Page 39447

1	Monday, 4 May 2009
2	[Open session]
3	[The accused entered court]
4	[The accused Prlic and Coric not present]
5	Upon commencing at 2.17 p.m.
6	JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Registrar, kindly call the
7	case.
8	THE REGISTRAR: Good afternoon, Your Honours. Good afternoon,
9	everyone in and around the courtroom.
10	This is case number IT-04-74-T, the Prosecutor versus
11	Prlic et al.
12	Thank you, Your Honours.
13	JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you, Mr. Registrar.
14	Today is Monday, 4th of May, 2009. Let me first greet the
15	accused, the Defence counsel, the entire OTP - they're all there - the
16	usher, the Registrar, and all the people assisting us.
17	You have four IC numbers for us, Mr. Registrar.
18	THE REGISTRAR: That's right, Your Honour.
19	2D has submitted its response to OTP's objections to its
20	documents tendered via Witness Ivan Bagaric. This list shall be given
21	Exhibit IC997. Some parties have submitted their lists of documents to
22	be tendered through Witness Dragan Juric. The list submitted by 2D shall

be given Exhibit IC998. The list submitted by 4D shall be given

Exhibit IC999, and the list submitted by the Prosecution shall be given

Exhibit IC1000.

Page 39448

1 Thank you, Your Honours.

2 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you, Mr. Registrar.

Very well. We're going to start the Praljak case today.

Last Friday, the Trial Chamber was seized of a request by the Prosecution for a hearing, a 65 ter hearing or a discussion hearing, in order to limit the scope or the extent of Mr. Praljak's testimony. The Trial Chamber notes that the dead-line for the other parties to respond is the 15th of May. The Trial Chamber will rule, therefore, after the 15th of May. At any rate, the Trial Chamber, as of now, is going to move to the 84 bis statement by Mr. Praljak, or declaration. As part of the 84 bis declaration, Mr. Praljak is going to take an oath, as had been decided by a previous ruling of the Trial Chamber, and in a few moments I shall ask whether Mr. Praljak promises and says that he's going to say—tell the truth and nothing but the truth. Then Mr. Praljak will make a statement for one hour and a half, so this might take us right to the end of the day.

Once this part of the proceedings are over, Mr. Praljak is going to testify as a witness. He then will take the stand in front of us, and Mr. Praljak will read out the solemn declaration that is submitted to all witnesses.

witnesses.

Mr. Praljak's Defence counsel have given us a schedule. There

- will be several days in examination-in-chief, and we shall determine the time for cross-examination by other parties.
- Regarding questions that might be asked of Mr. Praljak by the

 Judges, as far as I am concerned, and I only speak on my own behalf, I

Page 39449

- will only intervene when Mr. Praljak has answered questions by his
- lawyers and when the other counsel have proceeded to their
- 3 cross-examination, if any. Only then will I ask questions. Only then
- 4 will I put questions under three main headings, and I'm giving them to
- 5 Mr. Praljak straight away so that he not be taken by surprise.
- 6 My questions will first focus on his answers, but only related to
- $7\,$ $\,$ the indictment and the pre-trial brief. I will have questions based on
- 8 the documents mentioned in footnotes in the pre-trial brief. That's the
- 9 first part of my questioning.
- 10 Second part, it will only be focused on the documents that will
- 11 be presented to him by his lawyer during the examination-in-chief.
- 12 The third part, if any, will relate to questions put by other
- lawyers. So I'll break down my questions into three parts: first part,
- 14 indictment and pre-trial brief; second part, documents submitted by him;
- 15 third part, documents arising from questions by other counsel.
- 16 Yes, my colleagues want to intervene. They want to explain to
- you how they might proceed.
- JUDGE TRECHSEL: Just as an observation. On the record, on line
- 19 16, which is just about to disappear, it says that this will take us up
- 20 to the end of the day, and it should, of course, read "will take us up to

22 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you for this detail. 23 Mr. Praljak, please stand up. I am going to ask you whether you are going to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. 24 Are you going to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, Mr. Praljak? 25 Page 39450 THE ACCUSED PRALJAK: [Interpretation] Yes, Your Honour 1 2 Judge Antonetti, Mr. President, I will be telling the truth, nothing but the truth. 3 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you, Mr. Praljak. 4 Mr. Praljak, you may proceed for your opening statement under 5 6 Rule 84 bis. [Praljak Defence Opening Statement] 7 THE ACCUSED PRALJAK: [Interpretation] Thank you very much. 8 9 I would like to greet everyone in the courtroom, the OTP, Defence counsel, the honourable Judges, and all those doing their work. 10 11 I was living in the hope that I would be allowed three hours, but that was then limited to one and a half hours. Therefore, I have 12 13 provided binders, and I will start with paragraph 15 in the binders. 14 The Croatian Army in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The JNA attacked Croatia. The front was throughout the former 15 Yugoslavia. The rebelling Serbs, the army of the so-called Krajina, 16 together with the JNA, attacked Croatia. The front extended throughout 17 the former Yugoslavia. That was where the soldiers and the weapons were 18

21

the beginning of the first break."

coming from. The JNA, the Krajina soldiers, the Army of the Republic of
the Serbian Krajina, attacked Croatia. The front extended throughout
this entire territory, where attacks were occurring, the territory from
which the soldiers were coming who were involved in those attacks, the
territory in which the military equipment and weapons were being produced
that were used in those attacks, and all the territories and areas which
those weapons and equipment were transported. The JNA and all the other

Page 39451

- armies did not simply attack Croatia alone. They attacked all the
- 2 territories and all the peoples living east of the
- 3 Karlobag-Karlovac-Virovitica line, which was the imagined border of
- 4 greater Serbia.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 5 Throughout this area in which they were carrying out these
- 6 attacks which under the International Law of War is defined as a theatre
- of war, Croatia had every right to use military force to respond if on it
- 8 had been able to. Bosnia and Herzegovina, both as a territory and as a
- 9 state, was attacking the Republic of Croatia under the provisions of the
- international law. Croatia had every right to respond by dispatching its
- 11 troops to any sector of the theatre of war, if only it had been able to.
- 12 A referendum was held on the 19th of May, 1990, for an
- independent Republic of Croatia. 93 percent of the voters backed this
- 14 issue. At the first multi-party election, held in the spring of 1990,
- 15 members of the Croatian Parliament were elected.
- 16 On the 25th of June, 1991, and there's an error here if that

17	could please be corrected, 1991, a constitutional decision was adopted on
18	the independence of the Republic of Croatia, as well as a declaration
19	proclaiming Croatia's independence and sovereignty. This was the legal
20	and constitutive act creating the Republic of Croatia.
21	International recognitions were an important and principal
22	declaration of support to this newly-created state. A state, however, is
23	created by the will of the people.
24	On the 30th of July, 1991, the Lithuanian Parliament passed a
25	resolution recognising the independence and sovereignty of the
	Page 39452
1	Republic of Croatia. Next followed recognition by France, the United
2	States, England, and Germany; and this recognition had a greater
3	political significance. Nevertheless, the first recognition that came
4	from Lithuania, and then somewhat later from Iceland as well, had a
5	greater moral significance, incomparably so, in fact, than those that
6	followed when Croatia, despite predictions that it would soon be
7	defeated, stood its ground. Everyone, with the exception of Lithuania
8	and Iceland, first waited until those predictions came true.
9	Alija Izetbegovic, the president of the Presidency of the
10	Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, could or could not desire or
11	desired not to: A, prevent attacks on the Republic of Croatia from the
12	territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina; prevent the taking away of captured
13	Croatian soldiers from Croatia and Kostajnica to Serb camps in

Bosnia-Herzegovina; C, prevent the taking of Unista, VH territory, by

Martic's units; D, prevent the massacre that occurred in the village of

Ravno, or indeed he found this simply not to be their war, or as he said,

"This is not our war"; E, prevent attacks on Dubrovnik, Slavonski Brod,

Okucane and so on and so forth; F, prevent the recruitment of citizens of

Bosnia-Herzegovina into the JNA. The question is where was the Croatia

Army allowed to go. Under the provisions of the International Rule of

Law, this simply did not matter. The Croatian Army was allowed to go

into the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina Simply because that territory

was used to carry out acts of aggression against Croatia. It was a

theatre of war, from where Croatia Stood, as simple as that.

