Vojislav Seselj's nationalist propaganda: contents, techniques, aims and impacts, 1990-1994.

How mass media propaganda impacts on ordinary people's acceptance and participation in collective violence, and how Seselj's nationalist propaganda promoted and justified coercion and violence by the Serbs against non-Serbs.

An expert report for the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia

Author: Anthony Oberschall, PhD, emeritus professor of sociology at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA.

Methodology of the Content Analysis

This expert report is based on the scholarly literature on ethnic conflict, nationalism, collective violence, mass communications, propaganda, and the break-up of Yugoslavia – some 87 books, articles and reports listed in "citations"- written by scholars, UN agencies, NGOs, and other knowledgeable sources from Western Europe, USA, and the post-Yugoslav states.

Section 4, the description and evaluation of Seselj's mass media discourse from 1990 to 1994 on the relations between Serbs and non-Serbs he viewed as adversaries and enemies, rests, on a content analysis of his writings, speeches, radio and television broadcasts, and newspaper and magazine interviews selected from 44 volumes of Seselj authored texts and documents in Serbo-Croatian and some supplements made available by the ICTY, such as videos from documentaries and the news media featuring Seselj.

Seselj material on his personal life, internal Serbian politics, social and economic policy, the Serbian Radical Party, recruitment and organization of the volunteers, and some other topics not dealing with Serb/non-Serb relations, were excluded from the content analysis.

Selection of the texts for content analysis followed these steps. First, Anthony Oberschall, the author of this report, familiarized himself with Seselj's discourse on Serb/non-Serb relations from texts already in English available from ICTY sources. Given Seselj's discourse on nationalism and on conflict and conflict management between Serbs and their adversaries, and joining that discourse to the literature on nationalism[1] and mass media persuasion techniques (described in this report in the sections "information processing model of persuasion", section 3, message and "Seselj and the political ideology of nationalism"), Oberschall identified the following *themes* on which information was necessary to fully characterize Seselj's views and positions: victimization of Serbs (including past atrocities); threats to Serbs from internal and from foreign sources; glorification of Serbs; negative stereotyping and labeling of adversaries (including dehumanizing labels for non-Serbs); falsehoods and misuse of history; threats and warnings against adversaries voiced by Seselj; advocacy of coercion and violence in Serb/non-Serb relations, including specifically expulsion/exchange of population; revenge/retribution justification of coercion and violence; no compromise with adversaries; blaming others/accepting no responsibility for violence.

Oberschall also wanted to find out whether Seselj's views changed between 1990 and 1994, a time period that encompassed the pre-war Yugoslav crisis, the Croatian war, the Bosnian war, Seselj's rise in Serbian politics and his falling out with the Milosevic regime. He also wanted an adequate data base for the variety of sources (TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, assembly speeches, interviews, press releases, and other sources and venues) of Seselj's statements. The number of texts selected was not fixed in

---

[1] Smith, 2003

advance. Rather, when the statements on a particular theme became increasingly repetitious and redundant, with no additional information added, the selection for more texts on that theme was cut off. Correspondingly, if there was an insufficient data base for characterizing Seselj's position fairly and fully on a theme, a targeted search was made to add texts to the data base.

Given these goals, 242 *texts*, anywhere from one sentence to two paragraphs in length, were selected and translated by Biljana Belamaric, a doctoral candidate in Slavic languages and sociolinguistics at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, NC. USA. Ms. Belamaric is a native speaker of Serbian and Croatian; she translated the Seselj texts with all the lexical connotations and denotations inherent in the lexicon and semantics of any language. The texts are numbered 1 to 259 and are called "*records*." [1] The first selection of records 1 to 182 spanned all 44 volumes as well as the unnumbered volumes included in the ICTY compiled disc 1304040A, and represent 70.3% of all records. Belamaric located records by using Zlab's search software, specifically ZyIMAGE and ZyFIND modules (Release 5.0 of May 26, 2004) with the following query: "hrvat* or alban* or shiptar* or krv*", with additional query items "Srb* or Muslim*" added when more precision was necessary. From these texts, she selected those that contained information on the themes listed by Oberschall, and these became "records." The search engine is indifferent to content: e.g. statements on Croats are picked up by "hrvat" whether or not they express favorable or unfavorable views on Croats, and the same is true for the other search queries. The method of selection is mechanical and unbiased and not subject to human manipulation. Because we did not want to characterize Seselj's views and positions on only a few statements that might not represent his views on a theme fully and accurately, we searched for additional information on some themes in a targeted manner. The second supplementary selection was from volumes 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 28, 29, 34-39, and 42 using the above procedure together with location information from the ICTY summaries in these volumes on specific themes about which more information was needed. In the content analysis we thus made sure that the totality of texts we analyzed was a representative and unbiased sample of Seselj's views and his advocacy of actions. The second selection yielded records numbered 183-259, which is 29.7 % of the total.

A complete enumeration with the search queries from all 44 volumes would have produced several thousand texts the vast majority of which would have been redundant, i.e. repetitious of known information. A random sample of texts would have produced an inadequate text base for several themes. The methodology we used produced an unbiased, large, and representative selection of Seselj texts on each theme of interest, with a minimum of redundancy.

Each record, in English translation, is sequentially listed in Appendix 2. In addition to the text itself, the record contains cross-references to a volume and page number in the 44 volumes, together with date and venue of the original source (e.g. a radio interview on a particular station at a particular date).On the right margin of each record is a list of the categories on which the text content was coded, and a checkmark indicates the specific categories marked off for each text. The categories correspond to the themes that Oberschall had identified in the Seselj discourse; Oberschall also did the coding.

The sources by mass medium were as follows: newspapers and magazines 31%; television 17%; radio 10%; speeches or statements (from the legislature, press releases, news conference, at a rally, etc., which

---

[1] Seventeen numbers between 1 and 259 were skipped, e.g. 30, when we merged several text files, to prevent any possible overlap. There are 242 texts, and each has a unique record number between 1 and 259.

might also be and often was a subsequent story in a Serb mass medium) 39%; other and unidentified 3%. The records distribute by year as follows: 1990 has 12% (includes 2 from 1989), 1991 has 29%; 1992 has 20%; 1993 has 22%, and 1994 has 17%. Because there was hardly any variation over the years (with one exception discussed in the report) and between sources of Seselj's discourse involving the themes, the content analysis treats the entire set of records as an entity.

Preliminary note on terminology

Vojislav Seselj and other politicians in the former Yugoslavia who pursued a nationalist agenda attach to terms like state, nation, nationality, and nationalism meanings that are different from contemporary social science usage. To avoid confusion, this section indicates how these terms are used in this report, except when Seselj and other politicians are quoted or referred to.

"Propaganda" is the use of images, slogans and symbols that play on our prejudices and emotions…with the goal of having the recipient of the appeal…accept the messenger's position as if it were his or her own.[1] Another useful definition: "propaganda is an endeavor to spread ideas without regard to truth and accuracy."[2]

"Ethnic group" denotes a large aggregate of people who have a self-defined group name, believe they share a common descent, have common historical memories and elements of shared culture (such as religion and language), and have an attachment (even if only historical and sentimental) to a specific territory.[3]

"Nationality" [4] refers to a large group of people having a common and distinguishing racial, linguistic, and cultural background, and forming a constituent element of a larger group.

The two terms ethnic group and nationality overlap; social scientists prefer ethnic group because it is more richly descriptive, includes religion as a self-defined identity, and because some minorities that are ethnic groups are excluded from rather than forming a constituent element of a larger group.

"Nation" is a large body of people associated with a particular territory that is sufficiently conscious of its unity to seek or possess a government peculiarly its own.[5]

Nations that have a quite diverse ethnic composition and nevertheless have a sense of unity and a government of their own are often referred to as a "people", e.g. the American people.

"State" is a self-governing political entity that has sovereign authority in its territory, and is recognized, together with its borders, by the community of other states.

Most states are multi-ethnic (or multi-national). "Nation-state" is a frequently misused or loosely used term for states in which a single nation is dominant. A survey of 132 entities considered states as of 1971 showed that only 12 states (9%) can justifiably be described as nation states (i.e. with very small

[1] Pratkanis and Aronson, Art of Propaganda, 2001, p.11
[2] Tonnies, Kritik der offentlichen Meinung, 1922, preface
[3] Stuart Kaufman, Modern Hatreds, 2001, p.16
[4] Webster's Third New International Dictionary, 1981
[5] Random House Unabridged Dictionary, second ed. 1993

minorities distinct from the dominant nation, as e.g. Japan). In 30% the largest nation accounts for less than half the population, and in another 23%, the largest is between half and three quarters.[1]

"Nationalism" is primarily a political principle that holds that the political unit (the state) and the national unit (people) should be congruent.[2] According to Snyder "nationalism is a convenient ideology for ruling in the name of the people without actually granting the people full democratic rights"[3] There are two varieties of nationalism: the civic variety which is tolerant and inclusive, and the ethnic variety, which is populist, xenophobic, and exclusionist. Ethnic nationalism, according to Connor Cruise O'Brien , is a conglomerate of emotions that cluster around soil, land, ancestors, language, tradition and culture, often including religion.[4] In contrast to such "ethnic nationalism" is "civic nationalism" in the liberal democratic tradition, described by Vaclav Havel as follows: "Any kind of association, identity, and community, including 'nationality,' is flawed if it is not based on civic society, i.e. the recognition of fundamental civil and human rights, equally applied…To establish the state on any other principle than the civic principle – on the principle of ideology, of nationality, of religion – reduces us as a people…the sovereignty of the community, the religion, the nation, the state, and higher sovereignty in fact, makes sense only if derived from the one genuine sovereignty, which finds its expression in civic sovereignty."[5]

1. Explaining collective violence

Who commits collective violence? *The "ordinary man"*

The research and literature, on collective violence, on mass killings, on terrorism, and on genocide shows that it cannot be blamed on blood thirsty, sadistic, psychopathic perpetrators, nor on some dark streak in human nature that makes atrocities and crimes against humanity inevitable in group conflict. Rather, the scholarly consensus is the "ordinary man" view, as expressed by Ervin Staub: "under particular circumstances most people have the capacity for extreme violence and the destruction of human life."[6] The Stanford University social psychologist Albert Bandura agrees: "Over the centuries much destructive conduct has been perpetuated by ordinary, decent people in the name of righteous ideologies, religious principles, and nationalist imperatives…it requires conducive social conditions rather than monstrous people to produce heinous deeds."[7] A recent book on ethnic cleansing finds that "ordinary people are brought by normal social structures into committing murderous ethnic cleansing."[8]

An extensive body of research on collective violence -communal riots, atrocities, mass killings, terrorism, and genocide - supports the "ordinary man" thesis and describes the circumstances that make ordinary people into killers and supporters of killers during group conflict[9]

Recent research on the perpetrators of extreme collective violence concerns people arrested for terrorist

---

[1] Walker O'Connor, "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group…" Ethnic and Racial Studies 1 (4), 1978.
[2] Ernest Gellner, Nations and Nationalism, 1983, p.1
[3] Jack Snyder, From Voting to Violence, 2000, p.314
[4] "Nationalists and Democrats" New York Review of Books, Aug. 15, 1991
[5] "Home" New York Review of Books, Dec. 15, 1991
[6] The Roots of Evil, The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence, 1989
[7] The role of selective moral disengagement in terrorism and counterterrorism" 2004, pp.5, 24
[8] Michael Mann, The Dark Side of Democracy. Explaining Ethnic Cleansing, 2005, p.9
[9] cf. Donald Horowitz, The Deadly Ethnic Riot, 2001; James Waller, Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing, 2002, Ervin Staub, The Roots of Evil, 1989; Christopher Browning, Ordinary Men. Reserve Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland, 1992

activities, failed suicide bombers, torturers for state security agencies, and perpetrators of war crimes. Scott Atran, of the University of Michigan and CNRS in Paris, summarized the findings on suicide bombers thus:" If you look at the history of these kinds of extreme acts, they are directed pretty much by middle class or higher individuals. They have always been. Never have they been directed by wacky, crazed, homicidal nuts…the [suicide] bombers span the normal distribution and were slightly above it in terms of education and income…They give up well paying jobs, they give up their families, whom they really adore, to sacrifice themselves because they really believe that it is the only way they are going to change the world." As for state agency torturers, "Greeks who became torturers during the military junta of 1967 to 1974…were perfectly ordinary –in fact, above average intelligence. They'd get them to be torturers by indoctrinating them, by showing them how necessary they were for their societies, and getting these people to believe it."[1] Marc Sageman, a forensic psychiatrist at the University of Pennsylvania, who researched a profile of 130 al Qaeda and associated jihadist group members, finds that "two-thirds came from solid upper or middle class backgrounds, …as a group [they] were relatively well educated…[t]hree quarters were married and the majority had children. I detected no mental illness in this group or any common psychological predisposition for terror[2] . According to research on Palestinian terrorists, suicide bombers tended to be of average economic status. More than half had spent time in Israeli prisons. The most important factor is the organization: almost nobody does this as an individual; candidates are almost always trained."[3]

When do ordinary people engage in and support collective violence?

The circumstances and social conditions conducive for ordinary people to engage in and support collective violence consist of a conjunction of political leadership, ideology, and propaganda that promote and justify it: these organize the population at large and the smaller number of violence perpetrators to accept, support and engage in destructive and violent actions that are viewed as immoral and criminal under usual circumstances. These circumstances and conditions do not arise at random, nor without intent and planning. Michael Mann summarizes his findings on ethnic cleansing: there are three levels of perpetrators and contributors. 1. political leaders and elites running party-states 2. bands of militants forming paramilitaries 3. core groups providing mass, though not majority, popular support. [4]

Three instances of collective violence described in Appendix 1 – lynching in the U.S. South, communal riots in India, and the Rwanda genocide -permit an explicit formulation of these circumstances and conditions. The three instances of collective violence span three continents (Asia, Africa, North America), two centuries (nineteenth and twentieth), conflicts due to divisions on race, religion, and class, huge differences on circumstances, means, magnitude and duration of violence, and on spontaneity and prior planning. Despite such diversity, there is a common core explanation for collective violence as the highlighted words and phrases in Appendix 1 and below indicate, a core explanation that applies to many other instances of collective violence that might have been chosen in lieu of the three.

1. There is a *real conflict* between religious, ethnic, linguistic, racial, nationality groups (hereafter referred to as "ethnic" for the sake of brevity), be it competition for jobs and land, political power, collective identity and dignity, discriminatory treatment, language recognition, and the like. *Incidents of*

---

[1] Scott Atran, "The Surprises of Suicide Terrorism" <u>DISCOVER 24</u> (10) Oct. 2003, pp.1-2
[2] Statement of Marc Sageman to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the Unites States, July 9, 2003 www. Globalsecurity.org/security/library/congress/ 9-11_commission
[3] Jessica Stern, <u>Terror in the Name of God. Why Religious Militants Kill</u>, 2003, p.51
[4] Michael Mann, <u>The Dark Side of Democracy. Explaining Ethnic Cleansing</u>. 2005. p.8

conflict in inter-ethnic relations occur episodically (e.g. elections and religious processions in some Indian cities). But there is *also a history of peaceful coexistence and institutions for cooperation* and sharing. Institutions and popular culture embody both traditions and both realities.

2. *Political leaders make choices in dealing with ethnic tensions and crises.* Some draw on the conciliatory traditions and institutions of cooperation for conflict management. Other leaders manipulate the divisions and tensions, and are willing to risk collective violence when it serves their purposes. There is *no inevitable* linkage between ethnic, racial, nationality and religious divisions and *collective violence.* Brazil and the West Indies did not have lynching after slavery was abolished, but the U.S. South did. Some Indian cities with mixed Hindu/Muslim populations do not have communal riots; in others they are frequent. Rwanda had a genocide, yet race war in South Africa (widely predicted in the 1980s) was avoided when political leaders from all races and political factions agreed on a comprehensive constitutional settlement with power sharing and institutions for ethnic conciliation.

3. Non-conciliatory political *leaders* and elites *promote partisan* and *aggressive policies and actions against ethnic adversaries* in interconnected mobilizing institutions: *intellectual support groups, extremist organizations, armed bands, and the mass media.* These leaders and institutions vilify and *dehumanize their adversaries, spread falsehoods, magnify threats, amplify fears, and provide moral justification for aggression and violence* against ethnic adversaries. In the mass media they disseminate a "crisis" public discourse in inter-group relations (white supremacy, Hindu nationalism, Hutu power). The result is that bystander publics vote for extremist leaders in elections and actively support the ideology and policies of ethnic violence. Moderates are intimidated and silenced. Armed bands and organized extremists implement collective violence. When perpetrators go unpunished, criminal groups and others who target the victims for personal gain join and amplify the collective violence.

Similarly, in the breakup of Yugoslavia and in the wars that followed, these same three processes were at work[1].

1. Real problems facing Yugoslavia were the end of communism and the transition to democracy and a market economy, as in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and renegotiating a constitutional design for a multinational state that assured human rights and non-discrimination to ethnic minorities.

2. Political leaders, with some exceptions, diagnosed the problem as an irreconcilable nationality conflict. They amplified a nationalist "crisis" discourse and downgraded peaceful alternatives. Aleksa Djilas described it thus[2] : "The nationalist ambitions, fears and frustrations of Yugoslavia's constituent groups …were not the inventions of nationalist intellectuals or political elites. However the Yugoslav civil war would not have happened if elites … had not irresponsibly and deliberately manipulated nationalist sentiments with their propaganda and policies. The force of nationalist passions whipped up by these opportunistic leaders not only made conflict inevitable, but it also made the war exceptionally brutal. New borders were created not just by force, but by ethnic cleansing and the rape, persecution, and murder of civilians."

Conflict management could have built on long periods of cooperation among the people of Yugoslavia and on widely known models for multinational, federal, democratic states (such as Switzerland, Belgium, India, Malaysia and Tanzania). A large sample all-Yugoslav public opinion survey in May/June 1990 found that a majority of respondents were in favor of a democratic multiparty system with parliamentary

---

[1] cf. Susan Woodward, Balkan Tragedy, 1995; Sven Monnesland, Land ohne Wiederkehr, 1997
[2] "Fear Thy Neighbor" 1995, in Charles Kupchan ed. Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe, p.85

government. Furthermore, the public had a sophisticated understanding and reaction to various proposed constitutional changes such as on election of an all Yugoslav executive body, voting rules in assemblies, the allocation of tax revenues, the relationship between federal and republic institutions, the right to self-determination and to secession, and other matters[1] . Nevertheless, with some notable exceptions like Ante Markovic, the principal political leaders who decided the post-communist constitutional design for Yugoslavia promoted a political discourse and action which made war and violence extremely probable.

3. Mass media threat and hate propaganda by political leaders provided moral justification for aggressive and violent actions against ethnic adversaries. In Serbia, threats to Serbs outside Serbia and in Kosovo were exaggerated and were amplified by falsehoods during election campaigns and in the mass media. Many ordinary Serbs were persuaded by such propaganda to vote for political leaders promoting violence in ethnic relations. It is precisely because ethnic relations among ordinary Yugoslavs were cooperative before the late 1980's that the nationalist propaganda was made so extreme.

Mass media propaganda is particularly effective when it is disseminated in groups of youth and young men organized by ideologues and political parties– a phenomenon well known from the Nazi era in 1930's Germany with the Hitler Jugend and the brown shirts (officially 'Sturmabteilung' or S.A), and from the 1970's China with Mao Zedong's Red Guards who were acting out the aggressive nightmares of Mao's little Red Book, to name but two well known and documented examples. The leaders encapsulate the young men in bands and indoctrinate them with propaganda that justifies violence against adversaries. Their members wear distinctive clothes (uniforms) and lots of insignia and tattoos, chant the same songs and slogans, and promote hostile and aggressive actions against outsiders, dissidents and minorities. The next step is to transform them into paramilitaries and other military formations that do the leaders' bidding. Last but not least, threat, fear and hate nationalist propaganda secures a core group of citizens for nationalist aims, and they then elect and reelect the leaders, and actively support collective violence against other ethnic groups. Without the threat and hate mass media propaganda, it is not possible to organize such a three legged structure of violence, because the core group of citizens would be missing and because recruiting the militants would be problematic. According to the well-known political scientist Harold Lasswell, some political leaders use propaganda for the mobilization of national hatreds: "the enemy must be represented as a menacing, murderous aggressor, a satanic violator of the moral and conventional standard, an obstacle to the cherished aims and ideal of the nation…"[2] That is how nationalist propaganda was used in the former Yugoslavia.

