

## COPYRIGHT / USAGE

Material on this site may be quoted or reproduced for **personal and educational purposes** without prior permission, provided appropriate credit is given. Any commercial use of this material is prohibited without prior permission from The Special Collections Department - Langsdale Library, University of Baltimore. Commercial requests for use of the transcript or related documentation must be submitted in writing to the address below.

When crediting the use of portions from this site or materials within that are copyrighted by us please use the citation: *Used with permission of the University of Baltimore.*

If you have any requests or questions regarding the use of the transcript or supporting documents, please contact us:

Langsdale Library  
Special Collections Department  
1420 Maryland Avenue  
Baltimore, MD 21201-5779  
<http://archives.ubalt.edu>



EMBASSY OF THE SOCIALIST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA  
2410 CALIFORNIA STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20008-1679 (202)462-6566

July 17, 1991

Dear Senator Nickles:

I applaud the opening paragraph of the Senate Resolution No. 153 in which you praise the republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and Slovenia for having committed themselves to democracy and free-market economy, but I regret that you omitted the other two republics - Serbia and Montenegro, as if these republics were not committed to democracy and market economy. On the contrary, they are passing through the same temptations and challenges of the transitional period like the rest of the country.

When I read the Resolution which you have co-sponsored, I found it to be a highly biased and one-sided document as a whole.

What is it that I find unbalanced in that resolution? I shall confine myself to a few essential points.

Firstly, the Resolution advocates principles of democratization and self-determination in order to resolve the current Yugoslav crisis. These are noble principles contained in the Yugoslav Constitution which recognize the inalienable right to secession not only to the people of Slovenia and Croatia but to other Yugoslav peoples as well. However, that rights comes along with other equally essential principles, such as the right to territorial integrity of countries and non-interference in the internal affairs, etc. You have chosen to call for the respect of selective principles, implying that the integrity of Yugoslavia is not important and that the secession of the republics should be rewarded by advising the U.S. Government to establish diplomatic, political and economic ties with the Yugoslav breakaway republics.

The wisdom of such an one-sided attitude, which does not take into consideration the interests of the country as a whole, is highly questionable and, therefore, misleading. That is why the London summit of the G-7 gave an equal importance to both the principle of self-determination and of territorial integrity.

The Honorable Don Nickles  
United States Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20510-3602

Secondly, the Resolution accuses the federal institutions of Yugoslavia of stalling democratization and self-determination.

The Federal institutions are helping to keep the country together to enable the citizens to lead as normal a life as possible and to enable the country to honor its international political commitments and obligations while the process of democratic transformation and negotiations on the future architecture of Yugoslavia unfolds. It was widely recognized by the U.S. and other Western Governments that the Federal Government of Prime Minister Ante Markovic was the main instrument of democratization, introduction of multiparty democracy, and market economy in Yugoslavia, but that its program was torpedoed by the prolonged political crisis.

It is known that Slovenia and Croatia have opted for independence with a possibility of forming a loose confederation, that the two republics, namely Serbia and Montenegro, advocate a federal concept, while the other two, namely Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia, advocate an alliance of sovereign republics. The latter approach has been accepted by all of the six republics as the basis of a possible compromise. This is still the subject of negotiations among the six republics.

The unilateral declaration of secession by Slovenia and of independence by Croatia, together with the crisis in Kosovo and the prolonged conflict between the Kosovo Albanians and the Serbian authorities there, have crippled the capability of federal institutions to honor Yugoslavia's domestic and international commitments. The EEC and CSCE have, therefore, asked for a three-month cooling off period, a sort of moratorium on the implementation of the secession and independence decisions by Slovenia and Croatia in order to preserve the normal functioning of political and economic system, while negotiations should be intensified in order to clarify the possible outcome of the current crisis and to try to find the answer to the future of Yugoslavia. It is, therefore, very important that you, as a respected Senator, do not ignore all these and many other important developments and efforts while discussing and passing judgment on the current crisis in Yugoslavia.

Thirdly, you refer in several paragraphs to the elections in Kosovo and Vojvodina, as if no elections had taken place. As it is known, Kosovo and Vojvodina are autonomous provinces of the Republic of Serbia. Multiparty, free and fair presidential and parliamentary elections in Serbia were held, which was witnessed by many foreign observers. What remains to be held are elections to municipal and provincial assemblies and preparation for them is underway.

Albanians in Yugoslavia, naturally, should be represented in the ongoing dialogue on the future of Yugoslavia. However, you have failed to inform your colleagues in the Senate that the Kosovo Albanians boycotted the elections to the Serbian Parliament, thus excluding themselves from political activities of their

republic's parliament and depriving themselves of a chance to be adequately included in the dialogue. The Albanians living in Macedonia and in other republics have normally participated in multiparty elections and, therefore, have a continued impact on the legislative process in their republics. The Albanians from Kosovo refuse to recognize Serbia as their republic, they refuse to cooperate with Serbia, demand their own republic of Kosovo and thus challenge the territorial integrity of Serbia and Yugoslavia. At the same time, their political activities are developing freely: the Albanians in Kosovo have set up a number of political parties, they publish more than 26 newspapers in Albanian, they use freely their language at all levels of education - from elementary school to the University of Pristina, they communicate in Albanian in judiciary and administrative matters and enjoy rights that no minority in any country in the world does.

The Resolution demands the application of the principle of self-determination for the two provinces - Vojvodina and Kosovo - knowing that no international instrument gives the right to self-determination to territories and national minorities. The U.N. Charter established only the principle of self-determination of peoples (Chapter I, Article 1, principle 2.) To follow the logic of the Resolution would open up an endless process of global disintegration of states in which national minorities live.

I hope that you will take into consideration my friendly observations and try to understand the interests of Yugoslav nations and nationalities before taking position on the highly complex Yugoslav crisis.

Yours sincerely,



Dzevad Mujezinovic  
Ambassador