wire, Srebrenica.” Sports officials and public figures in Slovenia immediately condemned this behavior as shameful and unacceptable.

Slovenian media, the weekly *Reporter* among them, criticized the “insulting of the victims of genocide.” Member of the EU Parliament *Jalko Kacin* also strongly criticized the incident. Several days after the incident, the handball club Maribor Branik gave an official public apology for the behavior of its fans.

The match was attended by some 400 fans, including 50 from Bosnia. Around 10 of the local fans were responsible for the incident.

“As long as the Maribor Branik club exists, these men will have no access to our matches” said club director *Andrej Bauman*. He added that all who were involved in the incident should be banned from attending any sporting events. Bauman said he hoped Branik would not be penalized by the European Handball Federation, because the match was halted immediately after the incident, and the hooligans responsible were evicted from the sports hall.

The Slovenian police fined two of the fans, and confirmed that such chants could be punishable with up to two years in prison.

The Slovenian Ombudswoman *Zdenka Cebasek Travnik* warned that Slovenia would not avoid similar incidents in the future if it continued to react too mildly. She stated that “the use of the sufferings of a whole nation in hostile speech is the most hideous thing that could happen in a public place.” She added that the Slovenian legal system’s modest penalties for these and similar offenses, and the fact that such cases rarely ended in court rulings showed that the system was inadequate.
At its session on February 16, 2012, the Parliament of Australia adopted a resolution on Srebrenica, the text of which was in agreement with the decision of the Hague Tribunal which ruled that genocide had been committed against the population of the Srebrenica enclave. In their discussions of item 16 on the day’s agenda, Commemorating Srebrenica parliamentarians decided that the army and Serb police had “killed more than 7,000 Bosniak
Muslims when they seized Srebrenica in July 1995,” and that “all executions systematically targeted Bosnian Muslim men fit for military service, regardless of whether they were civilians or soldiers.” Parliament concluded that the executions “were an act of genocide, committed by members of the Army of Republika Srpska in and around Srebrenica in July 13-19, 1995.” In memory of the victims, July 11th will be marked in Australia as Srebrenica Remembrance Day.

INTERVIEW

Ursa Raukar: “We must first recognize our own sins”

Ursa Raukar, is an actress from Zagreb, a renowned activist and a member of the Zagreb Youth Theatre. She has performed in some 60 productions, as both supporting actress and in leading roles, in her twenty-year career at the Zagreb Youth Theatre. She has worked with Paolo Magelli, Christian Colin, Janusz Kic, Vito Taufer, Ivica Kuncevic, Vasilij Senjin and many other directors. She has recorded radio dramas, and occasionally made programs for television. About herself she says: “I’m primarily a theater actress, faithful to the Zagreb Youth Theatre, where I live my professional life in a top ensemble, which is a constant stimulus for further work and for all kinds of other searches.” In an interview for !Voice she explains her views on the Initiative for RECOM.

You are one of the artists who have been supportive of the Initiative for RECOM since its inception. What does dealing with the past mean to you?
Dealing with the past is certainly important, and we all know why. It is important to repeat this fact time and again – had we objectively dealt with the past in 1945, I strongly believe that the wars in the former Yugoslavia would not have occurred. Many individuals call
for dealing with the past and we've heard a thousand times, ‘never again,’ but we are still witnessing some terrible things. We have obviously not done enough, as a society, to prevent such events from happening again. Dealing with the past, therefore, is for me an activity, or a contribution, from each of us, as individuals, where first and foremost we must be willing to acknowledge our own sins.

**What are the consequences of dealing with the past today and why is this process important for the region?**

We see that every election campaign uses arguments from the wars and nationalistic feelings are stirred up in the voters in order to win a particular political argument, and political power is won on a wave of nationalism and unresolved emotions. Our lives are difficult and our very existence is threatened, so much so that people are suddenly left without a job. Fearing that people could blame it all on the inability of their governments, those governments throw them a bone of irrational national threat which temporarily distracts them and takes their thoughts away from everyday thefts, cheating and lies.

**You mentioned nationalism and small but powerful groups which manipulate the facts in different ways. What do you think of their claim that it is still too early to start taking a firm view on the facts concerning the consequences of war?**

It can never be too early, it may be just be too late. The sooner we begin to clear away, the sooner we will enter a phase of peaceful and reasoned discussion, and that is the basis on which the final confrontation with the past should play out. I have often heard that we should start by recognizing our own mistakes, but in the end it always turns out that the other side should do it first. It has always been important to me to work on what is wrong with me or in my environment, and it is for the other side to decide what they will do in their own environment.