2. Techniques and Effects of Mass Media Propaganda

There is agreement on the importance of mass media propaganda in the breakup of Yugoslavia and subsequent wars

If psychopaths, sadists, and warped personalities were the sole perpetrators and supporters of collective violence, mass media persuasion would have only a small causal effect (perhaps as a mere trigger) because personalities are formed during childhood and adolescence in intimate social milieus, such as the family and peer groups. If collective violence were deeply embedded in culture, as in tribal clans practicing blood feuds, where every adult male is expected to revenge injury and death suffered by a clan person with violence against members of the offending clan, mass media persuasion would not be

---

[1] "Public Opinion Survey on the Federal Executive Council's Social and Economic Reform, Yugoslav Survey 31 (3) 1990, pp. 15-26
[2] Lasswell, "Propaganda" in Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1934, vol. 12 p.524

necessary to incite a people to ethnic violence. If collective violence between nationalities were historically and culturally rooted so as to be inevitable, like gravity and the change of seasons, mass media persuasion and incitement would not be needed. But none of the above explanations for collective violence are true, according to most scholars (cf. above). To the contrary, it is ordinary people who commit and support collective violence. Ordinary people are as capable of cooperation in inter-ethnic relations as they are capable of animosity and conflict, including violence. They make choices, one way or the other, and it is these choices that are influenced by mass media persuasion. A hundred years ago the philosopher William James examined the new phenomenon of propaganda in the mass media, which he termed "the moral equivalent of war", and noted that it had abolished the distinction between peace and war: "It may even reasonably be said that the intensely sharp competitive preparation for war [with propaganda] …is the real war, permanent, unceasing, and that the battles are only a sort of public verification gained during the 'peace'".[1] Thus the study of mass media persuasion in ethnic conflict is of the utmost importance for explaining it.

It is not necessary for the media messages to be equally compelling for all those who are exposed. All that is necessary is for a large enough bystander public to be persuaded. Given a fractured political scene and a suitable electoral system, less than fifty percent (sometimes even as few as a third of the voters, as was the case in the last free election of the Weimar Republic in 1932) can elect a government that will control the media, the police and the army, implement aggressive nationalist policies, and suppress political opposition. In the first post communist Yugoslav elections of 1990, in Croatia, Tudjman and the HDZ got 41.5% of the vote, but 58% of the legislative seats. In Serbia, Milosevic was elected President in December 1990 by 47% of the eligible voters, 65% of those voting, and his SPS was chosen by 33% of the eligible voters, 46% of the actual voters, for 78% of the National Assembly seats [2]. As for the actual perpetrators of violence (typically men between 15 and 40 years old), they are recruited, trained, indoctrinated, organized and equipped for violence by the armed forces and by extremist organizations linked to political and other influential leaders. According to Stern[3] , "once inside an organization whose goals include killing, ordinary people can commit seemingly demonic acts." Without the political leaders and public support which mass media persuasion helps produce, collective violence in inter-group relations would be condemned, prosecuted and limited, much as organized crime is in most societies.

Political leaders and professionals in the former Yugoslavia knew full well the part that propaganda played in conditioning ordinary people for war and mass killings. Seselj underlined the importance of media control when he stated "The one who takes the TV stations has taken political power"[4]. On another occasion, Seselj[5] boasted to his followers: "We now have a powerful weapon in our hands, the newspaper *Velika Srbija*." To the question "Will there be a civil war in Yugoslavia?" Mira Markovic said in an interview on March 15, 1991 "Civil war is already happening in Yugoslavia. For the time being it is not an armed conflict…this civil war is one of information…its purpose is to cause national animosity to the point where an armed conflict is unavoidable."[6] Dr. Muradif Kulenovic, a psychiatrist who treated the victims of rape and other atrocities following the Croatian war, was asked "How was it possible to transform normal, peaceful members of society, a psychologically healthy person, into a machine for rape…?" His answer: "…war mongering propaganda in the newspapers, radio, and television prepared the Serb people for the 'final solution', dictated by Serb national aspirations…As it was impossible to send

---

[1] Quoted in Robert Park, On Social Control and Collective Behavior, 1967, p.149
[2] Woodward, Balkan Tragedy, 1995, pp.129-132; Vladimir Goati, Elections in FRY from 1990 to 1998, 2000, Appendix
[3] Terror , 2003, p.xv
[4] Duga, 13 April 1993
[5] Velika Srbija no.3, 1990
[6] Answer, 1996, p58

people overnight into an offensive war…it was necessary to produce hate against Bosnians and Croats…while hatred is not the cause of war, without hatred the war would not be possible."[1] . Dr. Jovan Raskovic, the Serb leader in Croatia, whose campaign for Serb autonomy in Knin Krajina and in Slavonia in 1990 highlighting Ustasha atrocities against Serbs in World War Two was widely covered in the Serb media, told an interviewer on Yutel in Jan. 1992 "I feel responsible for this [Croatian] war because I prepared for this war even if not in terms of military preparation. If I hadn't created this emotional stress in the Serb people, nothing would have happened. My party was the fuse of Serb nationalism, not only in Croatia but everywhere else in Bosnia and Hercegovina"[2]. N. Pejic, a Sarajevo TV producer, stated "without the media and especially without television, war in the former Yugoslavia is inconceivable"[3] . The Belgrade political scientist Predrag Simic maintains that "the task of war propaganda was to mobilize and to stir up, to glorify and to demonize, to justify and to accuse, and that is the reason that the media to a great extent were responsible for the outbreak and tragic course of the war in the former Yugoslavia"[4]. Foreign observers agree. Marco Altherr, head of the International Committee for the Red Cross mission in Croatia in 1991-92, stated that "the conflict [in Bosnia] was the first time I have seen such strong and effective propaganda on both sides. When you are talking to either side, they are absolutely convinced they will be slaughtered by the other side"[5] A Sarajevo foreign correspondent stated :" Every person killed in this [Bosnian] war was killed first in the newsroom."[6] And the then Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs Giovanni De Michelis said in September 1991 "This [Croatian] war is an invention of the media"[7]

Mass media, propaganda and persuasion

The social science analysis of propaganda and more broadly, persuasive communication got under way during World War II and yielded a rich harvest of results from experiments in psychology, social psychology, mass communications and advertising/market research [8].

How is the truth value (truth or falsity) of beliefs and opinions determined? The natural science has developed since the 16th century the experimental method and statistical inference based on the mathematical theory of probability for establishing the truth value of hypotheses, a method that does not depend on the attributes of the experimenters and the observers, e.g. the principle of replication of experimental results and observations by independent others who have no vested interest in a particular outcome. The presumption is that a hypothesis is not accepted as true unless competing hypotheses are shown to be mistaken. Accepting a new truth is made problematic and difficult with the scientific method.

In matters of justice in the common law jurisdictions (is a person accused of crime guilty or not guilty?), an adversarial method for establishing truth and falsehood has been institutionalized (with some variations) over the centuries. Both the accuser (the prosecution) and the accused (the defense) make the strongest possible case, under the same rules, and with an equal chance to question and rebut each others' evidence and argument, before a neutral third party (jury or judges) that will decide the truth value of the accusations. The presumption is that unless proven guilty, the accused is not guilty. Similar to the

---

[1] Seada Vranic, Breaking the Walls of Silence, 1996, p.198
[2] Kemal Kurspahic, Prime Time Crime. Balkan Media in War and Peace, 2003, p.53
[3] La Lettre des Reporters sans Frontieres, Dec. 1992, p.24
[4] "Yugoslavia: Media in Violence" RFE/RE Research Institute Reports, Munchen 1994, p.1
[5] internews.org/mediainconflict, fn.7
[6] Susan Carruthers, The Media Wars, 2000, p.46
[7] In Dusan Reljic, Killing Screens. Medien in Zeiten von Konflikten. 1998, p.41
[8] summarized in Carl Hovland et al., Communication and Persuasion, 1963; J.A.L. Brown Techniques of Persuasion, 1963; Ithiel de Sola Pool, ed. Handbook of Communication, 1973; Diana Mutz, Impersonal Influence, 1998

scientific method, guilt, not innocence, is made problematic by justice.

On political issues there is no legitimate, unbiased, and proven method of establishing the truth or falsity of beliefs, facts and opinions that enter political choice and decisions. In the "court of public opinion", adversaries use techniques of persuasion for influencing the public's assessment of truth value, ranging from the art of rhetoric to mass media propaganda techniques. As Charles Lindblom put it [1]: " I take it as undeniable that what people think about the social world – belief, attitude, value and volition -derive from social interchange far more than from direct observation…you depend almost entirely on other people, including acquaintances, journalists and other people who reach you through press and broadcasting. Most of the social world is too far away for anyone to observe much of it…" Mass media methods for establishing truth or falsity fall short of the scientific method and of justice on several counts.

1. Unlike science and justice, many in the public are not neutral or open minded, but have predispositions and prejudices about the matter at hand. In other words, they have a bias and prior beliefs about truth and falsity.

2. Unlike science and justice, the public is not exposed equally (sometimes not at all to one side) to the pros and cons in the controversy. The public may selectively expose themselves to the side they favor. A political regime may suppress the advocates and the media that oppose it. The public debate may be skewed or biased because of unusual circumstances, e.g. patriotic journalism at a time of war.

3. The purpose of political debate is not to establish truth and falsehood, as in science and justice, but to create a consensus (or majority support) for a position, regardless of its truth value. Unlike science and justice where the method is designed to extract truth from a jumble of often obscure and contradictory evidence, in public debate, by design, political leaders often spread false information and try to obscure and confuse, and suffer no penalty.

To be sure, free and independent news media, freedom of speech and of the media, fair and competitive elections, and other institutions of democratic polities make it likely that public debate will incorporate aspects of truth value assessment that are at the core of the scientific method and of justice. Nevertheless the primary goal of public debate, even in democracies, is to create a consensus (or strong support) for a point of view, and only secondarily to establish its truth value before an impartial public.

The information processing model of persuasion

Social science has rejected a simplistic model of media effects comparing them to a hypodermic needle or a magic bullet that penetrate and shape public opinion on any point of view advocated by a communicator[2] . A more informed model of mass media effects is provided by media experts Mark Frohardt and Jonathan Temin[3] when they write that "Media can be manipulated …to move a society toward conflict and non-democratic rule…[the media] are rarely a direct cause of conflict…Nonetheless the media can be extremely powerful tools used to promote violence, as witnessed in Rwanda, the former Republic of Yugoslavia…and elsewhere." For understanding the effects of public debate and of mass persuasion on opinions, beliefs and actions, social scientists have developed an information processing

---

[1] Inquiry and Change, 1990, pp78-9
[2] Carruthers, Media Wars, 2000, p.8, 24
[3] The Use and Abuse of Media in Vulnerable Societies, 2003, p.2

11

model[1] made of four components: cognitive frame, message source, message, and audience.

1. cognitive frame

Public debate takes place not in a vacuum but in an already existing political discourse embedded in culture, history and political loyalties that the public takes for granted. According to William Gamson and Andre Modigliani [2] "Every policy issue is contested in the political arena. Advocates'…weapons are metaphors, catchphrases, and other condensing symbols that frame the issue in a particular fashion…A frame is a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events, weaving a connection among them. The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue…"

Debates and public discourse fit issues into competing cognitive frames- called ideologies if they are promoted by political parties and groups – and thus explain them persuasively. Cognitive frames resonate with the public when they are embedded in culturally available metaphors, stories, and imagery. Cognitive frames structure the predispositions and prejudices of the public. Messages that do not fit a frame (or cannot be fitted to one) are likely to be ignored, forgotten, or discounted on credibility (i.e. lacking truth value).

2. message source (messenger)

Most of what we know or want to know about public affairs is not personally experienced (or only in part). We believe as true what trusted experts, influential and knowledgeable people, "authorities", vouch us to believe. A basic textbook on mass persuasion states that[3] "The accumulation of much research [on messengers] shows that a media model is most effective when he or she is high in prestige, power, and status." We also tend to accept as true opinions and beliefs that are widespread and voiced by the majority of citizens: surely, so many cannot be mistaken! Thus messages from high status sources, trusted sources, and those agreeing with majority views are likely to be persuasive and accepted as true.

3. message

The message itself has to be made credible . Propaganda techniques are designed to make messages credible. Propaganda [4] is the "use of images, slogans and symbols that play on our prejudices and emotions…with the goal of having the recipient of the appeal…accept the [messenger's] position as if it were his or her own." The most common techniques of propaganda are:

a. Stereotyping and labeling – positive, as in the glorification of the in-group; negative, as in the dehumanization of an adversary.
b. Generalization – all those in the in-group are courageous, loyal, united; all those in the out-group are treacherous, dangerous; there are no exceptions; entire groups, not individuals, are responsible for alleged wrongs
c. Testimonial – God and history is on our side; national heroes, religious leaders, experts and authorities all side with us and agree with us
d. Vox populi, vox Dei – the people, everybody, is in favor of our program, every one is joining,

---

[1] Anthony Pratkanis and Eliot Aronson, The Art of Propaganda. The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion, 2001
[2] "The Changing Culture of Affirmative Action, Research in Political Sociology (3) 1987, p. 143
[3] Pratkanis and Aronson, Art of Propaganda, 2001, p.152
[4] Pratkanis and Aronson, Art of Propaganda, 2001, p.11

we are united, no one can resist us, join the bandwagon, only traitors and enemies within are opposed.

e. Selective and false information – facts taken out of context, contrary evidence suppressed, deliberate misquoting, falsification and complete fabrications. Everything is called by its opposite: "aggression" is called "self defense," coercive population expulsion (ethnic cleansing) is "voluntary exchange of population," the property displaced persons and refugees leave when fleeing is "abandoned", prisoners and detainees are shot because "they tried to escape," "we have no choice" means "we don't want to compromise," and so on.

f. Repetition – no matter how big the lie, keep repeating it, over and over again; don't change the story.

4. the audience

The public varies on susceptibility to persuasion on particular issues. They possess a variety of cognitive frames, and different prejudices and presuppositions. They may trust different messengers. They may expose themselves to messages selectively. They check mass media messages with opinion leaders in their social milieu and discount those that are not backed up. All of these inhibitors of media persuasion have been thoroughly researched since World War Two[1] .

Nevertheless, under certain conditions, most of the public will react positively to mass media persuasion. By far the most powerful condition for raising *the susceptibility of propaganda* is raising the anxiety level and fear in the public with *threat messages*. Fear arousing appeals are particularly persuasive and create public demand for relief and action to reduce the threat[2]. A basic textbook on mass persuasion states that [3] "Experimental data overwhelmingly suggest that all other things being equal, the more frightened a person is by a communication, the more likely he or she is to take positive preventive action…Given the power of fear to motivate and direct our thoughts, there is much potential for abuse. Illegitimate fears can always be invented for any given propaganda purpose." A fear campaign in its extreme form is referred to in The Encyclopedia of Propaganda[4] as paranoia propaganda i.e. "fostering delusions of danger from external enemies and traitors at home, and of complete dependency upon leadership, party and ideology." According to the French political scientist J.P. Derrienic[5], the most common discourse of nationalist leaders is "You are threatened and you therefore need me as your leader." The Nazi leader Hermann Goering at the Nurnberg war crimes trial gave his views on threat propaganda in an interview: "The people can always be brought to do the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to greater danger. It works the same way in any country." [6]

The conclusions from the information processing model on effective mass persuasion are straightforward.

a. Discredit the existing cognitive frame(s) and promote a rival frame that becomes the hegemonic public discourse and sets the public agenda. As George Orwell put it in his classic book 1984[7] "The purpose of "Newspeak" was not only to provide a medium of expression for a world view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible." Newspeak was Orwell's name

---

[1] summarized in Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, 1955; Charles Wright, Mass Communications, 1959
[2] Hovland et al., Communication and Persuasion, 1963
[3] Pratkanis and Aronson, Art of Propagnda, 2001, p.210;215
[4] Robert Cole ed. 1998, p.566
[5] Les Guerres Civiles, 2002, p. 102
[6] Quoted in Jason Epstein "Mystery in the Heartland" New York Review of Books 51 (15) Oct. 7, 2004
[7] [quoted in Carruthers, The Media at War, 2000 .p76

for the cognitive frame of the rulers and people of Ingsoc, a future totalitarian society.

b. Convey trust and confidence for the messengers and advocates of your position, and discredit the messengers of your adversaries and critics.

c. Enhance your message with propaganda techniques that have proven their worth in the past and in social science research (cf. a. through f. above). The Nazi propaganda chief Goebbels wrote :"This is the secret of propaganda: those who are persuaded by it should be completely immersed in the ideas of the propaganda, without even noting they are being immersed in it." [1]

d. Focus on a threat the public will view with alarm and react to with fear, and advance your political agenda as a solution to the threat.

3. <u>Nationalist Propaganda in the Serb Mass Media – Part A</u>

The IPM model applied to the "crisis" frame in the breakup of Yugoslavia and the subsequent wars

I[2] analyzed mass media content, opinion polls, election campaigns, popular culture, history and other cultural material for Yugoslavia in the last years of its existence and the initial years of its breakup. All sides in the conflict used nationalist propaganda in the years immediately preceding the civil wars, and intensified it during the 1990 election campaigns. I found that Yugoslavs experienced ethnic and nationality relations through two competing frames, both culturally available: a normal frame in peaceful times expressing cooperative relations in workplaces, neighborhoods, and in public affairs, and a rival crisis frame for times of tension and conflict. The political and intellectual establishment of Yugoslavia, the nationalists who overthrew the communist leadership (or, more accurately, the communists who changed into nationalists), labored mightily with massive propaganda in the media, in social movements, and in elections to discredit the normal frame and to activate and amplify the crisis frame, after decades of dormancy. All the ethnic adversaries in the former Yugoslavia engaged in this sort of nationalist propaganda.

In the normal frame, which prevailed in Tito's Yugoslavia, ethnic relations were cooperative and neighborly. Colleagues and workers, schoolmates and teammates transacted routinely across nationality. Intermarriage was accepted. More than 3 million people in a population of 22 million in the 1980s were children of ethnically mixed marriages or were themselves married to a spouse of a different ethnic group[3]. Holidays were spent in each others' republics. In politics and public life, there was inclusion and resource sharing in proportion to demographics. In a large-scale all Yugoslav social survey in mid-1990, 62% of 4,232 respondents in 292 localities stated that the "Yugoslav" affiliation was very or quite important for them. On inter-ethnic relations, in work places, 36 % characterized them as good, 28% as satisfactory, and only 6% chose bad or very bad. In neighborhoods, relations were characterized as good by 57%, as satisfactory by 28%, and only 12% chose bad and very bad.[4] On constitutional choice, their expectations

---

[1] quoted in Pratkanis and Aronson, <u>The Art of Propaganda</u>, 2001, p.87
[2] "The Manipulation of Ethnicity: from Ethnic Cooperation to Violence and War in Yugoslavia" <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies</u> 23 (6) 2000
[3] Woodward, <u>Balkan Tragedy</u>,1995, p.36
[4] "Public Opinion Survey on the Federal Executive Council's Social and Economic Reforms" <u>Yugoslav Survey</u>, 31 March 1990, p.25

of a future Yugoslavia were "federation like now" 24%; "other federation" 25%; "confederation" 21%; "separate states" 7%; and other preferences and don't know 23%. In another large all-Yugoslav survey with over ten thousand respondents in the summer of 1990, to the question "Do you agree that every Yugoslav nation should have a national state of its own?", 61% answered "do not agree at all" and only 16% chose "agree fully" thus once again demonstrating how public opinion was in favor of preserving the federal state.[1] (The other answers were undecided, don't know, or qualified agreement and disagreement) . These answers reflect the "normal" frame in inter-ethnic relations highlighting cooperation that still prevailed on the eve of the 1990 elections and of the imminent violent breakup of the Yugoslav state.

The crisis frame, suppressed in the communist era, was grounded in the experiences and memories of the Balkan wars, the first and second world wars - and other wars and conflict before that. In these wars, civilians were not distinguished from combatants. According to the Carengie Endowment for International Peace, a soldier reported on his orders in the Balkan war of 1912: "We are to burn the villages, massacre the young, and spare none but old people and children…"; another wrote in a letter home: "It is horrible…there is nothing but corpses, dust and ashes. There are villages of 100, 150, 200 homes where there is no longer a single man, literally none. We collect them in bodies of 40 to 50, and then we pierce them with our bayonets…Pillage is going on everywhere. The officer told the soldiers…to sell the things they had stolen.[2] Atrocities, massacres, torture, ethnic cleansing and a scorched earth policy were the rule between ethnic groups that became enemies and adversaries. Old people, children, women, and priests were not spared. Everyone was held collectively responsible for their nationality and religion and became a target of revenge and reprisals. Tito had wanted to eradicate the nationalist crisis frame, but it simmered in the memories of older people, of the families of victims, of some intellectuals and religious leaders. Balkan expert Misha Glenny made the link from past to present when he wrote that "The devastation …during the Balkan Wars, and the horrific crimes committed by all sides, set the pattern for modern nationalist warfare in the Balkans."[3] Susan Woodward agrees that "The political goal of creating national states made little distinction between military and civilian, either as fighters or as targets."[4]Milosevic, Tudjman, Seselj and other politicians who pursued a nationalist agenda did not invent the crisis frame; they activated it and amplified it, and they undermined and discredited the normal frame.