Mr. Alija Izetbegovic, nevertheless, refused to sign a military

Page 39453

angreement with Franjo Tudjman. In order to not cause Serbs to become angry, he was not willing or wasn't able to protect Croatia from an aggression carried out by a state which he headed. He couldn't -- was not able to or willing to protect the Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina. He could not do that for the Muslims either. He, Alija Izetbegovic, has no power over 70 percent of this country's territory, and yet he is the president of the Presidency of this country. Nevertheless, he behaves as the leader of that country. He signs at that agreement on friendship and cooperation with the Republic of Croatia, allowing the Army of the Republic of Croatia to Carry out activities or intervene in the border areas. At the same time, he's negotiating an historic deal or agreement

12 with the aggressor, himself.

The Croatia Army did not cross into BH territory, except when an 13 operation was launched to liberate Dubrovnik. The belt in which military 14 15 activity was underway was so narrow that there was no way around this. 16 The volunteers of the Croatian Army, and the Croatian Army included about 15.000 volunteers from Bosnia-Herzegovina, were on their way back to help 17 18 defend Bosnia and Herzegovina. Unfortunately, there were too few of them. The figures never exceeded between 500, 600 volunteers who were 19 20 really involved in military activities, at least not before the 9th of 21 November, 1993, at which time -- or until which time I remained as the commander of the Main Staff of the HVO. 22

The text now continues, and I've provided a list of law books that I looked into, because it was my duty and because I wanted to look into them, all the texts which I studied in order to be able to write

Page 39454

1 this.

23

24

25

- 2 "International Law Number 3," by Andrassy, Bakotic, Sersic, and
- 3 Vukas, is one of the books I used. Page 4 reads:
- 4 "Under International Law of War, any area in which the warring
- 5 parties can prepare for combat activities is considered a theatre of war.
- 6 Above all, it encompasses the territories of the warring states, their
- 7 land, their sea, their coast, and their aerial space, air-space.
- 8 Nevertheless, military actions can also occur in territories not covered
- 9 by the sovereignty of any of the warring states."
- Therefore, according to International Law of War, a theatre of

war encompasses the open sea as well as no-man's land or "terra nullius."

The same thing that is stated here is repeated by Professor

Dr. Gavro Perazic, in his own book, who happens to be a Serb. This is

the same book. At page 7, it reads:

"A theatre of war can be in the territory of one of the warring states, as well as any other territories not falling under the sovereignty or control of any of the warring states, yet they may become theaters of war under International Law of War in which combat operations can be prepared or executed."

Therefore, there's a map, 3D03254, which I used -- which I found in Salzburg's book, which I used to show how America in the Second World War was dispatching too many countries in the form of loans, and this continued from March 1941 and September 1946. The quantities varied. Obviously, the value of the dollar is implied at the time, but back in the time it was an enormous amount of money.

Page 39455

If you look at map 3D03254, it shows Europe after the Nazi conquests. It clearly shows, for example, Norway. The moment the units of Nazi Germany or, rather, the Wermacht seized Norway's territory, Great Britain, of course, dispatched its own assault units, having previously carried out no consultations with Norway's Kwistling [phoen] government, and having not previously considered international law, simply because these were important ports in which German shelters and submarines took shelter and which they used to control the supply routes across the North Atlantic. That's on the following map, and the one that

10 I'm tendering is 3D03524.

The famous combat in Northern Africa between the Wermacht, on the one hand, under the command of Field Marshal Rommel, and at the outset, British units, later also the American units under the command of Field Marshal Montgomery. Therefore, they moved on towards Egypt, as the Wermacht tried to take possession of areas in which the oil was available, and then they also tried to cut across their supply route; but neither Great Britain or the United States saw this as a hindrance in terms of standing up to the enemy wherever the enemy happened to be.

Therefore, there was fighting going on for years. We have the battle at Kasserine, the famous battle at Kasserine depicted here, and that's where Rommel was at the time.

The next maps that we have there are marked as number 12. I'm using these maps to show the honourable Judges, the Prosecutor and everyone else in the courtroom to show the areas in which the SFRY military forces were deployed pursuant to the Warsaw Agreement, also

Page 39456

known as Plan S-1, the Warsaw Pact. Obviously, it would take up too much of my time to go into any great detail about this, but there are several things that immediately become clear. There was an attack that was expected to occur across Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, and the strategic reserves or, rather, the last-ditch defence line was meant to be in Bosnia and Herzegovina, more specifically in Central Bosnia and Herzegovina.

We can please move on to the next map, page 13, showing a deployment, and that's why drills were carried out under Plan S-2, the deployment of the armed forces of the Yugoslav People's Army, in the eventuality of a NATO aggression, showing again the axes in relation to Italy and Austria, and especially from the open sea, from the south and from Otranto. The reserve here was moved further south and is now in serbia. These military drills were being carried out throughout. While General Petkovic was still with the JNA in Slovenia, many times he had to

bring out his units in order to respond to a simulated attack from the

west.

Map number 14 shows the areas of the Serbs on rebelling in Croatia. In the lower part of the map, we see a description of what bears mentioning here. This covered about 25 percent of Croatia's territory, 11 municipalities, predominantly Serb municipalities, where 144.344 Serbs lived, or rather a total of 29.4 percent of all Serbs in Croatia. In the remaining 91 municipalities, there was 75 percent of the total number of Serbs living in Croatia; and they were not subjected to any sort of vengeance or harassment by the Croatia authorities, save for

Page 39457

1 a number of individual cases, which is something that always occurs.

Map 15 shows the initial idea of an aggression against Croatia and Slovenia. Look at the key. Everything is described there. You can see the deployment of all the corps there, the Guards Brigade and all the rest. Should there be any questions about this, I will be happy to

- provide additional explanations during my cross-examination.
- 7 If we move on to map number 16, we see the plan of the attack on
- 8 the Republic of Croatia following the withdrawal of the JNA from Slovenia
- 9 in July 1991. This is only a small addendum to the previous map.
- 10 Map number 17 shows the military and political situation in
- 11 Croatia between December 1991 on the cusp to January 1992, with the
- occupied territories of the Republic of Croatia as well as the axes of
- 13 attack or, rather, in this case defence. This was the plan, for the most
- part unsuccessful plan, by the Croatia Army.