**To what extent can theater be effective in dealing with the past?**

I think that theater has healing, cathartic powers. But these processes should not be confined to closed groups. Theater can certainly help, but I think we need to raise other media to that level as well and use every means possible to make things clear, to pressure the politicians and to react to every possible hint of any repetition of the crimes of the past.

**What role should public figures play in all this?**

I do not want to pick out any names, but I think that people who work in the public sphere have a duty to respond and raise the awareness of the community they live and work in, and that such talk is absolutely necessary. We live in a country where silence has ruled for decades, and we can say that the previous system is to blame, but I regret that the academic community has not made a move yet, although it has the kind of authority that carries with
it certain duties and responsibilities. I hope this silence will soon be broken because that’s the only thing that can save our morality, which has turned to ashes in this country.

**How important, in your opinion, is cooperation between public figures and civil society organizations?**

People love celebrities and stars, and when people see a celebrity advocating some idea, they get interested, if only in the most banal sense of obtaining the barest of information. This is why cooperation between public figures and civil society organizations is necessary even at this basic level.

**Could we say that such cooperation has contributed to the democratization of our society?**

Surely, mutual energy moved things. But we should use that synergy to shake the sleeping consciousness and work to ensure that people finally realize they have to think for themselves and not listen to what the political elite is telling them to do. When I looked back on all the protests I participated in, most of them had at best trivial outcomes, but I’m sure that today we would not be where we are had it not been for all that, because after fifteen years we can finally talk about Croatian war sins.

*Tamara Opacic, journalist, H-alter, Croatia*

**FROM OTHER MEDIA**

Mate Uzinic, Bishop of Dubrovnik: I asked Orthodox believers to forgive us for the wrong we did to them

Bishop Grigorije attended my episcopal ordination. He asked then for forgiveness for what happened to Dubrovnik. His was a response to my symbolically offered hand, not only to
Orthodox but also to Muslim believers, and members of the Jewish community and all people of good will. [...] 

At the prayer meeting, the Bishop did not speak directly of Dubrovnik, although the exact message could be deciphered from his speech. He spoke instead of forgiveness and asked forgiveness in a striking and thoughtful way, appropriate to the context of what was a primarily spiritual event. To that, I spontaneously, before the Lord’s Prayer, said to the Catholic congregation present, that if we were real believers and wished to pray together to Our Father, we must forgive. But also, in the spirit of the Bishop’s thoughts about forgiveness, we need to ask forgiveness for the wrongs we ourselves have done, because we too did wrong and we too have reason to repent. So in the name of those gathered there, and in my own name, I asked the bishop and the Orthodox believers for forgiveness, expressing the hope that they too were believers and would forgive us as believers.

The media publicized the bishop’s apology, but entirely ignored mine. That how the misunderstanding arose, which led Patriarch Irinej to say that it was good that the Bishop had apologized, but that it would have been good to hear an apology from the other side too. The apology was given, I repeat, but the media failed to publicize it. I mention this because in our local congregation in Dubrovnik some said afterwards that we had nothing to apologize for. I agree, in the case of Dubrovnik that’s true: we were attacked for no reason and no crimes were committed by our side during the liberation operations. But I want to stress one other thing: when I, as a Catholic bishop and Grigorije as an Orthodox Bishop, seek mutual forgiveness, it is a gesture that transcends political bickering, an act that matches the sacredness of community prayer. It is an act which in itself involves asking forgiveness for everything that happened during the millennial history of separation, and for all that intensified the separation.

Sunday, February 12th, marked the ten years since the beginning of the trial of the former President of Serbia and the former Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic at the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

The indictment charged him with genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as crimes against humanity, serious violations of the Geneva Conventions and violations of the laws and customs of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Kosovo. Milosevic was extradited to the ICTY on June 28th 2001, and his trial began on February 12th the following year. He defended himself. Milosevic died in the custody of the Hague tribunal on March 11th 2006 at the age of 65.

Is the process of dealing with the past over? What is the attitude of today’s Serbia to the legacy of Milosevic’s trial and Milosevic’s legacy in general?

