SLOVENIA

COUNTRY READER
TABLE OF CONTENTS

SAMUEL G. WISE, JR.
Political Officer
Trieste, Italy (1964-1967)

Samuel G. Wise Jr. was born in Chicago in 1928 and educated at the University of Virginia and Columbia. He entered the Foreign Service in 1955. His career included posts in Palermo, New Caledonia, Moscow, Trieste, Prague and Rome. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1995.

Q: Today is the 22nd of August, 1995. Sam, you were in Trieste from when to when?

WISE: Trieste from the summer of 1964 until the summer of 1967.

Q: What was the situation in Trieste at that time?

WISE: At that time, it was still a standoff situation between Italy and Yugoslavia over the border: the so-called "zones A and B," which represented a temporary solution of border claims after World War II. One of the purposes of the work of the Consulate was to watch the situation because it was considered a potential hotspot, where hostilities could break out if conditions were right. So, this was one of our jobs: to watch the activities of the Slovenians who came into Trieste. Many Slovenian families actually lived there, but there was a lot of across-the-border activity as well.

Q: How big was the Consulate?

WISE: We had about five Officers, three secretaries, and about seven or eight local employees.

Q: That was quite a good size, wasn't it?

WISE: It was and, as I say, I think it represented the United States' concern that this could be a potential hotspot.

Q: What was your position in the Consulate?

WISE: I was Deputy Principal Officer.

Q: Who was the head of it then?

WISE: I'll have to tell you as it comes to me.

Q: How did you keep an eye on the situation?

WISE: We were in touch with all the political leaders of the area. In addition, tried to get out among the population at large, to find out if there were resentments or concerns building up that might have led in a dangerous direction. We would occasionally go over into Yugoslavia, just to see the situation over there. I guess the nearest Consulate on that side was in Belgrade in those days.

Q: No, Zagreb.

WISE: Excuse me. Of course, Zagreb. There was nothing in Ljubljana. I think there might have been a USIA post: a library or something like that. It was a fairly stable situation. The press would try to fire up some things. On the Italian side, the Messini, the so-called "MSI," the ex-fascist types. And then there were some on the Slovenian side: newspapers that would try to heat up the scene. But, in general, the situation during my time there was fairly quiet. I did have one or two experiences that might be useful to mention. When I first arrived from Moscow (I arrived in the summertime), as is the custom, people were taking leave and transfers. I found myself, I think maybe from the first day or shortly thereafter, as Acting Principal Officer. About the first thing that happened, a month after my arrival, we had this tremendous disaster in our Consular District: a dam disaster, where a couple of thousand people were wiped away in a couple of seconds, or a couple of minutes at most, including a few American citizens, so I got involved in that and had to up and deal with the situation, and keep in touch with the Embassy in Rome. Of course, they were very interested in it. It was quite an experience just to be arriving at post.

Q: Did you have any dealing with the German or Austrian minority in Italy?

WISE: We watched it from the newspapers primarily. We occasionally made it up there and there were the occasional incidents over the years. But I don't recall any major incident. Our attention was focused on the Italian-Slovenian border.

Q: How did the Italians treat the Slovenians who lived in the Trieste area? Schools, housing?

WISE: Not too badly. There were complaints. You wondered how many times these complaints were fostered by outside forces trying to stir up some trouble. But they lived in certain areas and they weren't as wealthy as the Italians. But, on the other hand, there were some that had succeeded quite well in Trieste, in Italian society. There may have been some discrimination, but I don't think it was as bad as it was portrayed sometimes by the Slovenians.

ROBERT RACKMALES
Consular Officer
Zagreb, Yugoslavia (1967-1969)

Robert Rackmales was born in Baltimore, Maryland in 1937. He studied history at Johns Hopkins University and graduated in 1958. He received a Fulbright Scholarship to Germany and this influenced him toward his entry into the Foreign Service in 1963. He had twice served in Nigeria, Yugoslavia and Italy at various rotations. He was interviewed by Professor Charles Stuart Kennedy on May 11, 1995.

Q: Today is the 22nd of May 1995. What was the responsibility of the consulate general in Zagreb when you were there? We're talking '67 to '69.

RACKMALES: We had the normal responsibilities of any constituent post including protection and welfare of American citizens. Our consular district, which consisted of the two republics of Croatia and Slovenia, and we provided the full range of consular services including visas. We did political and economic reporting. For a constituent post, we were pretty well staffed. We had a consul general, we had two political-economic officers, we had two consular officers, although only one was a real consul. We had an admin officer, and of course a well staffed FSN group as well.

Q: *Now it's an embassy.*

RACKMALES: The basic staffing has stayed almost the same.

Q: *Who was the consul general when you were there?*

RACKMALES: Bob Owen. My tour coincided entirely with his. He stayed four years and I think I arrived in his second year and left at the end of his third year.

Q: *What was your particular assignment there?*

RACKMALES: I was chief of the consular section, so I oversaw all of the range of consular responsibilities that we had.

Q: *I know one of the things that gave me great pleasure was the fact that the autos trade, the so-called main highway between Croatia and Serbia when I was consul general in essentially Serbia was that you had two-thirds of the autos trade because a lot of accidents on the highways so you got a disproportionate number of the accidents as your responsibility, which did not give me any great heartache.*

RACKMALES: Actually, I have to say that tragically I lost a good friend who had gone through language training, Hanna Woods.

Q: *Yes, I knew Hanna. That was a terrible automobile accident, a very dangerous highway. What were the main consular things that you had to deal with?*

RACKMALES: We had very active visa issuance. There were a lot of Croatians who traveled to the United States, and the immigrant visa operation was also fairly busy because of the large number of Croatians who had immigrated after the war, so there were a lot of family petitions. And then we had protection cases, a few of them come to mind as having taken a lot of time and effort.

Q: *I'd like to get a feel for what this meant.*

RACKMALES: I guess the most dramatic one was a man who was a writer, in fact had won the National Book Award in the early '50s, but had suffered from paranoia, and I believe some drug addiction as well. He was living in Rome, and was involved with a "clinic" that was apparently being used as a drug center. The granddaughter of the first post-war president of Italy, Luigi Einaudi, became involved with this individual and in the drug scene. Partly because of her involvement there was an Italian crackdown on this group. The writer got wind of it, and hopped in his car and fled because he knew that if he were picked up in Italy he would be put away for a long time. So he drove across the border into Slovenia. This was at night and since his lights were defective he was picked up by Slovenian police and had his passport taken. He started calling the embassy for assistance, and started trying personally to reach the ambassador, and I think the embassy very quickly recognized that this was not a normal individual and it was going to be very complicated. He wanted to go down to Belgrade but, of course, they said, "No, you're in the Zagreb consular district." He got down to Zagreb, and then we began a period--it seemed like months, perhaps just a month for all of this to play out, but it seemed interminable. He did have money, so he was staying at the Palace Hotel, coming into the consulate every day and spinning fantasies about how the CIA and everybody else was out to get him, and becoming increasingly agitated. I was trying to figure out how to resolve this in a way that would protect his rights as an American citizen, but at the same time get him out of our hair because he was starting to take up two-three or more hours a day. At one point he called me at midnight, woke me up saying, "There are some men here who claim to want to take me to a hospital, but I don't know who they are or what's going on. Will you come down and check it out?" I did, and he was right but shortly after I arrived they left. But There was another man lurking in the background who came up to me as soon as they left and introduced himself. He was an agent of the Einaudi family, and he said, "I'm sorry that you interfered with this little action of ours because we really do think he needs help." As we talked I could also sense that his real concern was protecting the Einaudi family. Checking with the embassy in Rome, I was told to have nothing to do with the

writer who was considered potentially dangerous. The Italians had also put out through Interpol a look-out for him. What I finally did was, and this was skirting a fine line, to share most of what I knew with the Slovenia authorities. They had a foreign ministry because the republics had some nominal foreign policy responsibilities. I gave some of the background on the writer to the head of the office, Dr. Murko, and I said, "This person's passport is being held by your magistrate, and I'm going to accompany him up there and hope you will do the proper thing." I guess my assumption was that with the Interpol watch, and the other indications that the writer could be a risk, they might decide to contact the Italians, or take him into some sort of custody. In fact, when I went up there we went to the magistrate, he said, "Oh, yes, Mr. Rackmales, I've heard from a subordinate." He sat down, asked a few brief questions and then said, "Okay, here's your passport." The writer was quite pleased, and as we walked out we looked at each other, and said, "Okay, now what?" I excused myself because I wanted to try to find out more, if I could, from Dr. Murko, who had clearly decided to decline the hot potato. He said, "We gave him his passport back, aren't you happy?" I replied, "If that's your decision, fine, we'll take it from there."

Shortly afterward the writer did decide voluntarily to go for treatment in a clinic in Switzerland, much to my relief.

Q: *There's no real answer because you couldn't use restraints, and they could be dangerous. I mean both to themselves and to others, and yet your tools were essentially persuasion either with the person, which is not very good, or with the local authorities who also don't want to be involved at all, as you know. Get them moving.*

RACKMALES: Yes, I suspect that was probably the basic motivation. They also didn't want to have this guy hanging around.

Q: *Did you have problems with, particularly with Croats who had left before communist times, or fled during it, who became Americans, who came back and tried to agitate, and overthrow Tito and that type of thing?*

RACKMALES: I think it was still considered too dangerous for them to do anything that would make them conspicuous. Around that time we saw the first evident signs of Croatian nationalism, and a slightly freer atmosphere. We did have a few cases of people who had left for political reasons, and who would come back and get picked up on the charge of having avoided the draft. One case in Slovenia involved a young man who had made a couple of broadcasts in the Cleveland area, and he came back and was charged, not with political activities, but with having evaded the draft. Eventually he was able to get out. I do not recall any cases of individuals actually coming back and trying to organize political activities.

Q: *This, of course, on the record. How did you find dealing with the Croatian and Slovenia authorities? Not necessarily just on the consular side, but anything else.*

RACKMALES: In general, in my first year until the summer of '68, the Slovene authorities were warmer and friendlier. The Croats that I dealt with correct, but a bit standoffish. That changed in August of '68 dramatically.

Q: *You have to supply gloves and handkerchiefs too. Did you get any feel for Croatian and Slovene immigration to the United States, how successful it was, where the people were going to? Were there any patterns that you noticed?*

RACKMALES: The Slovenes in the Cleveland area were numerous, and in Chicago also, and the Croats on the Pacific coast. There were a lot of Dalmatians because of the fishing industry. A lot of our tuna industry is in the hands of Croatians. They also have vineyards in the Napa Valley, the Grgick family, and others. So there are concentrations in some of the large mid-west cities and the Pacific coast. There was a big Croatian community from one of the islands who all went to Hoboken. In fact there were more people from that island living in Hoboken than there were living on the island. I was struck with the success, with the frugality, and the ability of these immigrants in a very short period of time to accumulate savings which far exceeded what most of us are able to save and you wonder how did they do it. But they were obviously very hard working, energetic people, who lived modestly and saved so they could then afford to bring in other members of the family. So I never worried too much about these people becoming a public charge.

THOMAS P. H. DUNLOP
Consular Officer
Zagreb, Yugoslavia (1969-1972)

Thomas Dunlop was born in Washington, DC in 1934 and educated at Yale and the University of Berlin. He entered the Foreign Service in 1960. His career included posts in Belgrade, Saigon, Zagreb and Seoul. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1996.

DUNLOP: Again, I welcome this opportunity which you're giving to me. In the interim between leaving Saigon in June, 1969, and my assignment to Zagreb, Yugoslavia, in July, 1969, I was married. That is not necessarily a key element in these recollections, but I had a happy tour in Zagreb. I was the number two person in a small Consulate. I think that at most we had 10 Americans assigned there. We had consular responsibility for two of the six constituent republics of Yugoslavia: Slovenia and Croatia.

The Yugoslav people could begin to travel abroad and had less difficulty getting passports. They were permitted to form companies and to enter into joint ventures with foreign companies, although the laws on joint ventures were not very permissive. There were a lot of things about that which made that kind of arrangement unattractive to foreign companies. There was no great flood of foreign investment. Nevertheless, there was some, and that marked a big change. The most important single thing that Tito did between 1965 and 1969 was to devolve economic decision making from the central government and structures which had been in place in Belgrade since World War II to the capitals of the constituent republics. In our case, this meant Zagreb [Croatia] and Ljubljana [Slovenia].

This change was real. Tito had been unhappy with the economic performance of Yugoslavia, as well he should have been. Yugoslavia's so-called "Special Road to Communism" was not producing the "bottom line" results that he thought it should and could have done. So he listened to the advice of people who said, "Look, this top-heavy bureaucracy in Belgrade is not what we need. Let's dismantle that. Let's really give economic decision making authority, in significant measure, to the six Republics out there." And that was done. What I think that Tito did not anticipate, and those around him either didn't tell him or didn't know, either, is that it is very difficult to give away some economic decision making power without putting at risk your political decision making power.