6

- 3D03173, 3D03173, what follows, are maps that I've already used
- in this courtroom, the deployment of the JNA, its military structure in
- January of 1985. And then a significant change which occurred is
- reflected in the following map, 3D03175. Within the framework of the
- 19 conceptually complete military and political aspirations of Serbia, in
- terms of the disintegration of Yugoslavia, which was already in progress,
- 21 there was a major restructuring effort within the JNA, and this coincided
- 22 with the political positions stated in the memorandum, as well as
- 23 Milosevic's desires which might be summed up as follows: Slovenia, all
- 24 right, if it wishes to leave, it may as well do so, but if Croatia
- 25 decides to leave, only anything that remains north of the

Page 39458

- 1 Karlobag-Karlovac-Virovitica line they might keep. 3D00859 is another
- 2 exhibit in this case, showing the --
- JUDGE TRECHSEL: Excuse me, Mr. Praljak. I just want to make you

aware of a little problem that you may not be aware of.

this full title, then it's easier for us to follow.

You mention numbers of the e-court, like 3D00859, but I do not

find this number on any of the maps. You have indicated numbers of maps.

I do not find those numbers on the maps. You have indicated pages. I

have found that you spoke of maps which had another page number. So

perhaps it would be helpful if you grave us -- the maps have a title.

For instance, the last one we had was, I think, "12: Military-political

situation in Croatia, December of 1991 to January 1992." If you give us

The next map you want to talk about, if I am not mistaken, has as title on the top left side simply the number "1985." I don't know whether I am correct, but to help you keep up the connection with the

Chamber, I think it's useful that you're made aware of this.

MS. PINTER: [Interpretation] Your Honour, by way of explanation, the general has received a list of documents in e-court for a simple reason; so that the documents and maps could be shown on the screen. And the general is taking things in turn, and he's taking maps as they are in the binder. In your binders, you will not find e-court numbers because you have been provided with a hard copy. And just for the e-court, numbers have been provided to the general so that he could read them and so that the Judges could put them on e-court as the general mentions them.

Page 39459

THE ACCUSED PRALJAK: [Interpretation] And now we are looking at map number 18, and we are talking about the year 1985. This is the

3 deployment or the organisation of the Yugoslav People's Army, and it was

4 as it is depicted here, the 1st Army, the 2nd Army, the 3rd Army, the 5th

Army around Zagreb, as you can see it. This is especially important for

6 the fact that on the following map, which depicts the situation as it was

in 1987, there was a reorganisation of the Yugoslav People's Army in

8 keeping with the political aspirations of the Yugoslav People's Army and

the Serbian leadership. This was already explained in the memorandum of

the Serbian Academy of Sciences.

The explanation was this: As Yugoslavia breaks up, Slovenia Can leave Yugoslavia, and as for the rest of the former Yugoslavia and its other parts, the only area that can leave Yugoslavia was the area that is delineated by the line which leads from Virovitica to Karlobag north of Zagreb. It's a minute part of Croatia. And as for the rest, this was in line with the thinking of the group that was preparing the war. They believed that the rest of Croatia belonged to the Serbian national entity.

The following map, and the title is "The Operational Development of the Armed Forces of the SFRY," and depicts the situation as it was in 1992, and I believe that the map is already an exhibit as 3D00859. This map depicts the deployment of the units of the JNA after having left the Republic of Slovenia. You can see that the 13th Corps went in the direction of Montenegro, and that's the same corps that would later on go on to attack Mostar and the area around there. The 10th Corps moved from

Knin to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the 9th as well, and so on and so forth.

The following map depicts the distribution of JNA forces in

1

2

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bosnia and Herzegovina on the 20th of March, 1992, and this shows in

great detail what the distribution of the forces was and how many corps

there were, the 10th, the 9th, the 5th, how many soldiers each of them

And finally, for your information, I handed up a little table depicting the number of killed and wounded children in Slavonski Brod as a result of the artillery fire from Bosnia and Herzegovina. I have

had and how many volunteers. That map, as far as I can see, has been

admitted into evidence as 3D00859.

nothing further to add to this document.

I'm now moving on to the topic under number 16, which is possible methodological errors in understanding. In contrast -- which changed their political system. In contrast which along with the change in the political system emerged, or come into being, or constitute themselves, in contrast which along with the change of the political system and a simultaneous come into being must wage a war against an aggressor, in such countries neither the president of the state of Croatia, nor the Presidency or the president of the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina, nor the government, nor the ministers, nor the army, which by its voluntary nature enables the creation and existence of such a state, nor the commanders of the army, nor the military police, or any other structure of society, represent what these names mean in countries from which the honourable Judges and the Prosecutors come from. This is a very frequent mistake of distorted nominalism, to include into the

Page 39461

L	content	of	а	notion	meaning	of	а	state/culture/civilian	which	the

2 observer comes from.

In such a way, we come to a communication error, an error in understanding. The same word is used to denote quite different contents, and the interpretation of the system can be largely or even completely erroneous. I've seen and heard a lot of this from all the observers which were hanging around our areas during the war, too little knowledge about the country they were coming to and too many cultural, civilizational and political patterns that are valid in the countries from which the moderators of the crisis come from; for example, the pattern or matrix about the army in a structured system, which includes the training, law, troop tradition, finances, social aspects, positive selection, education, such psychological support, sufficient redundancy of human and material resources continues, control and checking of every segment, communication and so on and so forth.

There is another matrix, the one about a democratic society which starts functioning with the act of the passing of the law on free elections. The following is the matrix about the rule of law which appears when good laws are passed, the matrix about the police, which do their job well, when a group of citizens puts on uniforms and is provided with badges. Things are not as simple as that. To be more precise, things are much more complicated and harder, and usually take decades to take place, but I could go on for hours talking about all that.

Since sociology is a demanding science, and everybody who is

anybody dealing with society, and everybody usually knows all about it,

25

22

23

Page 39462

1 the most frequent mistakes that arise from that are as follows: 2 reduction of a system to the level of one's own ignorance and, secondly, 3 the introduction of wrong assumptions whenever we need an explanation for a certain phenomenon. I don't want anybody to think that this means that 4 those who do not have that, they don't have organised systems, that they 5 6 have the right to commit any kind of crimes. Certainly not. I'm not 7 saying that. However, a lack of order in any social system necessarily leads to an increased number of those who, with time, for a number of 8 9 reasons, cross the threshold of what is permissible. This, of course, 10 depends also on the effort, work, behaviour of those who lead such systems in the making. 11 I therefore think that only an all-encompassing and thorough 12 13 analysis of individual cases can provide an answer to the question 14 whether acts of crimes were incited, enabled through lack of punishment, 15 keeping secrets, tacit approval, or whether they fall into the usual 16 statistical distribution of adverse phenomena which every war and every 17 chaotic social situation bring with them. 18 For all those in the courtroom who might be interested, I have prepared short excerpts from a book by Len Deighton under the title 19 20 "Blitzkreig," describing the Second World War. I have emphasised the part which explains the underlying causes behind the troops of Wermacht 21

of the Nazi Germany, commanded by Generals Rommel, Manstein and Guderian,

not far from the place where we are at the moment -- when I say "not

from," I mean Belgium and the Ardeni range, in a certain way -- in a very simple way, broker French divisions and the English division corps.

Page 39463

And now I would read just one thing from page 4. One thing was clear. Whatever they did, whatever game they chose to play, the Allies would have a bad time and would find themselves in a quagmire only due to an obstinate refusal on the part of the Belgians to cooperate in their own defence. This attitude of the Belgians was finally confirmed when the Belgian ambassador in London, Several hours after the intrusion of Germans into his country, visited the British minister of foreign affairs and handed an official protest note of his government, sent because the British Army crossed the French-Belgian border to fighter against the aggressor without an official Belgian invitation.