“The authorities today seem a bit more relaxed when it comes to the Hague Tribunal. For them, the arrest of Mladic marked the end of Serbia’s cooperation with the Tribunal, and they think, accordingly, that the general process of dealing with the past has been concluded too. And we still hear in the media and in many political statements, the same arguments we have already heard and seen many times over,” Natasa Kandic, Executive Director of the Humanitarian Law Center in Belgrade told Deutsche Welle.

Director of the Center for Human Rights, Vojin Dimitrijevic, believes that the myth of Milosevic has not been destroyed in Serbia even to this day. “The big mistake may have been the fact that his trial was broadcast live without any critical commentary, in the naive hope that people would learn something from it. But quite contrary to expectations, Milosevic’s popularity only increased. It is very difficult to deconstruct the myth of a man for whom the masses consistently voted and who was compared with the greatest sons of Serbia,” said Dimitrijevic.
Revising recent history

Only two years after Milosevic’s death, his Socialist Party of Serbia (SPS) found itself in power, Dimitrijevic recalls. The SPS and its current leader, Ivica Dacic, who was the party’s spokesperson during Milosevic’s rule, have been playing an important role in the governing coalition for four years now. According to Professor Dimitrijevic, this is in fact a product of the revision of recent Serbian history. “We are now being led mainly by extreme and less extreme nationalists. We are in a period of severe dissatisfaction, because of the defeat, a period of fierce anger towards the international community. The ICTY is perceived as an alien court, and I think most people still believe it to be unjust. Countless lawyers and law professors, together with the media, worked to erect that image of the Tribunal, so it’s no wonder that such a belief is still strong,” said Dimitrijevic.

RECOM as opportunity

Natasa Kandic, however, believes that the legacy of the ICTY is very important for Serbia and for the entire region, and that it can be utilized, among other things, through the Initiative for the establishment of the Regional Commission for establishing the facts about the victims of the wars in the former Yugoslavia (RECOM). “The legacy of the facts, findings and conclusions that will remain after the Hague Tribunal closes its doors is huge and valuable, and it will always be disturbing for both institutions and the public. And that is the most powerful weapon in dealing with the past. This will not be easy because after it received wide political support, some politicians saw in RECOM a threat to their power. But I think the legacy of the Hague Tribunal, together with persistence in pushing for a regional fact-finding mission, are a guarantee that the Balkans will never again experience the crime and the horrific drama that ended in more than 100,000 victims,” said Natasa Kandic.

The Milosevic trial was the first trial of a head of state for offenses committed while he was in power. However, it is yet to be determined whether the indictment against Milosevic should have been shorter and more focused, so that the court process would have been more efficient and faster. As it was, the trial yielded evidence, but no judgment.

Dinko Gruhonjic, President of the Independent Association of Journalists of Vojvodina, Team of Regional Advocates of the Initiative for RECOM, source: http://www.dw.de/dw/article/0,,15737755,00.html
In 2011, the Republic of Macedonia celebrated its independence and marked the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Framework Agreement. There was not much reason for celebration, though: given the low level of economic development and poor democratic record, what remains is mere glorification of statehood and empty promises. Moreover seen through the prism of post-conflict stabilization, the fragility of peace in Macedonia has become increasingly apparent. The June parliamentary elections produced something that would seem unthinkable in the majority of post-conflict societies. The government, composed of the parties representing the majority of citizens of ‘conflicting’ ethnic communities, promoted ‘total reconciliation’. Interestingly, today’s ruling party (VMRO-DPMNE) is precisely the one that used to refuse any dialogue with ethnic Albanian rebels, while its current coalition partner (DUI) was created by demobilized National Liberation Army members in 2001. The strict interpretation of the amnesty law by the parliamentary majority enabled the remaining war crimes court cases, to be closed. This decision became the foundation on which the current government rests, as well as the foundation of the stability of Macedonian political system in general, given its consociational form. The general public remained silent with hardly any public response to this development. The issue of dealing with the past had never been high on the public agenda, but has now been completely removed from it, by a single political decree.