When I got to Zagreb in 1969, this process of devolution of authority was picking up momentum, on the political side as well as on the economic side. The political process of devolution was, it turned out, unacceptable to Tito. But that was not apparent at all at that time. There was a cadre of able, younger people at middle and upper middle levels of the communist parties in the republics who were really ready, willing, and eager to take this authority and to "run with it." In Croatia the names of the two people most associated with that were a man by the name of Mika Tripolo and a woman by the name of Savka Dapcevic Kuchar. In Slovenia there was a group of such people, but the most prominent was a man named Stanic Kuvete. There were people like this down in Belgrade in the Communist Party of Serbia, Latinka(?) Perovic, for example. There were some of them down in Macedonia in the Macedonian Communist Party. They weren't too evident in Bosnia or in Montenegro. However, there was enough going on in Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia to give a distinctly different cast to the political environment in which the country was operating.

What did the people of Croatia want? They wanted identity, they wanted to be thought of as Croatians, not Yugoslavs, they wanted control over their tourism earnings. They had the biggest chunk of the Adriatic Coast of Yugoslavia. They had made all of these Austrian schillings, Swedish kroner, and, above all, German Deutsche Marks, which were pouring in down there from tourist spending. They wanted what they regarded as a "fair cut," which would probably have amounted to most of it. They wanted to be able to decide that, if they needed a new railroad or new highway, they could allocate their own resources and not have to go to Belgrade, hat in hand. We couldn't see anything particularly wrong with those desires. The same thing was happening in Slovenia, and not much less in the Serbian and in the Macedonian Communist Party.

Q: Just to get a feel for this, what did the Consulate staff consist of?

DUNLOP: Well, we had a Consul General. When I was there, I served under two very nice guys, who changed in the middle of my tour. I was the number two guy in the Consulate. I had to do all of the operational political reporting, or, at least, to be responsible for it. I also did a lot of economic and commercial reporting. Any trade delegations which came our way were the responsibility of the Consulate, i. e., me. We had a big trade fair, the Zagreb Trade Fair, each fall, which, I think, was the biggest one in Yugoslavia. Certainly, it was the oldest one and probably the one with the most Western participation. The U.S. had a pavilion. We had to assist either the Department of Commerce or USIA [United States Information Agency], whichever was the action agency back in Washington, to set up and operate the U.S. Pavilion.

We had a fair number of trade delegations. This idea of "joint ventures" had attracted some attention among American businessmen. They were beginning to poke around in Croatia to see what the possibilities were. So we had the economic, political, and commercial function all wrapped up in me. I had one Junior Officer there, who was assigned to the Political-Economic Section of the Consulate, so to speak. He was my assistant. Then there was the Consular Section, with one assistant. That makes five officers. On the administrative side we had one officer who handled the administrative work. That makes six. USIS [United States Information Service] initially had three officers there. Later on, they added one officer, because we opened a Consulate in Ljubljana, Slovenia. USIS had a secretary, and the Consulate had a secretary. That added up to 10 Americans assigned to the Consulate in Zagreb. USIS opened an office in Ljubljana and got a third person assigned.

Of course, the administrative people were responsible for hiring and paying our Foreign Service National [FSN] employees. I think that we had about 35 FSN's at the Consulate in Zagreb. We had a good staff of FSN employees in Zagreb. As in the case of the Embassy in Belgrade, they were perhaps somewhat older than we would have liked, but they were quite energetic and willing to take some initiative on their own and do some things that were important. I had a good economic and commercial FSN, a man named Georges Njers. He was a Yugoslav of Hungarian origin. We also had a couple of Slovenes in the Consulate in Zagreb. The rest were Croatians, except that our chief driver and general handyman was an Albanian.

Q: Regarding your relations with the Embassy, you know I spent five years in the Embassy in Belgrade. At the time I used to say that the Serbs had spent 500 years under the Turkish yoke. After all of that the Serbian response, if something didn't work, was to blame the Turks. They have somehow come out of that. Did you notice a difference in viewpoint? How were the Consulate's relations with the Ambassador and other senior Embassy officers in Belgrade?

DUNLOP: Yes, that's very worthwhile talking about. I'm glad that you asked me. Like you, I had had a total immersion in "Serbdom." Our language instructors at the Foreign Service Institute were both Serbs, as you recall. I understand that this is no longer the case, and properly so. I had spent my two and a half years in the Embassy in Belgrade [1963-1965] almost exclusively in contact with Serbs. I didn't travel very much in the other parts of the Yugoslav republic, except to Bosnia and, maybe, to Macedonia. However, I certainly had not lived or been in contact with the people of the other republics.

Up in Croatia, I learned of the existence of the historical memory, although not at first hand, thank God. I learned of the atrocities committed by the "Ustashi," the fascist goon squads that the Croatians employed, especially during the early years of World War II. These were horrendous atrocities which took place against the Serbs. So I didn't arrive in Croatia with any pro-Croatian point of view. You know, intellectually we tell ourselves that we are very "objective." It is a very human thing, if you are sensitive to what people are really thinking and feeling, to try to understand the situation in which you live and to try, as it were, to get inside other people's skins. That's what Foreign Service Officers are supposed to do. There comes a time when you begin to understand why the local people think and act as they do. I suppose that that realization can "color" your objectivity to some degree, although we all try not to do that.

There was a difference between the viewpoints of the Embassy and the Consulate in Zagreb on the political issue between Zagreb and Ljubljana, on the one hand, and the central Communist Party leadership on the other. Here I am not referring to the leadership of the Serbian Communist Party, but to that of the central Communist Party in Belgrade. This issue began to get sharper and sharper over the years that I was in Zagreb. To some extent the Embassy tended to dismiss, or so we thought, the importance of what was happening, politically, in Croatia and in Slovenia. In the Consulate in Zagreb we said that, "These are real people, with goals and objectives which they are working hard at. So we need to pay attention to that." Perhaps, in this connection, I am somewhat gilding the clarity with which we expressed ourselves. However, the Embassy's view tended to be, "Well, that is the view of the 'boondocks,'", that is, of the sticks. That's Croatia, and Croatians always bitch and moan about the Serbs. This is all in the realm of domestic politics. It may be interesting but it's not all that important.

This difference was particularly reflected after Malcolm Toon replaced Bill Leonhart as Ambassador to Yugoslavia. Bill Leonhart was the Ambassador when I arrived in Zagreb. Malcolm Toon replaced him about half way through my tour [about in 1970]. Ambassador Toon was an old Russian hand and had broad experience with the old style, communist governments and ways of doing things. Although I may be doing Ambassador Toon a disservice, I don't think that he had quite understood the diversity of Yugoslavia, at least by the time I left Zagreb. He stayed on beyond the period of my service in Zagreb, and perhaps I'm not doing him justice by saying that. However, I think that we in the Consulate in Zagreb felt that the Embassy tended not to pay enough attention to what we were reporting was going on up in Slovenia and Croatia.

That's a comment on the professional side of things. I think that, when you have Consulates and Embassies in a given country, that's not uncommon.

Q: Tell me. Can you talk about getting around in Croatia and Slovenia on your various trips? Can you also discuss your access to various organizations, both private and public in Yugoslavia?

DUNLOP: The difference between Croatia and Slovenia was significant. The difference between these two republics and the rest of Yugoslavia was also significant. In terms of ease of getting around physically, the roads in Croatia and Slovenia were better than elsewhere in Yugoslavia. Trains tended to run on time. There were more hotels that were "bearable," and fewer rest rooms that were not, speaking in comparative terms of the facilities in the southern and eastern parts of Yugoslavia. So travel was easier.

Access was also easier. That may not have been the case before the "reforms" introduced by Tito in 1965. Both Croatia and Slovenia had a reputation for local security services which were very tough on diplomats, until the time that Rankovic was dismissed. I think that there was a logical reason for that. Those were the two parts of the country that the central government in Belgrade worried most about. It realized that the level of disaffection was probably highest in those areas and wanted to isolate diplomats as much as possible. By the time I got there [in 1969] that was all over, with the exception of one or two incidents, when we could tell that we were subject to surveillance. Every time that Betty and I overnighted in a little resort area, Prizren, and we may

have done this three or four times, we were always assigned the same room, whether we gave them advance notice or not. This room must have been electronically monitored [bugged]. It was a nice little area, half way between Zagreb and Split. If you wanted to go down to the coast but couldn't leave Zagreb until after work, you could get to Prizren easily, break your journey there, and all of that.

People in Croatia wanted to talk to Americans. I'm not saying that they wanted to talk to Americans and welcome them in a personal sense much more in Croatia or Slovenia than in Serbia. I think that, given the same opportunity, that was also true in Serbia. However, the Croatians and Slovenes certainly felt less constrained than I remembered from four years before in Serbia. Much of this probably was due to the fact that Croatia and Slovenia had a Western tradition. However, a lot of it, I think, was due to the fact that the police were no longer making it clear that our people were engaged in unwelcome and potentially dangerous activity.

There was also a big difference between Slovenia and Croatia. Slovenia was really a "Westernized" part of Yugoslavia. There were still some very "Balkan" elements about parts of Croatia, although it had also been part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and had experienced all of the trials and tribulations of the Reformation, the Counter Reformation, the Enlightenment, and all of that. There were still some areas where Croatia was pretty primitive, and people looked at the world through "Balkan" eyes. However, that was not true in Slovenia. The Slovenes were very sophisticated people. They had one of the highest literacy rates of any country in all of Europe, much less Yugoslavia. They were very proud of their literary and artistic traditions. Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, is a lovely little city which had been maintained more nicely than some. There was a lot of access to Slovenes. In Slovenia people were particularly aggressive in the economic field. They really had carved out a different relationship with the rest of the country, pretty early on. The "Reforms" brought in by Tito in 1965 helped this situation. The political leadership of Stane Kavere helped to implement these reforms, but the Slovenes were going to do that, anyway.

Of course, as you know now, the Slovenes were the first and only republic to break away with relative ease from the old Yugoslavia in 1991 or 1992, I guess. We always liked to go up to Ljubljana because it was a little bit different. The restaurants were a little different, the scenery was different, and it was just fun to go up there. People seemed genuinely happy to see us.

Q: Harry, what was your impression of the leadership qualities of these two figures?

DUNLOP: I was impressed with them. I was particularly impressed with Stane Kavete, but also with Tripolo. Tripolo had a wonderful, popular touch. I guess that some politicians are born with that, and some are not. Tripolo rarely made a misstep in public. He loved student agitation in the universities. This was, after all, about the same time as the 1968 problems with university students up in Paris and, of course, the turmoil in the American universities.

Some of that kind of ferment was also going on all over Yugoslavia. I am sure that there were some young folks who were also active in that way in the universities in Ljubljana [Slovenia], and Zagreb [Croatia]. Those were the two main universities in those cities. These young people would have liked to have created the same degree of turmoil and chaos as existed in Paris. They

never quite succeeded but they were able to cause some difficulties. I remember that there was a student strike in Ljubljana which went on for quite a while.

Kavete and Tripolo knew how to walk into the middle of a situation of turmoil and get the student leaders to sit down, reason with them as intelligent equals, and defuse some of the tension. These leaders were people who did not owe their positions of influence in the Communist Party to their activities during World War II. Some of them were old enough to have been active during the war, but as very young folks. They may have been committed "Partizans" and done brave things as children or near children but that wasn't how they earned their "stars," their "stripes," their "spurs," or whatever. Their achievements had come from their own ability and energy, their political acumen, and their ability to see that a change was needed. And they tried to effect that change.

They were an impressive bunch. I didn't personally know leaders like them in Belgrade at all, but there were some down there. I'm not talking now about the overall structure of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia but of the Communist Party of the Serbian Republic. It had Tomsic and Perovic, folks like that in it. I think that they would have been capable of successfully carrying the Communist Party through the death of Tito and the transition process to new leadership that followed it. But they were purged, and no one was there to do that after Tito's death.

The older Communist Party leaders who were given that task obviously failed at it. These other, younger leaders of whom I speak might have done better. In fact, I am quite sure that they would have done better.

Q: What was your impression at this time, 1969 to 1972, of Tito's "grasp" on the direction of events? How did you see this in the Embassy?

DUNLOP: I can tell you what I personally did. I had come away from my assignment to the Embassy in Belgrade [1963-1965], not in opposition to our policy toward Yugoslavia, because I thought that our policy of support for Tito was the correct one. It had proven its worth, and I still think that. However, there tended to be a tendency in the Embassy to blur over Tito's deficiencies. I saw no reason why, among ourselves, we didn't look at those inadequacies a little more objectively. However, I think that this may be an American trait. We tend to deal with some people who may have some unpleasant sides to them. We tend not to think or talk about those faults.