The crisis frame merged nationalism with threat propaganda. In nationalist propaganda, the glorification of "Us/Our Nation" uses ethnocentrism, national pride, xenophobia and domination values characteristic of some national cultures, and exaggerates them out of all proportion. According to Anthony Smith[5], an eminent British expert on nationalism, the major themes, symbolism, ritual and metaphors of nationalist discourse have a quasi-religious dimension. The nation is a sacred community deserving undivided loyalty, a chosen people superior to others and elected for great achievements, having a historic destiny and unique calling above all other peoples and nations, and with a right to a great homeland to fulfill its historic mission, justified by past sacrifices. When joined with exaggerated and/or imagined threat to the nation, nationalism becomes xenophobic. Nationalism sharpens the boundaries of us/them thinking, dehumanizes adversaries and makes them responsible for past and current wrongs. Aggressive action against other ethnic groups becomes morally justified because of past injuries. Collective violence is justified as "defensive." The relations between nations and ethnic groups are framed as a crisis.

---

[1] Laslo Sekelj, Yugoslavia, the Process of Disintegration, 1993, p.277
[2] Carnegie Endowment, Report, 1914, pp. 148-149
[3] Misha Glenny, "Birth of a Nation" 1995, p.26
[4] Susan Woodward, Balkan Tragedy, 1995, p.244
[5] Chosen People, 2003

The message: threat and fear mass media discourse activates the crisis frame

If the normal/cooperative frame prevailed in the late 1980s, as shown by Yugoslav survey findings, how did nationalists activate and amplify the crisis frame? The emotion that poisons ethnic relations is fear due to threat to the group[1]: fear of extinction as a group, fear of assimilation, fear of domination by another group, fear for one's life and property, fear of becoming a victim. After fear comes hate. The threatening others are demonized and dehumanized. Threat and fear create a demand for action, to eliminate the threat and remove the fear.

The crisis frame was resurrected by Serb intellectuals over the plight of the Kosovo Serbs with fears of extinction. Because of higher Albanian birthrate and higher out-migration of Serbs from Kosovo to more prosperous Serbia, Kosovo changed from 23% Serb in 1971 to 10% in 1989. Serb nationalists alleged that Albanians in Kosovo were threatening Serbs to leave and that the police and judiciary were refusing to protect Serbs against Albanian violence. Though evidence is lacking on the extent of anti-Serb intimidation and violence, the most comprehensive and objective research leaves no doubt that they were a real problem and that many Serbs in Kosovo believed that they were under siege and had decided to get out of Kosovo for these reasons[2]. As Blagojevic concludes in her analysis, "the Kosovo problem had been long silenced in Yugoslav public opinion, but once it became a public controversy, it was exploited for propaganda purposes."

Charges of sexual assault and rape by Albanians against Serbs were highlighted in the Serb news media. Vojislav Stojanovic, president of the Association of University Teachers and Scholars of Serbia stated[3] "…the savage Albanian terrorists are now running amok in Kosovo and Metohija, attacking and destroying everything that is Serbian…Kosovo and Metohija are gripped by fear of terrorists armed to the teeth…" The public was fed exaggerations that fit the crisis frame. Yet an analysis of crime statistics in Kosovo in the 1980s by Serb social scientists found that the rates of sexual assault and attempted sexual assault in Kosovo (0.96 per 100,000 adult males) were lower than in central Serbia (2.43) and in all Yugoslavia (1.63), and that rapes tended to occur within, not across, nationalities[4]. Social science findings were known to few and not publicized. Despite these figures, Mira Markovic[5], a professor of sociology and an important politician, called the victimization of Serbs in Kosovo "feudal terror." The Serb Academy of Sciences and Arts called it "genocide."

Fear of extinction was spread with highly inflated figures on the ethnic massacres in World War Two[6]. Serb and Croat nationalists engaged in a war of numbers and sought to prove victimhood that polarized ethnic relations. Bogdan Denitch[7] recalls:

"Everyone was traumatized by all the talk of World War Two atrocities…even those who had seemed immune to nationalism. Old personal ties and friendships crumbled as many intellectuals I knew, as well as families and friends, rallied to the defense of their own nation. The pressure to do so was immense."

---

[1] David Lake and Donald Rothchild, eds., <u>The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict</u>, 1996
[2] Marina Blagojevic "Der Exodus aus dem Kosovo. Ein Serbisches Trauma im Propagandakrieg, in Bremer et al. <u>Serbiens Weg,</u> 1998, pp.86-89; U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee, <u>Yugoslavia: Crisis in Kosovo</u>, 1990
[3] 9 Feb.1990 <u>Politika</u>
[4] Srdja Popovic et al, "<u>Kosovski Cvor: odresiti ili seci</u>," 1990
[5] <u>Answers</u>, 1996, p.19
[6] Branimir Anzulovic, <u>Heavenly Serbia</u>, 1999, pp.100-104
[7] <u>Ethnic Nationalism</u>, 1996, p.181

The most careful demographic analysis of World War II deaths that can be attributed to war fighting and to genocide in Yugoslavia estimated a minimum 896,000 and a maximum 1,210,000 deaths, of which Serbs and Montenegrins 460,000-590,000, and Croats 190,000-270,000[1]. This contrasts with Serb claims of over one million, and seven hundred thousand alone in the Jasenovac camp, and with Croat claims of one million, with three hundred thousand in Bleiburg alone[2]. According to Anzulovic, who summarized all the findings[3], "the Yugoslav authorities claimed 1.7 million war casualties in 1946 to the International Reparations Commission, yet in 1966 the total claims against the Axis forces came up with 597,000 victims, not including victims of communist forces. Including these, there were an estimated 869,000, of which 487,000 were Serbs – that figure included deaths from diseases, allied bombing, political executions." Serbs accused Croats of killing 700,000 Serbs in the Jasenovac death camp alone, whereas demographers estimate the victims there at 80,000-100,000, about 50% Serbs, the rest Jews, Gypsies, Muslims, Croats, and others. On the 60th anniversary of the death camp's liberation, April 21, 2005, the leaders of the Jasenovac death camp victims association stated that the Jasenovac museum had a list of 59,188 victims, and that although the real number may never be known precisely, his association estimates them between eighty and a hundred thousand, including Serb, Roma, Jewish, Croat, and other groups.[4]

Fears of oppression were roused by the incessant rape, atrocity and conspiracy stories. In an interview with the author[5], a Belgrade university student recalls a Serb writer asserting before a student club in 1990: "Serbia has three enemies: transnational capital, Islam and the Vatican. Their goal is to replace the population of Yugoslavia with Muslims from Arab countries."

Such statements by the political and cultural elites had become commonplace. Several systematic studies of the mass media in Serbia confirm that the crisis frame promoted by nationalist political and intellectual elites saturated both the print and the electronic media. Tadeusz Mazowiecki, special rapporteur for the UN Human Rights Commission, concludes[6] on the mass media in Serbia that "the media have served as an effective tool for the dominant political force in formulating a new agenda based on Serbian nationalism and in fomenting hatred against other nationality groups in the former Yugoslavia."

A research group of Belgrade social scientists and journalists content analyzed the main daily news programs on RTB/RTS from August 1992 and July 1993 and concluded that[7] "what really happened was not reported, e.g. what was reported in the media of other countries; only that was reported which the regime found acceptable. One is dealing with a radical mode of reality construction." Another researcher content analyzed three illustrated magazines – Duga, TV Novosti, and Ilustrovana Politika – and concluded that[8] "The most important characteristic of the magazines in 1990-91 is the linkage of the past (when Serbs were victims) with the present (when they have to be awakened to the dangers and to resist them) and the future (when Serbs are called to become avengers, heroes and victors)". A group of writers analyzed the discourse on RTB/RTS about the Bosnian war[9]: the Muslims are jihad warriors, criminals, slaughterers, Islamic Ustashas, mujaheddin, terrorists and extremists, whereas the Serbs protect their homes, wives and children, and their home grounds. Svetlana Slapsak analyzed the first six months of

[1] Srdjan Bogosavljevic, "Der Unaufgeklarte Genozid" in Bremer Serbiens Weg, 1998, pp63-72
[2] Monesland, Land ohne Wiederkehr, 1997, p.255
[3] Heavenly Serbia, 1999, pp.100-103
[4] Hina News Service, "60th anniversary…" April 21, 2005
[5] May 27, 1998
[6] Special Report on the Media E/CN.4/1995/54 Dec.13, 1994, paragraph 165
[7] Dusan Reljic, Killing Screens, 1998, p.48
[8] Zoran Markovic, "Die Nation: Opfer und Rache" in Bremer, Serbiens Weg, 1998 p.331
[9] Rade Veljanovski, "Die Wende in den Elektronischen Medien", in Bremer Serbiens Weg, 1998, pp.312-3

"Echoes and Reactions" in <u>Politika</u>[1] for 1990 on Kosovo topics and found that they lacked opposition opinions and debate, lacked facts and exact dates on alleged oppression by Albanians of other groups, lacked contributions by Albanian authors, lacked rebuttals by people who were attacked and accused of crimes such as treason, contained many negative stereotypes, among other things. In the following six months, Croats were subject to the same negative discourse. She concluded that stereotypes and hate speech was the principal way in which the public was prepared to accept war as a resolution for Yugoslavia's ethnic problems.[2]

4. <u>Seselj, messenger of Serbian nationalism: a content analysis</u>

The description and evaluation of Seselj's mass media discourse from 1990 to 1994 on the relations between Serbs and other groups rests on a content analysis of his writings, speeches, radio and television broadcasts, and newspaper interviews. The first section of this report describes the methodology of the content analysis.

There are four goals of the content analysis. First, we identify Seselj's media messages to the Serb public in which he promoted the "nationalist crisis" frame of ethnic relations and its moral justification for collective violence. Second, we describe Seselj's use of propaganda techniques for mass persuasion, such as negative stereotyping, victimization of Serbs, threats against Serbs, falsehood, and others. Third, we document the aggressive, coercive, and violent actions Seselj advocates for Serbs against other groups. Fourth, we analyze his political ideology – xenophobic nationalism – and its roots in nationalist conceptions about nations and nationalities, states, sovereignty, territory and borders. These conceptions are the philosophic, historical and moral underpinning of Seselj's "crisis" frame. We contrast his political ideology and conceptions with an alternative view, civic nationalism, which became the philosophic and moral basis for the South African constitutional settlement and for the Czech and Slovak settlement, which were cooperative, instead of coercive and violent, in a multi-ethnic state.

Threats, victimization, responsibility and justification for collective violence

The information processing model explains how messages of threats against one's group (threat messages) are the most powerful means of inducing fear and a "crisis" mentality within the public, and which are used to morally justify collective violence against enemies who are the source of the threat and danger. There is an extraordinary amount of threat messages in the Seselj texts, which are frequently coupled with Serb "victimhood" messages. Victimhood refers to past or on-going victimization of Serbs. Threat refers to current or future events: if not dealt with, they will make Serbs victims once again. Threat and victimization discourse is coupled with "Serbs not responsible" messages – i.e. the equivalent of boys fighting each other and each claiming "the other started it and I hit him back," or, in a lethal fight between men, "when he drew his gun and threatened me I had to shoot him in self defense." Victimization, threat and no responsibility in Seselj's discourse combine for a moral justification of collective violence and form the core of the "crisis" frame in ethnic relations. In the 242 Seselj texts, there are 40 mentions of victimhood, including eight instances of extreme victimhood (e.g., genocide), 29 instances of "external threat" (foreign sources), 28 instances of "internal threat" (Serb sources), 42 other threat messages, and 27 "Serbs not responsible" variety of messages.

---

[1] Politika was the most influential daily newspaper in Serbia, and its role in shaping public opinion was similar to that of Le Monde in France and the New York Times and Washington Post in the U.S.A.
[2] Svetlana Slapsak, <u>Ogledi o Bezbriznosti,</u> 1994

To start with the circle of *victimizers*, these are the West, Tito, Croats, Catholics, the Vatican, Germany, Ante Pavelic, Tudjman, communists in World War II, communists after WWII, the Comintern, the European Union, Western powers, the World, enemies on all sides, enemies in the West, President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, Muslims, Slovenes, the U.N. Security Council, UNPROFOR, and some others. If one groups them, Croats (Croats, Ustasha, Tudjman, Pavelic) come out on top with 18 mentions; the West (in a variety of forms) gets 15 mentions; Tito and communists get 8 mentions, and the others get one or two mentions.

Seselj kept warning Serbs of a pan-Islamic and of Muslim fundamentalist threats. In a speech on August 4, 1990 he stated to his supporters that "we [Serbs] will not allow at any cost the Islamic fundamentalists to roam around the Serbian lands, to dream of setting up a pan-Islamic state which would spread in the Balkans"[1] , and again in a television interview on May 4, 1991, he said "The Serbs have risen…everything that had been happening in Bosnia was characterized by a flow of pan-Islamism and Muslim nationalism in all areas, while the Serbs had no forces or chances to oppose it whatsoever."[2] He accused the Muslims for killing their own kind and blaming the Serbs : "The Serbian Radical Party condemns the barbaric act of Islamic fundamentalist in Sarajevo who used it for propaganda purposes, accusing the Serbian forces that they shelled civilians with mortars from the surrounding hills…these are the methods of the Bosnian pan-Islamists."[3]

What did all these enemies of the Serbs do, and why are they enemies? Some texts are not specific: "What would we do in that Europe, from which always, throughout history only evil came to us?" (record 173- 10/17/91) and "What can the West take away from us that they have not already taken from us?" (record 174 – 10/17/91). In others, Seselj is specific: the Western powers want to "narrow down the territory of Serbia to the borders of the Belgrade pashaluk" (record 58 – 8/27/92) and the West "lead[s] an organized propaganda against Serbia and the Serbian people" (record 53- 4/16/92). Seselj seldom gives reasons for the West's enmity for Serbs and partiality for the Croats. In one rare instance he explains it thus: "Even if Croatia had the most fascist authorities, like today, and Serbia the most democratic regime in the world, the West would still support them and be against us. Because they are Catholics, while we are Orthodox." (record 247- 4/13/91). Tito and the communists "forcibly governed" the Serbs (record 4 – 3/31/90) and created internal entities (Republics) and borders at the expense of the Serbs (record 217- 4/30/90). There are many mentions of Croat atrocities and crimes in World War II and in the Croatian war, including genocide, renewed genocide, mass graves, slaughterhouses, Serb expulsions from Croatia, worse crimes than those the Nazis committed, Jasenovac concentration camp, Ustasha crimes, attacks on unarmed people, women and children, slaughter of Serb children, terrorizing Serb inhabitants, and others. One text is an example of this discourse: "…the Croatian people exactly marked the borders of the Serbian state. It marked it with Serbian mass graves." (record 112- 8/4/90). To sum it up, according to Seselj, the Serbs have been and still are the victims in just about every type of relationship and engagement with other ethnic groups and foreign states.

Focusing on the recent past, present, and the future, who, according to Seselj, is a threat to the Serbian people? One way of sorting out the threats is by foreign source, internal source, and a residual category (which overlaps somewhat with the foreign and internal because Seselj may mention many and several

---

[1] Vojislav Seselj, Srpski Cetnicki Pokret, Belgrade 1994 pp.61-61
[2] Vojislav Seselj, Sizifovska Sudovanja, Belgrade 1992, p.23
[3] Vojislav Seselj, Milan Panic Mora Pasti – Konferencije za Stampu 1992. godine, Belgrade 1994, p.107. The incident referred to a May 27 1992 shelling of a breadline in Sarajevo by the Serb forces in which 18 civilians were killed and more than a hundred wounded. On May 27 and May 30, the European Union and the United Nations initiated economic sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro [Monnesland, Land ohne Wiederkehr, 1997, p.508]

types of threats in the same text). The most frequent *foreign threat* is the West and Western powers with eleven mentions, followed by Europe and the European Union with three, America with three, the Vatican also with three, and then one or two mentions for Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Turkey, Albania, the English, foreign intelligence, German TV, Italian TV, Great Powers, other states, and other unspecific foreign sources.

Why are these foreign states and powers threatening Serbia, and what exactly are they doing that is against the Serbs? According to Seselj, "…their [the West] basic goal is to bring Serbia to those borders which Adolf Hitler determined in 1941…and to simply destroy Serbs as a people" (record 83-6/10/93), i.e. take away Vojvodina, Sandzak, Kosovo and Metohija. In another text (record 157- 6/30/93), the Western powers' goal is "to abduct the Serbian lands and join them to the Croatian, that is Islamic, Bosnian Jamahiria" and in record 103 (12/13/93), their goal is to incite rebellion by the "Shiptars" (Kosovo Albanians) and Muslims. In record 164 (8/27/93), Seselj alleges that America wants "both Serbia and Croatia" to be "unstable states and torn apart by internal problems and clashes" because it is courting Arab countries and Turkey and wants a crisis pretext to station military forces, whereas Germany wants to have "Croats and Slovenes, as traditionally germanophile peoples, under its control."

In the 28 mentions of *internal threat* are included ethnic groups, political groups and leaders from just prior to the break up of Yugoslavia and groups and leaders within Serbia after the breakup. Commonly mentioned are "enemies of the Serbian people", "the Serbs are endangered" and division within the Serb people (record 212- 6/1/91: "If…Serbs start slaughtering each other"). More specifically Croats and Slovenes/Zagreb and Ljubljana, the communist regime, Serb communist leaders, the Serbian Movement of Deception[1], traitors to the Serbian people, the Serb media, Croats in Serbia, Albanians in Kosovo, minorities in Serbia, the government of Serbia, census takers, officials in Serb state agencies, and a number of specific political leaders and officials (Slobodan Milosevic, Ante Markovic, Milan Panic, foreign minister Jovanovic). All of these groups, agents and individuals are or have been working against the interests of the Serb people at one time or another. The minorities "would like to break away from Serbia and join to their native countries" (record 101-11/14/93). The Croats and Slovenes are trying "to stop the revitalization of the Serbian people" (record 4-3/31/90). The Serb media are "against patriotism" (record 168- 7/31/91) and the independent newspapers <u>Borba</u> and <u>Vreme</u> are filled with "anti-Serbian propaganda" (record 177-11/6/91). The communists built Yugoslavia on "anti-Serbian foundations" (record 217-4/30/90). Census takers "forced you [Montenegrins] to declare yourselves as members of an invented Montenegrin nation" (record 125- 3/23/91). Some apparent friends are enemies in disguise. In Seselj's view "Those [Croats] who act the best, who look like the best to us are in fact - the most dangerous. They are our worst enemies. They are the greatest criminals, like, for example, Ante Markovic. …he did much more damage [to Serbs] than Tudjman" (record 192- 4/8/92), and "those [disloyal sons] who are ready to sell themselves to the foreign lands for the honor of eating lunch with the American ambassador" (record 202- 6/4/91).

In addition to victimhood, external threats, and internal threats, we also coded a residual category of *other threats* against Serbs that again highlights the Croats (included are Ustasha, Tudjman...) and diffuse sources (Serbs "everywhere threatened", Serbs have "enemies on all sides"), as in record 158 (6/30/93) where unspecified enemies want Serbia "left without Vojvodina, Kosovo and Metohija, Sandjak… They intend a horrible fate for us [Serbs]…" and in record 83 (6/10/93) where the West wants "[t]o take away Serbian lands from the Serbian people and in that way to simply destroy Serbs as a people." In addition to these territorial threats to Serbs and Serbia, Seselj points to demographic and

---

[1] Seselj's word play in Serbian referring to the Serbian Renewal Movement (SPO), a political party of Vuk Draskovic

cultural extinction. In Kosovo, according to record 160 (7/9/91), the "Shiptars" have a "thought-out, planned insistence on a huge natality, that is encouraged by their faith community, that is encouraged by the foreign political factors, that are involved in the Shiptar separatist rebellion." The Serbs in Croatia are being forcibly assimilated and/or physically eliminated: "In Croatia there is no survival for them, they will always be… maltreated, eventually killed and certainly robbed. All with the end goal for them to disappear as an ethnic group" (record 13-9/3/93) and "there's no survival for them in the Croatian state. There is, but under the condition to stop being Serbs very soon" (record 33- 6/1/94).

The threat of extinction gives Serbs a justification for extreme measures to protect themselves, according to Seselj: "If it happens accidently that the Croats start leading a genocide against the Serbs, where we cannot intervene with our chetniks, we will retaliate in Zagreb. If necessary, we have stated, we will attack Krshko. [nuclear power plant]" (record 241-5/31/91; see also 240-5/31/91 on "blowing up" Krshko). Record 120 (10/91) exemplifies the linkage in Seselj discourse between threat, victimization, violent retaliation and its justification: "We will defend Serbian lands as long as we breathe" against the "poisonous snake, that's the Croats… This is the third time that poisonous snake has headed for us, and for the third time bit us on the heart. Now we need to smash its head so it never bites anyone again… The Serbian revenge will come very soon, the Serbian revenge is already starting"; the Serbian "land will be defended with rivers of blood if necessary, and nobody will stop us, Serbs, from again creating our own state."

