

**'Paradiplomatic' relations between the United States and Kosova:**

**A friendship between an elephant and a mouse**

Naim Dedushaj

A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Arts in the University of Malta for the degree of Master  
of Arts in Contemporary Diplomacy  
July 2006

Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test  
a man's character, give him power.

Abraham Lincoln

**To the Memory of our beloved President**

**Ibrahim Rugova (1944-2006)**

a remarkable leader and a respected pacifist

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. THE LDK REPRESENTATION IN THE US. AND THE ESTABLISHING OF THE PARA-DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1. KOSOVA IN 1989 AND THE BIRTH OF THE LDK .....	5
1.2. PARADIPLMACY AS A CONCEPT OF NEW INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS - LDK ACTIVITIES IN AMERICA AS AN EXAMPLE .....	9
1.3. THE KOSOVA-ALBANIAN DIASPORA IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE LDK MOBILIZATION .....	12
<b>2. THE LDK PARADIPLMATIC ACTIVITIES IN PRACTICE .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1. ELECTORAL FINANCING – A SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY TO INTRODUCE THE KOSOVA ISSUE IN HIGH LEVEL AMERICAN POLITICS .....	17
2.2. RELATIONS WITH THE US. CONGRESS.....	22
2.3. PRESIDENT RUGOVA IN AMERICA .....	28
2.4. USA STARTS TO TREAT KOSOVA SEPARATED FROM EX-YUGOSLAVIA.....	39
<b>3. THE ROLE OF THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE US. AND KOSOVA FROM THE 1999 WAR TO THE STATUS NEGOTIATIONS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
3.1. THE WAY TOWARDS THE WAR .....	46
3.2. THE UNITED STATES COME TO RESCUE (1999).....	50
3.3. A LOOK BACKWARDS – THE WAY TO THE UNBEARABLE STATUS QUO .....	59
<b>4. NON-STATE ACTORS IN THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS – THE CASE OF KOSOVAR PARADIPLMACY .....</b>	<b>62</b>
4.1. THE UNITED STATES AND THE KOSOVO WAR.....	62
4.2. THE ROLE OF STATE, SOVEREIGNTY AND DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY .....	66
4.3. PARADIPLMACY - RUGOVA TACTICS .....	70
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>80</b>

## Introduction

Today's world is witnessing a change in traditional diplomatic relations. Globalization, localization and many other world wide trends are changing the context in which the states carry out their relations. As Brian Hocking puts it:

“Developments are occurring in the realm of diplomacy that challenge assumptions as to its character and operational principles. Central to these is the erosion of the dominance of the professional diplomat as the agent of the state in its international dealings. Looked at in its broader context, of course, this should hardly be surprising since—despite the fact that diplomacy transcends any one phase in the evolution of the international system—it appears to sit logically with images of a transformational, post-Westphalian order. Thus we find the diplomatic milieu inhabited by a growing diversity of actors, which certainly poses a far more complex image of international interactions than does the traditional intergovernmental perspective.” (Hocking 2004, 147.)

James Rosenau has argued that there are two “worlds” in world politics, respectively, a world of states and a world of non-state actors (Rosenau 1988, 327-364). This is a conceptual distinction that is now commonly used in the international relations studies. We should however see that the question is not entirely black and white. To distinguish between states and non-state actors is not so easy, especially when studying diplomatic actors that interact. This thesis proposes an analysis of this change of diplomatic activities using as a case example the transition of Kosova from a “province” that was deprived of its autonomy in Yugoslavia to a quasi-independent state. To focus especially on the (para)diplomatic relations between Kosovar leaders and their foreign

counterparts, this thesis concentrates on the relations between Kosova and the United States of America, a world power that has played a crucial role in the recent developments in Kosova and in the Balkans in general. The United States of America gives us a fruitful case study also due to the numerous Albanian diaspora living in America. To understand the phenomenon on paradiplomacy (explained in the first chapter), it is important also to understand the role of immigrants.

The warm relations between Albanians and America date way back in history. Stories are still told about the first immigrants – their history has passed orally in families to become part of the national history. The first Albanian known to have moved to the New World left from Korça in Southern Albania and arrived in the United States in 1876, but he is told to have continued his journey from there to Argentina. The first Albanian who actually resided in the United States was Preng Doci who served as a catholic missionary in the Wild West coast from 1877 until 1881. He served two years as a priest in St. John, New Brunswick, just to leave for Rome in 1883. A few years later he was appointed as abbot now in his birthplace in Orosh of Miredita, where he served until he died in 1917. (Jacques 1994, 335.)

The first Albanian who stayed for good in the United States was Koli Kristofori (1858-1940) from the village Katund, near Korça. He arrived in Boston with a Greek ship in 1886, at the same year when the statue of freedom was dedicated at the New York port. Petro Nini Luarasi left for the USA in 1904 leading other exiled people from Korça. In New York 1906 was established the first ‘patriotic community’ together with a charity organization. It was called *Longing for motherland*. The same year Fan Noli (1882- 1965) left for America. Fan Noli was not only an outstanding leader of the Albanian-American community, but also a pre-eminent and multi-

talented figure of Albanian literature, culture, religious life and politics. The first ones thus left from the area of the current Albania.

The Albanian major migration flows from Kosova and other parts in ex-Yugoslavia took place much later. Albanian-Americans from Kosova organized themselves actively and played a crucial role in sensitizing the American leadership about the Albanian and Kosova issue. Albanians of America were organized in many associations ('LABI' from the word lobby) and organizations. The activities of the Albanian-American community should not be underestimated when studying the American policies towards Kosova in the 1990s. How were the *paradiplomatic* relations established and maintained between the representatives of Kosova and the United States administration? What has been the role of these relations in the recent developments in Kosova? Indeed, how these relations are an excellent example of post-modern international relations, a basis for a friendship between a super power and a non-state entity?

In this thesis the term 'Kosova' is used instead of 'Kosovo'. Kosova is the name used by the Albanians. The UN resolutions and most international sources use the international form 'Kosovo'. Kosova is not yet recognized as an official name. This name issue is however interesting when studying the US-Kosova relations, for example the introducing of the term Kosova into the American political debate (used in some Congress resolutions and official documents) can be seen as influence of the American-Albanian community on the American politics. The word Kosovo is used always if it is in direct quotation; this is how the difference between those who use the concept Kosovo and those who decide to choose the Albanian form Kosova can be underlined.

## **1. The LDK representation in the US. and the establishing of the para-diplomatic relations**

### ***1.1. Kosova in 1989 and the birth of the LDK***

When the Ottoman Empire was little by little breaking down to independent nation-states in the Balkan area, the Albanian populated areas were divided. Albania managed to get independence in 1912 (mainly thanks to American President Wilson who prevented Albania's division between the neighboring states in the Paris conference). Kosova was left to Serbia. Albanians were left without a republic status in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as they "already had a motherland" – Albania. Kosova was left a poor backyard of Serbia.

Living conditions in Kosova were not improving in the 1980s. Student manifestations in the beginning of the 80s had been repressed violently. There was little signs of waking international interest on Kosova Albanians, even though some active lobbyists tried to bring up the Kosova cause for example in the United States. Already in 1986, when the Europeans did not expect any political changes in the Cold War Europe, not to mention a war, and Yugoslavia as a non-aligned state was seen as a stable ally of the European Community, a resolution was introduced in the

US. Congress to condemn with strong words the repression of ethnic Albanians by the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The US. Congress was asked to note that Albanians constitute “one of the largest ethnic groups within Yugoslavia” and the proposed text criticized strongly the human rights violations in the province. The resolution introduced made allusion to the policies of the Kosova Albanians trying to bring up the Albanian political requests (an equal status of a Republic) on the Yugoslav political arena by “nonviolent manner”, but had encountered only violence from the Yugoslav Government side. US. Congress took up the situation of the large number of “political prisoners within Yugoslavia” that were mainly ethnic Albanians and discussed the issue for the first time. The situation in 1986 was grave. Albanians were already severely suppressed. (See the resolution H. CON. RES. 358 from 17 June 1986)

The resolution introduced went further than asking for respect of human rights as the resolution stated “Whereas Kosovo, the province which is the homeland for the majority of ethnic Albanians, has been denied, by the Yugoslav Government, full-fledged status as a republic equal to Yugoslavia’s six other republics which are the homelands for other ethnic groups with much smaller numbers than ethnic Albanians”. It pledged for the idea that Kosova should have a status of Republic such as Montenegro or Macedonia. It is quite obvious that the Albanian lobby in America was behind of proposing and drafting this resolution. At that time the American Congressmen were not this familiar with the political formation of the Yugoslav state – especially as the collapse of the Yugoslav state had not yet started. It is the Bosnian war that brought this state to the attention of the larger public. The resolution 358 was a political victory to the Albanian community as they managed to get the US. Congress to discuss their political request of getting a status of a Republic for Kosova. Even though the US. Congress did not officially pass this resolution that urged the Yugoslav Government to respect the human rights of



“ethnic groups in the Kosovo Autonomous Province; - - to work with ethnic Albanian leaders to elevate Kosovo to full republic status”. It was the first step of sensitizing the Congressmen to the situation of Kosova Albanians.

This resolution was introduced by Congressman DioGuardi seemingly of Italian descent. The story goes that a wealthy Albanian American overheard his father to speak Arberesh, an Albanian dialect spoken in the Southern Italy for centuries. This gave the Albanian Diaspora an opportunity to underline the Kosova case to Congressman DioGuardi, who had no idea of his family background, but when he learned of being related to the Albanians, started pushing the Kosova issue in the House of Representatives. In early 1986 a Democrat Congressman, Tom Lantos, from California helped him to introduce the above mentioned resolution 358 (17 June 1986) in the House of Representatives calling on Yugoslavia to protect Albanians’ human rights in Yugoslavia. The next day, Senator Bob Dole introduced the same resolution in the Senate. After that some Congressmen talked regularly about the situation of Kosova’s Albanians to their congressional colleagues, invited human rights advocates and Balkan experts to testify and wrote letters to the President Ronald Reagan and to Secretary of State George Shultz. DioGuardi lost however his seat in Congress in 1988. (Sullivan, 2004, p. 58-60.) At that time Albanians were already a numerous community in America, but their political awakening had just started.

These efforts did not have any impact on the Yugoslav government. On the contrary the situation and the repression got worse. In 1989 Slobodan Milosevic used Kosova as a political tool to get support from the radicals inside the Serbian community. He removed the autonomous status of Kosova. The disintegration of the former Yugoslav Federation indeed began with the unconstitutional change of the federal status of Kosova in 1989. Albanian American community tried to act and pleaded for help. Three resolutions were introduced in the US. Congress on

Kosova in 1989. On March 9 the Congress was proposed to appeal “for the continuing internal autonomy of the Province of Kosova as provided for in the Yugoslav Constitution of 1974” without any success. On April 4, another proposal criticized again the Yugoslav Government about the clear human rights violations as well as the suppression of Albanians in Kosova.

On 13 June 1989 a new proposal for a resolution (H. CON. RES. 152) in the Congress expressed again “the grave concern of the Congress regarding human rights violations in the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia” making allusion also to the statement of the European Parliament condemning the action of the Yugoslav Government in the Province of Kosova. The manifestations of Albanians against the removal of the Autonomous status of Kosova led to violent crack down by the Yugoslav police forces. Hundreds of Albanians were killed, wounded or imprisoned. An interesting feature in this proposal is that it makes allusion not only to known Human Rights agreements such as Helsinki Final Act and the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights but also to “the high ideals of mutual equality, dignity, and brotherhood among all of the country's nations and nationalities which has been a guiding principle of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslav since 1945”. The fact that the United States a few months before the fall of the Berlin Wall (and thus before the end of the Cold War) appeals for the ‘guiding principles of a socialist state’ is again a sign that a strong appeal for this resolution must have come from the representatives of Kosova itself. Naturally none of these proposals were past in the US. Congress, but the issue of Kosova had been put on the Congress agenda and was not to be removed until the Kosova issue would be resolved.

The Kosovars had different reactions to Milosevic revoking the province’s autonomy. A small fraction of Marxist-Leninist exiles (LPRK) in Switzerland called for armed rebellion (Judah 2002, 96-110), but most people in Kosova rallied behind Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, a university

literature professor, who advocated calm and non-violent resistance. Dr. Ibrahim Rugova had been chosen in the head of the Democratic League of Kosova (LDK), the first political party of Kosova created on 23 December 1989, and he was later elected the first President of Kosova in underground elections. The American branch of the Democratic League of Kosova was created soon after that in USA in 1990.

In Kosova the Constitutional Declaration was adopted on 2 July 1990 by the majority of the deputies of the Kosova Assembly (Parliament), the highest legislative body of the then autonomous Kosova, was the first legal step which was then followed up by the Constitution of the Republic of Kosova of September 7th 1990, the National Referendum on Independence of September 1991, as well as the national elections of 1992 and 1998, respectively. The Constitutional Declaration (i.e. Declaration on Independence) proclaiming Kosova an independent and equal federal unit in the then Federal Yugoslavia was an attempt towards an institutional reshaping of the realities in view of the right to self-determination of peoples.

## ***1.2. Paradiplomacy as a concept of new international relations<sup>1</sup> - LDK activities in America as an example***

Some researchers in International Relations have started to pay attention to foreign relations of different local government bodies (Aldecoa & Keating 1999). Local and regional governments handle their relations with their partners abroad through different cooperational structures. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The first time I saw someone use paradiplomacy as a concept in the context of Kosova was by a Finnish Balkan researcher, Tanja Tamminen, in a colloque at the University of Turku, where I had been invited as a key note speaker. Tamminen's paper, presented at that time in English, has only been published in Finnish, but for example the bibliography and discussions with her have been of great help in preparing this thesis. (Tamminen 2005.)

action in the international field of different *non-central governments*, NCGs have been called since the 1980s as paradiplomacy (or protodiplomacy) (Cornago 1999, 40).

The notion of paradiplomacy is debated, because it is considered as too vague (Aguirre 1999, 186) or it is seen as too much as imitating the traditional diplomacy or foreign relations, when many times the question really is of totally different kind of handling of international relations (Keating 1999, 11-13). This term has thus been controversial and it has been proposed other synonyms such as the politics of the micro-level. Der Derian uses the concept of paradiplomacy in different sense as it is understood in this thesis. Paradiplomacy is for Der Derian something happening totally outside the state foreign policy (Der Derian 1987, 5).

In this thesis paradiplomacy is not only understood as action of local governments such as regions but it is used as a general term to refer to the diplomatic action or foreign relations of non-state actors, in this case representatives of Kosova, a territory without a state sovereignty, an international protectorate since 1999. Noé Cornagio defines paradiplomacy as “non-central governments’ involvement in international relations through the establishment of permanent or ad hoc contacts with foreign public or private entities, with the aim to promote socioeconomic or cultural issues, as well as any other foreign dimension of their constitutional competences” (1999, 40). The word constitutional is especially interesting in the Kosova case, as Kosova’s autonomy was removed in 1989 by an unconstitutional act. Understood in a broader sense this definition can however be used. The Kosova had clandestine elections and the Kosovars chose a President and other representatives – they were above the actual local level but they were not recognized state representatives either – these representatives are here considered as members of NCGs (non central governments) until the establishment of PISG in 1999 and after that still as non-state actors until the final status solution will be signed. This is why all foreign relations

conducted by these representatives will be referred to as “para-diplomacy” in this thesis to avoid any misunderstandings. Studying the multi-level diplomacy in the case of Kosova will give an interesting perspective to the International Relations.