On the following page, page 5, I have also emphasised an excerpt to demonstrate how organised and trained troops might look when they are exhausted and facing the chaos of war.

This is what a British inspector wrote about a unit of the vitally-important 9th Army, and we're talking about the 9th Army of the French military:

"Rarely does one have the opportunity to see such a disorderly, dirty, and shabby unit. Almost all of its soldiers were unshaven, their horses un-groomed. On the faces of the soldiers, you could not see a trace of pride with oneself or the unit to which they belong. Still, what upset me most was the expression on their faces; solemn, frowning, dissatisfied, disobeying. Although an order had been given 'Salute to

the left,' they passed beside us with hardly any one of them making an effort to salute."

Further on, it says in this paragraph about the lack of effort, a

Page 39464

lot of propaganda, a lot of alcohol, and about a French state railway that had to set apart special rooms in all the major stations for the sobering of the dead-drunk soldiers. There is also reference to the courage of French soldiers and some splendid units, and then on page 7 a reference is made to the Supreme Command.

Very often, the Judges in this courtroom asked about communications in the army, who's contacting whom, how quickly one can react in situations like that, and so on and so forth. Look at the state of disorder that reigned in the relationship between the command of the French forces and the units of British forces subordinated to them, and then within the command of the French Army, and you will all see that on pages 7, 8 and 9. Since the British Expedition Force was small, there was no point in setting up a joint allied command, and that's why the British soldiers were subordinated to the local French commanders, they were subordinated to them.

It says later on that the structure of the French command system was so rigid that one could not convey any commands necessary for rapid reaction through such a rigid system. It says further on that the officers could not bypass this system of bad command. It says also that the Brigade General Charles de Gaulle did not receive almost any support when he tried to continue fighting the Germans with the man who had lost

the war on the 21st of June and struck a deal and signed a peace accord with the Germans. French General Gamelin, if I am pronouncing his name correctly, create the French strategy. He appointed unit commanders. He issued orders not only to the French forces facing the Germans, but also

staff.

Page 39465

the French forces on the Alps facing Italy and also the French forces in

Syria and North Africa. Interestingly enough, he did not have a general

France was the task of General George, whose title a very old and poorly defined title was made general of the army. Even the chief of George's staff once admitted that his officer was not absolutely sure where Gamelin's responsibility stopped and where his own started, and so on and so forth. And finally, when they lost the war, when he answered the question of how quickly he could send orders to the battle-field, he said that usually it took any order 48 hours to get to the battle-field. In a clash with the German units, the three generals who were close to the front were facing the army with good communications, and that army -- the French division simply did not stand a chance against the Germans.

And further on I would like to say something about fear, fear from tanks, even when Guderian's tasks could not break the line of the 5th Division, and how the 5th created havoc within a whole division that was deployed from Chaumont to Marfais [phoen] Hill.

And then it says on page 10 the command position of the 55th

Infantry Division -- let me start a bit before.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Interestingly enough, the stone which will turn into an avalanche of catastrophe did not start rolling in that creek. Actually, the avalanche was launched around 1830 hours on that beautiful day by the commander of a French artillery battery deployed near the village of Chaumont, when he sent a report saying the German tanks had penetrated

Page 39466

all the way to the hills of Marfais.

Intentions, Action and Power."

The report was completely incorrect. However, to every French commander who was tempted to throw it away as the fruit of sheer hysteria caused by fear, it gave the motive to change his mind when, a bit later, an artillery colonel from [indiscernible], south of Chaumont, sent to his corps commander another report, also premature, in which he claimed that the battle got dangerously close to his command post, so he had to either withdraw or reconcile himself to the fact that his unit would be surrounded, and so on and so forth. The text goes on to talk about the refugees, about the courage and morale of the French 213th Infantry Regiment which unfortunately failed in its attempt, despite the fact that the troops marched for hundreds of kilometres in order to join the fight. This is just an illustrate of what illustrates something that escapes our attention because of the nature of the work in this courtroom, and this is the war conditions of chaos, death, and blood.

If we were to interview people and ask them if they wanted the

And now I'm going to move on to my Chapter 17, "Wishes,

problems of hunger, disease caused by poverty, wars, killings, to disappear, the answer would certainly be "yes." How come we then do not manage to solve such problems? Why did it take Baroness Statures [phoen] several years to successfully solve the problem of the rampage of English football fans. Why did it take the French Minister of Interior Sarcozy several months to sell the problem of rampage of French citizens, the arson, killings, the malison of shops and cars in the suburbs of French

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Page 39467

cities. And it happened only recently as we all remember. How come responsible people in France cannot prevent the burning of cars every new year? Last year, there were 1200, and in the last 10 years the number of burned cars has been over 30.000. How come that the Greek government cannot stop the deluvial violence of its citizens in Athens which has been going on for months? How come that the US Army cannot stop the killing of several hundreds of thousands of civilians in Iraq, a country from which 4 million Iraqis have fled or have been forced to leave? Would this be ethnic cleansing? Would this be expulsion or flight to save dear life? Who is responsible, and how can these things be prevented? Why did Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland fight for decades in a civilised corner of the world? Are we not hurt by the fact that over 20 years ago China destroyed one whole civilization and culture in Tibet and that they continue to do so; and by doing that they have brought a whole people to the very edge of survival? What is it that we can do, and why is there nothing that we can do there? It would

be pointless to go on enumerating such examples. It would just take us too much time.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, finally, when, in this huge sea of evil of atrocities which floods this world of ours, we find out about some events, how often and in which way do we get to know who the villain or the perpetrator is?

Isn't it a hard way between the realisation that something has happened and finding out who the person behind the atrocities actually is? What do we need to have, in technological and organisational terms, and what do we have to do in order to uncover the perpetrators in such situations?

Page 39468

The impotence to do something to prevent or to uncover a crime is
a terribly wretched feeling, but this is not a crime. This terribly
wretched feeling is not a crime.

Chapter 18, the joint criminal undertaking or enterprise. 4 5 Voluminous literature is in existence about social groups, large and 6 small, professional, closed or open, more or less structured, 7 heterogenous, homogeneous, etiological, et cetera, what is the logic behind the choice of this accused group? The Prosecutor says all members 8 9 of the HDZ, all members of the HVO and the like, and then he says "except 10 for some." Whoever has studied logic to any extent, which is the basic of all human reasoning presuming we do not include pure fantasy, the mere 11 12 chemical-neural activity of the frontal lobe will never write all and 13 then add "except for some," because if all are involved in something, then those who are not all cannot exist. And if they are not all, then 14 15 who are and who are not the members of the group of the joint criminal

enterprise, and why only four deceased persons and six currently alive?

What is the criteria on which the choice was made?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

The question relating to the phenomenon of the society and war and the cause or meaning of this phenomenon is even more complex. Any phenomenon which appears as a riddle, either in natural sciences or in social sciences, is complex, and all these parts of a whole are interconnected by causal relations. Everything interacts with everything else. Thousands -- hundreds of thousands of variables interact, creating complex differential equations, but there are no final solutions, no final results.

Page 39469

Two major theories in the 20th century are important for the

understand of the world, the first one being the theory of determined 2 3 chaos which teaches us that small changes on the input side of a system, if we iterate them, which means repeat them slightly, repeat the slight 4 5 input values, we can cause large and unpredictable changes in the system. 6 This appears to me especially important in relation to the 7 situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, because initial small things, when they 8 were iterated, that is repeated, brought us to a single point of no 9 return, a point from which on there was no control. Then the other theory is the QED by Bohr, Heisenberg, Schrodinger, Dirac, Planck, which 10 11 introduced the principle of indeterminability as an essential part of reality, then the laws of probability as a logical form of understanding, 12 and the principle of complementarity, which says no truly basic natural 13 14 phenomenon can be determined by the words of everyday speech.