Violence in Serb relations with other ethnic groups *is justified* by Seselj because it is self defense, because the other group(s) started it, because it is targeted against armed aggressors and not the innocent, because it deters further victimization of Serbs. These are the most common reasons in the 24 mentions of "Serbs not responsible" messages. Typical mentions are "Who started ethnic cleansing first? The Croats! They first started to pacify Serbian territories with the sword and fire!... And every similar Serbian action was just an answer to what Tudjman already did!" (record 27-6/1/94; also record 21-1/26/94); "They [the Serbian government] didn't want it [the war]. They only wanted to stop a new genocide" (record 65- 6/1/94; also record 144-5/15/93); "In principle, there shouldn't be any quarrels between Serbs and Croats in Bosnia and Hercegovina, since our territories are ethnically clearly demarcated. But Croats want to grab that which is not theirs, which is in Serbian hands, which is on the territory of Serbian counties. And because of that, it came to severe clashes" (record 56-5/9/92). The Muslims/Izetbegovic are to blame for the Bosnian war. Instead of a cessation of hostilities, "…they [the Muslims] want war at all cost" (record 141- 7/31/92; also 239- 5/18/91).

Violence by Serbs is only retaliatory or defensive. In record 156, Seselj claims that "we don't want further bloodshed, but if we don't have any other choice, we will do it." On the shelling of cities like Zadar by Serb artillery, he says "the Croats first bombed the Serbian places of Benkovac and Obrovac. We are talking about pure revenge here…" (record 163-8/27/93) and "So, whose fault is it? They [the Croats] wanted a war, they have a war." (record 171-7/31/91). Seselj denies that Serbs target non-combatants: "The basic value of our nation, no matter how killed, harassed and humiliated it was throughout the history, was that the Serbs never bloodied their hands with the blood of innocent women, children and the old. The Serbian people never took revenge like this and the Serb people shall not take revenge in such a manner as to do to the Croats the same as the Croats did to them" (record 203- x/x/89); and "we are only aiming for those Croats who with guns in hand attack Serbian villages, we have not aimed for a single unarmed Croat" (record 215-6/1/91). Still he admits that civilian casualties are unavoidable but justified because of the extreme danger to Serbs. Here is one such mention in record 240 (5/31/91): "If the Croats hit the Serbs where we cannot efficiently defend them, we will hit them where Croats are the weakest, we will hit them in Zagreb. Naturally, some innocent civilian victims will fall too,

but what can you do. We have no other choice. We will not allow the Serbian throats to be unprotected before the… Ustasha[1] knife."

In summary, the content analysis of Seselj discourse to the Serbian people overflows with victimization and threat messages. The Serb people is besieged and under attack, as it was in the past, by foreign and internal enemies, and by the other peoples in the former Yugoslavia, especially the Croats. These enemies have created a crisis in which the very survival of the Serb people and its territory are at stake. Extreme danger to Serbs justifies Serb violence, which, according to Seselj, is defensive, retaliatory, and selective, unlike the violence of the adversaries.

Techniques of mass persuasion

An effective technique of persuasion is to glorify the in-group, here the Serbs, and to refer to adversaries with derogatory and demeaning labels and to characterize them with *negative stereotypes*. Another technique is *generalization*, i.e. labeling everyone in an ethnic category without making any internal distinctions. The Kosovo Albanians "are the most primitive people in Europe" (record 2-4/15/90); they are referred to routinely as "Shiptars", a derogatory label. The Muslims are characterized as rash, inexperienced, juvenile, performing "war bestialities" and "no one wants to live with them [Muslims]" (records 56-5/9/92, 77-4/22/93, 85-8/5/93). The Slovenes "committed such bestialities, torture, usage of inhumane ammunition, bestialities against unarmed people..." (record 139-7/8/91). These and other people in the former Yugoslavia (Montenegrins, Macedonians, Croats) are frequently labeled as belonging to "artificial" nations which are of inferior rank to "historical, authentic" nations such as the Serbs, and do no have a right to their own independent state. But it is for the Croats that Seselj voices the most frequent abuse and most negative stereotypes.

The Croats, often referred to simply as "Ustasha", performed "animalistic acts" of genocide, mass murder, torture and expulsion (record 27-6/1/94); they are a "poisonous snake" (record 120-x/10/91); they tortured innocent civilians, women, and children and old people (record 197-6/4/91; also record 1-3/31/90); they are a "genocidal" nation (record 230-3/25/91, also record 201-6/4/91; 105-12/13/93), the "dregs of European society" (record 249-1/14/92), "cowards" (record 197-6/4/91). Croats are "the last trash of Europe" (record 122- 5/4/91); "Croats have never been honest with any one" (record 206-6/7/91) Much of this rhetoric serves to dehumanize the Croats, which prepares a moral justification of collective violence against an adversary. At one time Seselj stated sarcastically that "[t]here are probably some good ones [Croats] somewhere, but I never met one in my life. So I don't know where those are" (record 192-4/8/92). No Croats can ever be trusted: "those [Croats] that pretend that they are good, that they are our friends, they always bring the worst destruction upon us, starting from Tito onwards" (record 192-4/8/92). The general tenor of Seselj's opinion of the non-Serb ethnic groups in Yugoslavia is captured in his statement that "If the Shiptars are the most primitive people in Europe, the Croats are the most rotten… The Slovenes are small-time peddlers and we hope that they will leave Yugoslavia as soon as possible so that we can simply get them off our backs" (record 206-6/7/91). He also said that "the Croats as people don't interest me at all, that is they interest me as much as Bantu blacks!" (record 225- 1/10/91).

---

[1] "Ustasha" refers to the World War II fascist Croat regime led by Ante Pavelic whose goal was an independent Croat state, and which was responsible for atrocities and war crimes, especially against Serbs. Ustasha was the name of a militia modeled on the Nazi SS that committed many of the atrocities. When Tudjman revived Croat nationalism in the late 1980's with the founding of the HDZ party (Croat Democratic Union), the movement adopted symbols and slogans of Croat nationalism which to the Serbs signaled a rebirth of the Ustasha regime and the persecution of Serbs.

By contrast to the 40 records that have negative stereotypes and labels of non-Serb groups – and it should be noted that a record might and often does have multiple instances of stereotyping which were not tallied separately - there are 29 records that *glorify the Serbs*. Most of these Seselj texts glorify the courage, fighting spirit, readiness to sacrifice, and other martial virtues of the Serbs. These texts often include invidious comparisons with the lack of such martial virtues in other peoples, as in record 1 where "Serbs are a powerful and historical people" but the Slovenes, Albanians and Croats are not, and the Croats were never placed into elite units by the Austrians because they were "bad soldiers." In record 10 (1/30/94) Seselj proclaims that "…in order to win against the Serbs… all our enemies would have to send at least a million soldiers, from which an enormous number would come back in tin coffins." In record 56 (5/9/92), he says that "… The fact that the Serbs are winning in that [Bosnian] war… that's I guess due to the Serbian courage, Serbian tradition…" and in record 80 (5/6/93), "…on land, the Serbian army is simply invincible." History and sacrifice are brought into some glorification statements, as in record 115 (8/4/90): "…the Serbian people was at war for that [Kosovo and Metohija] land several times throughout history, spilled rivers of blood and a sea of human lives, and we, the Serbs of today, will … spill new rivers of blood if necessary, but Kosovo and Metohija will stay Serbian land!" As the quotes show, Seselj's "Serb glorification" discourse praises and promotes aggression and violence in Serb relations with other ethnic groups and peoples.

Falsehood: ethnic cleansing

Ethnic cleansing is "the use of force or intimidation to remove people of a certain ethnic or religious group from an area…it was the central fact of the wars in Yugoslavia's destruction."[1] According to Aleksa Djilas[2] "The Croatian-Serbian war was brutal. The civilian population suffered greatly. Prisoners of war were tortured and murdered. Both sides engaged in "ethnic cleansing" and there were over half a million refugees… (in Bosnia) both the Serb and the Croatian offensives were brutal, although the Serb advances were far more extensive. Murder and rape were common and religious and cultural monuments were systematically destroyed. These crimes were tolerated and perhaps even encouraged by the respective military authorities as part of an overall strategy of intimidation and expulsion." UNHCR reported 2.2 million refugees and internally displaced persons from Bosnia alone.[3]

With thousands of victims and witnesses providing accounts, there is no mystery about how ethnic cleansing occurred. In Bosnia, Serb ethnic cleansing followed a definite pattern [4]. Serb paramilitaries, with the assistance of the JNA and local Serb militia, seized control of an area. Serb residents were told in advance to leave the area before the violence started. The paramilitaries terrorized the non-Serbs with some random killings, rape, looting, and the destruction of homes. Under a newly formed Serb authority, non-Serbs were rounded up, detained, confined and expelled amid more violence. They were forced to sign documents relinquishing their property rights to their homes before deportation and expulsion. Tadeusz Mazowiecki, the Special Rapporteur of the UN Commission on Human Rights, summarized the displacement of population as follows:[5]

"Paragraph 40. Displacement of populations has been effected by three means: involuntary population exchanges between municipalities under the control of opposing belligerents; private arrangements for emigration to the territory of another of the belligerents; and least commonly, the forced and immediate

---

[1] Roger Cohen in Roy Gutman and David Rieff, eds. Crimes of War, 1999, p.136
[2] "Fear Thy Neighbor" 1995, p.95-96, 99-100
[3] United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, The State of the World's Refugees, 1995
[4] United Nations. Final Report of the UN Commission of Experts, S/1994/674. 27 May 1994, Annex IV, paragraphs 83-118
[5] United Nations, "Situation of Human Rights in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia" 21 February 1994

expulsion of communities from their place of residence. These forms of displacement are associated with the phenomenon of "ethnic cleansing."…

Paragraph 41. The various forms of displacement are often accompanied by extortion and theft. Thus, for instance, displaced persons leaving Serb held territory are routinely subject to strip searches at the frontier and to confiscation of all valuables. One recent such incident occurred 28 November 1993 when Bosnian Serb forces plundered the possessions of Muslims leaving the village of Siprage"

Those who remained were terrorized. Paragraph 11 gives an example: "Muslim residents of the village of Vrbanja, five kilometers from Banja Luka, have been the victims of frequent shootings, assaults, threats and robberies. A recent incident, at 9 a.m. on 29 December 1993, involved the murder of a married couple and their neighbor and the theft of property. The police was informed of the incident at 9:30 a.m. but did not arrive until 5 p.m. when they spent just ten minutes on the scene. During the funeral on 30 December mourners were detained and assaulted by men in military uniforms."

Seselj developed a sanitized discourse about ethnic cleansing he termed "a civilized exchange of population." He denied its violent character, and claimed it was consensual, reciprocal, even beneficial to the victims. It is a falsehood.

In an interview with Tanjug (record 189-12/6/93), referring to the Serb Radical Party involvement in Vojvodina ethnic cleansing, he said "The Serbian Radical Party opted for a civilized exchange of population with Croatia… They [the Croats] received more valuable houses than the ones they used to have here. There was no violence involved."

Referring to Western Slavonia in an interview on Radio Stara Pazova (record 251-11/9/93), he said "a civilized exchange of population happened."

In an interview with Globus, a Zagreb based newspaper, on 7 May 1993 (record 191-5/7/93), he said "Zvornik is now filled with Serbs. At one time, many Muslims used to live there. There has been a spontaneous exchange of population."

In an interview on Radio Odzaci (record 187-11/24/93), referring to Central Bosnia, Zvornik, Srebrenica, and other towns, he said "A typical exchange of population occurred here. The Serbs from Central Bosnia inhabited the places along the Drina today, while the Muslims from that area withdrew mostly towards Tuzla."

In fact, when he attempted to morally justify ethnic cleansing by making international comparisons, he presented it in a similarly sanitized manner, which is a historical falsehood. For instance, in an interview at Studio B 8 April 1992 (record 192- 4/8/92), he said "After all, there was an exchange of populations during a demarcation between India and Pakistan. It happens in other places in the world as well. Why? If so much hate appears between two peoples that it renders their normal co-habitation impossible … then the populations should be nicely exchanged." What Seselj misrepresents is that this "nice" exchange of population was an enormous human tragedy that cost an estimated one million lives due to communal violence, that it was coercive and not an "exchange" at all, and that two hundred million Muslims cohabit with eight hundred million Hindus and members of other faiths in India despite his claim that "normal

cohabitation is impossible."[1]

Seselj's discourse on ethnic cleansing is not only contradicted by eyewitness and documentary evidence, but by many statements he himself made on numerous occasions when he accused the Milosevic regime, Ministry of Interior troops, Arkan's paramiliaries, Red Berets, White Ants, the police in Serbia, special units of the State Security Services, and others linked to the regime, of robbing and looting during and after ethnic cleansing. On Radio Ponos Belgrade (record 252- 4/21/92), he said "What were the biggest crimes committed by the Serbs? There occurred enormous looting which was organized under the auspices of the socialist regime in Belgrade. Paramilitary and para-police formations under their control systematically looted in the areas of the Republika Srpska and the Republika Srpska Krajina, took out looted goods in trailers, and sold them in Serbia." On Radio Valjevo (record 253-11/21/93), he said "War booty was pulled out on trailer trucks, convoys of trailer trucks…everything that was looted was looted with the consent of the authorities, in agreement with the authorities, or directly organized by the authorities…only a person with a permission of the MUP can drive a trailer truck full of stolen goods through those checkpoints." Other instances of Seselj describing looting and taking war booty by Serbs in graphic detail were on Radio Rosaverac [16 Nov 1993, V41/73], Radio Zrenjanin [27 Nov 1993, V42/260], Radio Ruma [20 Nov 1993, V41/122], and Radio Temerin [11 Nov 1993, V42/94]. He denied that his "volunteers" took part in the looting: at most they carried back "what could be put in one's pockets, or maybe carry in both hands" (record 253- 11/21/93). Be that as it may, it is a deliberate falsehood to speak of a consensual, voluntary exchange of population in one context and describe how these people were robbed on a huge, organized scale in another context – during the election campaign of November-December 1993 when he was an opponent of the Milosevic regime.

Misuse of history and fabrication

In his efforts to persuade the Serbian public about the validity of his territorial demands and claims for greater Serbia, Seselj uses partial, biased and misleading, and sometimes fabricated, information on history. Four instances will be briefly examined.

1. He repeatedly claims that Dubrovnik is part of Serbia because it was and is Serb. For instance, in record 203 (x/x/89), he says "Dubrovnik was never a Croatian city." In an interview (record 254-5/24/91) he replied to a skeptical questioner who said that Dubrovnik always used to have its autonomy as follows: "Yes, but it never was Croat. Its population is ethnically Serbian. That is a mixture of the Serbian people with the Romans they found there. They never had any contacts with the Croats." Without going into the long and rich history of Dubrovnik spanning Roman, Byzantine, Venitian, and Austrian history, and skipping over Napoleon and lesser episodes, it should be pointed out that the 1991 Yugoslav census reported the population as 82.4% Croat, 6.7 % Serb, 4% Muslim, and some others[2]. Since the 1921 and 1931 censuses did not distinguish Serbs and Croats, there is no Serb/Croat breakdown available for that period. Earlier enumerations of the Dubrovnik population listed their religion, but not ethnicity. For instance, in 1857, there were 98.3% Catholics, 1% Orthodox, and 0.8% Jews. According to an authority on the Dubrovnik population, "We cannot speak about an ethnic structure because we don't know the numeric ethnic composition of Catholics"[3]. This is the honest opinion of professional historians.

2. The second item of misinformation is the repeatedly voiced assertion by Seselj that 360,000 Albanians illegally migrated to Kosovo from Albania after the start of World War II in the Balkans when Kosovo

---

[1] Michael Mann, The Dark Side of Democracy, 2005, pp.485-86
[2] Yugoslav Survey no.1, 1992
[3] Stjepan Krivosic, Stanonistvo Dubrovnika i demografske promjene u proslosti, 1990, Dubrovnik

came under Albanian/Italian rule (which Seselj gives as a justification for the expulsion of Kosovo Albanians from Kosovo, and which will be further documented and discussed below in the section on expulsion). According to the historian Noel Malcolm[1] "Serbian nationalists account for this rise (of the Albanian population from 500,000 in 1948 to 900,000 in 1971) by saying that huge numbers of Albanians flooded Kosovo from Albania during the war; the figure 100,000 has been claimed for 1941-1945, and a petition of Kosovo Serbs in 1985 claimed that 260,000 had entered Kosovo since 1941 (mainly between 1941 and 1948). These figures are however pure fantasy. No evidence of any such mass migration can be found in any of the documents of the occupying powers. It is likely that a few thousand people did move from Albania to Kosovo: some of these were officials brought in by the Italians or Germans, and some were Kosovars who had moved to Albania during the inter-war years."

3. Seselj invokes historic events and treaties to justify current territorial and border demands and claims on behalf of Serbs against non-Serbs. An oft cited such event by Seselj is the 1915 Treaty of London. For instance he stated (record 207-11/24/91) "about the status of Osijek…what does it mean, the Serbs are a minority (in Osijek)? We don't care if they are a minority. That territory should be part of a Serbian state, even according to the London Treaty of 1915" (see also record 208- 12/6/90). According to Ivo Lederer[2], the Treaty of London was a secret treaty between Britain, France, Russia and Italy promising Italy huge territorial gains if it entered the war on their side – the Trentino, South Tyrol, Trieste, Istrian peninsula, parts of Dalmatia and Dalmatian islands, a strategic Albanian port, the Dodecanese archipelago, and more. Parts of Albania were reserved for Serbia, Montenegro and Greece. Croat, Serbian and Montenegrin post-war claims were a minor part of the treaty, i.e. a one paragraph note attached to article 5, and dealt with some ports and towns on segments of the Adriatic coast. Osijek had nothing to do with it. The definite borders of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes were established at the Paris Peace Conference during 1919 -1920 and in some subsequent treaties, and superseded the provisions of the London Treaty[3].

4. Seselj repeatedly claims that Macedonia is an artificial nation that has no right to an independent state, that Serbs live there and thus it should belong to Serbia, or, alternatively, should be divided up between Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia and Albania. In record 153 (5/18/93), he claims that "The Macedonian nation does not exist. That too was artificially created by the communists." In record 208 (12/6/90), he says "Macedonia, that is Southern Serbia, was part of Serbia before the creation of Yugoslavia and will remain a part of Serbia even after Yugoslavia's existence ceases" (also record 116-8/4/90 and 169- 7/31/93). In record 197 (6/4/91), he claims: "On the territory of Macedonia there live a majority of Serbs. They still cannot proclaim themselves members of the Serbian nation." In record 110 (8/4/90) there is the following exchange with an interviewer, who asks Seselj what he considers the Macedonians to be; Seselj responds "Mostly Serbs live there. And there are Bulgarians too." … "There isn't such a [Macedonian] nation anywhere in the world." The interviewer repeats that Seselj considers that to be an artificially formed nation, and Seselj adds: "Yes. As artificial as the Muslim one, after all, as artificial as the Montenegrin one. Those are all invented nations, which we will abolish. " He also disputes the validity of the 8 September 1991 referendum on Macedonian independence on account of the phrasing of the question put to the voters (record 106-12/14/93 and 102- 11/14/93). He advocates division of Macedonia between Serbia, Greece, Bulgaria and Albania (record 106-12/14/93, record 62-7/16/94, and 153- 5/18/93), even though it is a "traditionally Serb land…because it's not in our interest to have an additional 700,000 Albanians and 700,000 Bulgarians live within our borders" (record 62- 7/16/94). Note that this demographic statement is in direct contradiction with the earlier (record 197-6/4/91) one about there being a majority of Serbs in Macedonia, since the 1.4 Albanians and Bulgarians constitute 70% of the 2 million

[1] Kosovo, a Short History, 1998, pp.312-3
[2] Yugoslavia at the Paris Peace Conference, 1963
[3] Monnesland, Land ohne Wiederkehr, 1997, pp. 204-209

people in Macedonia!

The claim that the Macedonians are an "artificial nation" and therefore have no right to an independent state, applied by Seselj to other nations as well (as in the above quotes), rests on an arbitrary categorization and labeling of nations, rejected by prominent historians, that serve to justify Serb territorial claims (examined in a section below). Whatever Seselj may assert, the Macedonians, scholars, the international community, and others reject the "artificial" label. In the 1991 census, 66.5% classified themselves as Macedonian (compared to 2.2% as Serbs), and on November 21, 1991, the Macedonian parliament enacted a constitution under which the Republic declared itself a sovereign and independent state, which was admitted to the United Nations on April 7, 1993. `

In the ideological and nationalist battles on Balkan history, the fate of thousand of lives hinges on the misuse of history for inflaming nationalist passions. Seselj actually goes beyond words to try to change history. In record 110 (8/4/90), he said: "A 46-person delegation of the Serbian Chetnik Movement was at the famous Serbian monastery of Prohor Pcinjski yesterday. There we tore down what represented a great heresy, we tore down the pagan plaques that were attached to the walls of the temple and that were witness to an alleged formation of the first parliament of that artificial Macedonian state and an artificial Macedonian nation. " What the Chetniks "tore down" were plaques commemorating the 2 August 1944 meeting at the monastery of the Anti-Fascist Assembly of the People's Liberation of Macedonia. The Assembly decided to set up a Macedonian Republic within the future Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and adopted as the official language of the People's Republic of Macedonia a new standard language based on Macedonian vernacular speech[1]. This meeting was a peak event in the history of Macedonian nationalism that Seselj denied by removing the commemorative plaques. There is no better example of the intimate link between words and violent actions in the falsification of history.