However, when I returned to Yugoslavia for my assignment to the Consulate General in Zagreb [1969-1972], I began to see this situation from another perspective. As I assessed it, Tito was just not paying much attention to the overall situation in any detail but just acted as the "spiritual guide" behind Yugoslav Government policy. However, for the first and only time in my career I became a real "admirer" of Tito, because I mistakenly thought he would permit the younger generation of party reformers to work their will. How wrong I was!

For example, Tito would come up to Zagreb to take a look at the situation as a sort of "stern uncle." He would walk around and inspect the troops. Savka and Mika would trail along in his wake, attentive to his every word and gesture. He would be seen in earnest discussions with them

at meetings. He would give little speeches and let little remarks sort of drop off casually, as he was wont to do, in the hearing of the press. These were obviously well planned. They were little "sound bites." It all seemed to me to be very supportive of his general stance.

Once in a while he would say, "Now, we've got to watch this. This is still Yugoslavia. You owe an obligation to help the less fortunate, underdeveloped areas. We can't let you keep all the money that you earn. After all, it's the Yugoslav state which allows you to earn money, and it's the Communist Party, in its benevolence, that is still in charge of things around here." I really felt that he was very supportive, and wisely supportive, of the evolution which was taking place within the party framework but which was definitely a "modernizing" element.

However, on December 12, 1971, to my utter astonishment, Tito convened, initially a secret, and later on a public meeting of the Communist Party Presidium [top leadership], or whatever it was called at the time. The meeting was held at Tito's hunting lodge Karageordevo, in Voivodina. He exploded with wrath at the Communist Party reform leaders. They were not just from Croatia but also from Slovenia and Belgrade. He conducted one of those sessions where people were called on to confess their sins and faults. The "sins and faults" mainly involved nationalism. This was what people were being accused of. That is, of being Croatians first, Yugoslavs second, and Communist Party members last.

In my view there was no reason why they couldn't be all three, and I felt that this was a balancing act which they were successfully performing in Slovenia and Croatia, at least. At some point Tito decided that they were not doing this successfully. The mystery to me, as somebody who was interested in what was going on in Yugoslavia, was why did Tito change his mind. There was no significant series of events that had escalated "national euphoria," the phrase which was then coined to describe this alleged wild-eyed nationalism which would allegedly lead eventually to communal clashes and perhaps even bloodshed.

The conservatives in the Communist Party, both in the central party and the Communist parties of both Croatia and Slovenia, had begun to spread rumors about actual communal clashes. So far as we could find out in the Consulate General in Zagreb, and we made it our business to try very hard to look into these charges, there was no substance to any of the more lurid of these accounts. There were stories about police stations burned down, people assassinated, and so forth. Serbs allegedly had been subjected once again to "Ustashi" [Croatian fascist] terror down in Lika, the area of Croatia where the Serbs were in the majority. We found no evidence of that.

Tito didn't seem to believe that that was happening, either. However, something happened, at least in his mind, to make him "purge" the Croatian and Slovenian Communist Party leadership. It was a brutal purge. He didn't have anybody shot, but the purge went down at least to the second level of the Croatian and Slovenian Communist Parties. By the time this purge was over, at least 2,000 Croatian Communist Party officials in Croatia had been dismissed from their party positions or responsibilities, as well as any other jobs they may have had. The Director of the Zagreb Fair, a personal acquaintance of mine, was dismissed from this job, for example.

The process of constructive modernization, as I saw it, was brought to a screeching halt. This happened in 1971, just before the Christmas and New Year's holidays period. This was just nine

years before Tito's death in 1980. Nothing important happened in the country during these intervening nine years to re-start some fashion of bringing younger people into more senior positions. This was to prove a tragedy for Yugoslavia.

WARREN ZIMMERMANN
Ambassador
Belgrade, Yugoslavia (1989-1992)

Warren Zimmerman was born in 1934 and was educated at Yale and Cambridge. He entered the Foreign Service in 1961. His career included posts in Caracas, Belgrade, Moscow, Paris, Madrid, Geneva and Vienna and was named ambassador to Yugoslavia. He was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 1996.

ZIMMERMANN: All right. Croatia was still under communist leadership, and very retrograde communist leadership. It was not a reform communist government in Croatia. Tudjman was at that point in early 1989 a minor nationalist politician who had done jail time for nationalism in the Tito period. So, Croatia was not the nationalist opponent of Serbia, at least not to the extent that it became, that it was a year and a half later. Slovenia was the most interesting of the republics because it had a progressive reform communist leadership under Milan Kucan who is still the president of Slovenia which was prepared to organize Slovenian elections and to leave power if the communist party lost the elections. That is in fact what ultimately happened in 1991, and they did leave power. They were at the time I arrived in Yugoslavia, without any question the most liberal communist regime in the world.

Q: How did you see the various republics by the time you were there after about six months or so and well into your tour? Was Croatia and Tudjman just sort of on a train that was going to end up in one place, independence and Slovenia. I mean is this something you could do anything about?
ZIMMERMANN: It wasn't apparent in 1989. They hadn't had elections yet in the republics in 1989. That was in 1990. You still had communist leaderships in all of the republics. In some republics they were quite good leaderships. For example, Slovenia had a very progressive communist leadership, arguably the most liberal communist government that ever existed. That doesn't make it all that liberal but it probably is the least illiberal that ever existed, and it was run by a then young man named Milan Kucan who was prepared to risk communist rule in a free election. Which he did a year later and lost. He won the presidency but his party lost control. Kucan was not talking about independence in 1989. He was talking about somehow getting Yugoslavia out of the grip of Milosevic. He saw Milosevic very clearly as the enemy of Yugoslavia's ever getting in to the European organization because of Milosevic's attitude toward Kosovo, because of his dictatorial ways, because of his more retrograde communism. So Kucan was not talking about independence, but he certainly was talking about a kind of an autonomy for Slovenia that would make it independent of Milosevic's influence. In Croatia the party was quite corrupt, the communist party. They didn't like Milosevic but they were not pushing as Slovenia was toward a western style of democracy. In some of the smaller republics like Montenegro and

Macedonia, you had some very good people, young people, in charge who were quite interested in democratizing. So it was a very mixed picture, but Milosevic was terrifying everybody in the approach he was taking. I think many of the leaders in the republics realized that Milosevic really wanted to take over Yugoslavia and run it in Serbia's interest. Of course that horrified them.
Q: From your various sources, I am talking about the agency, political attaches, political officers, USIS and all were you seeing increased nationalistic, was that pox getting worse and worse?

ZIMMERMANN: Oh yes, particularly in Serbia and Croatia. In Slovenia, the nationalism was as much a pro-western democratic approach as it was a Slovenia for the Slovenes approach. Croatian and Serbian nationalism were extremely hostile to each other and extremely hostile to anybody who didn't agree with them. The word traitor appeared all the time. If you were a Serb who wasn't a Serb nationalist, you were a traitor to Serbia. You weren't a true Serb. The Croats went through the same thing. This was propagated very heavily by the intellectual class.
Q: I think of particularly receptions or dinner parties when you had a chance to sit down and talk. Did this become more and more the subject of dinner parties at the embassy and all?

ZIMMERMANN: Yes. We thought our job was to bring people together, so we would have people to dinner and receptions who might disagree with each other. Already the situation was so bad they would never see each other if they disagreed. We had one dinner party for Katharine Graham, the publisher of the Washington Post who came, I think that was in early 1991. She came with her editorial page editor and with one of the columnists, a very high flying Washington Post group of three or four people. We had a small dinner party. We had the president of Slovenia who flew in for it. We had a major Serbian intellectual and a couple of other people, and the Serb and the Slovene started to attack each other in a way that was so embarrassing to me. I just didn't know what to do. A maid who was serving the table was in tears about it. Of course I am not sure how Mrs. Graham took it. It was quite interesting certainly for her. It was illuminating about what the true situation was. But these were two people who both had extensive experience in the West, had been professors in western universities. The nicest people that we knew, and they were going at it hammer and tongs, very insulting to each other.
Q: During the sort of first phase of this, Slovenian independence, I take it this was not considered vital to anything was it or not?
ZIMMERMANN: Well, if Slovenia had declared its independence, and there hadn't been any other declarations of independence, then I think that you could argue that Slovenia could have become a small western European country, and the rest of Yugoslavia might have held together. The problem was that Tudjman very quickly said that if Slovenia declares independence, Croatia will declare independence. I think you can understand why he said that. He said that because with Slovenia gone out of Yugoslavia, Croatia is then exposed to the power of Serbia. Slovenia had no military power, but it had a lot of moral force and political power within Yugoslavia and economic power. With Slovenia gone, Croatia is naked to the sword of Milosevic. So Tudjman in fact gave the Slovenes a blank check. He said if they go, we go too, and that's what happened. They went within one day of each other.
Q: Like most of our people from the south in our military.

ZIMMERMANN: Exactly. It is an honorable profession to be in the military. That was true in Serbia; it was not true in Slovenia. Slovenes did not consider the army a very honorable

profession, although the number three ranking person in the Yugoslav army that attacked Croatia was a Slovene. He was an admiral, stayed on. So, you had this army which was predominately Serbian, but by no means exclusively Serbian. It had high ranking people who were from other republics. For awhile it stayed aloof from the nationalism, but it began to get engaged particularly when the Slovenes and the Croats started talking about breaking away from Yugoslavia, because the army saw that as a bottom line. Their job was to defend the integrity and the borders of Yugoslavia. Here Croatia and Slovenia were threatening to change those borders and to destroy that integrity. Then the army got very nasty. It tried to break up the local national guards that were forming in Croatia and Slovenia. There was a dramatic showdown in the Yugoslav presidency in March, I think was the month, of 1991 in which the defense minister told the presidency that he needed the authority to go in and beat up the Croatian and Slovenia irregular forces that were forming. He couldn't get a majority on the presidency for it because the Bosnian representative happened to be a Serb, but he wouldn't go along with it. He paid a big price for that afterwards from Milosevic and his people. This was only three months before the ultimate breakup of Yugoslavia. The army was moving towards a a pro-Milosevic line. Even in June of July of 1991 when the country broke up, I don't think Milosevic was giving the defense minister orders. I don't think it worked that way, but I think there was a kind of unity of view there. Of course once Croatia and headed toward independence, many of the Croats and Slovenes in the army and particularly in the high officer levels of the army defected and went back to their republics and started to form their own national armies. That is what happened. With the chief of the Yugoslav air force. I had been so impressed with him that when he was on a trip to the United States, we arranged a meeting between him and Scowcroft in Washington. He came back, and three or four weeks after that meeting he defected to Croatia and became the commander in chief of the Croatian army which consisted of nobody at that point. So what you had was a Yugoslav army which in a way become a totally Serbian army because the Slovenes wouldn't send any draftees to the army. Their officers were moving back to their republics. The same was happening with the Croats. The Macedonians were too small to be a major factor. The Montenegrins were mainly Serbs anyway so they were on the Serbian side. You ended up having what you could really call a Serbian army, not because it wanted to be a Serbian army, but because it couldn't get anybody from the other republics.

ROBERT RACKMALES
Deputy Chief of Mission
Belgrade, Yugoslavia (1989-1993)

Robert Rackmales was born in Baltimore, Maryland in 1937. He studied history at Johns Hopkins University and graduated in 1958. He received a Fulbright Scholarship to Germany and this influenced him toward his entry into the Foreign Service in 1963. He had twice served in Nigeria, Yugoslavia and Italy at various rotations. He was interviewed by Professor Charles Stuart Kennedy on May 11, 1995.

Q: *To go back to September of '89, how did we view the problem of ethnic diversity division at that time. What were we seeing?*

RACKMALES: Even before '89, there had always been concern over the viability of the system that Tito left behind, whether it could contain centrifugal forces which were obviously strong. There was growing hostility between Slovenia and Croatia on the one hand, and Serbia on the other. Tito's system as it evolved in the years since his death, had given more and more power to the individual republics and less and less to the federal government. To the point where we all knew that the greatest threat to the optimistic scenario I just described was in the unwillingness of the republics to allow the federal government to implement coherent policies. So our efforts in 89-90 was to try to bolster Markovic, whom we saw as the best hope, maybe the last hope, because if he failed the prospects were very gloomy. He seemed at that period, in the summer and early fall, to have the kind of leadership abilities that gave him a fighting chance to overcome the systemic problems of heading a government with very little power, with only the powers that the republics were willing to let him exercise. He went to the United States and made a good impression. As a person he was dynamic and knew how to talk to westerners. The only doubts were would he be allowed to carry out a meaningful reform program in Yugoslavia. And in the succeeding months it became clear that it probably wasn't going to happen.