When the most recent spiral of violent incidents, prompted by hate speech at the European Handball Championship and at the Vevcani carnival, escalated into street protests, the burning of the state flag, and the torching and desecrating of Orthodox churches and mosques, the public (again) were not surprised. The emphasis is always on ‘who started it’, i.e. which community is (more) to blame for the situation. The charges fall on both ethnic groups, on political parties, and even on the neighboring states. The culprits are found everywhere except among one’s own society. It is only when it gets really nasty that the politicians remember to sing the song about the long tradition of coexistence and multi-ethnicity. At the same time, they display a total absence of a sense of reality. At the meeting of the Committee on Inter-Community Relations (convened following the latest incidents), the representative of the parliamentary majority praised the
citizens who, the day after the end of the conflict in 2001, (supposedly) continued to take up their lives where they had left off before the conflict.

Thus, there is a hunt for a phantom to blame for making it impossible to hold a sports match without any incidents, for the fights between pupils in ethnically mixed areas so police officers have to maintain order between them, even on school buses. In this imaginary reconciliation, the political elites refuse to see that ethnic divisions have only deepened from 2001 onwards, while the frustrations have been left untreated. Political correctness in public discourse is a special form of self-censorship, and it seems as though the public sphere in Macedonia has disciplined and perfected its hypocrisy under the watchful eye of international observers. When a society reaches boiling point, the first thing to erupt from the surface is uncensored hate speech. Reporters and other participants in the public debate often do not even recognize the cultural and symbolic violence, or resort to justifying it by alleged freedom of artistic expression. Those in power practice the so-called ‘ostrich-strategy’, defining excesses as ‘isolated incidents’. The culture of impunity is widespread. Under such circumstances, the opposition is trying to profit at all costs, sometimes even by adding fuel to the fire. With rare exceptions, the NGO sector, similarly divided along political and ethnic lines, has entirely lost the credibility of independent watch-dogs. NGOs usually get engaged in projects related to inter-ethnic relations only when the issue is attractive to foreign donors. The mass youth movement, formed following the murder of a young man by a member of Police Special Forces on the day of the last elections, seems content to ask for justice and truth only for that one murdered young man, although the decision on a wider amnesty was being adopted in the parliament at the same time. No one recognized the need to expand the agenda by seeking the truth about the victims from 2001.

Macedonia needs an honest and open discussion between its segregated communities as well as to find out the truth about the fate of the victims of 2001. (Biljana Vankovska)

Unfortunately, the campaign to secure signatures in support of RECOM was completed before the elections, and nothing that happened after the elections worked for RECOM. Dealing with the past is undoubtedly more than necessary, but skeptics ask whether the conflict is really over, since societal divisions are being deepened. Direct participants in the conflict are not only present on the scene, but are also very powerful. Those for whom it is most urgent to open the process of dealing with the past are either powerless and marginalized, or under pressure. Historically speaking, not only are there no examples of critical dissent and more organized protest, but the dominant form of dealing with the past is in fact a specific (and traditional) form of reconciliation through forgetfulness, which political parties misuse as a strategy for dealing with other public issues as well. Macedonia needs an honest and open discussion between its segregated communities as well as to find out the truth about the fate of the victims of 2001. The lesson that can be learned through RECOM is how not to repeat the horrors that took place elsewhere in the region. Believing in a bright future (once the country joins NATO or the EU) or believing that Macedonia differs from other post-Yugoslav societies (due to the low death-toll in 2001), is nothing but self-deception.

Biljana Vankovska, Professor of the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje, Macedonia, member of the Team of Regional Advocates of the Initiative for RECOM

Initiative for RECOM
Do you clearly hear the voice of victims in the former Yugoslavia? Sometimes, it seems, acoustics is what is lacking in the midst of these judicial and political procedures, acoustics of the voices of those whose moral integrity we are trying to restore, at least in part, through public condemnation of the tragedy they experienced and of those who created this tragedy. The importance of the courts for victims is unquestionable – without determining the responsibility of those who have committed evil, evil will go unnoticed, it will marginalize the victims’ suffering, and that is unacceptable in any state aspiring to legality. The manipulative potential of political and, sometimes, religious discourse persists in the national courts. For example, my view of the rule of law rejects the fact that the Sarajevo Canton Assembly decided to finance the defense of alleged war criminals, thus depriving the status of victims to those who do not belong to the Bosniak ethnic group. One example of the bias of national courts is the fact that members of Musan Topalovic Caco’s brigade, who killed Serbian civilians in Sarajevo, were not convicted of war crimes, but of murder – with a maximum of six years in prison.