Seselj's arbitrary, distorted and idiosyncratic misuse of history justifies and legitimizes aggressive and coercive policies against other ethnic groups to the Serbian public. It reinforces the "Serb victimization" and "Serbs are threatened and surrounded by enemies" crisis frame.

Threats, warnings, advocacy of violence, expulsion, revenge and retribution, against adversaries

In the 242 records we content analyzed, we found 45 warnings and threats against non-Serbs, 47 statements advocating either violent actions or actions that had a high probability of resulting in violence, 47 statements on population expulsion (frequently labeled as "relocation" and "exchange"), 21 records with "revenge and retribution" themes, and 32 statements that express a "no compromise" position in Serb to non-Serb relations. Such discourse promotes a "crisis" frame in ethnic relations which justifies collective violence in lieu of negotiations and non-violent conflict management.

Of the *threats and warnings* issued by Seselj, 12 are against Kosovo Albanians, 14 against Croats, 12 against Muslims, and a few others against "foreign intervention", UNPROFOR, Slovenes, and others. Some frequent threats against adversaries is that "rivers of blood will flow", Albanians will be "suffocated" and "expulsed", Croatia will be "amputated", Muslims will be "erased." Here are some examples. "if it [Croatia] insists on war, we'll teach it such a lesson that it won't even think about it for the next 500 years" (record 41-1/16/92); Bosnia-Hercegovina will "bathe in rivers of blood" if it tries to become independent (record 96-2/20/92); Serb Chetniks have "a program to lead to the suffocation of that Albanian separatist rebellion" (record 111- 8/4/90), and Albanians will see "their houses in flames"

---

[1] Keston News Service, June 19, 2001

(record 84-6/10/93); if it comes to foreign intervention "we [Serbs] will erase the Muslims and Croats" we could "organize terrorist attacks in Croatia" (record 162-8/27/93), and "if even one Serbian head falls, we will come in the middle of Ustasha Zagreb to get Tudjman'" (record 221-9/23/90); "bomb Ljubljana" if conditions are not met for the withdrawal of the JNA (record 139-7/8/91).

Seselj is proud of his advocacy of violence. In record 213 (6/1/91) he boasts "… both Vuk Draskovic and I spilled human blood, got our hands bloody. Except the difference is that Vuk Draskovic spilled Serbian blood in Belgrade, and I was spilling Croatian Ustasha blood in Serbian Slavonia." Advocacy of *violent actions* is similar to violent threats, and sometimes difficult to distinguish from threat. "Amputate Croatia" is a threat before the start of the Croatia war, but becomes a war goal after its start. "Rivers of blood will flow" is a threat before massacres occur, but advocacy when ethnic cleansing and massacres are taking place. In addition to ten statements on the "amputation of Croatia" and nineteen on the "expulsion of Albanians from Kosovo" (which will be commented on further below), according to Seselj, a violent menu awaits the adversaries of Serbs: "rivers of blood" will flow, people will be "erased," "no mercy" will be shown, and the Serbian people "must win at all cost." In record 131(12/31/93), the Serb Radical Party protects the Serbian territories "whatever the cost", as Serbs did against the Turks from 1804 to 1878 which resulted in one million dead. In record 110 (8/4/90), Muslims, Macedonians and Montenegrins are termed invented artificial nations, "which we [Serbian Chetnik Movement] shall abolish." In record 232 (3/18/91), Seselj says "…Yugoslavia will cease to exist and its territory will most likely boil down to three state units: Greater Serbia, a small Slovenia, and an even smaller Croatia. We will perform an amputation of Croatia…" At times he is specific on weapons such as missiles that "can reach Italy" (record 148-5/18/93) and Thompson machine guns, which when they hit "a Croat in the forehead, both eyes pop out of the Croat's head, and when a round from a machine gun cuts him across the neck, it literally cuts off his head. Those are very good guns" (record 215-6/1/91). He considers retaliating against Croats by attacking the nuclear power station in Krshko "…fly up in an airplane and bomb Krshko" [near Zagreb, currently in Slovenia] (record 241-5/31/91) and "This is the last lesson to the Croatian people… we shall not stop before Zagreb!" (record 185- 5/4/91). On another occasion he said that "We (the Serbian Chetnik movement) have already deployed several Chetnik groups in Zagreb and other towns, which are trained for sabotage and terrorist operations" (record 254-5/24/91). Some Seselj threats are against multiple targets using a variety of means, which follows from his belief that Serbs are surrounded by enemies on all sides. In record 148 (5/18/93), he says "if the Serbian people were attacked from outside, we will respond fiercely to with all means. We have powerful weapons available with which we could endanger all neighboring countries. And we will attack all neighboring countries that participate in aggression or let the interventionist forces uses their bases. … Our rockets can't reach America, but they can reach Italy. And in that case, if Italy is on the side of the aggressor and helps the aggressor, it needs to beware. We will in that case be in a desperate position, we won't have anything to lose. And we will fight to the end for freedom, we will never capitulate. … Several thousand Serbian volunteers listen to me. And if it comes to a foreign intervention, it will be a horrible war. In a war, political control is lost. The army will listen to the person who is the bravest and most decisive in a given moment." In addition to his volunteers, there are 16 SS-22 rockets (that can be armed with conventional explosives or nuclear warheads) and Russian volunteers who fought in Afghanistan, all of whom will attack UNPROFOR forces, the Muslims, the Croats. "…if the Americans attack, then all restraints stop. Then we will lead a total war without mercy. … We will erase everything on the territory of Bosnia and Hercegovina. I will personally command the offensive on Sarajevo…"

All this amounts to a lot of violence and blood. Most of it is embedded in a "no responsibility/they started it/ the Serbs are merely retaliating" discourse which was analyzed above. That discourse is supplemented by Seselj with "*revenge and retribution*" rationales, of which the content analysis identified 21 instances.

Most of these take the form of "we will no longer forgive and forget" (records 239-5/18/91, 198-6/4/91, 137-7/8/91, 244- 5/31/91) or an appeal to the right to retaliate, also called by Seselj the principle of retribution (records 51- 4/2/91, 67-6/1/94, 87- 7/29/94, 182-4/1/92, 184-8/27/91 , 193- 6/12/92), which he asserts is justified by international law. In record 67 (6/1/94), he explains his views fully: "If one state treats a particular national minority in a certain way that is non-civilized, outside of the legal norms, then international public law justifies a similar treatment of the neighbor state to the national minority of the previous state. Besides, it's common in the world, to create international agreements in which the question of national minorities is treated reciprocally. … If Tudjman already expelled 300,000 Serbs from Croatia, and if they already came to Serbia, what is there more natural than to demand that Croats leave here [Serbia] as well." In record 195 (4/8/92), he says, "Concerning the Croat ethnic minority, the Croats already did what they did and continue to do it every day. It is up to us to respond based on the legal principal of retribution, i.e. revenge. What they do to us, that we do to them. It is done like that all around the world." Sometimes Seselj puts it more directly: on being asked about Serbs shelling Croatian cities, he answers "But, the Croats first bombed the Serbian places of Benkovac and Obrovac. We are talking about pure revenge here. The destruction was on both sides." (record163-8/27/93). With these arguments and rationalizations to the Serb public, Seselj presents Serb violence and coercion in ethnic relations as legally and morally justified: we didn't start it, we act in self defense, we have a right to retaliate, it has always been thus in history.

This same intellectual and moral apparatus of justification is invoked by Seselj when he advocates *expulsion of populations* in ethnic relations. It was already pointed out above that Seselj uses a deceptive, false terminology in his discourse on expulsion, which he refers to, when coming from the Serb side, as an exchange, or civilized exchange, or spontaneous exchange, or relocation of population which he claims is voluntary, non-coercive, reciprocal, mutually beneficial transaction (like a voluntary house swap between two households each of whom will end up in the ethnic neighborhood they prefer to live in). This benign rhetoric is contradicted by the parallel retaliation and retribution discourse for population expulsion, which implies that population movement is coerced and a costly collective punishment for a prior crime, hence not voluntary and beneficial.

 In the 242 records, there are 19 statements on expulsion of Albanians from Kosovo, 12 "exchanges" between Serbs and Croats, three of Muslims and Serbs, four expulsions of Croats from Serbia, and some others. On the *Croats in Serbia*, Seselj wants the Croats in Belgrade to leave for Croatia: "what are the Croats here in Belgrade waiting for?" (record 182-4/1/92, also 54-4/16/92), and "…as many people as Tudjman expelled from Zagreb, that many Croats we should expel from Belgrade" (record 182-4/1/92) according to the principle of retaliation or retribution. Expulsion, he argues, is justified because other states did it: "The Germans were expelled from Poland; the Germans were expelled from Czechoslovakia, from the area of Sudet. The Germans were expelled from Yugoslavia [after WWII]. Why not the Croats then [from Serbia]?" (record 192- 4/8/92). Elsewhere he invokes the "principle of retribution" when he calls for all Croats to move out of Serbia (record 193-6/12/92). At the same time, he asserts that the Serbian Radical Party was opposed to and did not participate in ethnic cleansing, but was in favor of a "civilized exchange of population" (records 90-1/26/94 and 91-1/16/92). On several occasions Seselj defends coercive expulsion of the Croats on security grounds: "…those Croats, whose expulsion we insisted on, they were sent to inhabit Srem by Pavelic during World War II, so that they would be the pre-guards of the independent state of Croatia. And they are the worst Ustashas from West Hercegovina!" (record 68- 6/1/94). In other words, expulsion in this case is a security and subversion matter. On another occasion he stated "They [the Croats] are roaming around Serbia doing everything they can to make the Serb position here difficult. They cooperate with Tudjman and act as his agents…" (record 255-4/21/92).

In a comprehensive statement he gave several reasons for expulsion: "I would expel Croats on several grounds. Firstly because they are utterly disloyal inhabitants of Serbia, the vast majority of them are members of HDZ, or collaborate with the party, and they do their utmost to internally destabilize Serbia. They are close collaborators of Ustasha. Second, we shall retaliate because Tudjman expelled 160,000 Serbs. In view of the latter what are the Croats in Serbia waiting for? Thirdly, the largest number of Croats living today in Serbia were settled by Ante Pavelic…we must foil those fifth columnists. We would do that in an utterly humane way. We would give them addresses of Serbs driven out of Croatia."[1]

If the fate of Croats in Serbia is expulsion, that of *Croatia* is "*amputation*," referred to in ten records (64, 140, 208, 226, 227, 229, 230, 232, 233, 246) starting on12/6/90, and throughout 1991, and in several other Seselj texts. Amputation of a state is a violence filled metaphor joining extreme pain, bloodiness, coercion and ending as a cripple. It should be noted that Seselj advocates the amputation of Croatia already on December 6, 1990 [record 208] and December 27 [record 236], which is three months before armed fights broke out in Pakrac (March 1-2, 1991) and in Plitvice (March 31, 1991). Seselj wants Croatia amputated if it stands in the way of realizing his goal of a Greater Serbia. In record 233 (3/21/91), he states in an interview: "A renewal of an independent and free Serbian state on the Balkans, which will encompass all Serbian lands, which means, other than the present-day narrow Serbian federal unit, also Serbian Macedonia, Serbian Montenegro, Serbian Bosnia, Serbian Hercegovina, Serbian Dubrovnik, Serbian Dalmatia, Serbian Kordun, Serbian Lika, Serbian Banija, Serbian Slavonia, and Serbian Baranja." The interviewer then asks: "And what if that was the choice of the entire Serbian people, would it be able to be accomplished only with political means?" Seselj: "We will try politically. Should it not be possible we will try some other means…a clever and smart head in Belgrade will perform an amputation of Croatia."

Corresponding to the amputation of Croatia is the enlargement of Serbia to Greater Serbia. In several statements Seselj specifies that the line of "amputation" on the Croat body is Karlobag –Ogulin – Karlovac – Virovitica (or K-O-K-V, that leaves only a narrow sliver of land between Greater Serbia and the Slovenian border), beyond which will be either a shrunken Croatia or Italy. He stated "I do not see any future for Yugoslavia… According to the first variant, it is possible that Yugoslavia will break away into three states. Greater Serbia, small Slovenia and even smaller Croatia. [see also records 198-6/4/91, 232-3/18/91, and 243-5/31/91] According to the second variant, should the Croats not like the first one, we, the Serbs, will reach an agreement with Italians, and in turn establish the Serbian-Italian border along the line [K-O-K-V], as it is just to return to the Italians what is theirs. We can talk to the Hungarians and Austrians as well…" (record 210-6/1/91, also 232-3/18/91, 243-5/31/91). On another occasion he stated "We do not want any compromises!!! We want the Serb border of [K-O-K-V], and Italians on the other side, with whom we will agree on a common border." (record 205- 6/7/91).

Seselj justifies territorial acquisition by Serbia on the grounds that it is a legitimate restoration of territories that once belonged to Serbia but were taken from it by the Communists. In record 116 (1/4/90) he claims that "Yugoslavia was the legal heir of the Kingdom of Serbia", and not the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes founded in 1918 and recognized in the Paris Peace Treaty after World War One. Tito and the Communists purposely and illegitimately removed huge chunks of the "Kingdom of Serbia". In record 217 (4/30/90) he explains his position: "…from the very beginning, Communist Yugoslavia was built on anti-Serb foundations. The Serbian lands were divided. From the Serbian lands they [the Communists] created six federal units. From the Serbian national being [nation], three new nations were invented: Montenegro, Macedonia, and the Muslims, with the exclusive role that Serbs, according to official statistics, cannot be a majority in the Yugoslav population. All of this was a perfidious communist

---

[1] Osmica, 22 April 1992

conspiracy." [see also record 223-3/21/91]. What remained after the dismemberment of Serbian territory and the Serbian nation was a "present day shortened federal unit" [record 109, July 17,1990], a "present day narrow Serbian federal unit" [record 233, March 21, 1991; see also record 234- 4/1/91]], a "shrunken Serbia" [record 185, May 4, 1991]. Seselj's goal is restoration of Greater Serbia. The historian Monnesland[1] describes the actual process and rationales for the demarcation of internal borders, which is at considerable variance with Seselj's assertions and accusations.

To handle the differences and conflicts between Serbs and Croats Seselj advocates either shrinking Croatia into a mini-state or abolishing it altogether. In dealing with the *Kosovo Albanians*, he advocates massive *population expulsion*, destroying Albanian institutions, coercive Serb rule, and populating Kosovo with Serb migrants and institutions. Throughout the spring and summer of 1990, when Kosovo is under a state of emergency and in a deep constitutional crisis, Seselj advocates population expulsion (record 3, April 15; record 216, April 30; record 220, July 4), and he will consistently continue advocating it over the years covered by the content analysis (record 25, January 26, 1994). The future of Kosovo and Metohija [hereafter Kosovo for short] is a major preoccupation of Seselj who discusses this topic in 22 records of the content analysis. In one comprehensive and typical statement he answers an interviewer's question about how Kosovo is to be liberated: "urgently revoke Kosovo's autonomy, declare martial law for 10 years, suspend all organs of government, discontinue all help for the Albanian population on the territory of Kosovo and Metohija, close all factories that work irrationally, open coal mines, build thermal plants, then through economic means force the Albanians to turn to serious manufacturing or leave their jobs, deal with dying from hunger - if they're not going to work… I suggest that in a belt of about 50 kilometers along the Albanian border, all the Albanian population needs to be moved out and into other parts of Yugoslavia, along with getting monetary compensation, that this most fertile land of all of Europe be given in ownership to the army, that it be systematically inhabited by a Slavic population, that all 360,000 Albanian emigrants who moved from Albania to Yugoslavia from 6 April 1941 to date, as well as members of their families, be handed over to the UN High Committee for Refugees…" (record 3-4/15/90). On other occasions he adds to the list: in record 119 (11/14/90), he wants 3 million Serb immigrants in the world to invest by buying land in Kosovo, attracted by one hectare of free land for growing wheat, which will transform Kosovo into a European bread basket; in record 209 (12/6/90), "closing of the University in the Shiptar language" as well as stopping state financing or support for cultural institutions and changing the ethnic makeup of Kosovo by relocating police academies, military and state institutions from Serbia together with several tens of thousands of officers, NCOs, police officers and state officials (who are Serbs).

These are extremely harsh and coercive measures, for which Seselj keeps repeating misleading arguments. He claims that most of the current Albanian population is illegal immigrants or the descendants of 360,000 immigrants into Kosovo from Albania after 6 April 1941 (when in World War II Kosovo came under Albanian/Italian rule), for which there is no record and has been discussed above in the section on misinformation and falsehood. He also claims that since all but ten thousand Albanians in Kosovo boycotted the 1991 census (as an act of non-violent civil disobedience protesting the end of Kosovo autonomy within Serbia and Serb repression), the 1.5 million Kosovo Albanians are not citizens of Serbia but immigrants from Albania. Moreover, since Albania has had a regime change and is no longer totalitarian but democratic, "refugees" from Albania should return there. For instance, Seselj argued "In our country we do have a Shiptar national minority…Those 10,000 Shiptars will have the best possible life conditions. Of course, when I speak of a Shiptar minority, I refer only to those who responded to last year's population census. However, the one and a half million Albanian immigrants who boycotted the

---

[1] Land ohne Wiederkehr, 1997, pp.259-262

census, who are not our citizens, should return to their country now that Albania has become democratic" (record 256- 4/21/92). And on another occasion: "The registration [census] of the population showed that there are 10,000 Albanians, you may laugh as much as you want. The rest are immigrants from Albania. And since Albania had become a democratic state, there is no reason for them to remain immigrants. Let all those who entered Serbia, that is Yugoslavia, since 6 April 1941 nicely go back to their houses in Albania" (record 195-4/8/92). Misinformation and misleading arguments are a cover used by Seselj to persuade the Serb public that coercive and violent means of dealing with other ethnic groups are justified.

Hate speech and public incitement against minorities in Serbia was a special worry for Tadeusz Mazowiecki, the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights. In the sixth periodic report, he wrote "A primary area of concern for the Special Rapporteur is the incitement to national and religious hatred in public life and in the media. In public life, leading political figures make inflammatory and threatening statements against minority groups on a regular basis. On several occasions, for instance, the leader of the Serbian Radical Party, Mr. Vojislav Seselj, has suggested that the Hungarian and Albanian minorities should be expelled from Vojvodina and Kosovo, respectively. The incitement to hatred by political leaders was particularly widespread during the campaigns leading to the parliamentary elections of 1993. The use of demagogic methods in order to intensify and manipulate irrational fears and prejudices among the electorate appears to be an important means of gaining votes."[1] Seselj claimed in a radio interview on October 26, 1993 that "We advocated an exchange of population there (towns in Vojvodina) …that they (Croats and Serbs) exchange homes and apartments…There was no coercion…"[2] Yet the Special Rapporteur stated in the same sixth periodic report, in paragraph 148: "Despite certain improvements in the situation in Vojvodina, the Special Rapporteur continues to receive reports of serious discriminatory treatment and other violations against members of certain ethnic and religious groups. In particular, the killing of a Croatian family from Ocmokic on 30 July 1993 in Kukujevci instigated the exodus of the majority of remaining Croats. Before the arrest on 15 November by the Serbian authorities of those suspected of this crime, and of the killing of a Croat from a village near Sid, some fifty Croatian families had left for their safety. Those arrested were all members of the Serbian Radical Party. There are increased reports of attacks against homes belonging to minority groups involving arson and the use of explosives."

Seselj's advocacy and justification of coercion and violence is coupled with *rejection of non-violent conflict management and of compromise*, of which the content analysis found 32 of instances. He advocates no compromise, as on July 17, 1990 [record 109], before armed engagements started and while complex negotiations on a non-violent resolution of the Yugoslav constitutional crisis were underway: "We, the Serbian Chetniks, will not enter into any compromises with anyone at the price of sacrificing certain Serbian national interests...a Serbia will not consist of present day shortened federal unit, but will also include Serbian Macedonia, Serbian Dalmatia, Serbian Lika, Serbian Kordun, Serbian Baranja, Serbian Slavonija, Serbian Banija…"

Here are other examples of no compromise on Serb-Muslim issues: "Well, it's time for Serbs not to offer any concessions any more. If Muslims still want peace, then the only way to achieve peace is on the front lines, the fronts achieved today" (record 9- 1/30/94); "There's not going to be peace until the Muslims are definitively defeated…" (record 60- 7/6/94); "…any sovereignty of Bosnia-Hercegovina is out of the question. The Muslims should understand that as soon as possible…" (record 238-4/26/91). Examples of Seselj's no compromise stand on Serb-Croat conflicts: "As far as the territory of Srpska Krajina is concerned, there can be no compromises there, no reciprocity. That's Serbian territory. It has always

---

[1] UN Commission of Human Rights, Sixth periodic report 21 February 1994, paragraph 124
[2] Vojislav Seselj, Milosevic Hapsi Radikale, Belgrade 1994, pp.20-21

been Serbian" (record 39- 1/16/92); "There's no one in this whole wide world we will negotiate with when it comes to our own territories and our own graves!" (record 113-8/4/90); "We don't want any compromises!!! We want the Serb border of [K-O-K-V], and Italians on the other side…" Interviewer: "How do you think the Croats will react?" Seselj: "What do we care about the Croats!!! They are not a historical nation, they are not entitled to have their own state..." (record 205-); "What should I talk to Croats about? There is no talking to them! …We don't have anything in common, and there is nothing we need to do together" (record 225-1/10/91). Elsewhere Seselj states: "We decisively support the will of the Serbian people of Serbian Krajina, Serbian Slavonija, Baranja and Western Srem to unite to today's Serbia… any kind of compromise with the Croats shall be the treason of the Serbian people…" (record 185- 5/4/91). An example of conflict management with the Kosovo Albanians: Interviewer: "You, obviously, don't believe that it [conflict in Kosovo] can be resolved in a peaceful manner?" Seselj: "What peaceful manner? With whom here can you negotiate at all?" (record 219-4/1/90).