The Balkan research has been for long time interested in the traditional networks of power, the role of family and other political networks based on loyalty. The example and analysis of the establishment and internationalization of the LDK as a democratic mass political party bring new networks on the agenda of the Balkan studies. Indeed, the LDK is an excellent example to study the political transition from the semi-authoritarian Yugoslav system to liberal democracy through the establishment of democratic political structures. It is even more interesting as this transition happens in a non-state entity that is part of a bigger state where the central government (of the rumps of Yugoslavia) follows a much slower democratic development. This contradictory situation added to the rising nationalism, ethnocentric and violent rhetoric and politics of the Serbian leadership directed against the Albanian population in Kosova, made it an absolute necessity for the representatives of the Albanians in Kosova to open up relations with the outside world. Their interests could not obviously be represented by the Serbian Foreign Ministry, but without state sovereignty Kosova could not establish abroad traditional Embassies of her own either. Milosevic had even removed the autonomous status of Kosova in 1989, so the Kosova stayed without any kind of legal mandate of local government who could have represented the ‘province’ on the international arena following the laws of the Yugoslav state.

The foreign relations established by the Democratic League of Kosova, LDK, can be understood as *paradiplomacy par excellence*. Indeed, if not legal (if the laws of Yugoslavia were considered), the LDK representation abroad was seen as legitimate in the eyes of the Albanian population who had with a large majority elected an LDK representative as President and

majority of LDK members to the Kosova Assembly in the clandestine elections. Later on through the constant connections with political decision makers abroad (not least in the United States) the LDK was considered as a legitimate representative of the Kosova Albanian population also in the eyes of the foreign governments. The LDK office in New York was thought the “Embassy” of Kosova as it handled the relations not only with the White House and the US. Congress but also with the United Nations and international relief organizations sending humanitarian assistance to the suffering Kosova.

### ***1.3. The Kosova-Albanian Diaspora in the United States and the LDK mobilization***

Already in the end of the 1980s Kosova Albanian Diaspora had tried to organize itself politically in the United States, but the gatherings had not resulted in something concrete. When the LDK was established as a political party in Kosova, also the idea was that the little by little the non-resident sympathizers would have the change to have institutionalized political organizations in their respective countries of residence. The American branch of LDK was established on 25 December 1990 as the local LDK branch for New York, New Jersey and Connecticut was established in a meeting that gathered up a large number of local Kosova Albanian activists. It took almost a year to organize this founding meeting in New York. New York was chosen as the focal point as for example the headquarters of the United Nations are situated there. The idea was that the LDK organization would be established on a spontaneous will of Kosova Albanians to organize themselves under a political umbrella. This was seen as an important step to make it possible to organize effective fund-raising activities to help the clandestine Kosova government and Kosovar society as well as to establish contacts with American political circles.

The meeting was finally organized as word got around about the organization of the LDK political branch in the United States. Individuals as well as already semi-organized Kosova Albanian associations or other groups joined the meeting to found this new “off-shore” LDK branch. The LDK headquarters in Prishtina were a bit cautious with the American activists first. The leaders in Prishtina wanted to make sure that organization was done in a democratic and serious manner and thus they did not want to rush the things. Earlier all efforts trying to register and politically institutionalize Kosova Albanian community in America had failed.

In September 1990 the LDK leadership in Prishtina sent clear instructions to America asking for the registration of the LDK sympathizers in America. The LDK leadership also asked the local organization in the United States to work in close cooperation with the old Albanian-American community present in America since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. They had already an association that had worked in close cooperation with the Congressman DioGuardi.

Dr Ali Aliu was nominated by the LDK in Prishtina to go to America to organize the founding of the local branch there. Intensive meeting were organized as well as a founding commission. In the first meeting the activists present elected a steering board who was given the responsibility to found the LDK branch in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. A temporary leader Din Derti was also elected. The basic condition that made it possible for this attempt of founding a political organization to survive was that all rules agreed upon democratically had to be followed cautiously. Prishtina made it clear in their instructions that democratic procedures and principles had to be followed in founding the LDK branch as well as in organizing its political structure.

In the meeting of December 1990 when the branch was founded, a democratically elected “parliament” or better said assembly of representatives was chosen and it was commonly agreed upon that everything decided by this elected highest body had to be executed. These representatives had then the right to elect a steering board as well as a leader, deputy leader, secretary and an accountant. Also a founding statute was decided upon. The steering board was chosen to lead the work but was directly responsible to the assembly of representatives. In the most important questions the steering board had to consult the assembly of representatives as well as the main leaders of the local groupings or associations.

The first main task of the LDK branch in America was to stabilize its work by registering sympathizers. Even if the action started only in three states (New York, New Jersey and Connecticut), the activities were rapidly spread all over the United States and the membership numbers tripled in a very short time. First the LDK office had been financed by one Albanian business man Rexhe Xhakli, but later the sponsored by Gjon Cotaj, another Albanian businessman, it was possible to move the office to Bronx and stay open every day of the week. Naim Dedushaj<sup>2</sup> was nominated as the head of this New York office, which was the only headquarters of the LDK in the United States and Canada, where the Kosova Albanian sympathizers were also being organized. LDK activities in the Northern America were organized in one block. All material and instructions coming from Prishtina were sent to the New York office and then distributed from there to local branches and associations. This office also worked hard to establish active contacts with other LDK “off shore” branches for example in the European states.

---

<sup>2</sup> I arrived in the United States of America in December 1991. I left Kosova just like many of my countrymen, because the situation was getting unbearable. I had been in the LDK since the establishing of the party in Kosova and I continued my activity within the party when in America. First I was the General Secretary of LDK in the United States and then nominated the Head of Office.



Quickly after the establishment of the Assembly and the LDK office, an active lobbying was also organized. The LDK office in New York established relations with the American political circles: administration, House of Representatives, Senate, State Department as well as with different relief organizations, international organizations and the United Nations. These activities will be detailed in the chapter 2.

The Albanian community in America as well as LDK in Prishtina were now certain that this organization was serious and stable and could contribute to achieve the major political goal: a free Kosova. In America major manifestations for the Kosova cause were organized. In New York 10 000 Albanians participated in one manifestation. Different manifestations and other activities were organized. 11 sub-associations were established. Also the fund raising was organized for Kosova and Albania.

Relations with the Congress and Senate were intensified. Ewa Brandley was started to be called as the Ambassadors of Kosova as she brought up the Kosova case numerous times in Congress. The LDK in America supported actively all pro-Albanian Congressmen and –women in their electoral campaigns and other issues and received in return their sympathy for the Kosova cause.

Step by step all doors of different American and international institutions opened for the LDK representatives. LDK started working as the diplomatic representation of Kosova in the United States. Indeed, President Rugova said that “all LDK branch offices outside Kosova are the first diplomatic information offices of Kosova”. (Dedushaj 2000, 55.) Little by little the relations with the American and international institutions and agencies formed and became more and more

institutionalized and official as LDK was little by little accepted as the official discussion partner seen as the legitimate representative of Kosova.

This way the Kosova Albanian demands and argumentation was heard on every round table discussion in New York where Balkan issues and especially the Albanian or the Kosova question were handled. Week after week, year after year the Kosova issue became more internationalized and more known not only to the American political circles but the American and international audience. Finally it became an issue handled by the United States and NATO as the suppression and human rights violations in Kosova became known by the whole civilized world.

## **2. The LDK paradiplomatic activities in practice<sup>3</sup>**

### ***2.1. Electoral financing – a successful strategy to introduce the Kosova issue in high level American politics***

LDK in the USA managed in one decade to introduce the Kosova issue on the top level of the American political elite and to achieve the confidence of the leaders of this world power. The President of the Republic of Kosova, Dr Ibrahim Rugova, appreciated highly the contribution of LDK's local branches in America in making Kosova issue known in the West. This chapter presents a historical overview of how in practice the local LDK representatives established such warm relations with their American interlocutors. How did they manage to make the Albanian

---

<sup>3</sup> This chapter is mainly based on my experiences as the head of LDK office in New York until 1999, the book that I have already written about that time in Albanian (Dedushaj 2000) and the archives of the Illyrian newspaper published in English in New York and concentrating on the Albanian issues. This is why the sources are not specified after each paragraphe.

requests and voice heard everywhere in America, where the Balkan issues were handled and debated.

The LDK office in New York played a central role in creating contacts between the American government and the representatives of Kosova. In the beginning, the LDK activities were concentrated on financing different political campaigns of the American political leaders, Senators and Congressmen and -women. This was seen as the quickest way to bring the Kosova question in the American political debate and raise it directly with these decision makers. This was the way to explain to the American politicians the situation in Kosova, the Serbian suppression, violence and tragic human rights violations (people expelled from the country, discharged from their state positions, use of the Albanian language restricted and the fear of violence). It was a clear strategic choice to finance electoral campaigns and this strategy carried fruit in a very short time. Millions of dollars received by donations were spent to different electoral campaign support, but this made it possible to get powerful friends and pro-Albanian decision makers into the US Congress as well as in other main institutions of the American state.

This tradition of financing electoral campaigns to get political support for one's own demands was not a new invention of the LDK. It had been in use already earlier with the Albanian Diaspora (and many other lobby groups in America). However, when the LDK branch was officially established in the United States it became an open and official political activity that was organized in close cooperation with the Albanian-American community and with the help of the Albanian businessmen that were active in America. A clear outburst of political activity in the United States politics was to be noted. Immediately in the first year (1991) LDK gave open political support funding to Senators Bob Dole, Clayborn Bell, Pressler, D'Amato, Simon and

congressmen such as Tom Lantos, Broomfield, Molinari, Sweat and Eliot Engel. (Dedushaj 2000, 56.)

LDK in America organized numerous meetings in the State Department and other institutions demanding for the US help in the Kosova question and pleading for material support for the suffering people of Kosova living in difficult and poor conditions under the Serbian yoke. The fundamental demand has been and still remains the recognition of the independence of Kosova by the United States. In 1991 as the LDK was an official and institutionalized actor in the American scene, the LDK office organized numerous introductory meetings with officials in different institutions such as the United Nations, Helsinki Watch, American Red Cross, World Bank, trade unions, ILO, AFL/CIO, American state agencies as well as American association of the defense of human rights and the freedom of press. Hundreds of meetings were also organized with famous journalists such as David Binder, Marvin Howe, Ken Danforth as well as other editors and journalists of different American newspapers, TV and radio stations and other media.

This PR work carried fruit and through the LDK office in New York special contacts were established that were to become tremendously important in the future. The LDK office was able to organize meetings between the United States government officials and the representatives of the Kosova governmental institutions which had been elected by free democratic elections in Kosova (even though they were not recognized by the Yugoslav authorities). These Kosova institutions were a product of peaceful resistance chosen by the Kosova Albanian people. These Kosova institutions managed to show and prove to the international community that the Albanian people aspired for democracy and freedom and that Albanians were a civilized and western nation. This was the task also of the LDK representatives in America. In 1992 the LDK office organized meetings in America for the Kosova leaders but helped also (i.e. financially) the

Albanian representation to the United Nations to organize a respectful reception of President of Albania, Dr Berisha on his first visit to the United States.

In Kosova the public life was organized clandestinely. 24 May 1992 Dr. Ibrahim Rugova was overwhelmingly elected to be President of the Republic of Kosova and also a Kosovar National Parliament was elected. Schools and hospitals and other services were organized in private homes and financed by the population of Kosova as well as the currency sent to Kosova by the Albanian Diaspora in America, Australia and Western Europe including Scandinavia. Everybody was expected to pay 3% of their income to keep the clandestine society working, but also to finance the paradiplomatic activities. The United States Congress was lobbied for support to President Rugova who tried to keep the Kosova issue on the international agenda, so that the Albanian suffering in Kosova would not be totally forgotten in the shadows of the Bosnian war. Contribution of the LDK branch in America was important as well in the election organizing as in supporting the shadow institutions. (Dedushaj, 2000.)

The LDK branch in America financed partly the trip of an American delegation to Kosova to observe the elections. During the elections the LDK office in New York was open 24/24 every day spreading information about the elections and the situation in Kosova to the Albanian community in the United States as well as to the Senate and the Congress and other American political leaders and decision makers. A concrete danger existed that Serbia would interfere with the elections and take up violent countermeasures.

In 1992 the LDK activities were concentrated in brining up the Kosova cause in discussions with the American political leaders and media so that Kosova would gain a place on the American political agenda. 1992 was also an electoral year in the United States. The LDK branch as well as

some of the Albanian businessmen in America concentrated themselves in supporting Bill Clinton to become a President. It is worth mentioning that in one meeting of the LDK representatives (26 April 1992) the LDK members were openly asked to support Clinton for president. This was a very bold and risky step, but turned out to be a wise one.

In the framework of Bill Clinton's electoral campaign, LDK sent 25 members to one electoral meeting where they paid in addition to an important "entrance fee" per each participant also a donation to the Clinton electoral campaign. LDK local branches in Chicago and Detroit supported several times Clinton and the Chicago and Detroit representatives then met personally with Bill Clinton and Al Gore. In New York LDK arranged several meetings in support of Al Gore and in all meetings the representatives of the LDK raised the Kosova issue and their demands for American support and help to free Kosova from the Serbian yoke and achieve independence. During one fund raising lunch organized by Hillary Clinton in May 1992 for her husband's campaign, LDK branch representatives together with other activists from the Albanian community sent 100 participants to the lunch, a thing that was not left unnoticed by the Clinton's campaign office who sent a special thanking message. In October 1992 in another meeting with the future President Clinton in New York LDK and Albanian community collected a serious sum of money for the electoral campaign thus gathering also strong electoral support among the Albanian Americans to elect Clinton as President.

When Bill Clinton won the elections, the Clinton's electoral office sent special thanks to the LDK office for the continuous support. LDK representatives were also invited to in January 1993 to Washington to listen to President Clinton to swear in for Office. There the LDK representatives had excellent opportunities to meet and mingle with Democratic Party Congressmen and Senators

who had a significant influence later on the American policies towards Kosova. (See for details Dedushaj 2000.)

## ***2.2. Relations with the US. Congress***

Electoral financing was only one strategy to approach the Congressmen. Bilateral and multilateral meetings and discussions were the main way to explain the situation in Kosova and to seek support. Some members of the US. Congress took Kosova on their personal agenda and started pushing for the Kosova cause in the Congress. Some resolutions had already been proposed in the late 1980s as we have seen. In 1990, new proposals for the Congress resolutions continued to appeal for the autonomy of Kosova condemning the human rights violations (26 April, S. CON. RES. 124). On the 2 August (H. R. 5449) one proposal stated that as “elements within the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have failed to meet their obligations as a signatory to the Helsinki Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe with respect to their treatment of ethnic Albanians” - - the products of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were removed the non-discriminatory (most-favored-nation treatment) with the United States.