15	Determination requires at least two mutually complementary notions.
16	Niels Bohr states as examples life, a quantum object, the physical
17	system, and the understanding of nature. And then they go on to say
18	there is no science without art, there is no beauty without ugliness,
19	there is no evil without good, and sunlight passing having passed
20	through a prism is a rainbow, whereas having passed through a lens burns.
21	Why is especially the principle of complementarity important for our
22	case? I will try to show so by introducing documents which have not been
23	tendered before to establish the total factual truth.
24	We know about 10 to 15.000 wars in human history, the number
25	depending on the definition of war. Since the Second World War, there
	Page 39470
1	have been over 500 wars. There have been over 200 military interventions
2	have been over 500 wars. There have been over 200 military interventions of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second
2	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second
2	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the
2 3 4	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the unfinished war between North and South Korea, China and Taiwan Or
2 3 4 5	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the unfinished war between North and South Korea, China and Taiwan Or Formosa, China and India or Pakistan, then there are the Tamil Tiger, the
2 3 4 5	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the unfinished war between North and South Korea, China and Taiwan Or Formosa, China and India Or Pakistan, then there are the Tamil Tiger, the Middle East, the Basques, Northern Ireland, Africa. I could go on
2 3 4 5 6	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the unfinished war between North and South Korea, China and Taiwan Or Formosa, China and India Or Pakistan, then there are the Tamil Tiger, the Middle East, the Basques, Northern Ireland, Africa. I could go on enumerating at infinitum. The number of military conflicts of greater or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of a great or a smaller scope of intensity of the USA after the Second World War. There is the unfinished war between Japan and Russia, the unfinished war between North and South Korea, China and Taiwan or Formosa, China and India or Pakistan, then there are the Tamil Tiger, the Middle East, the Basques, Northern Ireland, Africa. I could go on enumerating at infinitum. The number of military conflicts of greater or lesser intensity never falls below 25 to 30 at any given moment. In the

hunger every year. Communism killed millions of people, et cetera.

12

Twenty-five girls get pregnant due to rape every year in the USA. So

once they get pregnant, of course they are no longer girls but become

women.

And what about justice, judges and prosecutor agency since

Socrates was convicted 2300 years ago because he misled the youth, what

is there in the administration of justice that has been moral. The

trials in Rome, where slaves were considered lower in rank and value than

a thing, trials in the name of the church or the king, communist Nazi,

racial class trials in the 20th century. As late as 1962, America

banished racial segregation in schools, aided with the weapons of federal

troops.

Isn't it whole history of mankind just one joint criminal enterprise. Please don't misunderstand me. I'm not judging, or I'm not

Page 39471

preaching morals, but please don't speak about justice and the obscure concept of the international community with so much pathos. If I'm pronounced guilty of anything, I will answer to the victims because I respect them.

On the following pages, unusual as it may seem that I deal with these things, I even wrote a critique of the doctrine of the joint criminal enterprise. I studied the works of Professor Marijan Damaska, who retired recently, but until his retirement taught at Yale University in the USA, and at page 4, he mentions some things. I'll skip them over.

It's all here in writing. I don't wish to appear as thinking I'm the smartest guy around, but it's for the Judges to decide. But of course

everybody is free to study law and think about these issues, and I did
study ethics for 40 or 50 years, and so I also had to deal with the
relationship between law and morality.

So among other things, here it says that on the objective side, there must be a joint plan, design, or intent. It should be determined that the accused person committed an act, et cetera. We'll skip that.

After that, at page 5 he mentions the fogginess which accompanies a notion of a common intent. I'll read -- I'll just read out the following at page 6, how the international community behaved. It's from the book written by Florence Hartmann about the protected areas which, based on the decision of the permanent members of the UN

Security Council, were declared protected areas, where people had the right to survive, et cetera. It says here:

"Paris, London, and Washington failed in 1995 to undertake all

Page 39472

- 1 the necessary measures to prevent genocide which was step by step
 2 prepared in front of our eyes."
- As early as 1993, the intuitive international representatives

 4 called the tightening of the ring surrounding the besieged enclave a slow

 5 genocide or a gradual genocide.

Throughout the entire last offensive against Srebrenica from the 6th until the 11th of July, 1995, the major powers didn't stop claiming that the Serbian forces, in spite of their advances, have no intention of taking the enclave. Feigning surprise and without lifting a finger, they let Mladic enter the town on the 11th of July, 1995. Then I'm skipping a

bit. Jacques Chirac let this be known and tried to convince his partners to intervene.

On the 11th of July, the French president proposes to

Great Britain, the USA and Germany that they reclaim this enclave by

force. The next day, France addresses the Security Council and again

states that it is willing to put its forces at disposal for any military operation which will be judged as useful and feasible.

On the 13th of July, Chirac persists and calls Bill Clinton and tells him in Srebrenica they separated men, which are old enough to be able to carry arms, from the women, there's a danger of they're being slaughtered. The civilised nations must confront fascism and conduct a decisive and limited military operation, et cetera. Disinclined to engage American troops on Bosnian soil, Clinton refuses. Kofi Annan, still the commander of peacekeeping operations at the UN, assesses the French proposal as unrealistic and unfeasible, and we know what happened.

Page 39473

It goes on to say that Carla Del Ponte is aware of the joint
responsibility of international forces for the crime committed in
Srebrenica. She confirmed in her own words, saying:

"International forces knew that in Srebrenica a slaughter of massive proportions will take place. They were speaking about it and did nothing to prevent it."

And so on. Ms. Carla Del Ponte, in her book, says at page 9 of my text: One of the prosecutors of the Tribunal, a Canadian, well known in his circle for his wit and his anecdotes, had an aphorism that did a

good job capturing the difference between the Serbs and the Croats who

attempted to obstruct the work of the Tribunal. "The Serbs are

bastards," he used to say. In contrast, "The Croats are perfidious

bastards."

Through my attorney, I contacted dozens of relevant addresses, sending them this letter you have in front of you, claiming that

Del Ponte used the phrase "he used to say," which means to say that this was not a singular witty remark, but the habitual chauvinist and racist characterisation of all Croats as perfidious bastards. And, secondly,

Carla Del Ponte repeats the words of that prosecutor with no restrictions, which means that she completely agrees with such an opinion, which is in line with the formulation of that statement.

If I, Slobodan Praljak, had uttered such a statement, or in any form about any people or any group during the war in ex-Yugoslavia, I would have been sentenced to five years on account of that only.

Tab 19, quid pro quo or tutu quo, as said here in this Tribunal,

Page 39474

- the attack of the JNA on Croatian BiH, helped by the organised and armed formations of local Serbs, sent hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing from burning villages; concentration camps, the killing of civilians, destruction, rape, were all part of that aggression.
 - As in social relations, there is nothing but a law of causal relationship, that is, the law of action and reaction. When individuals or smaller organised groups outside of the control of the already weak government at all levels, the pain and despair makes them cross the

threshold of what is legally permissible, revenge occurs. This is true of both attacked peoples, the Muslims and Croats alike. It was like that in every war, or has been like that in every war, to a greater or lesser degree. With the passing of time and due to the mixed population, the war in BiH began, by the course of its own logic, to assume the characteristics of a civil war. The Muslims, pushed to the brink of extinction by Serbian conquest, expulsion and other acts, along with the international denial of the right to defence by the introduction of the embargo on the import of weapons, accepted the help of the fighters from the Islamic world, the Mujahedin. The Mujahedin introduced into that war chaotic elements of a religious war and substantially contributed to the idea of attacking the Croats.