Seselj advocates a no-compromise, no negotiation stance on territorial and border issues about what should be Serb and what should belong to other ethnic groups. Since that is the core issue in the break-up of Yugoslavia, Seselj's position on conflict resolution amounts to coercion, violence and war, i.e. a military solution. On occasion he uses the word "compromise" but it turns out not to be genuine. For instance he stated "…a compromise could consist of Croats no longer claiming Dubrovnik, that is the Dubrovnik coastal area up to the confluence of [the river] Neretva. The Croats would receive concessions on the territory of Western Hercegovina" (record 39-1/16/92), but Western Hercegovina is part of Bosnia, and not a Serb concession at all. Even after some settlement may be reached on territories and borders, Seselj advocates adversarial relations between Serbia and other states: "That moment when we finally establish borders, I will be the first to call for no cooperation, not diplomatic, or economic, or any other kind of cooperation, with Slovenia or Croatia for 100 years" (record 175-10/24/91).

Seselj and the political ideology of nationalism

Seselj's threat and victimization discourse in the Serb mass media is aimed at persuading the public of a dangerous and deep crisis in ethnic relations, i.e. adopting a crisis frame. What of his advocacy for bellicose, "no compromise", coercive and violent means of dealing with ethnic conflicts? Ethnic crises, as severe as that faced in Yugoslavia in the late 1980s and early 1990s, have been managed and resolved by non-violent negotiations and conciliation, as was the case for new constitutional design and power sharing in South Africa, not to mention the peaceful dissolution of Czechoslovakia into the Czech Republic and Slovakia. Seselj's disposition and advocacy for coercive resolution of ethnic conflicts is an integral part of his nationalist ideology, the ideology of Serb nationalism. There were other modes of thinking about redesigning the Yugoslav multi-ethnic state. The constitutional lawyer Tibor Varady, Minister of Justice of Yugoslavia from July 1992 to March 1993, analyzed in great detail the constitutional and human rights principles and international precedents for a multi-ethnic Yugoslav confederation that follows from civic, not ethnic, nationalism.[1]

According to John Brueilly[2], nationalism is a political movement seeking or exercising state power and justifying such action with a nationalist political doctrine. The doctrine makes the following assertions:

---

[1] Varady, "Minorities, majorities, law and ethnicity: reflections on the Yugoslav case" Human Rights Quarterly 1997
[2] Nationalism and the State, 1993, p.3

33

a. There exists a nation with an explicit character, i.e. some objective attribute like common ancestry or language, which makes it an objective reality like a river or mountain
b. The interests and values of this nation take priority over all other interest and values, such as the human rights of individual persons
c. The nation must attain political sovereignty, i.e. the goal of a nation is a nation-state

Ernest Gellner[1] agrees with Brueilly (and contemporary scholarship): nationalism is primarily a political principle which holds that the political unit (the state) and the national unit (the people) should be congruent. Thus for nationalists, ethnic boundaries should not cut across political boundaries.

In his speeches and messages to the Serb public as well as in the <u>Manifesto of the Serbian Radical Party for 1991</u>, Seselj articulates an extremist variant of Serb nationalism. In the words of the Manifesto (paragraph 1): "The restoration of a free, independent and democratic Serbian state in the Balkans … will include the whole of Serbdom, all the Serbian lands, which means within its frontiers will be , besides the current, imposed, federal unit of Serbia itself, Serbian Macedonia, Serbian Montenegro, Serbian Bosnia, Serbian Herzegovina, Serbian Dubrovnik, Serbian Dalmatia, Serbian Lika, Serbian Kordun, Serbian Banija, Serbian Slavonia, and Serbian Baranja." [2]

Seselj's nationalist doctrine on the subject of nations, ethnic groups, states, territories and borders, which justifies the claims to "the whole of Serbdom can be summed up from his statements:

a. There is a hierarchy of ethnic groups and peoples; some are nations like the Serbs; others like the Muslims and Croats and Macedonians are not, they are "artificial" nations. The Serbs, being a nation, have a right to a state, the others do not. The Serb state should be a nation-state that includes all Serbs, wherever they live. The territories on which "artificial" nations and ethnic groups happen to live should be divided and allocated to nation-states. The ethnic groups in a nation-state can either conform to minority status or, should they not do so, will be expelled to some other state and territory that will take them in (<u>Manifesto</u>, in particular paragraphs 1,8 and 25).

b. The typical "natural" sentiment between ethnic groups (at least if they are neighbors) is hatred: it has always been so, it will remain so. Seselj is actually proud of being hated by other ethnic groups: "The title of 'Red Duke' suits me well. I am proud of it. I am especially proud of the fact that today I am hated by most Croats, Slovenes, and Shiptars…" (record 136 -7/8/91). To stop the incessant fighting between them, they should be physically separated into different states, or territories. If separation cannot be done by mutual consent, then it should be done coercively. Asked what should happen to the Croats in Serbia, Seselj replies (record 14 -9/30/93) "I would love it if they didn't exist…I think that we definitely have to separate and never live together…we just want a civilized exchange of population with Croatia, that Serbs from Croatia come here and move into Croatian houses and apartments, and that Croats go to Croatia and live there in Serbian homes and apartments." For Seselj, the natural sentiments between ethnic groups are antipathy and rejection. On the Muslims, Seselj quipped (record 85 -8/5/93): 'No one to put it simply wants the Muslims with them. The Muslims are such a nice, smart, and pleasant people that no one wants to live with them!" Since nations have priority on statehood as far as territory and borders are concerned, the separation will be at the expense of "artificial" nations. International and internal borders that violate

---

[1] <u>Nations and Nationalism</u>, 1983, p.1
[2] All the Serbian lands are referred to by Seselj as "Great Serbia" or "Greater Serbia" as in Seselj, vol.29, 1993, pp.194-200, Seselj, vol. 30, p.140 and p.198. A map of Greater Serbia is on the title page of <u>Velika Srbija</u> no.2 1990 (1/8/90) and depicts the former Yugoslavia with only parts of Croatia and Slovenia missing. "Velika Srbija" means "Greater Serbia". The Associated Press reported on 24 Feb. 1993 that Seselj told them in an interview "I'll never give up the Greater Serbia goal."

the nation-state principle are illegitimate and subject to change.

Applied to Bosnia-Hercegovina, Seselj's ethnic nationalism results in the following "choice" for the Muslims, as expressed in record 237 (4/26/91) "…the Muslims can declare themselves what they want. They can declare themselves Japanese, Martians, or Muslim…But administratively the existence of a Muslim nation cannot be recognized. Because …it is senseless, it simply does not exist, it is invented…we can't allow them to separate a part of Serbian territory and on it form their own state," and in record 238 (4/26/91) "any sovereignty of Bosnia-Hercegovina is out of the question. The Muslims should understand that as soon as possible. BiH as a state is out of question." According to Seselj, the Muslims should have stayed within small Yugoslavia (following the secession of Slovenia and Croatia). In record 144 (5/15/93), he says "The Serbs offered Muslims the most convenient options possible for Bosnia Hercegovina to stay within the territory of the shortened Yugoslavia…the Muslims did not want that, they wanted a unitary BiH…"

We have already in earlier sections documented Seselj's beliefs and positions, as on Macedonia being an "*artificial" nation*. Other texts on Croats, Slovenes, Muslims, Montenegrins are in records 117-8/4/90, 197-6/4/91, 205- 6/7/91, 254-5/24/91. Seselj does not explain why the Serbs, but not the other people, are a nation. He sometimes refers to a distinct language, as in record 205 "What Bosnian language? There is no "Bosnian" language! … There is only the Serbian language which is spoken in Bosnia, and Bosnia is a Serbian land. Those who do not like it can move to Anatolia." At other times, contemporary nations must have had a past historic state: "When did the Slovenes throughout history have their own state? NEVER!" (record 117-8/4/90) and " What do we care about the Croats? They are not a historical nation, they are not entitled to have their own state" (record 205- 6/7/91) He also believes that a nation must have a single religion, e.g. when he claims the Macedonians are actually Serbs, in record 197 (6/4/91): "All those who celebrate a krsna slava [Orthodox Christian celebration] are of Serb nationality and they have never forgotten that." In record 236 (4/26/91) Seselj claims that "The Serbs are the only historical people on Yugoslav territory…when a historical and non-historical people clash, the non-historical people fall."

If Serbs (and possibly the Slovenes) are the only nation in (the former) Yugoslavia, according to Seselj's nationalist doctrine, they have a right to form a nation-state that includes all Serbs no matter where they live in Yugoslavia, and thus gives Serbs the right to draw borders, i.e. claim "the whole of Serbdom, all Serbian lands" (cf. Manifesto above). In record 198 (6/4/91) he states: "We shall not give even one small peace of the land in which there are Serb villages, destroyed churches, mass graves, camps, other Jasenovac-like camps. If we were to allow that, we would be unworthy of the glory of our famous ancestors, and would have to be ashamed before our descendants", and again in record 112 (8/4/90): "We will never allow any Serbian territories, any Serbian neighborhood, torn down church, or torched village, any Serbian mass grave site, concentration camp, trench, or slaughterhouse to find themselves outside of the borders of the Serbian state." To an interviewer's question "Do even small [Serb communities] matter?", Seselj answers "of course, wherever the Serbian people live" (record 254- 5/24/91). To another interviewer who wants to know about places where Serbs are a minority, Seselj answers "What does it mean the Serbs are a minority? We don't care if they are a minority. That territory should be part of a Serbian state…" (record 207- 11/24/91). He rejects the Republic borders: "we shall never recognize the borders that the criminal Tito drew inside Yugoslavia …these are for us purely administrative borders which are not defined by any legal regulations, and we dispute them" (record 258-5/3/91). And in record 113 (8/4/90), he makes clear that Serb territorial claims are non-negotiable: "There's no one in this whole wide world we will negotiate with when it comes to our own territories and our own graves!"

On *ethnic hatreds*, according to Seselj, "The hate among Serbs, Croats, and Muslims is too great for

them to be able to live together. That's why it is necessary to separate those peoples" (record 154-5/24/93), and again, "Seventy years of development of the Yugoslav state show that the Serb people could not live together with the Slovenes and Croats…" (V20/62) and "Concerning the question of exile of the Croats from Serbia… If so much hate appears between two peoples that it renders their normal co-habitation impossible, if a life together is impossible (which is so obvious in this case), then the populations should be nicely exchanged. …The most elegant solution: nicely Croats to Croatia, Serbs to Serbia. Every bird to its own flock. And let it be settled forever" (record 192-4/8/92). Seselj makes ethnic separation look simple and natural, as with the birds: "The Serbs will live on Serbian territory, the Muslims will live on Muslim territories, if there should be such territories, and the Croats will have Croatian territories…" (record 259-9/30/92). We have already described in the section on falsehoods and expulsion of Muslims from Eastern Bosnia, Croats from Serbia, and Albanians from Kosovo (which we shall not repeat here) how Seselj's sanitized and benign discourse on separation and exchange of populations is a self-serving, rhetorical cover for the tragic and ugly realities of ethnic cleansing. And as he himself stated above, "those [Muslims] who don't like it [the Serb state in Bosnia] can move to Anatolia" (record 205-6/7/91).

The liberal democratic philosophy and historical scholarship

Seselj's Serb nationalism rests on false doctrines and distorted facts. There are no "artificial" nations, only nations; there are hardly any nation-states, most states are multi-ethnic and multi-national. Although there are ethnic hatreds, many are neither ancient nor continuous and permanent, and most ethnic relations are in fact non-violent. The past two centuries (including and especially Balkan history) have shown the futility of drawing borders in ethnically mixed territories justified by nationalist principles of hierarchy, separation and exclusion as a solution for conflicts and wars.

In variance with nationalist doctrines espoused by Seselj, the political philosophy of liberal democracy legitimizes constitutional design and power sharing governance for multi-ethnic and multi-national states that promote conciliation, accommodation and non-coercive conflict management.

1. All nations are socially constructed, and that construction is an on-going social and historical process. The doyen of the liberal conception of nations and nationalism, the French historian Ernest Renan, in his path breaking lecture at the Sorbonne in 1882 "Qu'est ce qu'une nation?" [1](What is a nation?) wrote: "A Frenchman is neither Gaul, nor a Frank, nor a Burgundian. Rather he is what has emerged from the cauldron in which, presided over by the Kings of France, the most diverse elements have together been simmering…An Englishman is …neither the Briton of Julius Caesar's time, the Anglo-Saxon of Hengist's time, nor the Dane of Canut's time, nor the Norman of William the Conqueror's time; it is rather the result of all these… Is Germany an exception?...This is a complete illusion. The whole of the South was once Gallic; the whole of the East…Slavic…What is the defining feature of these states? It is the fusion of their component populations."

Renan demonstrates that no "objective" shared attribute(s) defines or has defined the individual human beings that later have become a nation: not race, not language, religion, geography, dynastic principle. What they have in common is a shared belief that they are a nation, which stems from an on-going historical and social process of constructing a "large scale solidarity", "a moral conscience", a "soul", a "spiritual principle" that binds the individuals in the nation (in contemporary terminology one would write

---

[1] Reprinted in Geoff Eley and R.G. Suny, eds., <u>Becoming National. A Reader</u>, 1996, pp. 42-46

"shared institutions and culture"). In agreement with Renan, Max Weber, one of the founding fathers of the contemporary social sciences, similarly shows that a nation cannot be "objectively" defined by individuals who share a language, or a state, or race and "blood," or any such attribute. Under certain conditions, "otherwise heterogeneous peoples can be melted together" through common destinies. Nation is rather a "sentiment of solidarity in the face of other groups," or a "community of sentiment... that normally seeks a state of its own." National sentiments and solidarity are a historical and social construction ("kunstlerische Art der Entstehung des Gemeinsamkeitsglaubens"); ethnic origins and similarity between different, even hostile, nations, can be greater than the ethnic origins and similarity of people within a nation.[1] Contemporary scholarship[2] supports the Renan-Weber social construction of nations.

Because nations are not a fact of nature, like the existence of species, because they can not be defined by "objective" attributes, and because all nations are formed and evolve through historical and on-going social construction, Seselj's nationalist doctrine of a distinction between genuine historic nations like the Serbs and others that are artificial, and of a hierarchic relationship among them that justifies privileged claims to territory and borders to some but not to others, has been discredited by social science and historical scholarship.

2. Seselj's conviction that ethnic groups/nations hate one another, that they cannot live peacefully with one another, and that they should therefore be separated into different states or territories, does not stand up to social science analysis. In the *Minorities at Risk* project, Marshall Monty and Ted Robert Gurr[3] identified some 700 ethnic groups (of non-trivial size) who have a self-defined identity that is also recognized by others. Of these 285 were politically active, and 161 sought some greater autonomy or self-determination within their state in 1998-2000. Of these 161, 120 pursued their goal peacefully within conventional political channels, and 41 engaged in some form of armed conflict – counting even small groups of insurgents – and that is about 6% of the total number. According to Brian Barry[4] "Very few nation states have existed –almost all states are poly-ethnic... The notion that ethnic identities are 'primordial' and have certain inevitable political expressions runs counter to all modern scholarship, which emphasizes the contingency of both identities and political consequences. …ethnic groups have lived peacefully along side one another for generations…what changes are hopes and fears facing members of these groups. The art of constructive politics is to avoid situations in which people see their future security as lying in the killing and expulsion of others."

For the specific case of Yugoslavia, Janusz Bugajski[5] critiques the "ancient hatreds" view as follows: "Proponents of the Barbarism Myth assume that the Balkans are riven by deeply rooted communal hatreds and impenetrable ethnic and religious divisions that simmer in endless vendettas and periodically erupt in uncontrollable violence… Contrary to the conventional wisdom preached by some Balkan sages, the south Slavs were not embroiled in any significant wars prior to World War Two. "Centuries of hatred" may have existed in the memories of some, but so did centuries of coexistence and cohabitation, and there were few recorded instances of mass butchery or forcible expulsions. Of course communal antagonisms existed… Conveniently forgotten in these simplifications are the long centuries of

---

[1] Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, Vol.1 part2, chapter 4, pp.234-244
[2] Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism, 1991, and the already cited authors
[3] Peace and Conflict 2003, 2003
[4] "Statism and Nationalism: a Cosmopolitan Critique" in Ian Shapiro and Lea Brilmayer eds. Global Justice, 1999, p.30, 46
[5] "Balkan Myths and Bosnian Massacres" 1996, in R.G.C. Thomas and H.R. Friman, The South Slav Conflict. History, Religion, Ethnicity, and Nationalism, pp. 119-121

Yugoslav non-conflict, interaction, mutual influence, and even productive competition."

Some deep seated national and ethnic animosities and hatreds have been changed to more peaceful and cooperative relations and reconciliation through leadership and statesmanship, in state to state relationships between France and Germany (De Gaulle and Adenauer) and the British and the Irish (a succession of political leaders and Prime Ministers contributed to 1998 Northern Ireland Peace Agreement which settled their one outstanding and joint nationality problem), and in internal ethnic conflicts as in South Africa (Mandela and De Klerk), to name but a few. As Stuart Kaufman put it[1]: "It is not easy to get people to fight ethnic wars, and it is even harder to get them to commit atrocities. Ethnic war is possible only in the presence of hostile myths, opportunities to mobilize, and fear of group extinction, and it breaks out only if these factors create mass hostility, a within group politics dominated by extreme nationalist symbolism and a security dilemma between groups."

In opposition to nationalist violence and expulsion in ethnic relations and state building, the liberal democratic philosophy is anchored on the principles of "equal citizenship and the politics of inclusion, rather than the politics of exclusion characteristic of ethnic nationalism…"[2] The principles of liberal democracy and civic nationalism have been incorporated by political scientists and constitutional lawyers into the constitutional design, electoral systems, and governance institutions (executive, legislative and judicial) for multiethnic states and societies[3]. In conflict over self-determination, territorial issues involve a choice between two approaches[4]: the nationalist approach advocates the creation of new boundaries, with separation and transfer of population (Seselj's position), and the liberal democratic approach, which disaggregates sovereignty through federalism, cultural autonomy, power sharing and other institutions that allow populations to dwell where they are and enjoy a full range of civil and political rights.

The politics of ethnic nationalism and of the mass media in Yugoslavia, and in particular the politics of nationalism in Serbia where Seselj played a prominent part, blocked the presentation of (let alone any meaningful debate about) the liberal democratic alternative to constitutional and governance design for a multinational successor state or states in Yugoslavia. What resulted was a major human tragedy.

Summary of the content analysis

The content analysis of Seselj's discourse to the Serbian public about Serb to non-Serb relations is based on 242 media messages in the years 1990-1994 drawn from his collected works and can be summed up in three words: "xenophobic Serb nationalism". According to the content analysis:

1. Serbs have been and are continuing to be victimized by other peoples and states in ex-Yugoslavia and by foreign states and international organizations; there are 40 victimhood and victimization messages in the total 242

2. Serbs and Serbia are threatened and surrounded by enemies, foreign states, neighbor peoples, even internal Serb traitors, all of whom want to weaken the Serb state by dismantling its territory and numerically diminish the Serb people; there are 42 "threats on Serbs" messages, and an additional 29

---

[1] Modern Hatreds. The Symbolic Politics of Ethnic Wars, 2001, p.39
[2] Brian Barry, "Statism and Nationalism", 1999, p.53
[3] Donald Horowitz, Ethnic Groups in Conflict, 1985; Timothy Sisk, Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts, 1996
[4] Gideon Gottlieb, Nations against the State, 1993 p.37

external threats and 28 internal threats, 38% of the 242 messages contain at least one threat (and often more than one).

3. The extreme dangers to Serbs and Serbia justify a "no compromise" stance (32 messages of no compromise or rejection of non-violent alternatives) and coercive and violent relations with non-Serbs on outstanding issues (47 messages), as exemplified by "amputation" of Croatia and expulsion of Albanians from Kosovo. Such coercion and violence is justified as defensive, for which the Serbs' adversaries are to blame (27 messages), and which are further justified by the principles of retribution and revenge (21 messages).