In the resolution introduced on 19 October 1990 (H. CON. RES. 385) the Congress was not only concerned by the human rights abuses but also the economic situation of Kosova. The proposal urged “the Government of Serbia to abandon policies which exacerbate the severe ethnic crisis in southern Yugoslavia and increase tensions in that country, to refrain from violence, intimidation,



and the threat or use of force, and to engage in peaceful dialogue with representatives of the Albanian Democratic Alliance Movement and other forces for peaceful dialogue”. The mentioning one of the Albanian political movements by name is a sign of who has been lobbying for the resolution. The proposal also urged “the Government of the Republic of Slovenia and the Government of the Republic of Croatia to meet their financial commitments to Kosovo and to remain engaged in working to resolve the grave economic conditions in Kosovo”. However, the situation in Yugoslavia was deteriorating fast and the Kosova case was to be forgotten by the international community when the bloody war burst out between Croatia and Serbia and later on in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Even though the next year the US Congressmen had to turn their eyes to the new war, the Albanian question was not, however, totally forgotten. A resolution introduced on 3 October 1991 (H. RES. 237) on the crisis in Yugoslavia made even allusion to the diasporas originating from the Yugoslav area by stating that “millions of Americans of Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Albanian, Macedonian, or other Yugoslav-region origin continue to maintain close spiritual and familial ties to their homelands”. Here Albanians are enumerated as any other nation in Yugoslavia, even though in the Yugoslav legislation the Albanians never got the role of a “constitutive nation”. The proposal still appealed for the minority rights of Albanians. These resolutions did not pass in Congress, but kept the discussion going.

Five days later in the bill H. R. 3518 (8 October 1991), the US Congress suspended all assistance to Serbia, as well as all air travel by the government of Yugoslavia. Also a trade embargo was imposed on parts of Yugoslavia controlled by Serbia. One of the enumerated reasons (including violence in Croatia, unfair elections etc.) the situation of ethnic Albanians was noted: “2 million Albanians in the province of Kosovo have been living for more than two and one-half years

under a Serbian-imposed martial law. The repressive measures instituted against Albanians in the province of Kosovo include thousands of political arrests, tens of thousands of politically motivated job dismissals, and widespread police violence against ethnic Albanians. The violence includes the excessive use of force by police to disperse peaceful demonstrations and random and unprovoked shootings by police that have resulted in at least 30 deaths and hundreds of injuries.”

A clandestine referendum had been held in Kosova during 26-30 September 1991 and an overwhelming majority of Albanians participated all voting for independence from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The United States Congress was asked to give a clear support to the Independence of Kosova already on 3<sup>rd</sup> January 1992 (H. CON. RES. 264). The proposed resolution was not passed, but many Congressmen and other political leaders in America started using the new constitutional name of the Republic of Kosova. The resolution introduced in the Congress asked the President to recognize the independence of Kosova and appealed for more assistance and trade with the Republic of Kosova. According to the proposal the Republic of Kosova should be considered as other Republics of Yugoslavia. The independence of those Republics can be and have been recognized also by the European Community. If this proposal had passed, the situation in Kosova would have been tremendously different of what it is now.

When the issues of the Yugoslav Crisis and the future of Yugoslavia were negotiated in the European Community Conference, the LDK and the Albanian community in the United States criticized strongly the fact the European Community did not want to handle the Albanian question in this table. The United States Senate on 7<sup>th</sup> February 1992 was asked to pass a resolution (S. RES. 257) “calling attention to the plight of the Albanian population in the former Yugoslav Republic of Kosova”. The choice of words in the title is especially interesting as the proposal referred to Kosova as if it had been a “Yugoslav Republic”. However, Kosova had been

an Autonomous Province and it had even lost the autonomous status in 1989. The resolution proposal takes up the fact that “Albanian representatives of Kosova have been denied a seat at the European Community Conference on the future of Yugoslavia” even though “the Albanian representatives of Kosova have informed the European Community Conference and its Chairman, Lord Carrington, of their wish for Kosova to be recognized as an independent state”. The Albanian-American community hoped for the US. support as it was a tradition of the United States to support “the rights of peoples to peaceful and democratic self-determination”. (Cf. S. RES. 257/1992)

The aim of the political elite among Albanians in Kosova at that time was to bring the Kosova issue to the international agenda, so that the status of Kosova would be decided upon at the same time as was handled the new status of Slovenia and Croatia (declared and recognized as independent). The politicians in the United States seemed to understand the needs of the Kosova Albanian representatives much better than their European counterparts. United States Congress was ready to discuss resolution proposals that talked about Kosova independence in the times when the Europeans wanted to forget the whole issue so that it would not disturb the already very complicated peace talks between Serbs and Croats. Also the Bosnian war was beginning.

On the 27<sup>th</sup> February 1992 (S. CON. RES. 96) in the American Senate, senators Alfons D’Amato, Robert Dole and Clayborne Pell introduced a new resolution on Kosova in the Senate expressing again that “the United States should recognize the independence of the Republic of Kosova, extend full United States diplomatic recognition to the republic and provide effective leadership in international bodies to protect democracy and human rights in Kosova.” Already then in 1992 an idea was brought up of creating an international protectorate in Kosova. The resolution reminded that over forty states have already recognized the independence of Slovenia

and Croatia and this should be done also with Kosova as the “the Government of Kosova has affirmed its willingness to accept and observe all commitments and obligations defined by the European Community as preconditions for the formal recognition of Yugoslav republics wishing to be recognized diplomatically as set forth in the Declaration on Yugoslavia adopted in the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the European Community in Brussels on December 16, 1991”. Thus the Senate was asked to admit that it was

- “(1) determined that Kosova has fulfilled criteria outlined for recognition of governments outlined by the United States;
- (2) recognized the independence of Kosova and should establish full diplomatic relations with Kosova;
- (3) provided appropriate assistance, engage in trade, and take other steps to support the Government of Kosova and encourage the further development of democracy and a free market economic system;
- (4) led actively within appropriate United Nations and other international agencies to ensure removal of unwanted foreign forces from Kosova and an early end to martial law; and
- (5) seek the inclusion of the Kosova question on the agenda of the United Nations Security Council, including a request for a factfinding mission to recommend observers or peacekeeping activities to restore peace and ensure a peaceful transition for an independent Kosova.” (S. CON. RES. 96/1992)

Senator D’Amato requesting the immediate involvement of Kosova’s representatives in Peace Conference of European union for Yugoslavia asked the Senate to approve the resolution and presented shocking facts about the current situation in Kosova: thousand of Albanians fired from their working places, thousand and thousand convicted in long term prison sentences, 90% of the political prisoners are Albanians, they are hungry and mal-treated, more than 30 intellectuals are isolated in a prison and face torture and inhuman treatment. While the resolution was presented in Senate, thousands of Albanians encouraged by the LDK incentive were sending letters to

Senators of their home areas in order to support the approval of this resolution. This resolution was naturally not passed and the independence of Kosova not recognized. More pragmatically the internationalization of the Kosova issue would have included trade relations with Kosova, international assistance, United Nations presence in Kosova, international forces acting against the “Unwanted foreign forces from Kosova” that we can understand to be the Serbian led Yugoslav army, bringing peacekeeping forces to Kosova, if we read the US Senate resolution. This is very close to the opinions of Albanian leadership in Kosova. A clear touch of the Albanian Diaspora in drafting this resolution can thus be felt.

The European Community recognized Croatia and Slovenia on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 1992, and Bosnia-Herzegovina on 6<sup>th</sup> April, 1992. On 7<sup>th</sup> April 1992 the United States followed the EC and recognized the sovereignty of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia. On 8<sup>th</sup> May (H. R. 5117) the United States prohibited all assistance to Serbia and Montenegro making allusion not only to the atrocities of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia and “Serbian” violence against civilians, but also to the repressive and violent measures against Albanians in Kosova.

The Congress was very reluctant to recognize the Yugoslavia formed by Serbia and Montenegro as successor state of the Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia and for example urged “the European Community, other members of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the United Nations to take immediate action to impose more comprehensive sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro such as an oil embargo” (21 May 1992, H. RES. 470). Unfortunately the Congress was not in agreement on how to treat the report of the human rights abuses in Kosova.

### ***2.3. President Rugova in America***

In March 1992, Republican Senator of New York Alfonso D'Amato had officially called the political leaders in Kosova to organize free elections under United Nation monitoring. These elections, according to him, would be a chance to reaffirm the Albanian will for independence underlining again Kosovars' determination. This would be an important sign that USA should recognize the will and determination of Kosova's population. His call was heard – at least in Kosova.

As we have seen, just two months later in Kosova presidential and parliamentary election were organized. Dr Rugova and LDK gained the support of the majority of the population in Kosova. Many observers, members of the well known human rights organizations (such as Helsinki Committee) and representatives of world medias followed the elections of 24<sup>th</sup> of May in Kosova. The election process was also monitored by a delegation for human rights from the American Congress attended by Konrad Hubers, Paul Behrens, Maks Primorac, Karl Rhoads and Kevine Tyne. This initiative was again realized thanks to influence of the LDK branch in New York on the American Congress, and as already mentioned financial contribution given for the expenditures of the delegation. The presence of American observers in many cities of Kosova during the election gave the Congressmen opportunity to see the situation for themselves and to give proven facts to the international media and to political institutions in America about the violence and terror exercised in Kosova by the criminal regime of Belgrade. They also learned to know the Albanian desire for peace and freedom. They also understood the Kosovars' strive to

create democratic mechanisms in order to realize these aspirations. This was thus an important contribution for the Kosova's issue.

These first free presidential and parliamentary elections in the Republic of Kosova were historical for the Albanian nation. Despite the strong presence and threatening behavior of the Serbian forces in Kosova, more than 762 000 or 89.32% of the Kosovar citizens with the right to vote, were voting free for the President of Kosova's Republic and deputies of Assembly. In the presidential elections 99.5% votes were for Dr. Ibrahim Rugova as a President of Kosovo's Republic. In the Assembly 100 deputies were elected, most of them candidates of LDK. The officials of political parties which participated in the elections together with the candidates and international observers from USA, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Denmark, Norway and others, evaluated that the voting process was democratic, free and fair, and that the elections had been well organized. This was very significant for the governmental and nongovernmental organizations, which were observing the election of 24 of May. The commitment and self-discipline of the citizens during the voting process, in very difficult conditions of occupation and under the threat of Serbian forces, impressed all observers.

By the end of June, 16 representatives of the American Congress send a letter to Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, to congratulate him for being elected as the President of the Republic of Kosova. This letter was signed by Congressmen Eliot Engel, Susan Molinari, William Broomfield, William Zeliff, Frank Horton Michael McNulty, Don Ritter, William Dannemeyer, Charles Wilson, Dick Swett, Tom Lantos, Albert Bustamante, Wayne Owens, James Sensebranner, Jolens Onsoeld, and Elton Gallegly. It was a strong sign towards Belgrade that the developments in Kosova were in the attention of the American political leaders. This letter stated that the Congressmen had observed free elections in Kosova on 24 of May with attention and worries that Belgrade regime

might use violence to disturb the voting and this step of taken by the Kosovars towards independence and democracy. Congressmen further congratulated President Rugova for the unanimous election and wished him success in achieving his goals, which for now still seemed very difficult. Congressmen also noted that they were aware that the President and other members of the new parliament of Kosova had decided to stay in Kosova to establish the functioning of the new government in a transparency. The risk, which they face, is big, but the Congressmen promised to do the outmost to support him in this difficult time. The signatories promised to continue with their efforts to achieve political freedom in Kosova and to oppose brutal policy of Serbian government. (Letter published in the Illyrian newspaper.)

Senator Bob Dole in a meeting with the Albanian community in September informed that he was working with the American administration to clarify the US. commitment as regards to Milosevic and his regime in relation with Kosova. Dole ensured the support and sympathy which the issue of Kosova is gaining in the Senate and the Congress. He encouraged Albanians to work more on gaining confidence on American opinion concerning the Kosova issue also through media. Senator Dole very authoritative personality in American policy told the Albanian community (LDK representatives), that he had seen that Croatian community in USA gives also big support to the rights of Albanians to achieve a free and independent Kosova.

A decision of the American Senate with a particular importance was the one made on 1<sup>st</sup> of October on humanitarian aid for Kosova in the amount of 5-8 million \$ - this financial assistance was designated especially for the poor in Kosova who were suffering the most of the emergency situation set by Serbia. Senators Dole and Pell during their amendment presentation underlined the fact that financial assistance given for Kosova would be humanitarian aid just as in many



other places in the world, but it would also has a political importance. USA made very clear to President Milosevic that both ethnic cleansing and ethnic violence in Kosova were unacceptable.

As the doors of the United States leaders were now opened for the Kosova representatives thanks to the paradiplomatic action taken by the LDK American branch in cooperation with the Albanian-American community, the high level visits to America started. In October 1992 the first visit of President Rugova and Prime Minister Bukoshi to the United States was organized. The Kosova Albanian delegation had meetings with different high political officials in Washington such as State Secretary Iqbalbalberger who promised that the United States will help Kosova with 5 million dollars.

On December 25, 1992, President George Bush composed a letter to Milosevic warning him that the United States would not tolerate the same politics as in Bosnia in Kosovo. (Sullivan 2004, p. 76). This letter was later called the President Bush “Red line for Kosovo”, it was “the famous Christmas warning, telling Milosevic that he should not abuse the human rights of the Albanians of Kosovo, but that Kosovo was part of Serbia”. According to Richard Hoolbrooke “this was a very complicated equation. But it was the position of the Clinton administration, and the Europeans inherited and held to it”. Indeed, Kosovo was seen as the “red line”, even though part of Serbia, President Bush tried to convince Milosevic that he would not be allowed to do everything he liked in Kosova. (Hoolbrooke 2005).

On the 8 and 9 of January 1993, President Ibrahim Rugova visited the United States again having several meetings with administration of President Bush and in the State Department, where he met especially with Mr. Arnold Kantor, Under Secretary for Political Issues within the State Department. The Americans made clear that they do support the peaceful way for solving the

conflict in Kosova. The USA expressed worries for the conflict in Kosova and underlined that the threat President Bush had announced towards Belgrade on Christmas was still in force. In this meeting President Rugova and the Under Secretary of State discussed in details the aid in amount of 5 million \$ for Kosova approved last year by American Congress. Rugova's visit in Washington was realized after his meeting in Brussels with Eagleburger, where he was advised to contact administration of the President Bush, and to make if possible meetings also with the new administration of the elected President Clinton, who was to start his work on 20<sup>th</sup> of January 1993. In these meetings Rugova insisted for an international intervention in Kosova as the only way to stop the conflict which is systematically motivated by Serbs. Rugova met also Senator and a friend of Albanians, Bob Dole and had a press conference at Arnold & Porter Law Firm, in Washington.