It is understood that a commander at any level, including others who hold any kind of office in that chaos, cannot take decisions contrary to International Law of War. That is not disputable. What is disputable, however, is the thesis of the Prosecutor, and I fear the honourable Judges might reduce the entire system in a similar war, that

Page 39475

- 1 the impossibility of managing all the parts of that chaos is guilt. That
- 2 idea sprang in the heads of many who called themselves -- call themselves
- 3 intellectuals and humanists.

- 4 One of them says that in 1992 he came to Mostar to help, but when
- 5 he saw the chaos, he returned home. Most of that spurious
- 6 intellectualism and humanism in people with such a mindset is then
- 7 reflected in retelling these stories in lounges, stories about the people

8 who remained, and if there is something they don't like in the 9 phenomenology of war, they will put the blame on them. I personally 10 despise the role of war theatre audiences and observers, and irrespective of acts which must be sanctioned. Here is what I say about 98 percent of 11 the boys and girls I commanded: Glory be to those who decided to defend 12 the Thermopylae, which is a quotation from the Greek poet Kavafis. I 13 respect their death, their wounds, courage, their freezing in the 14 trenches, their poor clothes and boots, poor food, the despair that 15 16 filled them when they thought about what would happen to their parents if 17 they get killed, the poor armaments and very often unclear aim and point of this struggle, which had too many unprincipled and immoral conductors. 18 The unprincipled proposals of the international community in 19 20 wartime BiH bereaved those deaths from the only possible sense too often. 21 States are created by peoples, and not the other way around. 22 Finally, for the sake of truth, we should mention that even the 23

Finally, for the sake of truth, we should mention that even the International Law of War in some cases accepts the quid pro quo logic.

This is what I found in the literature to which I had access; namely, the book by Professor Gavro Perazic from Belgrade about the International Law

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

Page 39476

of War; both that book and other books which I read during the war about the International Law of War, some Swiss books or books of other origin translated; and they say that in certain cases, when the enemy violates International Humanitarian Law constantly, there is the right to retaliation. However, "retaliation" may be too harsh a word, because it points toward the biblical principal of an eye for an eye, so that

7 nowadays "reprisals" is the more common word nowadays, and the definition of "reprisals" is: Reprisals represent a breach of war law as a response to the breach of this law on the part of the enemy whose purpose is the cessation of this breach. 10

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

Honourable Judge Prandler, it was not my idea for a moment that tu quoque could be a form of law. I always spoke only about the following: that in society, it can't always be avoided that in a chaotic state and bearing in mind a causal response, the role of those who should prevent and uncover, et cetera, becomes exponentially more difficult as the wartime chaos grows worse, especially as this war went on for quite a time.

How much time have I left, Your Honours?

JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] The Trial Chamber's legal officer told me five minutes, so that you've used so far one hour and thirteen minutes. You must have 15 minutes left so we could get to 4.00. You've got the clock here in the courtroom here. Make sure you finish at 4.00.

24 THE ACCUSED PRALJAK: [Interpretation] Tab 20, war crime, crime in 25 war.

Page 39477

When, in the Croatia language, we transform the noun "war" into an adjective, we get an assembly consisting of a non-flexible adjective and a noun, "war crime." A non-inflexible adjective, "ratni," the term 4 is the essence of the concept of the noun "rat" or "war" in front of 5 which it is placed. Likewise, Croatian orthography, Croatian literature,

French wine, Swiss watches, in this manner a special meaning is given to a subset of orthography of wine and watches. Likewise, to any crime in a war, a special cognitive content is given. It is extracted from the individual and transferred and directed to the structural part of war, the political and military commanding set. I do not agree with this. Why would a crime in a war be different from a crime in peacetime? A war crime is a crime which stems from a foundation, in the words of Husserl, i.e., a political idea which is realised by war, by ways and means which include crime, a political idea that can be realised only by crime. is, for example, the idea of the Nazi German political thought. This is the idea of the Communist Stalinist in Poland and the killing of Polish forces in the Katyn forest, and many other similar examples. I will not here expound on the Serbian political thought which led to the aggression in Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, or indeed on whether what happened in that war confirms the war crime as founded. I will also not dwell on the Islamic declaration, nor will I explore whether goals contained in that documents can be realised without war and war crimes. One thing I do know beyond any reasonable doubt is that Croatia'S political and military structures in Croatia, and Croatian political and

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

military structures in Bosnia-Herzegovina, never had as their goal

Page 39478

- anywhere anything that could be realised only by one form or another of 1 2 war crime.
- 3 War itself favours an increasing in criminal acts by contrast to 4 a social state of peace for a number of reasons, too many in fact to be

listed here. I will dwell on some aspects of social psychology at a later stage, though.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

As Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina can contemplate with this aggression, how to create their states and change their political systems, they were partly occupied with their utility, economic and social structure in tatters, Bosnia-Herzegovina more so than Croatia. The number of problems and difficulties in such a situation is difficult to even imagine for those who have never experienced such a thing. That is why the crimes committed by the members of the Croatia people in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina are crimes beyond any doubt at all, but also it is beyond any doubt that these crimes are crimes in a war. They did not happen due to their foundation in an idea or a political desire, inclination, aspiration, by those who managed and commanded, but in spite of the foundation, desire, inclination, intention and action. Just as we do not use the phrase "Parisian crimes" for crimes that occur in Paris ${\bf Of}$ American crimes in relation to any criminal offences committed in the course of a year in America or generally civilian crimes in relation to everything that goes on in the civilised societies in peacetime, much in the same way I think it is necessary to distinguish the meanings of crimes committed in war before we go on to classify them as war crimes or, alternatively, crimes committed in a war.

Page 39479

On the contrary, taking into account the number of criminal offences, we could easily be attempted to accuse of joint criminal

3	enterprise the governments, police, ministers, and mayors of many Western
4	countries because they do succeed, in spite of all their resources at
5	their disposal, in reducing the number of such offences below a certain
6	not even very low limit, and the number of those they manage to bring to
7	face justice is not really satisfactory, either. In relation to certain
8	forms of serious crime, the figure falls under 15 percent of the total
9	number of incidents.
10	Just in order to save time, let's move on to tab 24. If there's
11	time left, I would like to return to 21. Now let us try to move on to
12	24, please.
13	Indictment. Since the year 1102, the Croats have always been
14	fighting four their statehood and survival against all the states which
15	besieged them, conquered them, and occupied their territory. Ever since
16	1102, all there was for the Croats was the fight for survival against the
17	Ottoman intrusion, against Venice and Italy, against Austria and Hungary,
18	against Serbia, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and the unitary communist Tito
19	creation. Likewise, in 1971, within the student movement and then within
20	the Communist League of Croatia, with a huge popular support, Croatia
21	tried to gain a greater political, cultural and economic autonomy and
22	decentralisation of the SFRY. In other words, it sought to reduce Serb
23	domination and obtain greater democratic and autonomous rights. The
24	counter blow was strong and merciless. Hundreds of people ended up in
25	jails. Thousands upon thousands were left without a job. Thousands of