Q: *Something you said, we wanted to support Markovic. How do we support somebody? What does that mean?*

RACKMALES: First of all by having him meet with the President. That's one way of showing support to a leader of a...

Q: *This would be George Bush at this time.*

RACKMALES: That's correct...through the kinds of things that the spokespersons for the administration say about him. In succeeding months as he got more and more embroiled in difficulties there were other attempts. For example, at one point I remember Bush calling him up to express his support for him, and that information was released publicly that the President of the United States had called him. And we did begin in those months preparing an aid package for Yugoslavia. I remember going to Vienna to a regional meeting of all Eastern European DCMs, and AID directors, to discuss what kind of an aid package would be appropriate. The amounts earmarked for Yugoslavia were not very large. I had been, as DCM, in charge of preparing the recommendations for what areas we were going to assist. But even at that point, even in December of '89, I told the chair of the meeting who was Bob Barry, who was in charge of the office that was established to implement AID programs in Eastern Europe, that we should not actually dispense aid yet for Yugoslavia until it became clear that the severe breakdown in relations between the republics and the federal government showed some signs of improving. Because otherwise you were giving money to an entity that was not functioning. And in fact in succeeding months things got worse instead of better so we never really went forward with any concrete aid. That infuriated Markovic because he kept saying, what good is your rhetorical support if you can't come forward with hard cash. But it's very hard to justify in a situation where the IMF and other international institutions, and our own analyses, were that the federal government was impotent. It reached the point, for example, where Slovenia was not turning over to the federal government the customs duties that it was collecting for goods that were entering Slovenia. They were keeping them.

In late November of '89 the Serbs instituted an economic boycott of Slovenia. This within a country that is nominally united. In my own mind that was the clearest evidence that Yugoslavia was probably on a rapid downward spiral in terms of unity.

Q: *On the political reporting, were we in touch with the governments of the various republics, and if so what were we getting from them? What were they talking about?*

RACKMALES: There were three groups of republics. On the one hand there was Slovenia and Croatia who at that point were starting to head hell-bent towards independence at the earliest possible date. There were the first free and open elections took place in Slovenia and Croatia in the spring of '90, and both brought into power groups that were clearly headed in the direction of independence. Even before those elections it was clear that that's the way things were trending, but the elections intensified that process.

Anyway, you had those two northern republics. You had Serbia which basically would have liked to have been rid of the northern republics, felt strong enough to dominate the remainder, and so was not about to pay a price to keep the country together.

And then you had the other republics who basically were terrified of what a breakup would mean, Bosnia, Macedonia, and Montenegro. Montenegro was too much in Serbia's shadow to really do much more than wring its hands. But the two leaders who worked the hardest to try to keep a form of Yugoslavia together were Izetbegovic in Bosnia who was elected in November of '90, and Gligorov who became the leader of Macedonia in '91. Unity became more difficult to maintain with the demise of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia which formally broke up in February of '90. Its power crumbled very rapidly, but the underlying interests of the republics at that period were more or less as I've described it, namely two who only wanted to leave. One which was somewhat happy to have them leave provided in the case of Croatia that they didn't try to take Serbs with them. The Yugoslav constitution provided for secession but not secession of republics. Secession of ethnic groups, of nations as they called it, narodi. The Serbian argument was if Slovenes as a nation wished to leave Yugoslavia it's in the constitution that they have that right. If Croats want to leave, essentially as Croats, that's fine. But, and this becomes now one of the root causes of the wars that sprung up, that they do not have a right to take Serbs with them. The Serbs have the same right of self determination as anyone else. That in a nutshell was the Serbian position.

Q: *Let's turn to sort of the west. I'll let you tackle it however you want.*

RACKMALES: Okay. Let me organize it by using as a focal point the visit of Jim Baker, Secretary of State, in June of 1991 because that was the critical period from May-June '91 through probably the fall of '91, the key decisions were taken by everybody that led to the explosion of violence, first in Slovenia-Croatia, and then later in Bosnia. First of all, he came not just as the Secretary of State of the United States. This was a period in mid-1991, and we as an embassy had been working towards this, and it reflected, I think, the high degree of cooperation that existed among the missions. Everybody was beginning even as late as I would say mid-'90, in some cases towards the end of '90, some major embassies were still pooh-poohing the idea

that a breakup was imminent, or that if it happened, that it couldn't be handled in a fairly peaceful way. I think we were the least complacent of the embassies, but our views were pretty closely shared by the major west European embassies. So when Baker scheduled his first trip to Yugoslavia, it was one of the last times that we and the Europeans were on the same wavelength. And the policy was to send the following signals: was first of all to the Slovenes and the Croats who had announced that they were about to declare their independence unilaterally, and damn the consequences of that. The message was, that we would not support unilateral steps to break up Yugoslavia. That they needed to try to come up with a political solution, and preserve some form of Yugoslavia. If that was not viable, then they had to still continue to talk until an agreed dissolution could be achieved. That was the first part of the message, and that was aimed primarily at the Slovenes and the Croats.

The other message was addressed to the army and to the Serbs, was; you must not use force to keep Yugoslavia together. I think in those two messages, there was a contradiction that has bedeviled us all along and the contradiction is the following:

That it was not fully appreciated that except for Slovenia, all of the successor states to Yugoslavia were also multi-ethnic states. Bosnia was in the worst position because there was not even a majority ethnic group. So if you are let's say a Serbian senior military officer what you're hearing from the west is that we don't think that a multi-ethnic state should use force against a minority that wants to break away and form its own state. What would go through his mind is fine, if Croats want to leave Yugoslavia, the Yugoslavia constitution gives them the right as Croats. What it does not do is give them the right to take Serbs with them against their will. The Serbs have the same right not to be part of Croatia as the Croats not to be part of Yugoslavia. The underlying question, when is it justified for the international community to provide arms or other support to a multi-ethnic state facing a minority insurgency, is one of the most vexed of our times. But the foundations of our policy as it emerged vis-a-vis Croatia and Bosnia were shakier than we liked to admit. It helps explain why so many statesmen have been struggling with this. There are other aspects of it obviously but it's one that has never been resolved, and that may only be resolved when finally sadly, tragically, as a result of the war populations are moved so that new boundaries can be drawn and everyone throws up their hands and says okay.

Q: *How was Baker received when he came there?*

RACKMALES: He was very unhappy with the whole experience. I was on the bus with some senior NSC staffers and their attitude, and I believe that this reflected his as well, is that, first of all, the Yugoslav crisis was horribly complicated. One of them called it worse than the Middle East. Secondly, there were no good guys. Baker was not happy with any of his interlocutors, he thought they were all to a greater or lesser extent, mostly greater, lying to him, dissembling. He also felt that he had gotten some assurances from the Slovenes that the Slovenes later said was just a misunderstanding on his part. So when the Slovenes a few days later went ahead and announced their independence, he felt personally betrayed. At that point he was probably more angry with the Slovenes than any others. But his basic judgment (which I remember thinking at that time, and still do think was correct), was that, boy, if the Europeans want to take this one on, let them. He saw nothing good to be gained by the United States trying to play the lead role in

finding a way out of that maze. And the Europeans at that point were trying to forge a common foreign policy. This was a period of some optimism that a more united Europe could be...

Q: *How about in Slovenia? Slovenia has sort of passed over our radar so much that one doesn't think about it anymore. How did we see that situation?*

RACKMALES: The Slovenes were always the easiest to talk to. We, of course, knew that they did not have the kinds of internal problems because they were a homogeneous society. We tried to encourage them with very limited success to stay involved. We also supported Baker's message that a unilateral declaration of independence would set off the Croats but the Slovenes basically didn't give a damn about the Croats or anything else. They wanted out, they didn't care particularly what the consequences would be, and they wanted to simply go their own way, and the less they heard about the subject of Yugoslavia the better. So basically they would listen politely, and then shrug.

JOHNNY YOUNG
Ambassador
Slovenia (2001-2004)

Ambassador Young was born in Georgia and raised in Georgia, Pennsylvania and Delaware. He was educated at Temple University and entered the Foreign Service in 1967. Before being named Ambassador, Mr. Young served in a number of embassies in the administrative field, including Madagascar, Guinea, Kenya, Qatar, Barbados, Jordan and the Netherlands. In 1989 he was named US Ambassador to Sierra Leone, where he served until 1992. He subsequently served as US Ambassador to Togo (1994-1997), Bahrain (1997-2001) and Slovenia (2001-2004). Ambassador Young was interviewed by Charles Stuart Kennedy in 2005.

Q: You were in Slovenia from when to when?

YOUNG: It was in the fall of 2001 that I arrived. Prior to my arrival in Slovenia I came back here for my hearings. I was preparing myself all along before returning in terms of the issues that we had with Slovenia. I had my hearing and I want to tell you a little bit about that hearing. There was a moment in it that I thought was quite memorable. I was up with Dan Coats who was going to Germany. The fellow who was going to the Czech Republic who was the cousin of the president. Ambassador Lynch who was going to Ireland. It was quite a nice hearing. We were all treated very nicely. No great controversy. Dan Coats of course it was like a lovefest since he was a former senator. Senator Sarbanes introduced me. My daughter and son were seated behind me and I had the pleasure of introducing them to the members of the committee. Senator Sarbanes was chairing the committee at that time, but at one point Senator Helms came in and he was allowed to speak and he said and I'll try to imitate his voice. I'm not sure I'm that good at it, but he said, "Ambassador designate Lynch, you're going to Ireland. There's something I want you to

do for me when you get to Ireland." Ambassador Lynch said, "Yes, Senator Helms, I'd be glad to. What is it?" He said, "I want you to meet somebody who is going to be in Ireland and I want you to take good care of him. He's a good man and he does good work and I want you to treat him fine." Ambassador designate Lynch said, "Why, by all means I'll be happy to have him. Yes, I'll be glad to take care of him." Helms chimed in again, "I can assure you this is a very good man and I want you to take good care of him and I appreciate your pledge that you're going to take good care of him. His name is Bono." Well, my daughter kicked my seat behind me and later on she said, "Dad, I thought I was going to lose it at that point. When Helms tells the Ambassador designate to Ireland to take good care of Bono, I couldn't believe that that would come up at a hearing" and I couldn't either nor could anyone else.

Q: You might explain who Bono is.

YOUNG: Well, Bono is the lead singer in the U2 rock group and Bono does incredible humanitarian work particularly in Africa.

Q: He made man of the year.

YOUNG: He's been knighted by the Queen of England. That aside, you wouldn't think of Senator Helms, this right of right fellow lining up with this knee jerk liberal doing humanitarian work, but they became great friends. I thought it was interesting. We were asked a few questions and it all turned out very well. I had a statement prepared and I remember at one point Senator Helms saying, well, this looks like a really nice group of nominees here. I think they're all fine. We're going to break for lunch, not break for lunch; we're going to break because we have to take a vote. I think we ought to wish the best to this group and thank them for coming here. We just put our statements in the box at the end of the table. I was getting ready to say that such is the prerogative of the senate. They can do whatever they want in terms of how they interpret their role to advise and consent. You can prepare and prepare, but in the end if they say to you just drop your statement in the box at the end of the table, that's what you do. I mean we did have a small amount of time to make our individual statements, which we did. We were asked a couple of questions, but it was all brought to an end by Sarbanes and that was that.

I decided after I was confirmed that I would do something completely different for my swearing in. I had had three previous ceremonies in the Benjamin Franklin room to which hundreds of persons were invited. This time I decided I would do something different. I was told that the Secretary of State would swear me in if I decided to hold it in the Department, but my decision was to take it away from the Department, the swearing in, and take it to my high school in Philadelphia. I attended a vocational, technical high school in Philadelphia. It was a school that catered to underprivileged kids in the inner city and I wanted to do it there as a symbol of what is possible from kids coming out from that kind of school, not that they could all aspire to be ambassador or what have you, but to offer them a symbol and some encouragement.

Q: That's great.

YOUNG: I did that at the Edward Bok Vocational Technical High School in Philadelphia. I asked my mentor, Assistant Secretary Mary Ryan, to officiate and she agreed. We arranged with

the wife of the then Mayor of Philadelphia, he's now the Governor of Pennsylvania, Ed Rendell, for his wife to swear me in and we had it in Philadelphia. It was in September and it all turned out very well. Following the swearing in, which was something that these kids had frankly never seen before, we had a little reception in the library which had been named for me, the Johnny Young Library, which I thought was very nice. The local TV station covered it and it was written up in the newspaper. Billy Boy makes good, that sort of thing. There was one thing that made me feel particularly good about the whole thing. I was talking to a young girl who was graduating from this high school and she said, I wasn't sure that I wanted to go to college until today. Now I know I want to go. If she is the only one that I touched on that occasion, it was worth it.

Q: Absolutely. What was the situation in Slovenia?