4. Serbs' adversaries in the former Yugoslavia are inferior to the Serb nation because they lack the attributes of a genuine historic nation such as the Serbs, and because they are "artificial" creations of the Serbs' enemies; there are 29 messages glorifying Serbs and 40 negative labels and stereotypes of non-Serbs.

5. Based on the claim of Serb preeminence among Yugoslav peoples, on falsehood, and on the misuse of history – common propaganda techniques of xenophobic nationalist discourse – Serbs' adversaries within ex-Yugoslavia are denied by Seselj rights to a state, territory and borders that in any way limit the Serb goal of uniting all Serbs everywhere, even when they are a small local minority.

The consequences of Seselj's ethnic nationalism are the acceptance and justification for coercion and violence in Serb to non-Serb relations and a rejection of non-violent conflict management between states and peoples. Because ethnic groups hate one another and have always done so, statecraft in mixed population territories consists in separating them. Because the Serb goal of uniting all Serbs in one state is legitimate and can not be compromised, and should the Serbs' adversaries refuse the Serbs' demands, separation will be coercive (expulsion) at the expense of non-Serbs.

5. The Serb mass media – Part B

The audience

Nationalist propaganda in the mass media was persuasive. According to a study of public opinion trends in Serbia[1]: "under the influence of civil war, economic collapse, and the activities of the official propaganda, in May 1993 xenophobia was observed in 76% of the population instead of the earlier average of 10-15%." In a survey by the Institute of Psychology at the University of Belgrade in 1993, the researchers found a lot of hostility toward Croats (89%), toward Albanians and Muslims (85%), and toward the national minorities in Serbia[2] , which contrasted starkly to the pre-crisis 1990 normal frame findings reported above.

Ordinary people echoed the crisis discourse in the mass media promoted by nationalist political leaders and intellectuals, and they were induced to act. A female volunteer in battle uniform was interviewed as she was boarding a bus to join the Vukovar battle[3] in 1991: Newsperson on video: "This is rather

---

[1] quoted in Goati, Elections, 2000, p.78
[2] Sociologija 34 (1) Jan/Mar. 1997
[3] V000-3845

unusual, a young woman going to war, isn't it"? Female volunteer: "I don't think it is. We need to answer the call to arms…I'm the mother of two small children…when I watch television, I see what is going on and I want to help, and it is worth sacrificing my life for this here Serbia of ours." A young Serb soldier in his barracks tells an American reporter "the Muslims expelled us from Kosovo with their sexual organs…they want to do the same here [Bosnia]…the way they reproduce they need room. You will soon feel that elsewhere in Europe"[1]. Peter Maas[2], another journalist, asks a Serb refugee couple why they fled their village. Their answer: Muslims planned to take over, a list of names had been drawn up, Serb women were to be assigned to Muslim harems after the men had been killed. They had heard about it on the radio. The Serb military had uncovered the plan. The journalist probes: "Did any Muslims in the village ever harm you?" They reply: "Oh no, our relations with the Muslims in the village were always good, they were decent people." In the minds of the Serb couple, the crisis frame had eclipsed the normal frame. What under peaceful circumstances were totally implausible events – young women becoming sexual slaves in harems for breeding janissaries – become credible narratives of ethnic domination and annihilation within the crisis frame.

Regime controlled media put out a huge volume of disinformation and falsehoods, which was persuasive to a large segment of the Serb public. The Institute of Political Studies in Belgrade conducted a poll of 1380 respondents in Serbia in July 1992 that asked the following questions about the siege of Sarajevo: "Who bombarded Sarajevo from the surrounding hills in May and June? Answer: "Muslim and/or Croat forces", 38.4%; "Don't know", 22.5%; "Serb forces", 20.5%. At the time Serb forces controlled all the hills around Sarajevo and their artillery shelled the city regularly, while the standard news story on Belgrade TV was "the siege of Sarajevo is carried out by Muslims, not Serbs" and "the Serbs are protecting their own hills around the city." Bosnian Serb TV Pale meanwhile claimed "The Muslims are shelling themselves."[3]

War coverage became a casualty of these purges and of censorship. As California Senator Hiram Johnson remarked in 1917, "In war, truth is the first casualty."[4] Vlado Mares, a RTS journalist, tried to cover the Croatian war from both sides, despite both military and civilian obstacles. In Pakrac, when he managed to have Seselj's Chetniks describe "their methods of killing", Serb TV did not show his film.[5] During the expulsions and killings by Serbs in Bosnia in 1992, Belgrade TV showed "forced confessions" by non-Serbs who declared themselves guilty of anti-Serb activities, and were used to justify Serb attacks[6]. The media analyst Milan Milosevic[7] writes that "In Serbia and Croatia, TV fabricated and shamelessly circulated war crime stories."

False atrocity stories from the siege of Vukovar were typical. On November 1991 Reuters quoted Yugoslav free lance photographer Goran Mikic who had reported on Belgrade TV that he had seen and counted the bodies of 41 children massacred at an elementary school and that Yugoslav soldiers had identified the bodies as those of Serb children killed by Croatian soldiers. A day later Mikic admitted that he had neither seen nor counted any bodies. The story was a fabrication. Reuters retracted the story the next day, yet Politika on November 22 claimed the evidence of the massacre was covered up by Ustasha[8].

---

[1] Roger Cohen, Hearts Grown Brutal, 1998 p.434
[2] Love Thy Neighbor. A Story of War, 1995, p.113
[3] Mark Thompson, Forging War. The Media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina, 1994, p.126
[4] quoted in Carruthers, Media at War, 2000, p.9
[5] Thompson, Forging War, 1994, p.100
[6] Thompson, Forging War, 1994, p.254
[7] "The Media Wars 1987-1997" in Jasmina Udovicki and James Ridgeawy eds., Burn This House Down: the Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia, 1997, p119
[8] Kurspahic, Prime Time Crime, 2003, p.77-78

In another Vukovar fabrication, a Belgrade TV journalist covering the fighting pointed to his hand: "I am holding in my hand some gold teeth, they told me these teeth were extracted with a knife from practically living people, whom they [the Croats] killed." An elderly man, who said he had not personally witnessed atrocities, said on camera "they slaughtered, gouged out eyes, cut off children's fingers. In baking pans, on liberated territory, we found children they wanted to roast … the injured were disemboweled"[1] . False atrocity stories in the Serbian media, as about Serb children fed to the animals in the Sarajevo zoo by Muslims, were commonplace in the Bosnia war as well[2]. According to Goati[3], "The strict selection of information on civil war in Bosnia Hercegovina and Croatia created a kind of virtual political reality, a world of fiction that many citizens saw as more realistic than the world of reality…The majority of the population, being deprived of alternative sources of information, has accepted the persistent repetition of official statements as the truth."

Victimization, genocide, rape, atrocities and threats to Serbdom are powerful and emotionally charged appeals. Political and intellectual leaders incessantly spoke of them. The mass media were saturated with them. For many in the audience, the crisis frame was switched on. Threats, fear and the crisis frame provided the opportunity for nationalists to mobilize huge constituencies, win elections, attack moderates, and organize aggressive actions against other ethnic groups.

An international comparison of the end of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and in Serbia underscores the extent to which the dominant nationalist crisis frame in Serbia obstructed the transition to a liberal democratic polity[4]. In Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary mass demonstrations, strikes and protests pressured the communist regimes to concede democratic elections in 1989-90, for which the communist party reconstituted itself as a democratic socialist party. Absent a nationality issue, the anti-communist opposition won in a big way: Solidarity in Poland won every contested seat in 1989; the Hungarian successor parties to the communist party got only 13% in the first free election of 1990; in Czechoslovakia, Civic Forum and allied parties wiped out the communist successor party. All these elections were fought out on the issues of change from socialism to market economies and the democratization of all institutions.

By comparison, in Serbia, the nationality issue and the crisis frame prevailed over all other issues after 1989. According to Aleksa Djilas[5]: "The Yugoslav version of the end of communism differed from that in other East European countries. As so many times before in the history of the South Slavs, the national question overshadowed all others. As elsewhere in Eastern Europe, opponents of the regime demanded the introduction of liberal democratic institutions. But the main conflict turned out to be among its different national groups, not between the communists and their opponents." In Serbia, The League of Communists successfully reprogrammed itself under Milosevic as a nationalist party (SPS) with an even more ultra-nationalist party on the right led by Seselj (SRS). The liberal and social democratic opposition parties in the early 1990s – DS, DEMOS, Zajedno coalition, etc. – polled only 20-30% of the vote in various Serbian elections. Moreover, the Serbian opposition subscribed to the national crisis frame, though in a less strident and more nuanced manner than SPS and SRS. An analysis of DEPOS party slogans in October to December 1992 (leading to the presidential and assembly elections) found

[1]Lazar Lalic, "Images and Words of Hate: Vukovar 1991", ARHITEL 1995
[2] Lazar Lalic, Three Years in TV Serbia, Belgrade 1995, pp.106-7
[3] Elections, 2000, p.120
[4] Anthony Oberschall "Protest Demonstrations and the End of Communist Regimes in 1989", in Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change (17), 1994
[5] Fear Thy Neighbor, 1995, p.91

that their nationalist slogans were twice as frequent as those focusing on socio-economic issues[1]. A survey of a sample of Serbian citizens (excluding Kosovo) by the Institute of Social Sciences in October 1992 asked whether borders between Yugoslav Republics should be recognized as international borders. This was a crucial issue in the discourse on nationalism during the election campaign, and a yes answer signaled an anti-nationalist position (agreeing with the UN and other states' position on recognition of Croatia and Bosnia as legitimate successor states in Yugoslavia). 28.1% DEPOS voters answered "yes", compared to 18.3% for SPS supporters and 21.4% for SRS. In effect the nationalist response was overwhelming in all population groups. The DEPOS voters tended to be young, educated, urban, and white collar and professional, compared to the SPS and SRS, who tended to be pensioners, elderly, blue collar, low in education and residing in rural areas and small towns.

Political parties and leaders, with few and minor exceptions, all subscribed to the dominant Serb nationalist frame. In these years the Serbian opposition mounted huge protests and demonstrations for political reform, for access to the news media and against regime control of the state media, especially television, against electoral fraud, and democratic reforms, the very same issues that the East European opposition had challenged the communist regimes on with mass movements. The largest demonstrations were in Belgrade in March 1991 against regime control of the state media; in March and mid-June 1992 for political reform, and in December 1996 to January 1997 against election fraud. Typically for successive days (and even weeks in Winter 96/98), two hundred thousand protesters would march in the city streets and voiced their demands. And they were partially successful. After March 1991, the regime left some room for independent media. In 1992, the regime conceded new elections for December. In 1997, the regime conceded electoral victory to the opposition in disputed local elections. The democratic opposition was active in elections and in unconventional means of regime opposition on democracy issues. It had popular support, courage, staying power, and enough muscle for limited goal achievement. But it did not challenge the regime on Serb nationalism[2].

Bias and partiality in the Serb mass media

Milan Milosevic[3] shows how television financing, management, and content became increasingly controlled by Republic politicians who used it to promote nationalism at the expense of Yugoslav unity. Yutel, the last Yugoslav prime minister's (Ante Markovic) voice for defending Yugoslav unity, whose speeches were not reported on Republic television, was shown at 1-2 a.m. in the middle of the night on a second television channel in the Republics. Even cultural programming was brought under nationalist control. Musical program editors were fired from Radio Belgrade for broadcasting more Croatian and Slovene music than Serbian music, and the general manager of Radio Serbia divided his staff into "reliable Serbs" and "bad" Serbs. Before long the undesirable journalists and media professionals were pressured to leave their jobs in January 1993.

When a strike broke out in April 1992 at the second radio station (cultural and music service) of Radio Belgrade in protest of political control of cultural programming, Seselj held a press conference at which he made public on prime time television a list of radio and TV journalists he wanted eliminated because of their lack of patriotism and obedience to political masters. Most were subsequently put on "compulsory leave" or marginalized.[4] In 1993, Mark Thompson[1] writes that in another purge the

---

[1] Goati, Elections, 2000, p.70-1
[2] Goati, Elections, 2000, pp. 51-2, 60, 90, 123; Monnesland, Land Ohne Wiederkehr, 1997, chapters 10-13
[3] "The Media Wars: 1987-1997" in Udovicki and Ridgeway, Burn This House Down, 1997
[4] C. Humblot "Resistence et purges", Le Monde, 24 July 1993, p.4

reporters and staff resisted pressure, but were harassed, demoted, furloughed, banned from the TV building, and fired; eventually 200 journalists and one thousand staff were purged. Because of mass protests in Belgrade, the regime allowed some opposition media with limited means, circulation, viewers and listeners to survive. It assumed that control of state TV and the three largest newspapers was sufficient for its purposes. Even so, Studio B and other independent media were harassed and targets of attacks[2]. By 1995, the independent media were largely restricted to Belgrade. The result was that the majority of Serbs got biased and slanted news, filled with falsehoods.

As a result of the media purges and the promotion of patriotic journalism, a 1994 study of media coverage in recent Serbian elections[3] found that the regime party SPS received 227 minutes of coverage on regular RTS news (television news) compared to 58 minutes for all the other parties, much of it in "election chronicle" and not the daily national news program. Research by the Belgrade Institute of Political Studies[4] found that RTS was watched by 2.5 million in Serbia proper, 800,000 in Vojvodina, i.e. almost 70% of all adults, whereas 30% never read the daily press and 26% only occasionally. Politika, supportive of the regime, had a 200,000 circulation, compared to the independent Borba, with 30,000 (which was threatened with shut down in November 1994). The report concluded that the Milosevic regime controlled 90% mass media penetration, i.e. 90 % of information on public affairs and news reaching the public was though regime media[5]. The regime used its control of the state media for the winning of elections. For instance, in the December 20 1992 elections for president of Serbia, in the last three weeks, RTS presented in the main evening news Milosevic positively 17 times, neutrally 4 times, and negatively zero times, in contrast to the rival presidential candidate Panic with 7 positive, 8 neutral, and 17 negative presentations. According to Goati[6] "the official media have systematically presented a twisted picture of the political reform programme of Milan Panic on the claim that he compromised the independence and dignity of the country in favor of foreign powers, above all the USA."

Control of the mass media was physical and coercive in the Serb majority territories of Bosnia. On August 1, 1991, eight months before the start of war in Bosnia-Hercegovina, Serb paramilitaries supported by the Yugoslav army seized the Kozara mountain transmitter, shortly followed by other transmitter seizures. It cut off Sarajevo TV signals and exposed the Bosnian Serbs and others living among them to Belgrade TV only[7].

Mass media persuasion of the Serb voter

It is possible to make an estimate of the effects of mass media propaganda on the Serb electorate by comparing election outcomes when a party and candidate has access to and support in the mass media and when they do not, while controlling other variables such as the demographics of party supporters. Studies indicate that there were about 2.5 to 2.8 million strongly nationalist voters in Serbia, depending on turnout, who distributed their votes to SPS, SRS, and some smaller allied parties. The core of these voters were older and/or pensioners, rural, blue collar workers, and low education, compared to other parties in

---

[1] Forging War, 1994, p.93
[2] Eric Gordy, The Culture of Power in Serbia: Nationalism and the Destruction of Alternatives, 1999
[3] Mazowiecki, Special Report, 1994 paragraph 117
[4] Kurspahic, Prime Time Crime, 2003, p.56
[5] Kurspahic, Prime Time Crime, 2003, pp.41-42
[6] Elections, 2000,pp. 101,109
[7] Kurspahic, Prime Time Crime, 2003, p.98

Serbia[1] . In the December 20, 1992 elections for the National Assembly of Serbia, when SPS and SRS were allies in government and SRS had access to the media and got positive coverage, SPS got 1,359,000 (rounded) votes to SRS 1,067,000 votes. In mid-1993, the two parties turned adversaries over acceptance of the Vance-Owen plan for Bosnia, and SRS submitted a motion of no confidence against SPS government. This resulted in new elections for the National Assembly of Serbia on December 13, 1993. In the 1993 campaign, SRS and its leader Vojislav Seselj were presented in an extremely negative manner in the regime controlled media. For instance, Borba (September 28, 1993) accused Seselj of "…extremely primitive chauvinism", "instigating a war mongering atmosphere," whereas SRS deputies were accused of "treachery" and "political adventurism involving criminal activity." The 1993 outcome was SPS 1,576,000 votes to SRS 595,000 votes, a loss of 472,000, or 44% of the 1992 SRS vote. Further analysis showed that the SRS loss was first and foremost a switch within the strongly nationalist voters from the SRS to the SPS[2]. The loss of voter support for Seselj and SRS is a measure of mass media impact on the voters, i.e. the difference within the same voter pool that mass media support versus mass media opposition makes.

Another measure of voter persuasion by media propaganda contrasts the October 5, 1997 presidential election for Serbia with the December 21, 1997 presidential election, only ten weeks later. In October, Seselj got 1,734,000 votes to Zoran Lilic 1,475,000 votes. The state controlled media were non-partisan. In December, Milan Milutinovic, the regime candidate favored in the media, got 2,182,000 votes to Seselj 1,384,000, a loss of 350,000, or 20% compared to October. A content analysis of the RTS election campaign coverage in the last week showed that Milutinovic got 81% of air time reserved for presidential candidates, compared to 19% for Seselj. Whereas Milutinovic was almost never presented in a negative context, a negative disqualifying media campaign was conducted against Seselj[3]. In view of these two cases, access to and favorable depiction in the state mass media made a difference of between 20% to 40% of the nationalist vote, a decisive advantage (or liability) for a political leader and party.

6. Conclusion

1. Section one on the "explanation of collective violence" summarizes social science knowledge on how ordinary people are incited to support and participate in ethnic collective violence under some conditions, though they usually maintain cooperative relations with other ethnic groups. These conditions are present when there are contentious issues between them, when their political leaders advocate hostility and aggression in ethnic conflict management, and when threat and hate messages in the mass media amplify danger to the group, incite hostility to adversaries, and justify collective violence against them as a solution to outstanding issues.

2. Section two on techniques and effects of mass media propaganda documents that political leaders, media professionals and scholars all agree that mass media propaganda and justification of violence prepared the publics in ex-Yugoslavia for violence and war as the means of resolving outstanding issues. The theory and study of mass persuasion indicates that the public makes sense of public affairs through a cognitive frame that establishes the truth value of perceptions, beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and action norms. Threat messages in the mass media are particularly effective in switching the public's cognitive frame of peaceful inter-group relations to a crisis frame justifying coercion and violence. A diverse menu of other propaganda techniques, from falsehoods to negative stereotyping, further aids and speeds the

[1] Goati, Elections, 2000, pp57-8, 70-1, 78
[2] Goati, Elections, 2000, pp.99-112, and Appendix
[3] Goati, Elections, 2000, p.135 and Appendix

public's cognitive frame switch.

3. Section three on nationalist propaganda and the Serb mass media documents how messages on threats to Serbs, based on exaggerations and outright falsehood, activated the crisis frame in the Serb public.

4. Section four is based on a content analysis of Seselj's 1990-1994 nationalist mass media propaganda concerning Serb to non-Serb relations. It documents his massive use of victimization and threat messages when addressing the Serb public, his advocacy for coercion and violence, his rejection of compromise, his denial of any Serb responsibility for violence and war, his justification of Serb violence as self-defense and retribution, his opposition to non-violent conflict management, and his promotion of xenophobic Serb nationalism and the crisis frame in ethnic relations at the expense of more conciliatory forms of constitutional design.

5. Section five documents from Serb public opinion polls, voting behavior, and testimonials of ordinary people how a majority of the Serb public was immersed in and believed the xenophobic nationalist propaganda promoted by Seselj and other nationalists, and voted for nationalist leaders and parties.

7. Citations

[U stands for University, P stands for Press; translations from Serbian and Croatian made by Biljana Belamaric; translations from German and French made by Anthony Oberschall]

Altherr, Marco "statement" www.internews.org/mediainconflict

Anderson, Benedict 1991 Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism London, Verso

Anzulovic, Branimir 1999 Heavenly Serbia New York, New York UP

Atran, Scott 2003 "The Surprises of Suicide Terrorism" DISCOVER 24 (10) October

Bandura, Albert 2004 "The role of selective moral disengagement in terrorism and counterterrorism" Stanford University Psychology Dept.