National Security Council of USA, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February 1993 published an integral study together with options of the new Clinton administration to stop the aggression in Kosova. Within these options was also the option to shoot down the Serbian airplanes above the prohibited flight zone, bombing the airports and artillery positions, modifying the arm embargo, the use a peace force in Kosova and establishment of international commission for war crimes. Madeline Albright, Ambassador in the United Nations at that time, emphasized that National Security Council will soon meet to discuss about this priority issue of Kosova and the Balkan crisis. President Clinton was proposed a line of "aggressive diplomacy" by his advisor for National Security, Anthony Lake, his deputy Samuel Berger and the State Secretary Warren Christopher. Important was to stick to the Bush warning toward Serbia that an invasion of Kosova will not be allowed.

On 16<sup>th</sup> of February 1993 , President Ibrahim Rugova started another visit to USA. In a meeting held at Peace Institute, Carnegie, Rugova requested the establishment of UN peace keeping mission in Kosova in cooperation with NATO, setting Kosova under international protectorate of UN until its independence and full neutrality. President Rugova during this conference with participation of 60 representatives of American and world media, presented a plan compiled of 10 points for peace in Kosova. Rugova's Ten Point Plan for Peace, which was well noted by the US Congress in on 16<sup>th</sup> March 1993. The peace plan appealed for "deploying international peacekeeping forces to Kosova immediately; increasing the number of CSCE observers in Kosova; expanding the United Nations 'no fly' zone to include Kosova; disarming Serbian paramilitary units in Kosova and placing Serbian heavy weapons under international control; ending Serbian colonization of Kosova; ending the 'ethnic cleansing' already underway in Kosova; the reopening of the Prishtina Airport for humanitarian relief flights; freedom for the freely elected Assembly of Kosova to meet; exempting Kosova from international sanctions directed at Serbia; and releasing the \$5,000,000 in humanitarian aid appropriated by the Congress in 1992" (H. CON. RES. 65). The Peace Plan was supported by many US Congressmen but was not implemented (partly because of the unwillingness of action by the European Community whose common foreign policy was in total crisis because of the Bosnian war and confronting opinions of the EC member states). The resolution was not passed, but the Albanian-American community and its lobby found little by little more supporters for their cause in the Congress.

During his visit President Rugova had meetings in the American Congress with members of the Committee for international relations, Congressmen Lee Hamilton (president), Tom Lantos and Ben Gilman. President Rugova met as well with many representatives of international organizations as with some researchers. In his second day of visit in Washington DC, Dr. Ibrahim Rugova had meeting in White House with deputy advisor for National Security Samuel Berger

and his staff. Also a meeting was organized with the American Under Secretary of State for European and Canadian issues, Mr. Thomas Niles. In the evening the Council for Albanian Issues established by a group of Senators and Congressmen organized a reception to honor President Rugova and the delegation from Kosova. On 17 June 1993 (H. R. 2404) the Congress and the Senate together authorized the United State President to ask the UN Security Council to send peacekeeping forces to Kosova. Also more CSCE observers should be sent to Kosova, according to the Congress act.

Rugova had meetings with heads of Amnesty International and participated in Peace Symposium for conflict centers in the world organized in Atlanta, where the issue of Kosova was treated. Conference was organized by the Carter Center and International Negotiation Network. President Rugova had a particular meeting with James E. Carter, ex-President of USA and other heads of the Carter Center.

Important progress was however made in the financial side. The US. Agency for International Development in Washington on 18<sup>th</sup> of March 1993 declared that it will start to distribute aid in the amount of 6.5 million \$, dedicated to Kosova. The request that USA should help Kosova had been presented by senators Bob Dole, President of Republicans in American Senate and Claiborne Pell, President of Senate Committee for International relationship. Their amendment to help Kosova in October 1992, well known as Dole-Pell amendment, was unanimously approved by Congress within the annual package of financial aid that USA is dedicating to different countries of the world. The delays for distributing this aid was explained with administrative reasons by the American officials of USAID, and had nothing to do with politics they explained. For transport and other expenses, the office of the USAID contributed another 1.5 million \$ as additional aid to the amount 5 million \$. Three other non governmental organizations, Catholic

Services for Aid, International Corpus for Aid and Human Christian-Orthodox Society were presenting their proposals to undertake the responsibility for sending humanitarian aid to Kosova, in cooperation with Human Society Mother Theresa.

A delegation of the American Congress, Eliot Engel, Susan Molinari, Bill Paxon and Peter King, visited Kosova from 12-14 of April and had different meetings with political leaders of Kosova. The President of the Republic, Dr. Ibrahim Rugova during the reception informed them about the very difficult general situation in Kosova. Rugova thanked American Congressmen and American Administration for their support given until now for the Kosova issue. Congressmen Eliot Engel told that this was his third meeting with Dr. Rugova. Engel held this meeting more significant than meetings in Washington and New York, because it was taking place in Prishtina. He also underlined that in the US. there was a lot of understanding for the Albanian and Kosova issue and for President Rugova's peaceful war for freedom and democracy. Congressman Engel added that he will continue strongly to support the Albanian cause in Congress and American offices and he handed over to President Rugova the Resolution text for Kosova, which he had presented in the American Congress together with two other congressmen's. In this resolution the Peaceful Plan of President Rugova's 10 points presented during February in UN, Washington DC and to the other governments of western countries was supported.

Congresswoman Susan Molinari added that she would make it known in America that Albanians are occupied. This we will tell in our Congress and we will continue to support the right war of Kosova's population, she promised and thanked President Rugova, as she said "you allowed us to protect your cause in America" referring to the democratic and peaceful resistance President Rugova was advocating. Also Congressmen Paxon and King emphasized their determination to protect Albanian's aspirations and committed their engagement to help realize their legal rights.

American delegation except the meetings with Albanians representatives in Prishtina and Mitrovica also met with representatives of Serb government in Kosova. By the end of the visit in Mitrovica, congressmen Engel said that everything he had seen during two days in Kosova will be presented to the American Congress and he personally will report to president Clinton. "I am astonished with your unity and solidarity and I am convinced that in this direction you are going to win. We will help you" promised Eliot Engel. All observations and recommendations of the delegations were made public on 26 of April 1993. The report presented by them in Congress among other issues requested urgent establishment of UN peace keeping force in Kosova.

On 20th of April (one week after the above mentioned delegation), a delegation from Helsinki Committee and American Congress arrived for a short visit in Prishtina: Congressmen Dennis De Concini, Head, Bill Richardson, Oliver Spenser together with Samuel Wise, director of OSCE personnel and political advisor of the USA Embassy in Belgrade. In a meeting with them, in addition to explaining the hard situation in Kosova and the Serbian plans for ethnic cleansing President Rugova expressed the determination to constitute an effective Parliament in Kosova.

Senator De Concini said that this delegation from Helsinki Committee and American Congress wanted to express the friendly support for the Kosova Government and Parliament elected in democratic way as well as to observe the situation in the field of human rights. Senator Denis De Concini and Congressmen Bill Richardson declared in Prishtina that they are now requesting the autonomy, but they believed one day in Independence of Kosova.

De Concini after his meeting with the President of Republic of Kosova declared to the media that President Rugova is an excellent spokesperson for population of Kosova. He is articulating the wish and need for human rights with dignity for each individual, Serb or Albanian, and for all

others living in Kosova. "All we that are here and those in Washington, the American Congress, we have high esteem for Rugova." (Dedushaj 2000.)

Beginning of May 1993 in Minnesota a plan was published in order to stop the violation of human and national rights of Albanian in Kosova. A delegation for human rights activists (lawyers) had visited Kosovar cities in March and met with political and civil associations of Albanians and Serbs, as well they observed very close the worrying situation in Kosova. Members of the delegation Ms. Hicks and Mr. Coy recommend the setting of Kosova under the UN protectorate as a first phase to solve the problem.

The President of the USA, Bill Clinton, in a second week of May, officially confirmed American determination to protect Kosova in a case of an open Serb aggression towards Albanians. He underlined that what President Geroge Bush had said for Kosova, it is his determination as well. A Serb aggression in Kosova would meet the American army. As Clinton was in detail informed about the situation in Balkans by his staff as well as by the senators and congressmen visiting the region he started thinking with Pentagon of the possibility to send military troops in Kosova and Macedonia.

American Congress on 18 of June 1993 approved two amendments where the establishment of UN peace troops and the increase of OSCE observers in Kosova was requested. In first amendment presented in Congress by Susan Molinari, Administration of Bill Clinton is requested to oblige the American Ambassador to the UN to initiate in Security Council the issue of sending UN peace keeping mission in Kosova. The presence of peace keeping forces in Kosova would have a positive and preventive impact and will stop Serb repression in Kosova. Molinari reminded the Congress that such UN and American troops had been sent to Macedonia to protect

this country. Kosova is in need of a similar protection. The second amendment presented by Molinari requests the representative of USA in Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe to ask for an increase of the number of permanent observers of CSCE mission in Kosova from 9 to 50, observers that would be based in cities and villages in Kosova. Molinari and other Congressmen in support of Kosova aimed to include these two amendments in the same package with project law on financial aid.

American Secretary of the State, Warren Christopher on the 7<sup>th</sup> of July 1993 drew public attention to the fact that Slobodan Milosevic had decided that Serbia would ask the OSCE observers to leave Kosova in June. While State Department through a declaration given 3<sup>rd</sup> of July reminded that USA would be ready to answer in case of a conflict in Kosova, if this conflict is initiated by Serbia. Security Council of United Nations approved a resolution for Kosova on 11<sup>th</sup> of August, where Belgrade was requested to allow OSCE observers to go back to Kosova. This resolution supported and initiated by the United States of America it was a clear message that the world would not tolerate the Serbian violence against Albanians. American Ambassador in UN, Madeleine Albright, declared clearly in a meeting of Security Council: “ If Serbia starts war in Kosova, the American military will intervene “. American Senator Paul Coverdell who visited Kosova in the end of August declared that the threat for armed conflict is real.

American legislators, who were encouraged and supported by the Albanian-American community through different means, kept pressure on the American administration in support of Kosova. For example the Republican Senator of New York, Alfonse D’Amato on 15 of September ensured the vote of the Senate Committee for Operational Aid from abroad to increase the humanitarian help up to 10 million \$, which double of the amount approved in Congress Representative meeting in June of the same year. His request was welcomed with understanding.



When on the 23<sup>rd</sup> September 1993 the US Congress was asked to appeal for the prosecution of the war criminals, the proposal made by some Congressmen did not only refer to the crimes committed in wars between Serbs, Croats and Bosniacs. Kosova issue was also included as the resolution text said: “according to - - reports by the Department of State, the people of Kosova have been subjected to organized and premeditated crimes against humanity, including willful killings, abuse of civilians in detention centers, and ‘ethnic cleansing’ through police harassment, abrogation of civil rights (such as the right to vote, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly), and forcible expulsion of civilians.” (H. CON. RES. 154/1993)

#### ***2.4. USA starts to treat Kosova separated from ex-Yugoslavia***

The next spring 1994 the situation was getting even worse in Kosova as Milosevic had expelled the OSCE monitors from the Province. The US Congress was again asked to appeal to the President, the UN Security Council and the European Union for the creation of an international protectorate in Kosova (H.CON. RES.251/1994) .

The President of Republic of Kosova, Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, in the first week of March 1994 realized again a very successful visit to USA. President Rugova was invited to participate in a breakfast prayer in Washington, where among the 3000 personalities from all over the world also the Albanian Nobel Price winner Mother Theresa was present. Before the occasion started, President Rugova had a particular meeting with President Clinton, and his deputy Al Gore, where he was promised that the leadership in the USA is following situation in Kosova carefully and

that they will not allow spreading of the conflict to this part of ex-Yugoslavia. Simultaneously these two American leaders expressed their gratitude and encouragement for peace movement of Albanians of Kosova leaded by LDK and President Rugova. (Dedushaj 2000 and Illyria archives.) President Rugova had not yielded to those who advocated armed resistance and pleaded for opening a new front in Kosova to destabilize the action of the Serbian armed forces in Bosnia.

At the same day President Rugova had a press conference on the Capitol Hill, in the presence of the world media as well as many Senators and Congressmen. In this conference spoke also Benjamin Gilman, deputy president of the Committee for foreign affairs in the American Congress, Tom Lantos, Co-head of the Group for Human Rights, Eliot Engel, a Democrat from New York, Eduard Towns as well as Jozef DioGuardi, the president of the Albanian – American league.

Rugova had also high level meetings in State Department and he was welcomed by Peter Turnof , Under Secretary of State for Political Issues and by Steven Oxman, Under Secretary of State for European issues. President Rugova presented the political project of Kosova's citizens for an Independent and Neutral Republic, and appealed for an international mandate to create a protectorate in Kosova, as a temporary transition solution before independence. Mr. Peter Turnof, at this time one of the main political figures of American foreign politics, esteemed highly the peace movement and the Albanians contribution for stability in the region. Turnof said that the American determination had already been declared many times by previous President Bush, as well as the current President Clinton and other administrative officials: The United States will not allow any conflict in Kosova. This serious commitment continues to stay in force.

During the last day of his visit in USA, in a main cathedral of St. Patrick in New York, Manhattan, the president Dr. Ibrahim Rugova with his collaborators participated in a Sunday mass leaded by Cardinal his Excellency John O'Connor. Cardinal John O'Connor declared in his sermon that the mass was organized today to pray for Kosova and the freedom for its nation. More than 2000 people were listening. He continued that he was honored that in a this Sunday mass also the President of Republic of Kosova is participating, who is well known as a person of peace and non-violence while trying to realize the aspirations of population of Kosova. Cardinal of New York John O'Connor had also a bilateral meeting with President Rugova after the mass.

Americans were repeatedly underlined their ultimatum toward Serbia that the sanctions will be kept until Belgrade engages itself to find solution for Kosova. Under Secretary of State for Political Issues, Peter Tarnoff, on the 20 of February 1994 had declared in State Department that the issue of withdrawing the economical sanctions toward Serbia has to wait "until finding solutions for problem in Kosova and Krajina". At the same day the daily magazine The Washington Times, through an analyze of columnist Cord Myer paid attention that the situation in Kosova presented a "serious threat" for stability in the Balkans. According to Myer with the population of 2 million Albanians and 200 000 Serbs, Kosova is becoming today a big concentration camp, where Albanians are constantly violated by Serbian police and armed forces. - - Serbs are trying to provoke a massive insurrection in order to start ethnic cleansing, which is seen by Serbs as "final solution" (Quoted in Dedushaj 2000). For the USA the war scenario that Serbs would like to execute in Kosova was already very clear.

On 16<sup>th</sup> of March 1994, the LDK representatives organized in Manhattan in the framework of sensitizing the American legislators with the Kosova's issue a meeting with congressmen Jose Serrano from Bronx. Congressman Serrano, member of Committee for international aid in the

American Congress, had been also behind the decisions for granting humanitarian aid in amount of 10 million\$ for Kosova. After talking with the LDK representatives Congressman Serrano in a particular meeting with President Clinton requested a direct intervention of USA in order to solve the issue of Kosova.