YOUNG: In my statement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I had mentioned several items that I knew were controversial and that would get things kind of stirred up, but I wanted them to get things stirred up. I used that as a deliberate mechanism to engage the Slovenes in dialogue on these issues. One was the return of property confiscated during the time of the Tito regime, property that had not been returned to American citizens. Mind you the property had been confiscated before these persons had become U.S. citizens. Nevertheless, they were making claims now on their property. Slovenia was one of the countries that upon its independence said that it would return property. This was something that they decided that they would do on their own and that was a good thing. It was something that was looked upon very favorably by the transatlantic institutions that they wanted to get into such as NATO, European Union, etc. That was one issue.

The other was intellectual property. Slovenia had the reputation of its pharmaceutical companies taking the data developed by American drug companies and using that data to manufacture generics. This had the pharmaceutical industry up in arms. That was an issue I wanted to flag. Another was Slovenia's candidacy for NATO. The U.S. had not committed yet to supporting Slovenia's candidacy and I wanted to keep the dialogue on that open also. I also wanted to make sure that we could get as much leverage out of this as possible before we committed to supporting Slovenia's candidacy. Another was, of course, to try and help the country in whatever way we could with its transition from a centrally directed economy and state to one that was more open, with open markets and that was democratic and things like that, to support their civic institutions.

I arrived in Slovenia. The press had interpreted my remarks about the return of property as no support for Slovenia's candidacy for NATO if these changes in terms of property, in terms of intellectual property rights, did not occur in a positive way that we would not support Slovenia's candidacy for NATO. I had immediately to try and correct that misunderstanding because it was clear that it was going to follow me everywhere. That was one thing that I found right away. The Slovenes were very thin skinned. They didn't like criticism at all. They were worried about me. I began to see in the press right away racial comments about me. I was portrayed in local cartoons in an unflattering way in terms of my race and what have you. I said right away, look, if I am going to have any relationship with the people of Slovenia and with this government, then we've got to take race off the table. There's no way that this is going to fly. I said, you can challenge me, you can challenge my government on anything that you want except it cannot be based on

race. Let's put that aside and if we put that aside we can be friends and we can discuss business and we can work together. If that's going to be on the table, I can't deal with you. That cleared the air. I did it on television. I did it in editorials to the press. I made it very clear that that was a topic that I would not accept as a responsible basis for any kind of dialogue. The government never engaged in this sort of thing, but it certainly could affect my relationship with the government. We got that cleared up right away and we could then move on to do business.

After being in the country a very short time, it was very clear to me that Slovenia was indeed a very good candidate for NATO. I favored strongly supporting their candidacy although we had not committed yet. I continued to press them on the reform of the law on intellectual property. What had happened was in preparation for their European Union candidacy, Slovenia had passed a law that made it illegal for companies to use the intellectual property of someone else to support generics. That was good, but they did that well in advance of their candidacy for European entry. What happened was their own pharmaceutical companies were furious. They realized what this meant to them. They pressured the government which immediately passed a law that rescinded the law that they passed. Pharmaceutical companies reverted back to using this data developed by other drug companies.

Q: When you're talking about pharmaceutical companies, you're talking about the indigenous pharmaceutical companies.

YOUNG: Yes.

Q: Because in no way could a country go into the European Union which is engaging in stealing of intellectual property.

YOUNG: That's correct, right, that's why they passed this law, but they passed it almost two years before they had to meet this requirement. The pharmaceutical companies said my God, that's two years that we can continue stealing, so rescind the law. That's what happened. The American companies of course were furious. I continued to pressure. They thought, oh God, if we don't do this we won't get the U.S. support for our candidacy for NATO and they knew that if we didn't support them for NATO, they would never get in. They had had an opportunity to join NATO in 1999. It was a foregone conclusion at that time that of any of the countries to be considered, Slovenia was going to be number one. Slovenia was going to be number one, not the Czech Republic, not Hungary, not Slovakia, but in the end Slovenia was cast aside and it was Hungary and I think it was Hungary, Poland and Czech. They were brought in. The Slovenes were devastated.

Q: What was behind it?

YOUNG: Well, no one has heard the definitive answer why. Some say it was the French who screwed them at the last minute and did them in because they wanted these others in. Some said no it was the U.S. who did it and I don't know what the pressures were, but we never got to the bottom of it frankly. Anyhow, they were devastated that they didn't get in. They wanted this more than anything else. This to them was a badge of respectability and of status and, you know, it really made sense. Also it meant that they could reduce the amount of money that they were

spending to defend their small territory and basically count on the umbrella that would be provided by NATO and channel their funds in a more efficient way. It really made good sense.

We made our case to our government that we should support Slovenia, but we were not getting full support. I mean there was a great deal of opposition by one element in the Department of Defense to this. There was the feeling out there at that time, I don't know how it started, but the feeling was that Slovenia was somehow arrogant about its candidacy, that it was too sure of itself, that it was too cocky. If you looked at it in terms of GDP, when you look at it in terms of democracy, when you look at it in terms of economic reform, when you look at it in terms of the military, the kind of military they had, the discipline in the military, all of these kinds of issues, they were at the top of the list. Number one, number one, number one, but the feeling developed that because they were number one in all of these categories, they were arrogant. They weren't taking it seriously enough. That they needed to do more to demonstrate that they really wanted this in the worst way. Well, the Slovenes' response was we do want it in the worst way, but hey don't you remember what happened to us in '99 when you screwed us? They said we're like a rejected suitor. We tried the first time and we were turned away. We're trying again, but we are afraid we may be turned away again. So we are reserving a little bit of perhaps enthusiasm and are being a bit guarded just in case this doesn't work out. We will not be as devastated and as disappointed as we were the last time. This didn't fly over. Nobody bought this in Washington and as I said the biggest obstacle to a more immediate support from the U.S. side came from the Department of Defense.

Q: Any particular branch?

YOUNG: Yes, specifically the office run by Ian Brzezinski. I don't remember the specific office. He was determined that he was going to make Slovenia a case that to demonstrate the seriousness with which we were taking this whole business of the expansion of NATO that we weren't going to just take a country because they were good in every respect, but we were going to really be tough and hard on them.

Q: It sounds like something that I've seen described before and that is one somebody trying to show they have, let me put it in diplomatic terms, somebody in a bureau or a place in the government showing they had balls. At the same time picking on the small country when they knew they couldn't get away with it say with Poland or something.

YOUNG: That's the bottom line.

Q: I can prove to my guys at the golf club that I'm really tough. I mean did you get that feeling?

YOUNG: Oh, no question about it. I'll demonstrate that in other ways later on. Here we had this little country that was doing things its way and we feel that little countries frankly should dance to our tune. When we want them to do something they should do it and that should be that. Slovenia was a very successful country. One that succeeded because it did things its way. For example, the World Bank and the IMF had counseled Slovenia to take a certain approach in its economy following its independence in 1991. Slovenia didn't listen to that advice at all and did it its way and was able to demonstrate in black and white that if it had taken the approach

suggested and recommended by the fund in the bank it would have been in a terrible state compared to where it was. So, it did it its own way and it made it very difficult for subsequent IMF and World Bank teams to come out and tell them do this this way, because they had done it themselves. That was in their nature and it's part of their nature anyhow. They're very stubborn people and I always said that's part of the reason why they existed for 800 years under Austrian rule because of a certain stubbornness and a certain cautiousness and carefulness as well.

Anyhow, we had this resistance on the part of DOD in saying okay we're going to support Slovenia whereas we had said we were going to do this. In terms of a few other countries, we'd said it informally; we hadn't come out and said so publicly. There was good support in the congress for Slovenia's inclusion. There was support in other quarters as well. All of the European countries, all of the European members of NATO were fully committed to Slovenia, but we had not committed yet. Anyhow, in May of 2002 we succeeded in getting a visit to the United States by the then prime minister of Slovenia, Drnovsek. He came and was able to make his case with President Bush. He had visited the country in June of 2001 where he met Putin for the first time. They had their meeting in Slovenia. When I had my photo op with President Bush in August of 2001, he greeted me and he said, "You're going to Slovenia?" I said, "Yes." He said, "You're going to love it. It's a wonderful country. I loved it. Laura and I had no idea that it was so beautiful and that the people were so nice" and on and on. He said, "You're going to enjoy this." When I met him again in May of 2002 for the pre-brief prior to the meeting in the Oval Office with Prime Ministers Drnovsek, the first thing he said to me was "How do you like Slovenia?" I said, "It was just as you said, Mr. President. It is absolutely wonderful." He said, "See, I told you so." Then we got down to discussion the issues and he said, well, what are the problems? I said the problem is Slovenia wants to join NATO and it would like our support. I think it should be a member of the alliance. They continue to make the reforms necessary to complete their application for NATO membership and they're doing a good job in reforming their economy. It's a solid democracy and on and on. He listened and then we had the meeting. The photographers came in and they're snapping all away and then the word was get them out. Then like rats leaving the ship, they all left and we were left there to have our discussion with the Slovenes. President Bush, Secretary of State Powell was in on that meeting, Condoleezza Rice left to attend another meeting, but Scooter Libby was thee. I'll never forget that because I have a photograph of it.

Q: Libby being the principal aide to the Vice President.

YOUNG: I don't know what role he was in at that point, but he was in the meeting and Dan Freed who was the head of the European office in the White House was in on the meeting as well. Now, a couple of amusing incidents during this meeting. Of course the Slovene expressed his friendship and solidarity with the U.S. in terms of September 11th. They're with us and they want to help us and what a good relationship we have and what an important role we played in terms of Bosnia how important a role Slovenia played in that as well. When we got ready to do the bombing we had asked for overflight clearance from Austria and Austria denied us and then we asked Slovenia and Slovenia agreed. So, the planes came over Slovenia and then into Bosnia.

The president was at one point reared back in the chair like this, just his basically his shoulders resting on the back of the chair and his legs way out. His heels basically on the bottom of the

floor and he's sort of swinging a little bit like that. The prime minister said, oh, we'd love you to come back to Slovenia and the president said, well, I don't travel. My Secretary of State doesn't like me to travel. He's afraid I'm going to make a faux pas. We all had a good laugh and Powell didn't say anything, he just looked on. The president asked good questions. He was briefed. He knew exactly what to ask. He asked how the reforms were coming along and how was the country doing, etc. Then he said, "Oh, I don't know why but there's this reputation that Slovenia has taken for granted that it's going to get into NATO. There's this feeling that Slovenia is arrogant about this whole process. Mr. Prime Minister, do you have any idea why that happened or why this has gotten out and is circulating?" Prime Minister Drnovsek is a very sour looking fellow with a sort of a pear shaped face, he looks almost like something out of Munch's painting, The Scream. He literally has that kind of head and that kind of tight mouth, very serious intellectual. I mean a brilliant man. He said in his perfect English, "Mr. President, I have no idea where these things circulate. I, too have heard rumors of that type. But, I want to tell you there's no basis to them whatsoever. We work very hard to try and meet all of the requirements of our NATO membership application. We will be a good and responsible member of the alliance if we are selected. I don't know how these things get started. Maybe some low-level person on your staff has put this in a report and its gotten its way up to you. At that point the president turns to Dan Freed and says, "Dan, did you put this in my report?" Well, I thought I would fall out of the chair at that point. Dan said no or didn't respond, I'm not sure what it was. That was really quite something that he would do that because Dan wasn't fully committed either I must say at that point, but I give Dan full credit in the reporting cable, he reported that incident in the telegram which I thought meant a lot. That showed a great deal of integrity on his part. He was at least faithful to what transpired although it was sort of in a light moment. It was a good meeting. In the end the president kind of let slip when he said to the prime minister, he said, I'll see you in November at the summit which was the big meeting that would decide who would be invited into NATO and who would not. That was a slip. It was a positive one because the president did not commit in that meeting. He was as supportive as he could, but he didn't commit that, you know, you have our support. It was a good meeting. The prime minister left happy. I left happy and all turned out well. That was May of 2002.

The big NATO summit was scheduled for Prague in November of 2002 and it would be at that meeting that the decision would be made. Now, prior to that we had many meetings in the United States trying to firm up our position. Prior to the Prague summit we received a cable in which I was instructed to go to the government and tell them that the U.S. would support Slovenia's candidacy for NATO. That was one of the most wonderful moments that I can remember.

Q: Did you get any feel for where again the Department of Defense you're saying one section of the Department of Defense, did you feel that the prime minister's visit had sort of trumped the, I mean it was, I'm sure the prime minister knew exactly where the problem lay.

YOUNG: Yes, I think that it was certainly beneficial. I think that there were two meetings that were crucial and that helped. The prime minister also had a separate meeting with Donald Rumsfeld, the Secretary of Defense. Now, Rumsfeld had been an ambassador to NATO, so he understood I think to a much greater degree what was involved here versus members of his staff including Brzezinski with all of his brilliance.