National political elites are able to manipulate the results of the trials before international courts. Opposition from the vast majority of Croatian and Serbian people to the Hague tribunal is a product of political interpretations of trials, which plant doubts in the minds of the public about the impartiality and objectivity of the Tribunal. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) has been characterized as an “anti-Serb” and an “anti-Croat” court, and that view has generated resistance to the mechanism of establishing the facts without regard to national insignia. Reactions to the arrest last year, of three Croatian generals is one example of this resistance, caused by political manipulation. The majority of the Croatian public could not comprehend that the Tribunal did not dispute Croatia’s right to territorial integrity, but its right to kill and persecute innocent civilians as a means of establishing that integrity.
In addition to local politicians’ manipulation of the results of trials of the ICTY, the ICTY itself has made some unforgiveable mistakes. How can one expect the Serbian public to believe that Milosevic was guilty, when the politicians all along remain silent about the indictment against him and about the publicly available evidence in the trial, while the ICTY classifies this information as confidential without legal basis? Without publicly disclosed evidence, there will be no end to the culture of denial, which is the main obstacle to acknowledging the victims and to showing sympathy for them. Accepting the terms offered by Serbia in exchange for the crucial evidence of Milosevic’s guilt demonstrates that conviction of the accused is still the only focus of the courts. Confidentiality of key evidence of his guilt does not make the guilt very convincing; instead, it remains procedural and nothing essential changes, nor does it rehabilitate the societies shattered by war, while distrust among members of different ethnic groups remains the same. It is understandable that the courts are primarily concentrat ed on the trial, but the ICTY, in accordance with its founding resolution, should contribute to reconciliation with the past, with personal responsibility and reconciliation among nations. But only in the non-judicial sphere of the supra-national can one find enough willingness to hear the voice of the victims, because there, the victims are obvious, and well away from manipulations which give different names to the same suffering. However, this so-called ‘extrajudicial supranational sphere’ has the potential to give more space to the victims, to be understandable and accessible to everyone, and it may assist the courts in determining the responsibility of the accused in the context in which the crimes were committed.

Only when members of one ethnic group recognize that their own group too has given birth to criminals who brutally destroyed all that is ‘other and different’, only then can we say that the mind has won over mental inertia and ethnic politics, and that human dignity was returned to those who suffered only because they had or were attributed a different ethnic and national identity. Once we realize that some were deprived of human dignity just because they were who they were, will we be able to leave the misleading, tribal concept of self-defense, and say that we belong to a civilized world that does not operate according to the codes of a manipulative leader, but according to a sense of the universal and the human. And that is what is most lacking in our quasi-democracies. I said ‘our’; I hope those tribally-minded will forgive my use of the possessive pronoun.

*Edina Djurkovic*, Director of the association **Transitional Justice, Responsibility and Memory in Bosnia and Herzegovina**
Shyhrete Berisha is one of the three survivors of the massacre of more than forty Albanian women, children and men of the Berisha family in Suva Reka, on March 26, 1999. She testified three times before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia about how she had lost her husband, four children and forty members of her extended family in an attack by the Serbian police.

My name is Shyhrete and I am 37 years old. I lived in Suva Reka with my husband Nexhat, our two daughters Majlinda (1983) and Herolinda (1985) and our two sons Altin (1988) and Redon (1997). Our home was across the road from the headquarters of the Suva Reka police. I lived with my family on the left side of the house and Nexhat’s nephew Faton Berisha lived on the right side of the house.

Late in 1998 the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) rented our house. Our family moved in with my parents in Mushtisht, which is about 9 kilometers away and Faton moved his family to his uncles.

The OSCE evacuated from the area of Suva Reka on the 20/03/1999. On 21/03/1999 my husband called me on the telephone to come back to our house with the children. We cleaned the house because we wanted to move back in soon. We were staying with Faton and his family.

During Wednesday 24/03/1999 there was a lot of movement of Serbian police and Serbian vehicles. Throughout the day and night I saw tanks, buses full of policeman, »Pitzgauer« and military vehicles.

About 5am on Thursday the 25/03/1999 there was a knock at the front door and I got out of bed and opened the door. There were three Serbian policemen standing at the door and they
were pointing their automatic weapons at my chest. The tall policemen was poking my chest with the end of his weapon and yelling at me in Serbian, “Where are your guests? Where are the Americans? Where is NATO?” Then he asked me where my husband was and told me to call him immediately. My husband came to the door and the police took him outside and they walked towards our house. I saw that there was a large tank parked about 20 meters away pointing straight at the house.