At the same time, American Senators Bob Dole, Alfonse D'Amato and Carl Levin requested in a letter sent to President Clinton that after Bosnian peace solution, the USA has to start mediating the Kosova issue. The members of a special committee for Albanian issues in Congress kept their colleagues informed of the difficult situation in Kosova. In the end of April 2004 President Bill Clinton told officially his concerns about the tragic situation in Kosova. After a meeting with Greek Prime minister Papandreu, while answering to the comments of one journalists related to the rights of Greek minorities in Albania, Clinton added that the United States is very concerned about the situation of Albanians in Kosova, too, and the risk of spill over of the conflict in Yugoslavia.

In a second week of May, 11 members of American Congress Representatives send a letter to President Clinton expressing their worries for Kosova and requesting that in the future peace talks on Balkans also Kosova must be included. Already at that time voices were risen that representatives of the Republic of Kosova should be included in the peace talks and that the right of the Albanians for self determination should be respected.

Congressmen Engel in a hearing on the 26 of October 1994 requested the State Department to discuss the possibility to open the American Information Office in Prishtina, in order to have American presence in Kosova. "It is important that USA establishes own presence in Kosova", said Engel. Already two years earlier the American Congress had approved the idea of opening a

cultural center and an information office (USIA), but the establishment of this office had been delayed for security reasons.

President Clinton repeatedly underlined that the American determination was to keep the sanctions on Serbia until the Kosova issue had been solved. President Clinton held the meetings with President Rugova as mutually informative and fruitful. He was determined to bring back the human and political rights to the population of Kosova. In a letter to Congressmen Engel and Molinari, Clinton appreciated the role of President Rugova and his refusal of violence and his patience in front of the Serbian repression. Clinton also underlined that with the support of Congress, the USA can continuously send humanitarian help to Kosova.

About the representation in Kosova, Clinton urged the US. Embassy in Belgrade to stay active in visiting Kosova. While saying this, he also greeted President Rugova's idea to open an office of the LDK in Washington

American State Department expressed support on 26 of March 1994 for opening of USA office in Prishtina. During a hearing held in American Congress, while answering to the questions of congressmen Engel, ambassador Ralph Johnson said that the State Department supports the establishment of USA office in Prishtina as soon as the security conditions for American diplomats are convenient. Meanwhile, a week before deputy secretary of the state Richard Hoolbroke had supported officially the idea to open a USA office in Kosova.

It was indeed, mainly in the hearings of the US. Congress where the American policy line on Kosova was openly declared. The Secretary of Defense, William Perry and chief of Army John Shalikashvili, in a hearing held in Congress, declared that they will not allow dispersion of the

war to Kosova and made an allusion to the American interests. It was the first time that USA expressed clear and official opinion of having vital interests in the Albanian populated areas.

Now the contacts between the USA and Kosova were official in the highest levels. Invited by Secretary of the State Warren Christopher, President Rugova visited Washington in the end of June. Christopher together with his colleagues, Peter Turnoff for Political issues, Richard Hoolbrooke for European Issues and John Shattuck for Human Rights all met with President Rugova. During the same trip a meeting with two candidates in the future presidential elections, senators Bob Dole and Richard Lugar, was also very useful as they both together with many other members of the US. Congress and Senate promised to try very hard to promote the issue of Kosova in the American political agenda. In the future they raised the issue in the hearings with the high officials of the State Department, they wrote letters to President Clinton, they proposed resolutions and amendments on financial aid to Kosova and so on.

On the 10 of October 1994, the American Senate approved an amendment presented by Senator Dole, where the Senate requested to keep the sanctions for Serbia for the time being for as long as Albanians are not given back the human and civil rights and the political autonomy is not restored in Kosova. This amendment, even different with the Engel's amendment that had been approved in July, had value of a good engagement of American administration in order to find a solution for Kosova.

5 days earlier on the 5<sup>th</sup> of October, President of Kosova Ibrahim Rugova had started again an official visit in USA, invited by State Department. His visit was realized a few days after the talks for ex-Yugoslavia in Dayton, where an agreement for solution of the conflict in Bosnia had been signed. Meetings in Dayton had been accompanied with Albanians protests against the fact

that Kosova was not included in the package solution given for Bosnia. The Albanian-American community organized strong protests near the place where the peace talks were held, which resulted to a promise from the US. officials that Kosova would be set on the agenda. American State Secretary, Warren Christopher in a reception organized for President Rugova declared that after solving the crises in Bosnia, United States will put Kosova first on the agenda and is engaged to find a solution to all crises of the Balkan region. President Rugova had also a meeting with Christopher Hill, director for Central and South Europe, part of the negotiation group headed by Richard Holbrooke, as well as with Senator Bob Dole and Congressman Eliot Engel. President Rugova discussed the Kosovar situation with Anthony Lake the Advisor for National Security, the first advisor of the president Clinton, and Alexander Vershbow, special assistant of president Clinton and many other high officials, senators and congressmen not to mention all the representatives of non-governmental organizations and the world media, Balkan experts as well as representatives form foreign embassies. President Rugova pointed out in all these meetings that this Dayton momentum should be used and a solution for Kosova should be found at the same time. Especially the European leaders were however reluctant to include the Kosova question in the peace talks and the cry for reason of President Rugova was not yet listened to.

### **3. The role of the relations between the US. and Kosova from the 1999 war to the status negotiations**

#### ***3.1. The way towards the war***

The situation continued unchanged as the Kosova issue had not been solved in the Dayton deal; Milosevic had not been convinced by the international community that the situation was unbearable. LDK representatives together with the Congressmen engaged to promote the Albanian cause in the United States had still many colleagues to convince that it was in the US. interests to help this distant area in Europe. Finally, on 29 July 1996 a Congress Resolution 155 on Kosova was adopted. This resolution reminded that the political rights of the Albanian majority in Kosova had been “curtailed when the Government of Yugoslavia illegally amended the Yugoslav federal constitution without the consent of the people of Kosova on March 23, 1989, revoking the Kosova’s autonomous status”. It also noted that in September 1990, “a referendum on the question of independence of Kosova was held in which 87 percent of those eligible to participate voted and 99 percent of those voting supported independence for Kosova”. Moreover, the resolution underlined that President, Dr. Ibrahim Rugova, had been “freely and



fairly elected” and stated annoyed that the democratically elected Parliament of Kosova was “not permitted to assemble in Kosova”. Many important issues were taken up in this resolutions and finally it stated that “the future peace in the Balkans hinges largely on a settlement of the status of Kosova”. (H. CON: RES. 155, passed 29 July 1996)

Despite the Congress resolution the crisis continued without any effective international engagement. The Resolutions introduced in the Congress did not anymore underline the support to the Independence of “the Republic of Kosova”. If in the beginning of the 1990s among the Albanian Diaspora an enthusiasm had been felt hoping for a quick independence, now more important was to safeguard human rights of Albanians. The United States started warning Milosevic of use of force in case the rights of the Albanians were not restored, but a certain frustration could be noticed. The Congress did not discuss so many resolutions any more on Kosova as it had used to in the beginning of the 1990s. The international climate had been such that the Congress interest on Albanian issues had not been heard elsewhere. Also among the Albanians this was clearly felt and understood. Some young people got frustrated as there did not seem to be any change in the international stance towards Kosova and took up arms in the Kosova Liberation Army.

The Congress resolution made allusion to the President Bush “red line” statement on Kosova by stating that “the President has explicitly warned the Government of Serbia that the United States is prepared to respond in the event of escalated conflict in Kosova caused by Serbia”. It is interesting to see that it has already been specified that this implies in case of the conflict being escalated because of Serbia. It could be understood as a slight and non outspoken support to the possibility of armed resistance among the Albanians (that might also escalate the conflict).

In 1998 (H. CON. RES. 205, 28 January 1998) a new resolution was again introduced at the Congress deploring human rights abuses in Kosova and calling for increased American involvement. This time it was not passed, but kept the Kosova issue on the Congress agenda

March 18 1998, the Congress resolution 235 was however passed condemning with strong words the “violent repression carried out by the Serbian police and paramilitary forces against the ethnic Albanian population of Kosova”. According to this resolution “the violent repression carried out by the Serbian police and paramilitary forces against the ethnic Albanian population of Kosova should be condemned by the United States and the international community” and “efforts of the international Contact Group (the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy) in support of a resolution of the conflict in Kosova are to be commended and intensified”. It was also underlined that “the United Nations Security Council should consider the question of restoration of the human and political rights of the people of Kosova and actions to halt Belgrade's violent repression of the region's population.” (H. CON. RES. 235)

The same day 18 March 1998 another resolution was passed in the Senate (S. CON. RES. 85) reminding that “the Contact Group has called upon Milosevic to withdraw special police units from Kosova and enter into unconditional negotiations with ethnic Albanian political leaders in order to find a peaceful political solution to the conflict or face additional international sanctions” and that “a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Kosova must respect the rights of members of all ethnic and religious groups in Kosova, all of whose representatives should be involved in negotiations about the resolution of that conflict”.

Finally the Democratic League of Kosova in the United States together with the Albanian-American community had succeeded in opening up the eyes of the Congressmen both at the

House of Representatives as in the Senate to the suffering of the Kosova Albanians. Four months later another resolution was passed in the Senate (S. CON. RES. 105) accusing Milosevic of war crimes and ethnic cleansing. If until now only very few of the introduced resolutions on Kosova in the end passed in the Congress, in 1998 a change occurred and many resolutions were adopted.

The United States Congress discourse however clearly changed. An in-depth knowledge of the situation can be seen in the resolutions in the end of the 1990s. If in the beginning, the resolutions introduced had been well-meaning signs of support to a small suppressed nation that nobody knew nothing about and to whose independence was thus easy to discuss about, but after the Dayton agreements, the years of Yugoslav wars, a better analysis of the region had been made. The words of the resolutions were much more carefully counted: no more talking about Republic of Kosova, no more allusions to independence... Of course, this careful choice of words made it also possible for some resolutions to actually be passed.

There is a mixture of the use of the old form Kosovo and the Albanian form Kosova in the resolutions. Also aggressor had got a clearer image: it was the dictator Milosevic, no more the unidentified Yugoslav Army soldier. Also the appearance of the Kosova Liberation Army had changed the tone. Even though the resolutions were careful not to criticize KLA directly, the Congress was forced to note the unaccepted use of violence by stating “the United States should condemn any terrorist actions by any group or individual in Kosovo” (S 18 March 1998) or “all parties should refrain from acts that could lead to heightened tensions in Kosova” (C 18 March 1998).

Indeed, the Albanian Diaspora had to use its power again to convince the U.S. leaders that KLA was no terrorist organization. In early 1998, Robert Gelbard, the U.S. special envoy to the

Balkans stated publicly that KLA was a terrorist organization. If KLA would be officially declared as a terrorist organization, this would make it tremendously difficult for the Albanian Americans to collect and send money both to support the KLA and the parallel system of society in Kosova. (Sullivan, 2004, p. 156-157.) The LDK offices in America engaged themselves in an energetic lobby campaign in Washington D.C. among the politicians, especially on Capitol Hill. Despite the massacres taking place in Kosova by the Serbian special military units, the State Department was still refereeing to the rebels as terrorists. The House of Representatives International Relations Committee held a hearing on Dayton Peace Accord on March 12 1998 (just four days before the above mentioned resolution was passed in the Congress). Gelbard from the State Department was there to testify. Gelbard was strongly pushed by several pro-Albanian Congressmen to renounce the characterization of KLA as terrorists. State Department did condemn the Serbian action as “outrageous and immoral”, but Gelbard did not directly admit not to call KLA as terrorist organization, but since that day he never used those words in public anymore. (Sullivan 2004, p. 63.)

### ***3.2. The United States come to rescue (1999)***

Moreover, the US Congress continued to express a clear support to the Albanian aspirations also with innovative ideas such as compensations for war damages. According to a resolution of September 23, 1998 (H. CON. RES. 315) the Congress condemned “the atrocities by Serbian police and military forces against Albanians in Kosova and urging that blocked assets of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) under control of the United States and

other governments be used to compensate the Albanians in Kosova for losses suffered through Serbian police and military action”.

The Congress urged the President and the Secretary of State to take a clearer role in the international arena in favor of the Albanian claims and “to urge all other countries to follow a policy which permits ethnic Albanians who have suffered as a consequence of the brutal actions of Serbian police and military forces in Kosova to make claims against the assets of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) which are in the control of the respective country”.

In the same resolution the fault of the creation of KLA was passed on Serbian politics and on “the stubborn denial of human rights and political rights to the ethnic Albanian majority in Kosova by the Government of Serbia” that “has been the major factor in the radicalization of the political situation in the province and made the prospects of a peaceful resolution of the conflict there difficult if not impossible”. (H. CON. RES. 315.)

Indeed, the worse the situation got in Kosova, the stronger became the discourse of some Congressmen towards the United States President for taking a clear action towards Milosevic. On the 1<sup>st</sup> October a resolution was introduced in the Congress that clearly state what the President “should” do:

“(1) the President should immediately seek NATO agreement to take direct and decisive action against those forces attacking civilian populations in Kosova in order to halt these attacks and ensure they are not resumed, and to compel the withdrawal of security forces and secure access to the vulnerable population for humanitarian aid; and

(2) the President should strongly urge the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia to pursue actively investigations of the assault taking place in Kosova for prosecution

as war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide, including through the provision of all information which could be relevant to such prosecution of Slobodan Milosevic and other Yugoslav and Serbian officials in addition to those comprising the security and military forces present in Kosovo.” (H. RES. 561) This resolution did not pass, but the idea of NATO involvement was now also on the Congress table.

The Congress discourse against Milosevic and Serbia was strong. Words used were the heaviest ones. Congress referred to “crimes against humanity”, “genocide” and “humanitarian catastrophe”. However, the choice of not wanting to use ground forces when attacking against forces that were attacking civilian population in Kosova as was stated in the Congress resolution of 8 October 1998 (H. CON. RES. 343) could be seen in this sense even a contradictory statement from the Congress. The Congress used such arguments as “Kosovo, unlike Bosnia, is a province of the sovereign nation of Serbia” – Earlier the Congress had used in the discussions even the notion of “Republic of Kosova”.

Moreover, “there is no vital United States national security interest at stake in the current violence taking place in Kosovo” (it had been easy to discuss about the right to self-determination of people, but when it comes to sending “own boys” to fight for that the tone gets more critical) and “an Act of Congress is necessary for the introduction of the Armed Forces of the United States into hostilities or situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances, when such action is not required for the defense of the United States, its Armed Forces, or its nationals”. The Congress clearly noted that “President Clinton is contemplating ordering such a deployment to Kosovo in the near future in conjunction with NATO” and wanted to oppose to the Presidents ideas and the deployment of ground forces for any “peacemaking or peacekeeping purposes” in Kosovo. It is interesting to see that first the

Congress appeals to the President to take firm action and then opposes to an action going too far. This is of course understandable in the sense that it is not easy to send “our boys” to fight in a foreign land, but the change of discourse is still good to note in this situation. (8 October 1998, H. CON. RES. 343.)