Q: This is Zbigniew's son?

YOUNG: Yes. So, those two meetings were key and of course the meeting he had with the Secretary where the Secretary was very favorable and very positive. I think it was basically those three meetings that helped to bring it all together and we had piled on the reporting. We had put it on every way you could possibly think of in terms of our analysis of the economy, of the political situation, of the reforms of the military; all of the data was there and clearly positive in terms of this is what should happen. As I said that glorious moment did come when I could go to the government and say we will do it. The cables went out to all of the posts at the same time. I think it was either in Estonia or Latvia the ambassador went in and told the prime minister or president of the U.S. support. The official said, "Read it to me one more time. I want to her it again." It was truly a glorious moment.

Then in November there was the summit where it was all formalized. The day following the summit Rumsfeld visited Slovenia to reaffirm what had occurred. He said, now that this has happened and we want you to follow through on these reforms. Brzezinski was there and was just chomping at the bit to say, you got in, but let me tell you, let me just slap you around a little bit. But he was kept in check. I remember later on in a private meeting Rumsfeld saying to Brzezinski, "I knew you wanted to say something, but I'm proud of you that you kept quiet." It was really a good meeting. It was with the prime minister, the president and the foreign minister and all. That was my first time to meet Rumsfeld, the most charming guy you'd want to meet. Smart as a whip. It showed Slovenia at its most glorious so it was really wonderful. That was in November of 2002.

Q: Okay, well, we'll stop at this point and we'll pick this up the next time. We talked about Slovenia and NATO. Not much else about Slovenia.

YOUNG: I want to talk about the intellectual property rights and some of the other reforms. I want to talk about what we were doing with some of the civic society or civic institutions. Then I want to talk about the Iraq war.

Q: Today is the 31st of January, 2006. Johnny, just refresh my memory. You were in Slovenia from when to when?

YOUNG: From 2001 to 2004.

Q: Okay, you were mentioning a whole series of things to talk about. Do you want to start with intellectual rights and explain what that was and what the problem was.

YOUNG: At my confirmation hearing I had put down a marker in terms of intellectual property rights being one of the issues that I would take on. I knew that this would get people stirred up in Slovenia, but I wanted them to really engage with us in dialogue on this particular issue. I arrived and the press was waiting for me to just shock me to pieces. The pharmaceutical companies in Slovenia had put pressure on the politicians in the country and on the press to go after me. The issue was a very simple one. American pharmaceutical companies had spent considerable money in developing their brand name products. Slovenia has a very extensive and successful generics

industry and they would take the data developed to support the American brand name products to produce generics and then sell these generics throughout Europe, Africa, India, you name it, making lots of money.

Q: With no money going to the drug companies?

YOUNG: Oh, absolutely. None going to the American drug company for the use of their data. The drug companies were very upset. All of them, Pfizer and Wyeth and all of them were there and they were quite upset. They would come to me and they appreciated that I had taken this on as an issue. They wanted me to move ahead on it and I did in press conferences, in TV interviews and in special meetings that I would hold. In other words, press conferences that I would call to speak on this issue. I was just relentless in raising this and in making it known that this was something that had to be dealt with.

Q: Would you call it stealing?

YOUNG: Well, that's what it is. We just said it was wrong and it was wrong and Slovenia knew that it was wrong. What had happened was in preparation for its candidacy to enter the European Union it had passed a law that made it illegal to use data and intellectual property illegally. That was fine. It had passed this law well in advance of the time that it would be required to be passed. Then the pharmaceutical industry in Slovenia pressured the politicians to pass a law to repeal the law that they had passed. They basically said, look we've got a good thing here. We don't need to have this law in place for another year and a half to two years, so why do we do it now. Let's repeal it and enjoy for the next two years the benefits of being able to use the intellectual property and data from these American companies. Now the Europeans didn't concern themselves with this. It was only the Americans who were carrying the ball on this.

Q: Were the pharmaceutical companies doing this in Slovenia really homegrown or were they sort of offshoots of other outfits in other parts of Europe?

YOUNG: These were companies developed locally. These two companies were Slovene inventions and were part of the Slovene success story. These two companies together had sales of $1 billion, which is quite substantial for a small country of two million people. They were just quite a force to be reckoned with. Since during my time there one of them was bought out by Novartis and is a part of Novartis at the moment. I had all kinds of meetings with the parliamentarians and I told them, this is not going to look good. If you want to be a real member of the alliance you've got to demonstrate that you carry yourself in a way that is consistent with the standards expected of the members of the alliance. I used that as part of my argumentation as well.

Q: Was there any illicit threat on our part?

YOUNG: No, our only threat was how they would be viewed in the alliance and the kind of support we would give them. We were giving them military support as well in order to prepare them for their membership in the alliance. No out and out threats. This was through jawboning and moral persuasion that we finally succeeded and we got the law repealed and the American

pharmaceutical companies were very happy. The Slovene pharmaceutical companies were not and it was amazing how they bounced back though after that. For example, shortly after that I mentioned one of the companies became part of Novartis and then what they began doing was bid on American contracts for generics. They had still some requirements to fulfill before they could really succeed in that era in that way and they finally did and then began selling generics to the United States. It was a win-win all the way around. Now, that didn't end all of the problems in terms of pharmaceuticals. Let's face it, American pharmaceutical companies I don't think are 100% happy in any country that they're in. They are constant moaners and groaners and that's just the way it is and it's our job to try and help them in whatever way we can.

Their next complaint was that the government had concocted a scheme to bring down medical costs which is something that I think governments around the world are faced with and it's no different in this country as well. The government's program was very similar to one in Italy. It was similar I think to one in practice in one or two of the Scandinavian countries. It was basically to limit the amount of reimbursement patients could receive for their medications with the highest reimbursement going to those patients who use generics versus those who used name brand products. Those who used name brand products got a very small reimbursement. This had an impact on those American pharmaceutical products because all of the American products were name brand products and some of them of course were able to stand on their own and really didn't have generics to equal them. This was another complaint. They wanted my support in trying to get the government to implement a scheme that would be more generous to brand name products. I did my best on that, but really there was little defense that I could offer for that. This was a problem that is being dealt with internationally.

I just wanted to add one thing on the success of our program in Slovenia. It was cited in telegrams that went out worldwide as an example of how this can be done. I remember Tony Wayne, the assistant secretary for economic affairs, sending out a telegram and we took great pride in that I must say.

Q: What was the reaction among the Slovenian contacts, the ones who were not specifically connected to the pharmaceutical thing? I mean did they understand what they should.

YOUNG: They did. Many Slovenes who were anti the regime in power gave me a pat on the back. You're showing them. This government needs to be shown that it can't get away with anything and it needs to do the right thing. They were pleased with the moral implication of pushing the government to do the right thing. That is not inconsistent with Slovene morals. They are very strict people, very moralistic. They don't look for sideways to do things. They're very straight.

Q: How did you find the government reaction in the people you would meet in government. Were they just sort of uncomfortable?

YOUNG: They knew that it had to be done. They knew that it was something they had to do. It was a requirement to join the European Union. They just wanted to postpone it as long as possible. I got cooperation from the folks in the government and they knew that it was political, that it was the money and the influence of the pharmaceutical firms that brought about this

problem.

Q: How did you find the media? Was the media a good response?

YOUNG: The media was after me. They were after me because of what I had mentioned earlier in terms of Slovenia's entry into NATO. They thought that I was going to sabotage Slovenia's entry into NATO by working to deny them support from the U.S. government for their candidacy. They learned very shortly that they had one of the best allies they could find in me and applauded my efforts.

Q: Was there any other intellectual property problems like books?

YOUNG: No, you didn't find counterfeit books and you didn't find counterfeit CDs and tapes and that sort of thing. They had a good record in that regard, but that was petty business. It's not a country that specializes or has much of that kind of gray market trade.

Q: Sometimes border countries are basically smuggling countries. It's what they do for a living.

YOUNG: Yes, but this is not a smuggling country. This is a very successful country with a developed economy and a sound political system so they don't have those kinds of problems. It was just in pharmaceuticals because it was such a big business. Those two pharmaceutical companies there, they were national treasures and they were regarded as part of the patrimony. These companies were incredible. In many ways they were exactly like Hershey. It's not just the product that they produce, but its their impact on the total community where that product is produced. That was true in the case of these two pharmaceutical companies. They run schools, they run clinics, they have basketball teams, they have soccer teams. I mean they have all of these different things, all of these different institutions that you find in the community and very often maybe just supported in a small way. I mean they literally run them and it's so funny to see the basketball team. They've brought in a couple of black players from the United States and those few black players and myself, we were the only blacks in the entire country. Of course they stood out even more than I did because they were so tall.

Q: What were some of the other issues you were dealing with?

YOUNG: We tried to contribute to the development of civil society. We tried to help with funding small groups that had begun to support and encourage democratic governance in various areas at the community level. We attempted to help groups that would try and help with wayward youth and with the elderly. We tried to work with the judiciary in areas of judicial reform particularly in the implementation of the alternative dispute procedures. That was very important particularly with the judiciary. Slovenia had a wickedly backlogged judicial system. Our goal was to try to break that up so that justice could be administered in a more efficient and faster manner. We brought over judges. We sent judges from Slovenia to the United States to meet with judges here to show them our court system in all of its different levels and had terrific dialogue on that particular issue.

One big problem was also in trafficking of persons. Slovenia was not a destination point. It was a

transit point for people coming out of the Dalmatian coast, Albania, Macedonia and Serbia through Slovenia and into Italy and then into Europe. There were some who remained there. The majority of the people traffic were of course women. There were no organizations really set up to deal with that problem. One group began during our time there and we helped to fund them to get them started. They opened up a shelter for women who were traffic and we worked with the government in providing them some money so that they could continue this work and expand it. We had some leverage there because Slovenia was a category two country. We classified countries in their trafficking as category one, two or three. Category one is basically the top of the line, no problems of any significance and category two countries have some problems and government needs to do more. Category three countries are where you have major problems. Slovenia, as a new member of the alliance and as an aspirant to the European Union, wanted to be in the same company as European Union countries and that is category one. The leverage was in persuading the government that it had to do more to get into category one. At the time of my departure we were lucky in maintaining them in category two because there was a push really to move them into category three.

Q: What was the problem because I think of Slovenia as being so small and you have this all going through and if they don't stay over, I mean.

YOUNG: The government had no laws on the books to protect people who were the victims of trafficking. That was the problem to persuade the government, the parliament to do something, to put some laws on the books, to protect those who were traffic. What you raise is a very good point. You would go next door to Italy and trafficking was as obvious and as flagrantly practiced as you would want to find it anywhere. In the middle of the day in Rome you could pass these little alleys and you'd see women waiting there, African women and Asian women, waiting to be solicited. We raised this with the folks in Washington. Why was Italy with this kind of practice being so obvious being in category one, and yet a country like Slovenia where you didn't have that kind of behavior at all was a category two. They said, as bad as it is in Italy, Italy has laws on the books. So people who are traffic can actually go to the courts and say under law number 23 or so and so my rights have been violated. There was nothing like that in Slovenia.

Q: I'm thinking Slovenia since they weren't the ultimate destination there would be no particular problem for them to pass a law.

YOUNG: Well, they finally did, but it took a lot of pressure to get them to do so. It finally did.

Q: They didn't see a need or were they forced to say don't do this because we're making money.

YOUNG: Slovenes are inclined to let things alone if they don't see it as a problem. I don't think that's so unusual. I don't think they're unique in that regard. They feel that if it's not a problem, you know, why bother with it. They didn't see it as a problem. It took a lot of sensitizing to get them to see it differently and they also view sex completely differently than we do. We think it's immoral and wrong to have people trafficked and to have people engaged in prostitution and that sort of thing. Their attitude is different. I forgot the number, but there were something like 60 private clubs in Slovenia where prostitution was practiced and the government knew that it was practiced and it was legal. It's a completely different attitude.

Q: What about relations with Italy? You know for years particularly around the area of Istria and all there were Slovenians trying to have Slovenian taught in the public schools, the Italians were vehement about this and all. How did that work?

YOUNG: I think overall I would say relations with Italy were good, but there would be flare-ups from time to time. As you probably know there is an Italian minority in Slovenia and there is a Slovene minority in Italy all around the border areas where the border had shifted back and forth before the lines were finally drawn. Anyhow the Italians do have a member in the Slovene parliament, but I don't think there's a Slovene in the Italian parliament. I could be wrong, but I know there is an Italian in the Slovene parliament. Relations were good. Problems occurred when Slovenia was moving towards its entry to the European Union. One of the minority parties in Italy rose up and said it was going to block Slovenia's entry because Slovenia had not settled debts from World War II with the Italians who had lost property and business interests in Slovenia at that time. That was not true. There had been a settlement on those issues. In fact the U.S. government was party to it, but the Italians despite having signed the agreement at the time hadn't moved to collect the money that had been put in the accounts to settle those disputes. That would flare up from time to time. Slovenia was a little bit uncertain about Italian support for its entry to NATO. I mean it finally did get it and for its entry to the European Union.