Barry, Brian 1999 "Statism and Nationalism: a Cosmopolitan Critique" in Ian Shapiro and Lea Brilmayer eds. Global Justice New York, New York UP

Blagojevic, Marina 1998 "Der Exodus aus dem Kosovo. Ein Serbisches Trauma im Propagandakrieg" in Bremer et al. Serbiens Weg in den Krieg

Bogosavljevic, Srdjan 1998 "Der Unaufgeklarte Genozid" in Bremer et al. Serbiens Weg in den Krieg

Brass, Paul 2003 <u>The Production of Hindu-Moslem Violence in Contemporary India</u>, Seattle, Univ.of Washington Press

Brown, J.A.L. 1963 <u>Techniques of Persuasion</u> Baltimore Penguin

Bremer, Thomas et al. 1998 <u>Serbiens Weg in den Krieg</u> Berlin Berlin Verlag

Brogan, Patrick 1998 <u>World Conflicts</u> Lanham MD Scarecrow press

Brueilly, John 1993 <u>Nationalism and the State</u> Chicago Chicago UP

Browning, Christopher 1992 <u>Ordinary Men. Reserve Batallion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland</u> New York Harper Collins

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh 1993 <u>Lynching in the New South</u> Urbana, U. of Illinois P

Bugajski, Janusz 1996 "Balkan Myths and Bosnian Massacres" in R.G.C. Thomas and H.R. Friman eds. <u>The South Slav Conflict. History, Religion, Ethnicity, and Nationalism</u>. New York, Garland

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 1914 Report of the Commission to Inquire into the Cause and Conduct of the Balkan Wars Washington, D.C.

Carruthers, Susan 2000 <u>The Media Wars</u> New York St. Martin's Press

Cohen, Roger, 1998 <u>Hearts Grown Brutal</u> New York Norton

Cole, Robert ed. 1998 <u>The Encyclopedia of Propaganda</u> Armonk NY Sharpe

Connor, Walker 1978 "A Nation is a Nation, is a State, is an Ethnic Group…" <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies 1</u> (4) pp.379-88

Denitch, Bogdan 1996 <u>Ethnic Nationalism</u> Minneapolis Minnesota UP

Derrienic, Jean Paul 2002 <u>Les Guerres Civiles</u> Paris Presses de Sciences Po

Des Forges, Allison 1999 <u>Leave None to Tell the Story</u> New York Human Rights Watch

De Sola Pool, Ithiel 1973 Handbook of Communications Chicago Rand McNally

Djilas, Aleksa, 1995 "Fear Thy Neighbor: the Breakup of Yugoslavia" in Charles Kupchan ed. Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe. Ithaca, Cornell UP

Epstein, Jason 2004 "Mystery in the Heartland" New York Review of Books 51 (15) Oct. 7

Frohart, Mark and Jonathan Temin, 2003 The Use and Abuse of Media in Vulnerable Societies Washington D.C. United States Institute of Peace

Gamson, William and Andre Modigliani 1987 "The Changing Culture of Affirmative Action" Research in Political Sociology (3)

Gellner, Ernest 1983 Nations and Nationalism Ithaca NY Cornell UP

Glenny, Misha 1992 The Fall of Yugoslavia London Penguin

Glenny, Misha 1995 "The Birth of a Nation" New York Review of Books, November 16

Goati, Vladimir 2000 Elections in FRY from 1990 to 1998 Belgrade CeSID

Gordy, Eric 1999 The Culture of Power in Serbia: Nationalism and the Destruction of Alternatives University Park Penn State UP

Gottlieb, Gideon 1993 Nations against States New York Council on Foreign Relations

Gutman, Roy and David Rieff eds. 1999 Crimes of War New York Norton

Havel, Vaclav 1991 "Home" in New York Review of Books Dec. 5

Hina News Service 4/21/05 "60th anniversary of Jasenovac death camp's victims to be marked on Sunday."

Horowitz, Donald 1985 Ethnic Groups in Conflict Berkeley U. of California P

Horowitz, Donald 2001 The Deadly Ethnic Riot Berkeley U of California P

Hovland, Carl et al 1963 Communication and Persuasion New Haven Yale UP

Kakar, Sudhir 1996 <u>The Colors of Violence</u> Chicago Chicago UP

Katz, Elihu and Paul Lazarsfeld 1955 <u>Personal Influence</u> Glencoe IL Free Press

Kaufman, Stuart 2001 <u>Modern Hatreds. The Symbolic Politics of Ethnic Wars</u> Ithaca NY Cornell UP

Krivosic, Stjepan 1990 <u>Stanovnistvo Dubrovnika i Demografske Promjene u Proslosti</u> Dubrovnik

Kurspahic, Kemal <u>Prime Time Crime.</u> <u>Balkan Media in War and Peace</u> Washington D.C. United States Institute of Peace

Lake, David and Donald Rothchild eds. 1996 <u>The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict</u> Princeton Princeton UP

Lalic, Lazar 1995 "Images and Words of Hate: Vukovar 1991" ARHITEL

Lalic, Lazar 1995 <u>Three Years in TV Serbia</u> Belgrade Independent Media Union

Lasswell, Harold 1934 "Propaganda" <u>Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences</u> New York Macmillan

Lederer, Ivo 1963 <u>Yugoslavia at the Paris Peace Conference</u> New Haven Yale UP

Lindblom, Charles, 1990 <u>Inquiry and Change</u> New Haven Yale UP

Maas, Peter 1995 Love <u>Thy Neighbor. A Story of War</u> New York Knopf

Malcolm, Noel 1998 <u>Kosovo. A Short History</u> New York New York UP

Mann, Michael 2005 <u>The Dark Side of Democracy. Explaining Ethnic Cleansing</u> Cambridge, Cambridge U.P.

Markovic, Mira 1996 <u>Answers</u> Kinston Canada Quarry Press

Markovic, Zoran 1998 "Die Nation: Opfer und Rache" in Bremer et al. <u>Serbiens Weg in den Krieg</u>

Mazowiecki, Tadeusz, 1994 Special Report on the Media United Nations E/CN.4/1995/54

Milosevic, Milan 1997 "The Media Wars 1987-1997" in Jasmina Udovicki and James Ridgeway, <u>Burn This House Down: the Making and Unmaking of Yugoslavia</u> Durham Duke UP

Monnesland, Svend 1997 <u>Land ohne Wiederkehr</u> Klagenfurt Wieser

Monty, Marshall and Ted Robert Gurr 2003 <u>Peace and Conflict 2003</u> College Park MD U.of Maryland, Center for International Development and Conflict Management

Mutz, Diana 1998 <u>Impersonal Influence</u> New York Cambridge UP

Oberschall, Anthony 2000 "The Manipulation of Ethnicity: from Ethnic Cooperation to Violence and War in Yugoslavia" <u>Ethnic and Racial Studies 23</u> (6)

Oberschall, Anthony 1994 "Protest Demonstrations and the End of Communist Regimes in 1989" in <u>Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change 17</u>

Park, Robert E. 1967 <u>On Social Control and Collective Behavior</u> Chicago, Chicago U.P.

Popovic, Srdja et al. 1990 <u>Kosovski Cvor: Dresiti Ili Seci</u> [Kosovo knot: untie it or cut it] Belgrade Biblioteka Kronos

Pratkanis, Anthony and Eliot Aronson 2001 <u>The Art of Propaganda. The Everyday Use and Abuse of Persuasion</u> New York Freeman

Prunier, Gerard 1997 <u>Histoire d'un Genocide</u> Paris Dajorno

Reljic, Dusan 1998 <u>Killing Screens. Medien in Zeiten von Konflikten</u> Dusseldorf Droste

Renan, Ernest 1996 [1882] "Qu'est ce qu'une Nation ?" in Geoff Eley and R.G. Suny eds. <u>Becoming National. A Reader</u> New York Oxford UP

Sageman, Marc 2003 ""Statement to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States" www.Globalsecurity.org/security/library/congress/911_commission

Sekelj, Laslo 1993 <u>Yugoslavia. The Process of Disintegration</u> Boulder CO Social Science Monographs

Serbian Radical Party 1991 <u>Manifesto</u> 23 Feb. 1991 <u>Velika Srbija</u> no.9 1991

Seselj, Volislav 1991-2001 <u>Collected Works Vols. 1-44</u> Belgrade, and unnumbered volumes included in UN compiled disk 1304040A

Shea, John 1997 Macedonia and Greece. The Struggle to Define a Balkan Nation Jefferson NC McFarland

Sisk, Timothy 1996 Power Sharing and International Mediation in Ethnic Conflicts Washington D.C. Unites States Institute of Peace

Slapsak, Svetlana 1994 Ogledi o Bezbriznosti – srpski intelektualci, nacionalizam i jugoslovenski rat [Studies in Lightheartedness – Serb intellectuals, nationalism and the Yugoslav war] Belgrade Radio B92

Smith, Anthony 2003 Chosen People Oxford Oxford UP

Simic, Predrag 1994 "Yugoslavia: Media in Violence" RFE/RE Research Institute Reports Munchen

Sociologija 1997 vol. 34 (1) Jan/Mar.

Snyder, Jack 2000 From Voting to Violence New York Norton

Staub, Ervin 1989 The Roots of Evil. The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence New York

Cambridge UP

Stern, Jessica, 2003 Terror in the Name of God. Why Religious Militants Kill New York Harper Collins

Thompson, Mark 1994 Forging War. The Media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina Avon Bath press

Toennies, Ferdinand 1912 Kritik der Offentlichen Meinung Leipzig

Tolnay, Stuart and E.M. Beck 1995 A Festival of Violence Urbana U of Illinois P

United Nations 1994 Final Report of the UN Commission of Experts S/1994/674

United Nations, Commission on Human Rights 1994 "Report on the situation of human rights in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. Sixth periodic report" 21 Feb. E/CN.4/1994/110

U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee 1990 Yugoslavia: Crisis in Kosovo New York Human Rights Watch

Varady, Tibor 1997 "Minorities, majorities, law and ethnicity: reflections on the Yugoslav case" Human Rights Quarterly 19, pp. 9-54

Varshney, Ashutosh 2002 Ethnic Conflict and Civil Life New Haven Yale UP

Veljanovski, Rade 1998 "Die Wende in den elektronischen Medien" in Bremer et al, Serbiens Weg in

den Krieg

Vranic, Seada 1996 Breaking the Wall of Silence Zagreb Biblioteka Elektra

Waller, James 2002 Becoming Evil Oxford Oxford UP

Weber, Max 1956 [1921] "Ethnische Gemeinschaftsbeziehungen" in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft vol.1 part2, chap.4 Tubingen Mohr

Wright, Charles 1959 Mass Communications New York Random House

Woodward, Susan 1995 Balkan Tragedy Washington D.C. Brookings

Yugoslav Survey 1990 (no.1) "Public Opinion Survey on the Federal Executive Council's Social and Economic reforms, 31 March 1990"

APPENDIX 1 The Explanation of Collective Violence

Lynching

In the US South, in ten states, there were about 2800 lynchings from 1880-1930; 88% were black victims lynched by white perpetrators. Blacks were lynched for alleged crimes: 68% for murder or sexual assault, 32% for lesser offenses. Lynching was often a public event: crowds gathered at the court house and jail in a small town, some men forced their way into the jail, removed the black prisoner, hung the victim on a tree nearby, sometimes accompanied by torture and mutilation. The perpetrators were known. At times women and children attended. Bystanders were photographed standing proudly near the hung body of the victim. The white community supported the lynching; few dared speak out against it. The law enforcement authorities were vastly outnumbered, and sometimes did nothing to stop the lynching. When perpetrators were indicted, white juries refused to convict. It was a very low risk crime for the offenders. Some lynchings were perpetrated by smaller groups of armed men hunting down a black alleged offender, and lynching him when apprehended. These too were publicized. How could such group violence take place for so many decades with so much Southern white public support?

The *racial division and animosity* between whites and blacks was real. Economic competition in the one crop cotton economy of the South was intense. In politics, whites sought to regain the political power monopoly they had been forced to share after slavery ended. The racist *ideology of white supremacy* held that blacks were inferior and dangerous. The norms of justice derived from English common law (innocent until proven guilty, trial by jury, etc.) were alleged to be inadequate to control blacks, and consequently *lynching* (a violation of those norms) was *morally justified*. Church leaders, elected officials,

and other prominent whites all backed white supremacy, and white public opinion was solid. *Political leaders* exploited racial animosity and fear of blacks. Racial politics defeated repeated attempts to realign politics on a class basis, with poor whites and blacks together challenging the more affluent whites who governed and who controlled the cotton economy. *Secret societies* of armed white supremacists (e.g. Ku Klux Klan) were organized to intimidate blacks and moderate whites. *Newspapers* (the only mass media of that era) sensationalized black crime stories and spread fear of blacks, and sold many copies. News stories blamed outside agitators for black aspirations for equality. The supremacists succeeded. Black voters were disenfranchised, legal separation of the races (segregation) was imposed, the poor white challenge to Southern elites was deflected and the South became a one party region until the 1960s.

Lynching started to diminish in the 1920s for a number of reasons. Black out migration to the North during World War One worried cotton planters about loss of cheap labor, just when poor whites were also leaving farm labor for new cotton mills (for whites only). Together they diminished white-black competition in cotton agriculture. Politicians and planters reacted with a less coercive racial policy; influential white church women, church leaders, and some newspapers condemned lynching; there was more law enforcement and prosecution to stop lynching. White supremacy and segregation was not however overturned until the non-violent civil rights movement succeeded in the mid1960s.[1]

Communal Riots in India

Religious riots between Hindus and Muslims in India – called "communal riots" – have occurred repeatedly in many cities such as Hyderabad, Ahmedabad, and Aligarth, with mixed Hindu/Muslim populations. A riot is typically occasioned at a religious event, festival, or procession which is perceived as provocative when it takes place at a time of rising political and religious tensions. These tensions are whipped up by political leaders during a political campaign and elections. As Paul Brass writes[2] "…communal riots are a continuation and an extension of communal politics by other means." Professor Paul Wilkinson agrees[3] : "When engaged in close electoral races in urban areas, Indian politicians foment violence and encourage polarization…Gujarat in 2002 bears this out. Violence was incited throughout India in response to Hindu nationalist fears that the Congress would win the next elections."

The trigger for collective violence are religious insults, defiled sacred symbols, violations of religious taboos, i.e. public humiliation of the dignity and religious identity of Hindus and/or Muslims. Young men trained in body building, weaponry, and religious fervor, known as "warriors", supported by bystander crowds, attack, arson, loot, destroy, kill (often accompanied by mutilation and atrocities) indiscriminately the members of the other religion ("there are no innocents") and their property, while the local police is unwilling or incapable of stopping the rioting, and sometimes takes sides. Perpetrators of violence and bystanders express no remorse or regret. Victims flee their homes. Destroyed neighborhoods are later rebuilt and developed by politicians and realtors at a profit. Sectarian cleansing and urban redevelopment resulting from the riot makes for more religiously and politically homogeneous districts in the city, which heightens religious and political polarization.

How explain these communal riots? There is a *real division and conflict* in India between Hindus and

---

[1] based on Stuart Tolnay and E.M. Beck, <u>A Festival of Violence</u>, 1995, and W. Fitzhugh Brundage, <u>Lynching in the New South</u>, 1993, Urbana, U. of Illinois Press.

[2] <u>The Production of Hindu-Moslem Violence in Contemporary India</u>, 2003, p.242],
[3] talk at Duke University colloquium, Jan.15, 2004

Muslims, historical and cultural, which led to the partition of British India into India and Pakistan amid massive collective violence. The rivalry and competition is not only manifest in politics, but in striving for status and dignity, e.g. competitive temple and mosque building. These *animosities, rivalries and divisions* keep getting *activated by political leaders*. According to Brass [1] " One cannot say …that there is a bedrock of communal prejudices having nothing to do with politics that lies slumbering , waiting to explode. These antagonisms are partly created by political mobilization, nurtured in apparently peaceful periods, and drawn upon by political leaders and parties when an emotional issue…becomes salient or is made salient."

Under Nehru and Indira Ghandi, the Congress Party had stood for secular nationalism and modernization. When economic development stagnated and caste division within Hindu society increased, Hindu nationalists successfully challenged the Congress , calling for Hindu solidarity and *highlighting threats* against Hindus from Muslims (e.g. further partition, higher birth rate), while Muslims themselves experienced a growth of Islamic fundamentalism. Political discourse in *election campaigns and in the mass media spread moral justification for violence* against the "other" community with stories of revenge for past injuries, group defense against threats that justify preemptive strikes, victimhood, deterrence against status quo challenges ("teaching them a lesson"), and other similar moral and intellectual rationalizations. [2] The message to perpetrators of violence and bystander publics is clear: different norms of conduct are appropriate in normal times and during periods of collective conflict and rioting.

In cities (e.g. Lucknow, Surat) where political divisions between Hindus and Muslims are lesser – internal divisions among Hindus along caste and among Muslims on sectarianism (Sunni/Shi'ia) create opportunities for cross-religion coalitions – local Hindu/Muslim political alliances and civic cooperation are robust in withstanding growing communal tensions, and these cities experience no, fewer, or less intense communal riots.[3] Communal rioting is not simply an inevitable result of long standing religious animosities and conflicts, as politicians and authorities claim, but a *calculated choice by political leaders* in some cities, but not in others, *to manipulate* these *animosities* for own advantage.

Political mobilization for aggressive and violent behavior and protection of perpetrators ensures risk free *criminal conduct* and *absence of accountability*. Varshney writes that[4] "Without the involvement of organized gangs, large scale rioting and tens and hundreds of killings are most unlikely, and without the protection afforded by politicians, such criminals cannot escape the clutches of the law." Communal riots are stopped when outside police and law enforcement vigorously intervenes.

Rwanda genocide

The Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda (as well as nearby Burundi) share the same language, religion, and culture, but differed on economic status and political power. High population density, fierce competition for land and for scarce government positions was the source of conflicts. Periods of peaceful cooperation and intermarriage were disrupted by episodic collective violence, as during the transition from colony to independence in 1959 and the early 1960s when political changes instituted by the Belgian colonial administration upset Hutu-Tutsi relations. Many Tutsi at that time were victims of massacres and violence and fled into exile to neighboring Uganda. *Divisions* and *animosities were real*, but so was a *tradition of*

---

[1] Hindu-Muslim Violence, 2003, p.242
[2] Sudhir Kakar, The Colors of Violence, 1996, p.132
[3] Ashutosh Varshney, Ethnic Conflict and Civil Life, 2002
[4] 2002, p.11

cooperation and sharing institutions.

By 1990, 1.3 million Tutsi refugees were living in neighboring countries. The second generation of Tutsi exiles in Uganda wanted to return to their homeland, organized the Rwanda Patriotic Front (RPF), declared war on the Hutu regime, and invaded Northern Rwanda in October 1990. Over the next 3 years, the RPF gained territory and won battles against the Rwanda army. There existed a *real political and military crisis* in Rwanda. Under international pressure, President Habyarimana undertook a conciliatory approach in peace talks with the RPF and in August 1993 both sides agreed to power sharing governance, Tutsi refugee return, cessation of the war and a merger of the two armies.

That *compromise* was *unacceptable to* a powerful faction of the regime calling itself "*Hutu Power*". Instead of peace, they organized a unilateral "final solution" to the Tutsi problem: genocide.[1]

It is estimated that 800,000 Tutsis and ten to thirty thousand Hutu regime opponents were killed in waves of massacres that spread through Rwanda during 3-4 month in 1994.[2] Ordinary villagers were recruited, indoctrinated and trained for killing by the *militant Hutu Power militia "Interhamwe",* which stockpiled and distributed weapons and drew up Tutsi "enemy" lists in each locality[3] . According to Carruthers[4] "in Rwanda …violence was preceded by months of propaganda, encouraging its recipients to hate and fear enemies portrayed as ethnically distinct." Indoctrination of militants in camps targeted the Tutsis and moderate Hutus as security threats who would side with the invading Rwanda Patriotic Force army and as enemies and traitors who deserved to die. Moral justification for violence against Tutsi was spread in the *hate and fear propaganda of Radio Milles Collines*. Among its messages inciting massacres were the following: "You have missed some enemies! Some are still alive! You must go back and finish them off! The graves are not yet full!" [5]

The actual massacres were triggered by the shooting down of the President's aircraft on 6 April 1994 as he was returning from an international peace conference on implementation of the Arusha peace accord. Within 45 minutes the massacres started. The massacres had been advocated for months earlier on Radio Milles Collines and in the newspaper Kangur, media outlets controlled by Hutu Power. The killers were the army, police, Interhamwe militias and bands, and thousands of ordinary villagers mobilized by government officials. The genocide organizers called village meetings and demanded that villagers "cut down Tutsis" because they would side with the invading RPF army. The peasants were made agents of the regime and the state, *relieving them of moral responsibility for killing*, in fact commanding them to do so. Victims were hacked to death with machetes regardless of gender and age, amid other atrocities. The *genocide* was a *deliberate choice* of *Hutu Power leaders* – an educated elite – *to manipulate the threat of invasion* by amplifying fears and directing hatred against Tutsi and conciliatory Hutu, and destroying them once and for all. They chose the goal of keeping a monopoly on power (as their name indicated) instead of power sharing governance agreed during the Arusha peace process, at a cost of hundreds of thousand lives.

---

[1] Alison Des Forges, Leave None to Tell the Story,1999.

[2] Patrick Brogan, World Conflicts, 1998, p.33
[3] Gerard Prunier, Histoire d'un Genocide, 1997, p.288
[4] The Media Wars, 2000, p. 46
[5] Brogan, World Conflicts, 1998, p.33