On 6th February 1999, the international community invited the Kosovar leadership as well as the Belgrade representatives to a Castle near Paris, Rambouillet, to negotiate peace. Milosevic was clearly threatened by air strikes if he did not stop the violent suppression of Albanian in Kosova. The President Clinton had out ruled the sending of ground troops, but air bombings would start if Serbia would not accept to sign peace.

Sending ground troops would have been a decision that would have affected directly the United States and the Congress was reluctant. However, the Congress supported a NATO intervention. In February the Congress stated again its support to the right to self-determination of Albanians in Kosova (below). Interesting is to note that if the resolutions introduced in the Congress supported an immediate recognition of independence of the Republic of Kosova in the beginning of the 1990s, now 1998 much more sophisticated plans were made about the final status of Kosova. The Congress proposed for “Kosova the right to genuine and enhanced autonomy with democratic and effective self-governance provisions and protection of minority rights during (an) interim period at a level greater than provided by the Constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia”. This interim period would be followed by “a referendum on the final status of Kosova, to be held within Kosova on a date certain, which should include independence as an option, and be guaranteed by the international community”<sup>4</sup>. Now after the bloody conflict, the old referendum that had not been monitored by the international community seemed to loose

---

<sup>4</sup> Interesting to note that now that the status negotiations have started, Ahtisaari has clearly ruled out a referendum to decide on the fate of Kosova.

importance. The Congress wanted to influence the negotiation in Rambouillet and to provide a new set of rules to solve the Kosova status question once and for all according to international law. References to the old Yugoslav legislation were numerous to prove the legality of the secession of Kosova. (H. CON. RES. 32, February 11, 1999.)

The Rambouillet negotiations failed. The Albanian delegation was ready to sign the proposed agreement, but Milosevic did not agree. Richard Hoolbrooke was sent to Belgrade to negotiate one more time with Milosevic. He did not seem to believe the NATO would strike. Hoolbrooke remembers him saying "Are you crazy enough to bomb us over these issues we're talking about in that lousy little Kosovo?" Hoolbrooke had answered "You bet, we're just crazy enough to do it" . . . (Hoolbrooke 2005). On February 23, 1999 (S. J. RES. 12) the Congress together with the Senate authorized "the conduct of air operations and missile strikes as part of a larger NATO operation against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) for the purpose of bringing about a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Kosovo".

On 11 March the Congress agreed on "the use of United States Armed Forces as part of a NATO peacekeeping operation implementing a Kosovo peace agreement". The Congress noted that "the conflict in Kosovo has caused great human suffering and, if permitted to continue, could threaten the peace of Europe." There was hope that "the Government of Serbia and representatives of the people of Kosovo may agree in Rambouillet, France, to end the conflict in Kosovo" as the negotiations were scheduled to restart in France on March 15, 1999. President Clinton through the Former Senator Robert Dole encouraged all parties to reach an agreement. "President Clinton has promised to deploy approximately 4,000 United States Armed Forces personnel to Kosovo as part of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) peacekeeping operation implementing a Kosovo peace agreement." (H. CON. RES. 42)



In May the Senate declared Slobodan Milosevic as a war criminal referring to “the Serbian military and paramilitary forces (that) have undertaken a massive ethnic cleansing campaign that has displaced more than one million Kosovar Albanians; -- Serbian military and paramilitary forces (that) have conducted a systematic effort to strip Kosovar Albanians of their identity by confiscating passports, birth certificates, employment records, driver's licenses, and other documents of identification; -- (and) the International Criminal Tribunal (that) has collected evidence of summary executions, mass detentions, torture, rape, beatings, and other war crimes” (May 24, 1999, S. RES. 105). The Senate also expressed “the sense of Congress regarding the need for vigorous prosecution of war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity in the former Republic of Yugoslavia” (May 24, 1999 S. CON. RES. 33)

Before the start of the air strikes, it was estimated that more than 2,000 ethnic Albanians were killed in Kosova. NATO engaged in an escalating bombing of Yugoslavia (Operation Allied Force) on March 24, 1999. The United States President Bill Clinton addressed the nation (Clinton 1999) by stating that President Milosevic “who over the past decade started terrible wars against Croatia and Bosnia, has again chosen aggression over peace. He has violated the commitments he, himself, made last fall to stop the brutal repression in Kosovo. He has rejected the balanced and fair peace accords that our allies and partners, including Russia, proposed last month -- a peace agreement that Kosovo's ethnic Albanians courageously accepted. Instead, his forces have intensified their attacks, burning down Kosovar Albanian villages and murdering civilians. As I speak, more Serb forces are moving into Kosovo, and more people are fleeing their homes -- 60,000 in just the last five weeks, a quarter of a million altogether. Many have headed toward neighboring countries. Kosovo's crisis now is full-blown, and if we do not act, clearly, it will get even worse. Only firmness now can prevent greater catastrophe later. -- (Clinton 1999.)

Later in his memoirs “My Life” Bill Clinton states “I was determined not to allow Kosovo to become another Bosnia” (2004, p.849). In spring 1999 the fate of over 200 000 ethnic Albanian men in Kosova remained uncertain. Communication lines to Kosova were down. Many were killed. Some of the bodies carried to the Serbian side were returned only this year in 2005. In May 1999, the House of Representatives urged the United Nations to resolve the crisis in Yugoslavia so that the bombings could stop. (H. RES. 196, May 27, 1999.)

The Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari was appointed by the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan to conduct shuttle diplomacy with Belgrade to persuade Milosevic to withdraw. President Ahtisaari (who was nominated in November 2005 as the UN Special Envoy to conduct Kosova status negotiations) managed to get Milosevic to back up and leave Kosova for international protection. The US led air strikes against Serbia created a context in which this persuasion was possible.

On June 17, 1999 (S. CON. RES. 40) the Senate (together with Congress) thanked the President and the Armed Forces for the success of *Operation Allied Force*. The Resolutions also demanded from Slobodan Milosevic:

“(A) The withdrawal of all Yugoslav and Serb forces from Kosovo according to relevant provisions of the Military-Technical Agreement between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

(B) A permanent end to the hostilities in Kosovo by Yugoslav and Serb forces.

(C) The unconditional return to their homes of all Kosovar citizens displaced by Serb aggression.

(D) Unimpeded access for humanitarian relief operations in Kosovo.”

It is interesting to note that the “the Congress urged the leadership of the Kosova Liberation Army (KLA) to ensure KLA compliance with the ceasefire and demilitarization obligations and all nations to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and to assist in bringing indicted war criminals, including Slobodan Milosevic and other Serb military and political leaders, to justice.” Here war criminals are presupposed to be only “Serb military and political leaders”. It is partly against US wishes that later some KLA leaders were later indicted by the Haag Tribunal.

In August the Senate gave a long resolution “regarding United States policy toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in light of the Alliance's April 1999 Washington Summit and the conflict in Kosovo.” Indeed, the Kosovo crisis and the NATO response had been an eye opening situation to both United States and for the EU. According to the resolution “NATO's military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in 1999 highlighted the glaring short-comings of European allies in command, control, communication, and intelligence resources; combat aircraft; and munitions, particularly precision-guided munitions; and the overall imbalance between United States and European defense capabilities. - - This imbalance in United States and European defense capabilities undercuts the Alliance's goal of equitable transatlantic burden-sharing.” (5 August 1999, S. RES. 175) The United States had had to engage NATO and fellow NATO members with the Kosovo crisis without United Nations Security Council mandate. This was a first time in history the alliance attacked a sovereign country without a UN mandate (impossible to be achieved because of the Chinese and Russian veto right). The European Community had been totally divided and unable to act during the Bosnian war. Now the situation was a bit better. The EU did have a new framework of decisions

on foreign and security policy. But the short-comings were still great, as stated in the Senate resolution. The United States was disappointed with the European Allies and on the European side for example the French were critical about the US. leading role in bombing an old French ally, Serbia, and worst of all without a UN mandate.

On the American side, about 39,000 members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the United States were deployed at the peak of the 1999 conflict in Kosova; approximately 700 United States aircraft were committed to combat missions, about 37,000 NATO combat sorties were flown by aircraft of which approximately 25,000 were flown by United States aircraft, more than 5,000 weapons strike missions were completed during that conflict. Indeed, the Kosova conflict was the largest combat operation in the history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization until then. All military objectives were achieved and there were no United States or North Atlantic Treaty Organization combat fatalities during that conflict. (November 8, 1999 S. RES. 224)

After the conflict the Senate was generous in allocating funds for the newly funded Balkan Stability Initiative. The House of Representatives did not forget the Kosova case either after the official ending of the war. On October 10 year 2000 a new resolution was passed in the House of Representatives reminding the situation of returning refugees, the sake of those Albanians who are in Serbian prisons. The resolution called for local ownership as it stated for example that “the administration of all baseline services such as police, sanitation, water, telecommunications, and electrical supply should be put into the hands of the people of Kosova at the earliest possible date” and that “the strategy for economic reconstruction in Kosova should be focused on utilizing private investment and empowerment of the people of Kosova to take charge of their

livelihoods”. Enhancing local ownership did not happen at all as fast as the US Congress would have liked to see. (H. Res. 451.)

Following the NATO’s 77-day bombing campaign against Yugoslavia in June 1999 the UN Security Council had adopted Resolution 1244, which vested the UNMIK<sup>5</sup> with “all legislative authority” over the territory and people of Kosova. The competencies were supposed to be transferred to the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government (PISG). The UNMIK Administration did not manage to transfer competencies to locals very fast. On the contrary the years were passing and nothing very significant was happening. People started little by little get frustrated... Already in 2002 some Congressmen took up the Independence issue again in the US. Congress, which on the European side was kind of forgotten. (H. RES. 467, introduced 27 June 2002.)

### ***3.3. A look backwards – The way to the unbearable status quo***

International community had been very slow to react to the Kosova issue. This thesis has argued that the role of Kosovars themselves was a decisive factor in putting the issue of independence on the world agenda. The road to the status negotiations of 2006 was however long. The Peace conference on Yugoslavia that was hosted by Lord Carrington in August 1991 had been powerless to prevent the tragic Bosnian war. The Kosova Albanian leadership had already then argued that Kosova was considered as a constitutive unit of the Yugoslav Federation and was included in the talks as any other Republic. This had not happened. On the contrary Badinter

---

<sup>5</sup> As Kosovo lies in Europe, the SRSG (Special Representative of the Secretary General) who was to lead the international administration, UNMIK (UN Mission in Kosovo) was decided to be a European. However, his deputy was to be an American.

committee ignored the self-declared independence of Kosova and the requirements of Kosova Albanian leadership for equality within Yugoslavia. (See Abazi 2004, 12-19.)

In separate letters to Lord Carrington and Dutch Foreign Minister Hans Van der Broek, Senator Bob Dole, Republican Leader of the US. Senate had urged the two to consider receiving legitimate Albanian leaders. He stated his concern “that there appears to be no current intention to include representatives of Yugoslavia’s large Albanian community in the Brussels talks.” He reminded the European leaders that Albanians represent the third largest group in Yugoslavia. There can be no lasting agreements on the future of Yugoslavia unless Albanian rights are fully protected and Albanian interests fully and fairly taken into account. - - But far more is at stake there than just legalities. The hard reality is that Kosova is a tinderbox that could go up in flames of mass violence and mass slaughter at any time. Year of Serbian repression have made the people of Kosova not second, but third or fourth class citizens, in their own country”, Senator Dole wrote. One obvious choice to be included in the talks according to Senator was Dr Ibrahim Rugova, the acknowledged leader of the human rights movement in Kosova. He pleaded them at a minimum to meet with Dr Rugova. (Letter published in *Illyria* 7.9.1991.) His concerns were not listened to.

Even if in the United States many people among the political leadership understood the significant role of finding a solution to the Kosova issue to assure a stable peace in the Balkans, Kosova was still left out from the Dayton Agreement (1995). International community felt that there was simply too much to negotiate with Milosevic at that moment and simply left Kosova for a later stage. The Kosova issue is mentioned only once in the Dayton agreement and cited in connection with the preconditions for lifting the “outer wall of sanctions” from Yugoslavia. This decision, as it was later to be seen, created a negative effect with respect to the Kosova case.

Milosevic had not been strongly blamed for his harsh policy and human rights violations in Kosova and he felt he was able to do anything he wanted. The American warnings were not powerful enough when the European leaders were just pleased that the actual war had ended in the Balkans. (See Abazi 2004, 19-23.)

Rambouillet (1998-99) was the first serious attempt to tackle with the Kosova issue, but by that time it was too late to fix the situation without the use of violence. President Rugova had pleaded for peaceful means to solve the conflict for years and he had asked for an international protectorate. When the international protectorate was finally established in Kosova, it seemed the situation had gone too far and now it was quasi impossible to get rid of the international presence anymore. It took years before the final status issue was tackled after the Kosova war. The international community seemed to want to forget the status issue of Kosovo that was not resolved by the UNSC Resolution 1244. On the contrary, the policy of “Standards before Status” introduced, which made it impossible to build a functioning state and economy in Kosovo as the future status was open. A specific set of conditions (Standards) were decided upon which Kosovo should fulfill before the status issue could be negotiated. Status negotiations started finally in November 2005 following the Special Representative Kai Eide’s report on the implementation of the famous “Standards”. Ambassador Eide admitted that not all Standards were fulfilled, but underlined that any postponing of the status talks would make things worse. The Congress resolution 467 from 2002 is now waiting for the end of the negotiations that are headed by the UN Secretary General’s Special Envoy Martti Ahtisaari.

## **4. Non-state actors in the international relations – The case of Kosovar paradiplomacy**

### ***4.1. The United States and the Kosovo war***

The war in 1999 was essentially an American war and there was relatively little opposition to the war within America. The causes behind this, or especially the role of the Albanian paradiplomacy, are however often ignored. Kosovo war has become an easy case study in the international field to prove and argue for different kind of interpretations of both the American foreign policy doctrine, American politics and the post-Cold war international arena. Most of the writers and theorists however start their analysis from the 1998 just with a brief overview of the past (mainly making allusion to the archaic debate between Albanians and Serbs on whom does the land belong to – Albanians as the descendents of the Illyrians or Serbs because of the defeat of “Kosovo Polje”). Robert Singh in the book *Kosovo – perceptions of war and its aftermath* sees Kosovo war mainly as President Clinton’s personal attempt to stay in the history books as a foreign policy actor (Singh 2001, 71-73). Noam Chomsky who already in 1999 had advised the Americans “If you can’t do no harm then do nothing” (ibid, 63) wrote later on a book “The new military humanism: lessons from Kosovo” (2000) where he argues that the Kosovo war was pure American propaganda and lies used merely to secure the American political and economic



interests in the world. This argument is however very much contradictory to the other American critics who opposed the war especially because there were no American interests at stake in Kosovo (including James Baker and Henry Kissinger) (Singh 2001, 63).