As far as Croatia is concerned, there were border dispute problems. There were some other problems that had been around since the time of independence in 1991. Those issues were believed to be resolved in an agreement that was initiated by the prime ministers of both Croatia and Slovenia in 2001. Everyone breathed a sigh of relief that this agreement was resolved. The borders were established. Property claims were settled on both sides and a number of other issues as well. Number one was the border and also the demarcation of the territorial waters. That was a major issue as to where the Croatian line was in in the Adriatic and where the Slovene line was in the Adriatic. This affected fishing and lobstering and that sort of thing. This was a very nice agreement. Prime Minister Drnovsek was very pleased with it and the Croatian government seemed pleased and little by little it began to fall apart. The Croats said we're not going to adhere to it, this is no good; the party that raised this was a party that was campaigning to be elected in place of the party that had signed this agreement with Drnovsek. The Slovenes just stood their ground. They said we signed the agreement. We're not going to budge. That's it. It's up to you to honor it. This went back and forth and back and forth. When I left in 2004 it still had not been resolved, but the Slovenes had not backed up at all. Special envoys were appointed to go to negotiate between the two countries, but when I left in 2004 nothing had been resolved. It was basically the status quo. There were flare ups during my time there when Slovene fishing vessels were seized and then Croat crabbing vessels or lobstering vessels were seized. They had these little spats going back and forth. Then you'd have Slovenes who would say, well, I went down to Croatia for my vacation. I was treated like a dog. They were disrespectful and it was nothing but contempt and they looked down on me. Mind you, they'd go by the tens of thousands to their vacations in Dubrovnik and Cortula and all of these lovely places along the Dalmatian coast. Some of this resentment goes back decades because when they were all together in the Republic of Yugoslavia, Slovenia was the most envied of all of them. The other members of the republic thought the Slovenes were haughty and arrogant and disdainful of them and the Slovenes thought the others were a bunch of slackers because the Slovenes work hard. They had the most

successful economy in the republic. They made up about a thirteenth of the population, but produced a quarter of the GDP. They were very proud of this and they are very proud in any case. Then there was also the feeling that when Slovenia broke away in 1991 that they left the others holding the bag. Some of them said, well, yes, those Slovenes broke away and they had a war that lasted 10 days, but the rest fell on us. That's not quite the case either. There are a number of reasons for that kind of resentment, but nevertheless things were good. As I said, relations stayed fairly even. You'd have these flare-ups over fishing, you'd have flare-ups at the border and the Croats would decide all of a sudden that they were going to slow things down and the cars couldn't get through and they'd be at the border backed up for tens of miles and that sort of thing. Overall, pretty good.

Slovenia knows that the best place for Croatia would be in the alliance and in the European Union.

Q: The alliance, you mean?

YOUNG: NATO. That these are key anchors for stability in the region. The only one who has that at the moment is Slovenia, but Slovenia would like to see the other members of the former republic of Yugoslavia become members of these institutions as well. Relations with Austria were good except again for some of the same reasons that I mentioned earlier in terms of Italy; you have a Slovene minority in Austria. You don't have it the other way around. You have some of it, but not too much. You have more the other way around of the small Slovene minority in Austria. Unfortunately it was in the region of Styria which is the area headed by Haider.

Q: I was going to say Haider, we've talked about him.

YOUNG: Yes, well, he's quite a guy to say the least, a real troublemaker. Austria had laws that said there would be bilingual education in the schools where the Slovene communities were located. There would be bilingual signs and things like that. This was by law and by affirmation by the courts of Austria. Haider said, I don't care what the courts say, we are not having bilingual education any longer and we're going to take down the signs and they're going to be in German and that's that. Of course this got everyone riled up and by the time I left things were still pretty much the same. There would be these flare-ups that would occur in that region of Styria where Haider was.

Q: Haider had been Prime Minister for a little while, wasn't he?

YOUNG: Oh, yes, he was impossible.

Q: He was essentially seen as a neo-Nazi.

YOUNG: Well, he is.

Q: Certainly an extreme nationalist.

YOUNG: An extreme nationalist is a gentler word.

Q: He had his followings in Styria?

YOUNG: Yes, Styria. You know the Slovenes were ruled by the Austrians for 800 years and that has put a certain stamp on the Slovenes. I think their sense of orderliness, their drive to work hard, I think there's a streak in them that you find in Austria as well.

Q: Sort of Germanic.

YOUNG: Yes, Calvinistic I would say. They worked very hard. Don't take too much outwardly, don't make very outward shows of emotion and pleasure. I went to a dinner hosted by the U.S. government for the graduates of a program we had in the region to send college graduates to the States for graduate education where they got masters. It was for the Balkans and for Central Europe. I remember at this function the speaker was giving awards. He said, now we have an award for Mr. so and so of Romania. There would be some applause. Then he said, we now have such and such an award for Mr. so and so let's say, Hungary. Again, gently even applause. This went on and on. Then he said we have an award for Mr. so and so of Slovenia, very quiet applause. Then he said we have an award for Mr. so and so of Serbia. Well, the room went crazy. There was all kinds of yelling. The Slovene fellow next to me gave me a nudge and said, Serbs. In other words they're full of emotion and you don't get this outward show of emotion on the part of Slovenes. They certainly have fun and they make jokes and what have you, but they are completely different in terms of they are more Germanic and more Austrian in that sense of the word. The Slovenes have this great admiration for Austria and they take pride in, they're also neat the clean and as I said orderly. That's why if you travel from Slovenia into Austria it's a seamless transition. You travel from Italy, from Slovenia to Italy; you can see the difference. You travel from Slovenia to Croatia you see the difference. You travel from Slovenia to Hungary you see the difference, but into Austria it's a seamless transition. It's amazing.

Relations with Hungary were very good. No major problems there. The Slovenes looked at Hungary as a model of what they could do in terms of being a member of NATO. Hungary had not yet entered the European Union. They were in the same line of candidates as the Slovenes. There is a Hungarian minority in Slovenia and there is a Hungarian member of the Slovene parliament. There is a Hungarian who is in the Slovene parliament, but not the opposite way around. Very good solid relationships there, very good.

Q: Well, how did the Balkan troubles, particularly Bosnia and Kosovo. We're talking 2001 to 2004. How did they play I mean or were you seeing new repercussions or was Slovenia somewhat removed?

YOUNG: They were removed, concerned, and the recipient of many thousands of refugees as a result of this. As removed as they were, they were affected. They played a key role for us in the bombing of Serbia because when we were ready to do it, when we were ready for the air strikes we asked the Austrians because that was the shortest distance to fly and the Austrians declined. They wouldn't allow us to overfly their country. Then we asked the Slovenes and the Slovenes said yes. We did it and the Slovenes felt it was the right thing to do. They knew that this problem had to be put to an end.

Q: The Serbians _____ Kosovo in the area and it was a tremendous crisis.

YOUNG: They got all of these refugees in, mostly Serbs. They got some others as well, but the majority were Serbs and that created some problems for them. They had to find a place for them and then at some point they gave them the opportunity of becoming permanent residents there and they handled it fairly well. In 2001, however, this issue of those refugees who had come in became a political issue. One party said that the people who had come in had been given permanent resident status and was then stripped of that status and were not allowed to vote and things like that. This particular candidate wanted that whole issue reexamined and it became a huge issue in the campaign for prime minister in 2001. It was a significant issue. The guy who raised it. He won. He ousted the regime that had been in power since the time of independence.

Q: Was this a major factor?

YOUNG: It was a factor, definitely. But I think the main reason why the opposition was elected was because people had grown tired of the regime that had been in power since independence in 1991 and wanted to try something different. The feeling was that in some ways this was basically like the old communist days with the old regime. Everybody knew everyone and everything got done through these connections and they felt that the time for that was over.

Q: Were there any other developments of this political nature? I mean was this something that, did we get involved in the refugee matter at all?

YOUNG: No, we didn't. We got involved to the extent that we kept emphasizing human rights. The need for the rule of law, the need for fair play and those kinds of things. Its amazing these human rights cases. Some of them were just unbelievable. There's a small Muslim community in Slovenia. The Muslim community had been campaigning for years to build a mosque and the government finally gave them land or agreed that they could buy land in this particular area for this mosque. Then this became a huge issue whether they were going to get this mosque or not. They got the land and then questions were raised as to putting this issue to a referendum or just allowing it just to go forward on its own. We knew that if it had gone to a referendum it would have been defeated. Then it would have gotten into another area in terms of a religion not being able to practice freely. We kept emphasizing with the government the importance of demonstrating that there was religious freedom in Slovenia and that this mosque would move forward. In the end it got into the courts and everyone got involved. I mean these things that seemed so small became an emotional issue. This was a serious issue though. I mean serious concern here. In the end they agreed, I think it was a result of a court decision, that basically said even if they had a referendum they couldn't have abridged the right to religion or freedom of religion. That was a basic right that everyone enjoyed.

Q: Well, now, what was the role of the Catholic Church?

YOUNG: Good question. The Catholic Church. If you ask a Slovene what religion are you he'll say Roman Catholic. About 85% Roman Catholic, by profession, not by practice. You'd go to Catholic Church on a Sunday and you could count the number of people in the church.

Q: Particularly all women.

YOUNG: The majority, you're right there, but that's not unusual anywhere.

Q: It was like that when I was in Italy.

YOUNG: Yes, that's very true, but you ask the man and they'll tell you they're Catholic. Almost everyone in the country, 85%. My wife and I are Roman Catholic and we'd go to mass there on Sunday. We would make these observations that you have, look its all women. The Catholic Church had considerable influence and had owned at one point extensive properties. Following independence the Slovenes said they would return property to former owners and one of the former owners was the Roman Catholic Church. They owned forests, they owned basically state parks. I mean what came to be a state park that encompassed hundreds of thousands of acres, way up in the mountains. They had these schools all over. They had monasteries all over. They had chapels all over. The church played quite a significant role in the evolution of the country going back to the time of the attempts by the Turks to conquer that area. You go to Slovenia for example and on every hill there's a church. On every hill there's a church and those churches were placed on those hills for strategic reasons. They would serve as lookouts and around the church there's always a wall. The person who was the lookout would keep an eye out for the Turks. If he saw Turks coming he would give the signal, the villagers would come into the yard at the church and then they would fight the Turks from the wall of the church. The role of the church in Slovenia as being able to defend the country from subjugation from the Turks is just one example of their influence. Then they ran all of the schools at one time. They ran the universities. They've had a tremendous impact in the evolution of the country, but during the time of the communists the church was cut out. Basically the church was brought back into society at the time of independence. People were allowed to exercise their right to practice their religion, so the church was basically reborn at the time of independence. It wasn't happy with just being able to practice as it wanted to. It wanted the government to give it more money. It wanted the government to insist on religious education in the schools and things like that, that just would not go, would not be acceptable to Slovenes. So you had this tension between the church and the government. While I was there an agreement was hammered out between the Vatican and the government that allows the church to operate freely, to have its own schools, to have Catholic education in the schools, but not have it in the public schools and not getting huge amounts of money from the government. The archbishop was a very controversial fellow named Rodey who has subsequently moved on to be one of the key figures in the Vatican working with the present Pope. He was very outspoken. In fact he on occasion would inflame the situation in Slovenia particularly among the people in the Muslim community. In one public statement he equated them to all being terrorists and the government had to be careful in measures to be sure that we weren't encouraging them in their terrorist activities and that sort of thing. Well, everyone went ballistic when they heard. He would do things like that.

He was very influential. For example, in terms of persuading Slovenes to vote for NATO and also persuading Slovenes to vote for entry into the European Union. Slovenia was the only country of the candidates invited to join NATO that had a referendum on it. The referendum succeeded. I think I mentioned that earlier that the referendum succeeded.

Q: Yes.

YOUNG: I wanted to go back to that a little bit because it leads to what was happening in terms of the war on Iraq. In 2003, at the beginning of the year, the talk of a possible war was getting louder and louder and as it got louder and louder the opposition to it in Slovenia grew in intensity. It was very clear. The Slovenes wanted absolutely nothing to do with the war in Iraq. The referendum on NATO and the European Union was scheduled for March 21st I think in 2003. Little did we know that the war would begin I think it was the 23rd of March or the 22nd of March, 2003, so it was literally within days. We had no doubts about the Slovenes agreeing to enter the European Union, but the polls indicated that it was very uncertain about the Slovenes voting for entry to NATO. We were afraid that with the war on the horizon that the Slovenes would vote against it. In the end they voted for it, two-thirds of them voted for entry to NATO and 90% voted for entry to the European Union. That was a big success.