They went to our house. The police could not open doors of the OSCE offices upstairs so they kicked the doors in. The police were swearing and screaming at my husband and they were hitting him as hard as they could.

I saw that the tank was still there and there was now a truck in the courtyard. Police were loading things into the truck from our house. The police stole a lot of valuable equipment like televisions, computers and the heater, everything they could carry.

My sister-in-law, Fatime and I went towards the front door when we saw the first three police with my husband walking back towards Faton’s house. My husband stood slowly and they walked into the house. I could see that my husband had been beaten and his face was all black.

The tall policeman told us all to sit down and he said in Serbian, “Give us money, otherwise we will kill you and burn your house with your children.” Fatime had some money on her chest and she tried to pull some notes out but the policeman with the black gloves put his hands on her chest and grabbed all the money. I had 3000 DM on my chest and I gave it to the policeman with the black gloves because I was so scared he would want to undress me.

They finally left about 6.30am to 7am.

We were all afraid to stay in our house so we went to my husband’s uncle, Vesel Berisha’s house, which is about 30m behind our houses. We wanted to escape but throughout the night we heard gunshots and we were too afraid to leave the house. In the house was my whole family, and the following people: Faton Berisha (27), his mother Fatime (48), his sister Sherine (17), his wife Sebahate (25) and their two sons Ismet (1996) and Eron (1998), Vesel’s wife Hava Berisha (60), Vesel’s sons Sedat (44), Bujar (40), Nexhmedin (37), Bujar’s wife Flora (38), Nexhmedin’s wife who was 8 months pregnant Lirije (24), Sedat’s wife Vjollca (37), Sedat’s daughter Dafina Berisha (16), and sons Drilon (14) and Gnuoz (9), Bujan’ s sons Vlorjan (17) and Edon (14), and daughter Dorentina (4). Only three people that slept in the house that night survived what was about to happen.

About 12.20pm on Friday the 26/03/1999 I saw a large number of people leave the police station from across the road. There was about 30 of them, some were in civilian clothes and some were wearing police uniforms. They were all canying automatic weapons. Sedat looked
out the window and he said, “They are all from Suva Reka.” They ran into Ismet Kuci’s house.

The next thing I remember I heard a Serbian man yelling out in Albanian, “Bujar, where are you?”; I recognized the voice as being a Serbian man called Zoran. Zoran spoke very good Albanian and he used to drive the Albanian bus. Zoran then yelled out in Serbian, “Where do you have your Americans? Get out here.” First, Bujar’s mother Hava walked outside to speak to Zoran. All the men and children went down into the basement of the house. I heard Zoran scream out in Serbian, “Where is Bujar? Get him out here now.” Bujar walked outside and asked Zoran in Albanian, “What do you want?” We were still coming out and I was looking for my children and everyone was saying, “Hurry, hurry.” I heard two gunshots and Bujar’s wife Flora cried out, “They just shot my Bujar!” It was worse than the movies. Everybody was running for the back door and there was a lot of confusion. We were all barefoot as there was no time to put shoes on.

We ran out the back and towards our house, I saw that we were surrounded by police and civilians everywhere. I recognised the man who stopped my husband Nexhat was the man called “Miscovic”, the owner of the Boss Hotel. One of the policemen grabbed Faton by the hand and Faton’s mother Fatima was trying to stand between the policeman and Faton. The same thing happened when they grabbed Nexhmedin, his wife Lirije, who is pregnant tried to step between them.

I remember seeing an empty yellow truck parked out the front of our house and on the ground in front of the truck was the body of a large man laying face down.

I heard “Miscovic” say to Nexhat, “Raise your hands in the air.” When he did, “Miscovic” shot him in the back three times. At that moment I remember Nexhmedin and his wife Lirije started to run when they saw what had happened to my husband Nexhat. Nexhmedin was pulling his wife by the hand and one of the civilians was yelling out in serbian, “Shoot. What are you waiting for?”

At that moment the shooting started without stopping and there was a lot of confusion. We started to run in all directions. Majlinda with my two sons went one way and I went another way. We stopped at the place, which used to be an Albanian coffee shop and there we found three other Berisha families. The women and children from our house were there and within a minute Majlinda and my two sons arrived from another direction. I saw that Altin was bleeding and I asked him what happened. He told me that they shot him in the hand and leg but not to worry. The Serbians were shooting at my children while they were running away. His heart was beating so fast and his face was all pale.