Indeed, ancient history together with some international politics theories alone is too little to understand the driving force behind the American political elite. We need to look at the whole decade of the 1990s and how the Kosova issue was brought to the agenda of the American political leaders. The first two chapters have given an overview of the 1990s and of the Albanian-American activities during that time to promote the Kosova issue. This chapter aims at discussing more theoretically the Albanian paradiplomatic activity that I argue to be a decisive factor for understanding the American policies towards Kosova in the end of the 1990s. Indeed, without taking into account this context, the theorists fail to explain why the Americans approved so overwhelmingly the Kosovo war, even though most of them were not even able to place it on a map. (56% of the Americans were for the war in April 1999.) (Singh 2001, 66.)

The Kosovo war was mainly fought by the Americans. Europeans had again proved themselves incapable of mounting a decisive action, not least a bombing campaign. The US aircraft flew two-thirds of the strike missions. The targets were identified using US intelligence. However in 1999 the US inner policies were very polarized and marked with distrust between the Republican Party (majority in both House of Representatives and the Senate) and the Democratic Party (with its leader President Bill Clinton). But as Robert Singh remarks “these [domestic] conflicts ultimately had relatively little substantive effect on US involvement in the war”. Even if the Congress made many decisions “less on an assessment of our national security interests, and more on an animosity towards Bill Clinton” (Norman Ornstein, quoted by Singh 2001, 70), there was no clear Republican opposition towards the Kosovo war decided by the President. On the

contrary, among the Republicans there were many who supported the Kosova cause as we have earlier seen. This is however ignored by Singh, who stays in his analysis perplex in front of the “absence of clear opposition” and the fact that those who appealed for need of “national security” issues at stake before the US could engage in military action remained marginal in the decision making process (ibid, 62).

Robert Singh sees only contradictions in the President Clintons actions as he does not see how a President who in his youth opposed the Vietnam war and had himself managed not to be sent to fight, was now ready to send even American ground troops to Kosova using a very idealistic rhetoric such as “ If somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them en masse because of their ethnic background or their religion, and it is within our power to stop it, we will stop it” (Clinton, quoted by Singh 2001, 64). However, as we have seen Clinton was, when he was elected as President for the first time, already at that time well informed by the Kosova issue by the Albanian-American community who had taken part in the election campaigning even financing the Clinton’s electoral campaigns. Clinton had been following the events in Kosova closely meeting President Rugova himself and being informed by his staff that were in constant contact with the Albanian-American representatives in New York. Indeed, Clinton already before becoming the President had promised to help the Kosovars and he had not forgotten the pledge he made.

It may thus be difficult for observers who ignore the relations between the Albanian-American community and the Clinton administration to understand the idealistic war in 1999 fought without clear American security interests at stake. The Albanian-American lobbying and good relations also with the Republican Party explain also why the future president George W. Bush did not criticize the war or even oppose the idea of sending ground troops to Kosova in 1999. The

sending of ground troops was denied by the Congress afraid of casualties. Noam Chomsky (2000) who analyzes the Kosovo war only from the point of view of the failed Rambouillet negotiations and who sees the KLA action as the only form of Albanian activity fails also to understand the driving force behind the American decisions. By ignoring some key issues such as the Kosovar peaceful resistance in the 1990s, the action of President Rugova and LDK, he uses the Kosovo war merely to argue for his own personal interpretations of the current world system.

LDK started an active lobbying searching for political and financial support for Kosova immediately after the establishment of this political party. During the next 10 years LDK organized demonstrations, collected money for the Kosova underground institutions and parallel society and lobbied among the political leaders. LDK informed daily the Congressmen and Senators as well as the White House about the situation in Kosova. LDK offices were opened in many US. cities and they were open daily. The office in New York was coordinating the action as well in America, as with the LDK in Kosova and elsewhere in the world. The LDK offices started to resemble mini-Embassies of Kosova. They coordinated the Kosova public relations, diplomatic meetings as well as the collecting financial aid. In the beginning of the 1990s there were not many people interested in the Kosova cause in the US. Congress, not to mention among the wider public, but thanks to the long term hard work of the LDK offices, more and more interest and support could be noticed towards Kosova by the Congressmen and the White House. There were of course other Albanian organizations also active in the United States, but since the beginning of the 1990s the LDK offices and lobby was the most professionally organized as we have seen in the previous chapters. The LDK representatives in the United States worked as non-state diplomatic actors and a more theoretical analysis of this paradiplomatic activity can provide us with understanding of the American actions in Kosova.

#### ***4.2. The role of state, sovereignty and diplomatic representation in the 21st Century***

Paradiplomacy is a concept often used to describe international action of regions or entities of federal systems. Sovereign states still often regard this international activity of subnational actors as an intrusion into their exclusive domain. Indeed the international relations field is today changing due to both globalization (and the need to find different alliances to survive in global competition) and the localization (the growing activity of local entities). Non-central governments constitute themselves as actors also in the international field through different associations (of municipalities or regions for example), cross-border cooperation projects and off-shore representation offices. However, some of these actors *de jure* seen as ‘subnational’ below a sovereign state, indeed, regard themselves as national, if not fully sovereign actors. The cases that have been studied by an extensive theoretical literature are for example the Basque country, Catalonia and Quebec. (See Aldecoa and Keating 1999.) The literature concerning Kosovo in this sense is almost non-existent.

It is difficult to choose if Kosovo should be handled in this context at all of paradiplomacy – activity of non-central governments such as regions. Kosovo could as well be studied as an example of a delayed national liberation and nation-state building process in the Balkans following the example of the neighbors (Greece, Albania and so on, who gained their independence in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century). Or Kosovo could be studied as a case of colonial liberation – a territory occupied by foreign forces for centuries and now being liberated passing through a phase of international protectorate (UNMIK could be seen as a late example of the UN trusteeship activities created to support the independence of the colonial states in Africa).

However, I have chosen to analyze US.-Kosova relations and especially the activity of the Albanian-American community through the notion of paradiplomacy, because this notion has already been used to similar cases such as Quebec (and not only to refer to traditional decentralized administrative units of national states). In fact, Kosovo can be a very fruitful case study in this sense.

Michael Keating notices that “politics can be detached from territory, as transnational social and political movement or groups defined by ethnicity or gender compete with traditional forms of mobilization. Some observers have take this so far as to talk of the ‘end of territory’. Yet this is only part of the story, since there has also been a reinvention of territory as a functional requirement and as a political principle, within the new global order (1999, 2). Keating refers to the restructuring of territorial politics within states with the rise of new actors and issues. His remarks fit very well to the case of Kosova. In fact, the activity of the Albanian-American community together with the Kosova government in exile in the 1990s show that the politics as such can be detached form territory – they do not need to be handled in a specific traditional nation state framework – but at the same time territory (the region or para-state) is needed as the legitimation and the scope of action of these de-territorialized political actors.

In the case of Kosova, the federal state (Yugoslavia) lost the last bits of loyalty of the Kosovars when Milosevic abolished the autonomous status of Kosova. New forms of collective action were sought and the establishment of the LDK, the first democratically formed party was a major step. Later on the clandestine elections and the referendum for independence were clear steps towards creating a *de facto* clandestine state within a state.

Keating remarks that “those regions with nationalist aspirations” – “distinct historical and cultural identities may also use diasporas to enhance their political influence in other countries and to mobilize resources. The role of the Irish diaspora has been important at various times in the Northern Ireland conflict and the peace process. The Basque diaspora in America provides an arena for the Basque movement” (1999, 5). Keating does not mention Kosova, but what he describes was the strategy taken up by the Kosovars, too, as LDK established a representation in America in early 1990s and mobilized the Albanian-American community to support the Kosova cause. Keating continues, that “in other cases regionally concentrated minorities may look to a motherland for support” and takes up the case of Quebec and France (idem.). In the case of Kosova, Albania as a poor state going through a difficult transition phase from dictatorship to democracy itself, could not be of great support against the Milosevic regime. Kosovars had to look for help elsewhere among more powerful friends such as the United States.

The Kosova representatives in the United States looked for useful strategies tailored for the American context. They financed electoral campaigns to get their voice heard. They organized rallies and manifestations. They informed the Congressmen of the current situation and so on. According to Keating “the strategies adopted by regions in their external relations are shaped by their motivations and the opportunity structures facing them. Paradiplomacy is not the same as conventional state diplomacy, which is about pursuing a defined state interest in the international arena. It is more functionally specific and targeted, often opportunistic and experimental.” (Keating 1999, 11.) If the LDK action in America in the beginning of the 1990s was indeed opportunistic and experimental – looking for the best ways to open the doors of the American administration and to get support for Kosova, little by little the activities have grown to resemble more and more traditional diplomacy. Indeed, today even though Kosova does still not have a Ministry for Foreign Affairs and thus no formally accredited Ambassadors, Kosovar politicians

and representatives are engaged in traditional “diplomatic” relations with other state representatives: They pursue a “defined state interest” as these interests are defined by democratic institutions Assembly and Government (PISG). In some international arenas the Kosova representatives still have no right to speak for themselves (but are represented by the UNMIK), but gradually this is changing too as even the UN Security Council has now in July 2007 invited President Sejdiu to speak about the current situation in Kosova (even if in “unofficial” meetings). This is seen as a sign that Kosova will be given a UN seat when the final status (independence) is decided.

The Albanian-American community and the LDK office as a paradiplomatic actor did have different means in their action as conventional diplomatic actors could have used. They were able to influence the domestic politics in America (they were seen as an important electoral asset for the Congressmen and Presidential candidates they choose to support). As Brian Hocking notices, the status ambiguity of paradiplomatic actors “may afford them advantages associated with NGOs. Apart from possessing policy relevant knowledge and expertise [they] can employ modes of behavior unavailable to national governments” (1999, 28). No conventional Embassy would have financed electoral campaigns for example. However, we can also note together with Hocking that “the nature of diplomacy itself is changing as the traditional representative of the state – the diplomat – is frequently required to act as a facilitator, assembling coalitions of actors in attempt to manage problems which are beyond the capacity of government alone” (1999, 20). The LDK office in New York was helping both the Albanian-American community to get information about what was happening “home” in Kosova, as well as the democratic but clandestine institutions of Kosova to get their voice heard in America to get support from both the Albanian-Americans as from the American political leadership.

#### ***4.3. Paradiplomacy - Rugova tactics***

President Rugova has been criticized by some observers as well as some political circles inside Kosova of having chosen passive resistance, a line of policies that failed to free Kosova. (See for example Judah 2002.) However, many of these critics fail to see the importance of the patient work of paradiplomatic institution building aiming at internationalization of the Kosova issue. Those who look only at the years 1998 and 1999 may want to explain the success of the internationalization of the Kosova issue by the armed resistance put up by the KLA. However, without a longer period of sensitizing work among the foreign public and policy leaders that the LDK representatives had been doing especially in America, the reaction of the foreign leaders towards the KLA activities might have been completely different.

President Rugova saw in the beginning of the 1990s that armed resistance at that time (especially when ethnic genocide was going on in Bosnia) would have been suicidal. He was responsible as any democratic leader of a nation for the well being of the whole population in Kosova, and was not willing to risk innocent lives. On the contrary he chose a different path, the path of pacifist resistance. After the declarations of independence of Slovenia and Croatia, it was evident that Yugoslavia would not exist anymore. Kosova's future would be independence. This had to be communicated to the international community – this had to be approved by the international community.

Those who have knowledge of international relations know that many conflicts are settled in favor of the stronger side. Voltaire has supposedly said “God is always on the side of the larger



battalions” (Hughes 1991, 136). Indeed, war was not an answer in a situation where the enemy was much stronger. As Hughes notices “when conflict occurs, one side has miscalculated” and that “many states that initiated wars failed” (1991, 137-138). Croatia tried to convince the Kosovars to open a new front in the south to disturb the Serbian warfare, but a freedom war without international back up would have been doomed to fail. It was crucial to secure the international support for Kosova’s cause. President Rugova knew that undemocratic actions and especially adding violence to the already burning Balkans would have backfired on the Kosovars.

Noe Cornago notices that “internationalization of ethnic conflicts can contribute to finding solutions through mediation or international negotiation” - - but can also “escalate tension, serving partisan strategies and foreign intervention” (1999, 41-42). President Rugova and the LDK paradiplomatic activities aimed first of all to include the Kosovars in the peace negotiations in the aftermath of the Yugoslav wars. The international community was too afraid to include Kosova in the Dayton peace talks, because they feared that the leaders of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Izetbegovic, Tudjman and Milosevic) would walk away from the talks. Dayton peace was not perfect, but it meant end of fighting. However, the fears of those who had warned about the tragic consequences of leaving Albanians out from the talks (such as Bob Dole quoted this thesis, too), did become reality. There was no lasting peace in the Balkans without resolving the Kosova issue.

If the international climate and the unprecedented situation in the Balkans in the middle of the 1990s had made it impossible to find solution to the Kosova case through international mediation, the internationalization of the Kosova case served however the partisan strategies of those who then decided to take up arms against the Serbian forces. “Internationalization”, as

Cornago notices, “can certainly encourage ethnic demands, increasing the capacity for mobilization and establishing new logistics and sanctuary opportunities” (idem.). As even during the conflict years President Rugova and LDK continued assuring the functioning of the parallel structures in Kosova (to fulfill the basic needs of the citizens) LDK’s paradiplomatic action continued also to assure international approval and continuous support for the Kosova’s aspirations for freedom. In the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to fight barbarism you needed to stay civilized, that was the idea behind passive resistance. When this tactic was first chosen according to Shklëzen Maliqi (quoted by Judah 2002, 67) “the key to the solution of the Kosova problem and the Albanian national question [was seen to] lay in democracy”. The formula, he argued, appeared “simple”, that is to say “pluralism, market-economy, parliament and democratic institutions”. If you had those, then there was “no need for war”. It would be enough to know that all Albanians favored independence and once that was clear then its achievement would not be far away” (idem.). This approach is qualified naïve by those who think that the passive resistance was a failure.

However, those who underline the decisive role of the KLA often forget the bigger picture and the question of how we did arrive to such an international climate, or such a political situation especially in the United States, that the world leading military power was ready to engage itself and NATO for the first time in history to interfere in the as some would say “internal” matters of a “sovereign” state – that Yugoslavia was considered to be at that time. We should not underestimate the role of the KLA and the armed resistance – it is indeed a heroic part of the Kosovar history – but we should see the interconnection of President Rugova’s extremely intelligent tactic of internationalization of the Kosova case through peaceful paradiplomatic means and the surprising moral approval of the international community of the armed resistance in the end of the 1990s. It is hard to believe that the United States would have engaged into a

very expensive war to support an armed group in a province of a state that their public (electorate) would have never heard of and were the ethnic minority (which the armed rebels claimed to represent) would not have had any democratic representation not to mention a democratically elected leadership. Democratic institution building was a goal in itself, but it was also part of the necessary image building in order to institutionalize the Kosova question. The establishment of the international protectorate (UNMIK) in Kosova served to stabilize the region, to assure depart of the Serbian occupying troops and the safe return of the refugees. However, the prolongation of the international presence unfortunately hindered the efficient institution building process to continue naturally.