Q: Were certain assurances given at that time saying the war in Iraq is not a NATO matter?

YOUNG: Despite those assurance and what have you, it was the U.S. NATO was looked at unfortunately through the prism of the U.S. -- that this is a U.S. run institution and you know, if we vote for this, we are voting basically for the U.S. and we're agreeing to war with Iraq. A very important thing did occur just before the war started. We knew we were going to go into Iraq. I got a message from Washington instructing me to go to the government to get permission for our planes to overfly Slovenia to get to Iraq. I went in, put the request in and the government was very quick to get back to me. They said no thank you. I communicated that back to Washington. They were very unhappy as you can imagine. Literally we had hours to move because the instructions were given that we were going to go that night. We couldn't do it, so the planes were going to come out of Aviano in Italy and over Slovenia and then on down. But we couldn't do it, so they went over Macedonia.

Q: Did they have to go over Albania?

YOUNG: They did that as well and so those two countries as a result of that became our best friends, among our dearest friends and best friends. Slovenia ended up in the dog house as a result of that. That was a major item. The war started. The opposition just grew and grew in intensity. We had all kinds of demonstrations outside of the embassy. My car was attacked one day while I was leaving for home. The editorials in the papers were all anti-U.S. and it was all directed at President Bush. It was all seen as a result of this man. It was Bush, Bush, Bush. Nothing we could do would deter them from this. I continued to give access to the press anytime they wanted it. They were relentless in asking me about the war and what the U.S. was doing and how wrong it was. I would give the spiel about what we were trying to do there and how we were going to build democracy and how this was necessary and we got rid of a wicked dictator and that sort of thing. I don't know if I mentioned what had happened with Slovenia's signing on to the Vishegrad statement. This was when Powell went to the United Nations. Did I mention that?

Q: No, I don't think so.

YOUNG: Oh, okay, well that was a big issue. We were looking for support in terms of proof that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and that the United Nations should support the Secretary in what he was proposing to the United Nations. We went to the 10 countries that were proposed for membership in NATO and/or the European Union. They were called the Vishegrad 10. All of them had signed this letter except Slovenia. I remember calling Foreign Minster Dimitrij Rupel and saying this is going to look really bad. You want to look good. You want to be counted among those who have signed this letter. We've got the proof. Holding up like Powell did later on, we've got the proof. He said, well, I've got to run this by a couple of people here and I will get back to you and I gave him I think 15 minutes and I called him again and I said, we're waiting in Washington, you know. They're waiting for you. You're the only holdout on this. We need this. This is so important. This is critical; we've got to have it. He said, well, I've got to run it by more people. In the meantime I learned later on that one fellow who was sort of a real anti-American member of the ruling government was pressing him on how to tweak the statement and Rupel did make a few little tweaks here, but nothing significant in terms of the substance of it. This letter basically said, based on the evidence that Secretary of State Powell has represented to the United States, we believe that the United Nations blah, blah, that this is what they should do. That was pretty powerful stuff. Anyhow, I kept after the foreign minister. I was relentless in my pressure on him and in the end he signed. We were able to communicate that back to Washington and that was one of the statements that Powell used in his discussion with the United Nations. The Slovenes regretted that later on and Powell did too as a matter of fact, but anyhow that was what happened in that particular case.

Q: Did you feel, I've had sort of the impression that being the number one, the most powerful country in the world and all, obviously this brings resentment, you can't help it. I mean this just comes with the territory and the fact that Bush seemed to give no attention or care to European sensitivities allowed all this anti-American resentment to sort of well up and concentrate even before the Iraq war.

YOUNG: Yes, at the time.

Q: There was the ____ agreement, a lot of this, a little could have been done to assuage the sensibilities of the Europeans which other presidents had done, like Bush's father, but he didn't. Did you have a feeling that this was kind of built into it?

YOUNG: There's no question about it that that was the case. When Bush was initially elected there wasn't euphoria at his election, but there was certainly a willingness to stand back and give him a chance to see what he was going to do. Then when he took these unilateral moves, abrogating agreements that we had signed and what have you.

Q: Anti-ballistic.

YOUNG: Yes, an alarm went out, not only an alarm, but opposition and criticism and it just never stopped. They felt that, well, if we are members of an alliance, if we have this relationship that's very special. I'm not just saying Slovenes, but Europe in general, then we should be consulted. I remember having a discussion with Secretary Powell and I said, "You know we

don't do a good job in communicating with our friends in telling them privately, not going public, but handling it in a private way that this is how we feel about a particular issue. We know you don't feel that way about it, but we want you to know this is how we're thinking. This is how things are shaping up in the U.S. This is how it's likely to come up." That would I think have had a different result than just barreling ahead without any kind of consultations at all. That's just not the way you deal with a friend.

Q: How did Powell respond?

YOUNG: Well, he listened. I think he was just in a listening mode at that point. I think Powell was a believer in this. He was a believer in consulting and conferring with your friends and what have you, but this was a little bit beyond him.

Q: Tell me, now this is, I'm just moving as we do these oral histories with people who have been dealing with this particular time and I have to state my prejudice. I feel this has probably been the darkest period of American foreign policy since World War II I mean as far as our ability to exert our influence through diplomatic means. Did you find one in yourself and also in the officers there having trouble dealing with this major reverse in American foreign policy?

YOUNG: We did, but we kept that to ourselves. We realized that we had a responsibility to represent the president and to do that in a professional and resolute way, and if the situation got so bad that we couldn't do that anymore, then it was really time to leave. Someone like myself, for example, I knew that upon completion of my assignment, that I was going to leave and that I would be a free man in a relatively short time. So, that sort of helped me to stay the course. The others would voice their views privately. They wouldn't even voice them to non-Americans, but amongst ourselves there was great disappointment of the direction we were going. I think it may have changed a little, but I think the Secretary has done some positive things to try and change it.

Q: I've talked to someone who was serving as the DCM at a European post. He had a lot of trouble because people would come up and say, all right, you've talked about this and you've presented it, but what do you really think.

YOUNG: Oh, we get that. We get that, yes. If you're dealing with the press, you have to be extremely careful or else it will get out, well, although Ambassador Young said so and so and so, he privately believed so and so. I never let my private thoughts out in public.

Q: Did you have much consultation with your fellow ambassadors around the area?

YOUNG: They were very nice, very gracious. You mean of the fellow American ambassadors?

Q: Fellow American ambassadors.

YOUNG: We'd have a conference here in Washington once a year, which was always interesting, because we'd have 54 ambassadors there. I was the only black in the entire room. I said that I was president of the association of black ambassadors in Europe. Then later on we got one more, the guy who was in Iceland, and so I told him, now you're the vice president. I'm the

president. We would have those and they would provide an opportunity for informal discussions. The career people did their job in terms of defending the president and speaking out and not trying to hide and duck from the issues. I think some of the political people took a very low profile and wouldn't speak out and wouldn't have the same kind of relationship with the press that they would normally have. So, we would meet there. NATO would have an annual regional conference and we'd meet at that conference as well, but that was about it.

Q: How did your public affairs officer deal with this matter because this was a very difficult time.

YOUNG: An extremely difficult time. I was very fortunate though in having one of the best public affairs officers I have ever worked with. A woman named Laurie Weitzenkorn who worked with me in seizing every opportunity imaginable to do exactly what I wanted to do which was to show the U.S. government in a very positive way. If we were doing something for example with the judiciary and an alternative dispute resolution conference or something like that, she would arrange for me to have press conferences. She would arrange for me to give the keynote address and of course this would be carried in the papers and then she would arrange for me to be on a panel or something like that with other ambassadors or jurors or jurists. Again all of this would be picked up in the press, and it was neutral. It was neutral; it wasn't political at all. That worked out very nicely. She would arrange to do something with Fulbrighters. We had a good size Fulbright program. Programs with scholars and speakers on different issues. She programmed me to the hilt, but always with one goal in mind. She didn't skirt those occasions when it was clear that the reporter or the press or the television wanted something said politically. That's what they were after. She did her best to prep me and to get me ready for this and it all ended up very nicely. She was just an extraordinary public affairs officer. Engaged, creative, full of energy, very well connected in the community, particularly among people in the press and academia, just what you want.

Q: How did you find life in Slovenia?

YOUNG: I always tell people that I certainly enjoyed the issues and enjoyed my time there. I couldn't have asked for a nicer post to conclude a career. To do so in a country that was democratic, that had open markets, that respected the rule of law, that believed in integrity that didn't have problems of corruption, that was moving ahead, that believed in reforms. I mean it was doing all of those things that we had attempted to do in one way or another in so many countries that we had been in over the years. Then to be able to do that in a country that was so spectacularly beautiful was an extra treat. The other thing was to also do it in a country that took such pride in culture and art and music was also an extra treat. I went to more concerts in Slovenia than I have gone to in total in the United States and other countries combined. There were all kinds of world class performers. They had a world class orchestra of their own. The little country had three symphony orchestras. Just unbelievable. We just loved it, soaked it all up, traveled all over the country, just loved it.

I attended the ski flying competition in Planica. I had never been to a ski resort let alone to a ski flying competition. We were at the foot of the mountain where the skiers land and to see them come off of this run. Slovenia has the longest run in the world for this kind of jump. Its I think its

250 meters which is just unbelievable. To see these people go up in the air and then come down, they literally are like birds, but its just absolutely spectacular. I've never seen anything like it. It was one of the most breathtaking and thrilling things I've ever seen. I went every year I was there except the year that the war started and I wanted to go. I had been talking about it for a long time and my country team advised me don't go. They said, look you're going to be very visible, there's no question about that although you'll have 40,000 people there you're going to be a very visible person in that 40,000 crowd. That was the one year that I didn't go, but I did go the next year and loved it, loved every minute of it. It was wonderful. Slovenia is a gorgeous country. Ljubljana is just a delightful town. A small city of 325,000 people. One person described the country to me I think in a very apropos way. She said, you know if Disney created an Alpine village it would look like Slovenia. I think there's some truth in that. Its just gorgeous.

Q: I'm thinking as sort of an up to date note, just last week they had an election and a very solid free election in Palestine which the fundamentalists Hamas won and you were saying that in talking about Bahrain that you know if they had a full democracy in Bahrain, you thought that sort of the fundamentalists could well win.

YOUNG: I think that's the case if it were a one man one vote because its clear with three quarters population of Shia and the Shia being very sympathetic to Iran and to other Islamists and sympathetic to the Shia in Iraq, I think that that would probably be the outcome and I don't think that would be in our interests frankly.

Q: We're pushing democracy, but at the same time it's a complicated world out there.

YOUNG: It's a very complicated world. I don't know what will finally prevail in Bahrain, but they do have a charter that was voted in democratically and that charter does provide for some participation by the citizens in those who represent them in the legislature. As I mentioned final veto rests with the king and the king wants to maintain his power. In fact when the former emir ran into difficulty with the legislators, that is Sheik Isa, he disbanded it. He disbanded the parliament because it was clear the parliament was moving in a direction that if it continued to exercise the power that it did, he and his entire family would have been out on the street. He disbanded them and they had no legislature until his successor. His son made this new arrangement as a result of a national charter that was voted in.

Q: Well, back to Slovenia, is there anything more we should discuss do you think?

YOUNG: No, I think we've covered the major issues, the intellectual property, the war continues to be a big thorn in our side. After the war got started, Slovenia was asked if it wanted to be a member of the coalition of the willing, even a silent member of the coalition of the willing and they said no thank you. We don't want to be a part of the coalition of the willing. We have to also keep in mind that at the time Slovenia had a new prime minister. He was afraid of taking any stance that was inconsistent with public sentiments for fear of not being reelected which he was not eventually and so he was not about to stick out his neck at all. He would say the right things when we would meet privately and he talked a good game, but he was not prepared to back us. We were pressing him to send some forces to Iraq, to send some forces to Afghanistan, but they were not prepared to do any of that unless it was under the cover of NATO. Slovenia

was not about to break on its own, break ranks with its European Union allies in order to demonstrate support for the United States. If it demonstrated any support for the United States it would only do that under the umbrella of NATO or the European Union. Now, for example, they are about to send I think a few people to Iraq, but this would be under the NATO training program that is being worked out now. They do have people in Afghanistan. That started while I was in Slovenia, but again this is not a unilateral thing. It is part of NATO. They are part of the NATO alliance and they're demonstrating that they're good members. They don't have huge numbers out there. I forgot the numbers, but its small, 10, 12, 14 or something like that. As we know it's the symbolism that's important in this. We talk about the coalition of the willing. If you look at the real numbers it was still the U.S. that was doing this. It was just symbolic.

End of reader