The police had arrived and screamed at us in Serbian to go inside. We went inside and sat down when they walked in and started shooting us. I was shot in the right shoulder and I
fell to the ground. When they had finished shooting they walked outside and I could hear them speaking but I could not tell what they were saying. Some of the people were still alive, not even wounded. I don’t know how they survived. There were about 40 to 50 people there, mostly women and children, there was only four men.

My children Majlinda and Redon were not wounded. At that moment Redon was saying to Majlinda, “I want to go to mum.” I took Redon from Majlinda and I took a bottle of milk, which I had in my trousers, and I gave it to Redon.

They must have heard us speaking because they came to the door and threw something like a handgrenade into the room. I turned to look at my children. I saw my son Redon was sitting there with blood all over him and he was still holding his bottle of milk. I saw Majlinda and half her head was missing. I saw Sebahate and half her head was missing as well. I slowly touched my youngest son Redon with my feet but he was dead. From the door they were throwing something and they were precise because they were hitting the heads. They did not come in, they remained at the door. The two children of Sebahate, Ismet and Eron were still alive, they were crying. Ismet the 3 year old was crying and calling out everybody’s name and asking for water. He was saying, “Mum my leg is hurting.”

After throwing those things the Serbians moved away from the doorway. I heard the Serbians talking and one of them said something about placing our bodies into a truck. Vjollca and Altin’s heads were close to mine and I told them that they were going to place us into a truck and that they should not move and act dead. Then the Serbians came again. They hit Eron with that thing they were throwing. It hit me in the right thigh and went straight through my leg and hit Eron. Eron did not move anymore, I think he died as soon as he was hit. I later realised that I had been hit in the stomach as well but I did not realise it at the time.

They walked into the room and started to load the bodies onto a truck and I remember that I could still hear people moaning. They dragged my body by the leg and by the arm while I kept my eyes closed and mouth slightly open so I could breathe. I remember that while they were dragging my body one of the men say in Serbian, “Fuck life. What kind of life is this? I can't handle this anymore.” The other one that was dragging me was just saying, “Hurry, hurry. We have got to clean this place.”

They placed my body on a stretcher and removed two gold chains from around my neck by finding the latch and unlocking them. They threw my body onto the back of the truck. I landed on a number of bodies and above me they threw my oldest daughter Majlinda. When they had finished they pulled the curtain of the truck shut and the truck started to move.
couldn't breathe from the smell of the blood and bodies. When I looked I saw the body of my son Altin and called out to him to see if he was alive but then I saw that his head was divided. His eyes and mouth were open.

At that moment Vjollca must have heard me and raised her head and said, “Shyhrete, are you still alive?” I replied that I was still alive. I asked if Gramoz was still alive and she answered, “Yes”. I suggested to Vjollca that we jump from the truck. She said, “No we shouldn't jump because the truck is going too fast but when they bury us we should escape from the dirt.” I said, “If they bury us, all these bodies will be above us and then they will place dirt on top and there is no way that we will be able to get out.”

I told Vjollca that we should jump from the truck from the back, and not from the sides because they would see us in the mirrors. There was a rip in the truck curtain at the back so I checked to see if there was anyone following the truck. I was so injured that I did not think about it, I just jumped. I injured my forehead in the fall. I later realised that I had jumped out in the village of Malsia E Re and I was on the main road from Suva Reka to Prizren.

An old man I later met in Kukas told me that he had seen me fall from the truck and he told two young men to run over and place me into a car. They drove me to a house nearby and placed me in the courtyard of the house. The young men drove me to another village called Grejkoc where I received medical treatment. Later two cars of KLA soldiers arrived and they transferred me to the village of Budakova. The doctor who treated me there recognised me because we used to catch the same bus. He treated my wounds and there were twelve on my body.

When the soldiers picked me up in Grejkoc, I asked them if they would follow the truck I rolled off and find out where they bury the bodies of my family. Five days later a soldier came and told me that there were two mass graves in the area of Ljubizhda and that the soldiers had marked the graves.

People have told me that Vjollca and Gramoz did survive and are still in Kosovo in the village of Capacrc.

*Witness statement by Shyhrete Berisha given to ICTY investigators as evidence in “Prosecutor v. Slobodan Milosevic” (ICTY, IT-02-54: Milosevic, Exhibit P00252)*