Already the decision of LDK to demand for Kosova's own foreign activity in the beginning of the 1990s and the establishment of the LDK office in New York was a clear step towards independence. This decision questioned the right of diplomatic representation as a domain reserved to the Yugoslav state. It was an important part of the clandestine but democratic institution building in Kosova – together with the establishing of the Presidency, Assembly and the Government (in exile) the diplomatic representation even in this paradiplomatic form was part of creating a state. And not many diplomats can say they have managed to change a whole American “doctrine” on military intervention – however President Clinton did clarify the American policy position on humanitarian intervention based on the Kosova case. This American military doctrine was only changed after the 9/11 attacks in 2001. It is indeed admitted by many observers, that the Kosovar tactics of armed resistance would not have been approved anymore in the post-9/11 era.

## **Conclusion**

Since the Paris Congress 1919 and the extraordinary support of President Woodrow Wilson to the independence of Albania (territory that the bigger neighbors wanted to share between each other) the special relationship between Albanians and Americans has remained. During the communist dictatorship in Albania and the Yugoslav era in Kosova, the United States did not play a special role if not as a dreamland or the destination of dissidents and those who looked for a better future. However, when things were getting worse in Kosova in the 80s, thousands of Albanians moved to the United States. And when the communist regime in Albania collapsed, a real exodus started from this poorest country of Europe. Most of them left for Greece and Italy but many were able to travel all the way to America. The Albanian-American community, that had been present in the United States for over 100 years already, grew in numbers and in power

The Milosevic era was the worst for the Albanians living in Kosova. Milosevic removed the autonomous status of the province, chased the Albanians from public jobs and forced the whole almost 2 million people population to organize their life in a shadow society. The Albanian leadership elected in underground elections, tried to internationalize the difficult situation of the population by bringing the issue up in the meetings with Western leaders. The role of the lobby in America and especially the LDK offices overseas was crucial when looking for support in the US. capital city and the Capitol Hill. LDK officers in the USA engaged themselves during the

1990s in a long campaign to sensitize the US. political leaders with the Albanian cause. And they did succeed. Presidents George Bush, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush all leaded foreign policies favorable to the Albanian cause. Also an important number of Congressmen and – women as well as Senators rallied behind the Kosova issue and helped pass Congress resolutions to form the American policy towards Kosova and Milosevic. Thanks to these efforts the United States was ready to go to war against the Serbian aggressors lead by Milosevic (even without a proper UN mandate until then always needed to get NATO bombings started).

Among these Congressmen and women that heard the appeal of the Albanian-American community were Eliot Engel, Sue Kelly, Peter T. King , Benjamin Gilman, Sam Gejdenson, Nita M. Lowey, Tom Lantos, Bill Zellif, Jose Serrano, Joseph Kennedy, David Boinor, Susan Molinari, William Broomfield, Dick Swett, Edolphus Towns, Bill Paxon, James Moran, John Poter, and many others. On the side of the Senate Senators such as Bob Dole, Larry Pressler, Alfonse D'Amato, Joseph Liberman, Paul Simon, Al Gore, Ted Kennedy, John McCain, Joseph Biden, Hillary Clinton, Charles Shuman, Elizabeth Dole, Mitch McConnell were sensitive to the cause of Albanians. The President Bill Clinton, who was the one to make decision on the bombings in the Spring 1999, and his wife Hillary Clinton, as well as the then Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, are all considered as important heroes of the Kosova Albanians – They were seen to come in the rescue of the Albanian population suppressed by genocidal policy of the Serbs and expelled from their homes and from Kosova.

When Kosova was in summer 1999 liberated, an international administration was created called UNMIK. NATO guaranteed the safety by bringing the KFOR peacekeeping force to the area. The United Nations took up the administration and police; the OSCE was put in charge of the institution building; and as the United States had paid the expensive war against Serbia – the EU

took up on its turn the reconstruction of Kosova. The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 saw this arrangement as a provisory one. Little by little the situation in Kosova stagnated. The transfer of competences from the international administration to the hands of the local institutions such as the Government of Kosova was terribly slow. Also the privatization that was supposed to handle by the UNMIK did not proceed well. The frustration of the young population blew up in violence during the March 2004 events, which woke up the international community finally to realize that the status quo situation in Kosova was unbearable. The economy was in a horrible state, unemployment high and the young population missing all future opportunities.

The UNMIK era forced the Kosova institutions to adapt themselves to the international presence – local ownership was lacking in many areas. Even if the international administration assured many vital reforms, it failed to support the democratic development started in the 1990s. Without independence the Kosovar institutions stayed in a certain limbo situation – without really being able to act efficiently. In front of the international tutelage, corruption and selfish aims started characterising the local politics. The open question of the final status delayed the state building process. Even the paradiplomatic activities changed their character. Kosova was no longer under the Serbian rule, but still had no clear international representation. Sometimes Kosovar representatives had a right to speak; sometimes they were replaced by the UNMIK international representative.

Ever since 1999 the Americans have been more open than the Europeans to include Kosova representatives (in stead of UNMIK civil servants) in the official talks. If the UNMIK has not been much loved in Kosova due to the fact that the international stuff often ignores the will of the local institutions and democratic representatives, the USAID has made it clear that their stuff is in Kosova to support the institution building and to mentor the local administration, in stead of

leading the administration themselves. Little by little also the United Nations grew to understand that the status quo of international administration of Kosova was unbearable.

Finally this year 2005 in November the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan nominated a former Finnish President Martti Ahtisaari as his special Envoy to head the status negotiations for Kosova. The United States nominate their own member of the status negotiations team and are expected to back up a solution that would suit to the Albanian population. Naturally after all this waiting and suffering the Kosova Albanians will not settle to any other solution than independence. On the Albanian side the negotiation team was headed by President Rugova until he tragically passed away in January 2006. He was then replaced by his successor President Sejdiu. The negotiation team is formed of representatives of the actual Government (LDK, AAK) as well as the major opposition parties (PDK, Ora) and civil society. President Rugova was a highly respected figure among the political leaders in Kosova as well as abroad and his disappearance was a great blow to the whole nation. It is however believed that his life work for the independence of Kosova will be finally come to conclusion this year. The negotiation team gets valuable support and advice from many prominent Americans that already in 1990s became acquainted with the Albanian lobbyists and the Albanian cause. If and when the negotiations come to an end and Kosova is given the status of independence, the US. Congress will surely be among the first to recognize it – in fact the resolutions aimed at the recognition of the independence has already been introduced in the Congress (H. RES. 467, 27 June 2002) and is waiting for the status negotiations to finish. On Monday 24 July for the first time since the war and for the first time as equal partners the Kosova leaders sat down in the negotiating table with their Serbian counterparts to discuss the future status of Kosova.

The determination of Kosova's final status will be a complicated process as the Serbs still consider Kosova as the "cradle of the Serbian people", whereas Albanians in Kosova remember the ancient history of their ancestors in the region and finally hope for the rightful rewarding of their patience in seeking self-determination and freedom from their long-time oppressor (see Sejdiu, 2005, for legal arguments for the independent status of Kosova). After what had happened in the 1990s it is obvious that for Albanians independence is the only possible outcome of the negotiations.

Even if the United States have been the major contributor to the liberation of Kosova, the future of Kosova lies in Europe. The European Union has stated that the future status of Kosova must guarantee the euro-atlantic integration process of Kosova (as well as its neighbours). Today the Kosova Government remains strongly committed in fulfilling all its obligations for a smooth integration into the European Union. The 2003 Thessalonica Summit sent a clear message to all countries in the Western Balkans - their integration in the European Union would be guaranteed. Bearing this in mind, it can be assumed that the future of Kosovo will be a peaceful, multiethnic, well governed independent country, in the heart of a European region that is fully integrated and the unity of which is based on close multi-level cooperation between different nations, states, regions as well as municipalities.

Indeed, the diplomatic relations between United States and Kosovo are a good example of non-traditional multilevel diplomacy between state and non-state actors. The state-building process in Kosovo during the last 16 years has been directly linked and dependent on the diplomatic relations with the United States. The LDK representation in America was in a crucial role also when the United States decided to start the air bombings against Milosevic regime even without a proper mandate of the UN Security Council. Kosova owes a lot to the American friends and the



American leadership. The political power has shifted many times in the United States during the last 16 years, but the American political elite has not mixed the Kosova issue with their domestic disputes. On the contrary, Kosova has been a common concern to both Democrats and Republicans. On the contrary in Europe, the Kosova case is much too often looked at from the domestic point of view (Spanish making allusion to the Basque question, Russians, to the other conflict areas in their sphere of influence. It is thus not suprising that the population in Kosova trusts more their friends in America than the leaders of Europe. The European union has a lot to do to win a similar loyalty or trust of the Albanians in Kosova. This is however an important task for the EU as Kosova already has an EU perspective and the Europeans are expected to remain in Kosova even after the status settlement at least in a role of monitors and mentors. Kosova will have to look more towards Brussels in the future.

## Bibliography

Abazi, E. (2004). The role of international community in conflict situation. Which way forwards? The case of Kosovo/a conflict. *Balkanologie* VII (1), pp. 9-31.

Aguirre, I. (1999). Making Sense of Paradiplomacy? An Intertextual Inquiry about a Concept in Search of a Definition. In: Aldecoa, F. and Keating M. (eds). *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relation of Subnational Governments*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 185-209.

Aldecoa, F. and Keating M. (eds). (1999). *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relation of Subnational Governments*. London: Frank Cass.

Chomsky, Noam (2000): The New Military Humanism: Lessons from Kosovo. Monroe: Common Courage Press.

Clinton, B. (1999). *Statement by President Clinton on Kosovo*. Press release, The White House, Washington, DC, 24 March.

Clinton, B. (2004). *My Life*. New York : Alfred A. Knopf

Cornago, N. (1999). Diplomacy and Paradiplomacy in the Redefinition of International Security Dimension of Conflict and Co-operation. In: Aldecoa, F. and Keating M. (eds). *Paradiplomacy in Action: The Foreign Relation of Subnational Governments*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 40-57.

Dedushaj, N. (2000). *LDK ne SHBA Historia e nje levizjeje ( LDK in the USA The History of one movement)*, New York.

Delli Zotti, G. (1996). Transfrontier co-operation at the external borders of the European Union: Implications for sovereignty. In: O'Dowd, L. and Wilson T. M. (eds). *Borders, Nations and States: Frontiers of Sovereignty in the New Europe*. Avebury: Aldershot, pp. 51-72.

Der Derian, J. (1987). *On Diplomacy: A Genealogy of Western Estrangement*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hocking, B. (2004) Privatizing Diplomacy?. *International Studies Perspectives* 5 (2), 147-152.

Holbrooke, R. (2005), interview in *Frontline* [online]. Available form <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/kosovo/interviews/holbrooke.html> [Accessed 13 November 2005].

Horvat, B. (1998). *Kosovas Question*, Zagreb : Globus.

Hughes, B. (1991). Continuity and Change in World Politics. The Clash of Perspectives. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Jacques, E. (1994). *The Albanians: An Ethnic History from Prehistoric Times to the Present*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company
- Judah, T. (2002). *Kosovo War and Revenge*. New Heaven and London: Yale Nota Bene.
- Malcolm, N., (1998). *Kosovo: a Short History*. London, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- O'Dowd, L. (2003). The Changing Significance of European Borders. In: Anderson, James, Liam O'Dowd & Thomas M. Wilson (eds). *New Borders for a Changing Europe: Crossborder Cooperation and Governance*. London: Frank Cass, pp. 13-36.
- Pettifer, J. (2005): *Kosova Express A Journey in Wartime*. London: Hurst&Company.
- Reka, B. (1994). *Kosova – A case for preventive diplomacy*. Prishtine: Grafika Rezniki.
- Rosenau, J. (1988). Patterned chaos in global life: Structure and process in the two worlds of world politics. *International Political Science Review* 9, pp. 327-364.
- Roudometof, V. (2002). National minorities, nation-states, and external national homelands in Southeastern Europe. In: Kourvetaris, G. A. et al. (eds). *The New Balkans: Disintegration and reconstruction*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 54-83.
- Sejdiu, K. (2005). The Revival of a Forgotten Dispute: Deciding Kosova's Future. *Rutgers University Journal of Law and Urban Policy*, 3(2), pp. 106-118 [online]. Available from [http://www.jlup.org/jlup\\_issues\\_3\\_1.html](http://www.jlup.org/jlup_issues_3_1.html)

- Singh, R. (2001): American Perceptions. In: Buckley M. and Cummings S. N. (eds.). *Kosovo – Perceptions of war and its aftermath*. London: Continuum, pp. 61-77.
- Smaka, R. (2003). Political-juridical status of Kosova in the context of interest of relationship between great powers, *Dardania Sacra*, scientist journal. Prishtina.
- Stavileci , E. (2005) *Kosova dhe çeshtja shqiptare ne udhekryqet e kohes (Political History of the Kosova Issue)*. Prishtine: Prograf.
- Sudzuka , A. (2004). *Lessons Learnt in Bosnia and Hercegovina*. Postgraduate diploma in IT and Diplomacy [online]. Available from <http://www.diplomacy.edu/courses/>
- Sullivan, S. (2004): *Be Not Afraid for You Have Sons in America: How a Brooklyn Roofer Helped Lure the U.S. into the Kosovo War*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- United Nations (1999). *Resolution of Security Council of United Nations for Kosovo* no.1244/99. New York: United Nations.
- Witt, A. (2001): "National Borders: Images, Functions, and Their Effects on Cross-Border Cooperation in North America and Europe". In Papademetriou, D. G. and Waller Meyers D. (eds). *Caught in the Middle : Border Communities in an Era of Globalisation*. Wahington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Tahiri, E. (2001). *Konferenca e Rambujese (The Rambouillet Conference .* Peje : Dukagjini

Tamminen, T. (2005): Yhteistyön tilat ja toimijat murroksessa eteläisellä Balkanilla: Eurooppalaista identiteettiä rakentamassa? Available online: <http://www.valt.helsinki.fi/staff/tpalosaa/ump/paperit/tamminen.pdf>

(Original in Finnish, an English version of the paper has been presented at The Sixth Finnish Colloquium of South East European Studies, Turku University, Finland, 23-24 September, 2005)

### **The Congress resolutions:**

The Library of Congress (2005): Congress Resolutions and Bills concerning Kosova, electronic resources accessible on line <http://thomas.loc.gov> [Accessed 12 November 2005].

The main resolutions concerning Kosova can also be found in the annex of my PGD thesis:

Dedushaj, N. (2005). *THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FATE OF KOSOVA*  
*The resolutions discussed and adopted by the US. Congress.* Postgraduate diploma in IT and Diplomacy. Mediterranean Academy of Diplomatic Studies.

### **Other sources:**

The Archive of Democratic League of Kosova, Prishtina

The Archive of Democratic League of Kosova in United States

The Archive of Kosova Information Center Prishtina

The Archive of the Illyria Newspaper, New York