- 1 others fled the country. The majority of the best Croatian intellectuals
- 2 ended up in jails, without work, or outside the country. Many of these
- 3 distinguished emigrants were killed abroad by Yugoslav Secret Police.
- 4 Let me just mention the killing of Bruno Busic in Paris. Vlado Gotovac,
- 5 a distinguished Croatian intellectual, poet and writer, was brought
- 6 before a judge as an indictment was read to him, verbal offence and
- 7 attempt to overthrow the socialist self-management order. Asked to enter
- 8 a plea, he answered, "The indictment is absurd. Therefore, it is
- 9 irrefutable." He sat five to six years together with the common
- 10 criminals.
- 11 When I entered a plea about the indictment against me, I said
- 12 that I understood it verbally; that is, I understood the words of the
- language in which I read it. Its logical, cognitive and legal essence,
- 14 however, escaped me. The indictment is absurd. When, during the trial,
- I read the books of Florence Hartmann, Carla Del Ponte, and I confirmed
- 16 all my suspicions about political games going on around and in the
- 17 Prosecution, and I understood what way of reasoning predominated there,
- 18 my skepticism became fully grounded. The virtual world of political
- 19 interests, stories, and repetition of the message about the good guys and
- 20 bad guys, partiality instead of wholeness, all of that demolished the
- 21 factual truth.
- Hagel was once told by some people that some facts did not agree
- with his philosophical postulates. He answered coldly, So much worse for
- the facts.
- Number 24, "Statement." Never, nowhere, not in a single meeting,

1	conference or rally, in Croatia or Bosnia-Herzegovina during the war,
2	between 1991 and 1995, did I hear anyone plan, incite, tolerate cover up,
3	or in any other way foster or advocate any misdeed or any act punishable
4	by any positive law, nor indeed did I do this myself. As for members of
5	my own people, on various occasions I would swear and yell over and above
6	any civilised norm of behaviour. Sometimes I would even hit a person. I
7	falsely signed my signed documents as a general, although I was never
8	a general of the HVO. I exercised command over certain operations,
9	although I did not have formal authority to do that. I made threats. I
10	threatened Croats, of course, with acts and powers that had no legal
11	foundation, and the like. Obviously, I am prepared to answer any
12	questions regarding that during the cross-examination. I'll explain what
13	motives led me to do that and what the meaning of all these actions was.
14	We were brought up to not speak about ourselves, particularly not
15	speak favorably and positively about ourselves. It is not a polite thing
16	to do and, therefore, must not be done. In numerous interviews and
17	conversations during and after the war, I never said a single word about
18	the good that I did or, indeed, about my behaviour in the war. Then lies
19	started mounting, false constructions, false witnesses and false truths.
20	Eventually, I was brought to face a court as a criminal. I have had
21	enough now. I now switch back to first person singular free from any
22	consideration visibly the so-called civic politeness and that I claim
23	that there exists the Archimedes-Praljak law which says: Praljak,
24	immersed into war, will reduce the quantity of evil in that war by the

unit of one Praljak. This unit consists of energy, daily quantity of

Page 39482

- 1 hours in which this energy is active. As far as I was concerned, this
- 2 amounted to about 20 hours per day; C, passion or the speed of burning
- 3 this energy; D, courage; E, knowledge; F, intelligence quotient. Of
- 4 course, all of these belong to Slobodan Praljak.
- 5 As far as some of the above elements are concerned, some people
- 6 may have stronger qualities than me, such as knowledge and intelligence,
- 7 but those are few and far between, and the differences cannot be that
- 8 significant. This might be qualified as arrogance. Nevertheless, in
- 9 relation to each and every one of these claims, I am prepared to be
- 10 examined by a psychologist. They can study my IQ, and they can determine
- 11 the extent of my knowledge.
- 12 One thing I do not admit is that anyone at the time had the
- qualities which, added up, would give more -- would yield more than one
- 14 Praljak, the unit defined by the Archimedes-Praljak law. To achieve more
- in those times and in that position, one should have had the attributes
- of a god.

25

- 17 My time is up. I regret the fact that I have not been able to
- 18 complete this, but I will try to do my best to finish this while I'm
- 19 being examined by Mr. Kovacic.
- 20 I thank the Judges for lending me their ears. I thank the OTP
- 21 for listening to my statement.
- Thank you.
- 23 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Very well. It's time for a

- 24 break. We will now break for 20 minutes. We'll resume after the break.
- 25 Mr. Praljak will go to the witness box, and he will answer questions put

- 1 to him by Mr. Kovacic after having taken the solemn declaration, of
- 2 course.
- 3 We'll resume in 20 minutes.
- 4 --- Recess taken at 4.01 p.m.
- 5 --- On resuming at 4.25 p.m.
- 6 [The witness takes the stand]
- 7 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Let's proceed with the solemn
- 8 declaration.
- 9 General Praljak, could you please stand up. Could you please
- 10 tell us, for the transcript, your name, surname, and date of birth.
- 11 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] My name is Slobodan Praljak, born
- on the 2nd of January, 1945, in Capljina.
- JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] What was your last occupation?
- 14 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] The last thing that I'm dealing
- 15 with is this trial here. Previously, I retired after a long career. I
- 16 have done a number of different things throughout my career, so ...
- 17 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Very well. One last question
- 18 before you read the text. Have you already testified in this Tribunal?
- 19 If so, could you please tell us in which case?
- THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Yes, Your Honours, I testified in
- 21 the Naletilic-Martinovic trial. I appeared there as a Defence witness.
- JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Very well.

23 Mr. Usher, could you please give the text of the solemn 24 declaration to Mr. Praljak. 25 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] I solemnly declare that I will Page 39484 1 speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. WITNESS: SLOBODAN PRALJAK 2 3 [The witness answered through interpreter] 4 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you. You may sit down. 5 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Thank you. JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Mr. Praljak, you know exactly 6 7 how things will proceed. For three years, you've been attending this 8 trial. You will first answer questions put to you by Mr. Kovacic. He 9 will show you some documents, and you will give us your opinion on these 10 11 documents, according to the questions put to you. After that, the other 12 counsels will put questions to you during their own cross-examinations, 13 but this is a few weeks from now because you are going to testify for 14 quite some time. The Judges on the Bench can ask questions, of course, 15 but I told you this morning when I would take the floor, and of course my 16 fellow Judges can take the floor if they feel a need to. After that, it 17 will be up to the Prosecution to ask questions in the framework of their 18 own cross-examination. 19 Let me tell you that during the first phase, Mr. Kovacic, the 20 other counsels, and the Judges, during that stage everything should run 21 smoothly; but you know that the Prosecutor, according to the Statute, is

22	there to lead evidence; so maybe from time to time the questioning will
23	be a bit difficult for you; but please stay cool, please listen to the
24	questions put to you by the Prosecution and answer them. And please
25	refrain from entering into controversies with the Prosecutor. He's only

- 1 here to do his job.
- 2 I've read with interest the different cross-examinations that
- 3 were led during -- when you actually testified, and everything ran very
- 4 smoothly, so I'm sure here everything will run smoothly also. So I trust
- 5 you on this account.
- I say this to all witnesses, and I'm saying this to you also.
- 7 Try to be very concise and specific in your answers. This is a very
- 8 important moment for you. In the Rules, the accused can testify after
- 9 taking the oath, and the Judges can give probative value to what is
- 10 actually said. So this is a very important moment for you, and try and
- 11 be as specific as possible, and very specific.
- 12 This being said, I will now give the floor to Mr. Kovacic so he
- can put questions to you for his examination-in-chief, and please answer
- 14 all the questions put to him [as interpreted] by your lead counsel.
- Mr. Kovacic, you have the floor.
- 16 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] Thank you, Your Honour.
- 17 Good afternoon to all.
- If I may, there is a technical issue to deal with before I begin.
- 19 Today, we submitted the IC list with a delay of about 17 minutes. It was
- 20 supposed to be submitted, that is the IC list, in relation to the last

witness, Drago Juric. We were 17 minutes late, and it was a technical
hitch-up that caused this delay. Therefore, I would like to have the
Chamber's permission to get the list introduced in relation to
Witness Juric. There was a technical delay - Dragan Juric - and we were
an additional 15 minutes late.

- JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Let me consult with my fellow
 Judges.
- 3 [Trial Chamber confers]
- JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] The Trial Chamber deliberated

 and notes that you have handed the IC list, with 1.020 seconds -- it was

 1.020 seconds late, but still we accept this filing, and we're asking the

 Registrar to please give us a number for it.
- 8 THE REGISTRAR: Your Honour, the list submitted by 3D for
 9 documents -- their documents tendered through Witness Dragan Juric shall
 10 be given Exhibit IC1001. Thank you, Your Honours.
- 11 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Thank you, Registrar.
- 12 Mr. Kovacic.
- 13 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] Thank you, Your Honour.
- 14 There is another observation that I wish to make before I begin.
- 15 You said that I would be doing the examination. In fact, I will be doing
- 16 part of the examination, and part of the examination will be taken by
- Ms. Pinter, my co-counsel. We tried to carve up the work in order to be
- 18 as effective as possible.
- 19 Secondly, I would like to say something about the witness, the

- person now appearing as witness, and bearing in mind the procedure that

 has applied throughout in this courtroom. We would like to invite the
- 22 Chamber to interrupt the examination with no hesitation whatsoever at any
- point in time should there be any questions that you wish to ask,
- 24 anything at all of interest, anything that you believe needs specifying,
- or for any other reason whatsoever. I believe General Praljak is willing

- 1 to respond to any such situation that may occur, and we should find it
- 2 easy enough to adapt and take everything in our stride. I don't think it
- 3 will cause any major disruptions to our examination plan.
- 4 The same thing, of course, applies to the cross-examination, but
- 5 that is too distant now and we shall cross that bridge when we come to
- 6 it.
- 7 With your leave, Your Honours, I would like to commence.
- 8 Examination by Mr. Kovacic:
- 9 Q. [Interpretation] Good afternoon, Mr. Praljak.
- 10 A. Good afternoon.
- 11 Q. You've mentioned all these things, but I would like to ask you,
- 12 nevertheless, your date of birth, the 2nd of January, 1945. You stated
- 13 that for the transcript. Why am I saying that? Because the indictment
- does not state that. We filed something in writing to that effect, but
- that was never included in the indictment. So the 2nd of January, 1945;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Place of birth, Capljina; right?

- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. General Praljak, given the fact that you were born in Bosnia and
- 21 Herzegovina, specifically in Capljina, and that you spent a large portion
- of your life and most of your life in Croatia, which citizenship do you
- 23 hold?
- A. I am a citizen of Croatia or, rather, I'm a citizen of both
- 25 states.

- 1 Q. Dual citizenship, then?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Is that perfectly in keeping with the laws of both these
- 4 countries?
- 5 A. I don't know, Mr. Kovacic. But if citizenship was granted, those
- 6 making the call probably knew what the law said on the matter.
- 7 Q. Very well. Thank you very much.
- 8 The transcript does not record this with any degree of clarity,
- 9 but it is clear that we're talking about two countries, the following two
- countries: Croatia, on the one hand, and Bosnia-Herzegovina on the
- other. I think the question that followed made this abundantly clear.
- 12 General, your subjective view on this objective fact, the
- existence of dual citizenship, in a formal sense, why do you feel or see
- 14 yourself as a citizen of both these countries?
- 15 A. Because I spent time living in both these countries and working
- in both these countries. I was born in one of them. I went to school

17	there until I turned 18 or, rather, 17 and a half was how old I
18	actually was when I left. My parents continued to live there, as was my
19	sister, her husband, her two children, in Sarajevo, the parents in
20	Mostar. Even when I was in Zagreb already, I still had Mostar for a long
21	time stated as my formal place of residence. I was in Zagreb on a
22	temporary basis, and that situation continued for a long time.
23	We all have our native areas, formally speaking, but human beings
24	tend to behave as plants when it comes to their native surroundings,
25	unlike other animals. How I perceive myself is as a person from
	Page 39489
1	${\tt Herzegovina},$ that's where I feel I belong, is the joy that I feel when I
2	go there; it's this feeling of being pleased to see the native stones of
3	my native area. Obviously, I have a great time whenever I go to Paris, \boldsymbol{I}
4	like visiting museums and all that, but this is how I feel about this
5	subject.
6	I lived and worked in Croatia, but then there is Bosnia and
7	Herzegovina too. These two countries, I am a citizen of both these
8	countries, which is not the most unusual thing that, well, one might come
9	across, surely.
10	Q. General, sir, what was the reason that as early as 1992, in those
11	difficult times, you decided to leave and go to Bosnia and Herzegovina?
12	JUDGE TRECHSEL: Mr. Kovacic, you have so kindly invited us to
13	ask questions to clarify.
14	Mr. Praljak, do you have two passports?

15 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Yes, yes. 16 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Thank you. 17 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] No, no, Your Honour. I have documents from both countries, but I don't have the BH passport. I never 18 19 applied for it, the simple reason being the restrictions in travel for 20 holders of that passport are far greater than those applying to holders 21 of Croatian passports. That is why I don't have both, but I have all the 22 on the personal documents, such as the ID card and all the rest. JUDGE TRECHSEL: [No interpretation] 23 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] 24 Q. Perhaps it would be a good idea for you to answer the question I 25 Page 39490 asked you previously. What was your motive? Why did you go to 1 2 Bosnia-Herzegovina in 1992, as early as that; your own personal, 3 subjective motives? It was with a very high degree of certainty and precision, or to 4 5 the extent that it's possible in the setting of a social science, or any social science which always, by nature, is probabilistic, that I knew 6 7 what the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina would be like, what sort of war would be waged. 8 9 If the Chamber so wishes, or anyone else, for that matter, I can 10 bring a whole lot of people here who can tell you that I had predicted the war in Yugoslavia 15 years before it even began. 11 12 My interest in the social sciences and my professional inclinations, the amount of information I had available to me, was 13

telling me one thing. The Yugoslav crisis could not be resolved in a peaceful way. The only way for it to be resolved in a peaceful way was for someone from abroad to intervene in this crisis, what we refer to as the international community or the great powers. Everything that, in a political and social sense in Yugoslavia, kept growing, kept accumulating, ever since the 1970s; the movement that we refer to as the Croatian spring, pointed to one thing. The Serbian thought in a social sense was developing in one direction. They would never be willing to allow for a peaceful disintegration of Yugoslavia by allowing the republics who, under the 1974 Constitution, had state-like powers, and this in turn was something that had been implanted in the first Constitution in Jajce for Yugoslavia back during the war, and then

Page 39491

particularly it was the power of the ZAVNOH, Croatia's partisan movement,

at its meeting in Toposko, and it was then that Croatia was defined as a

state and, as such, would form part of the Federative People's Republic

of Yugoslavia.

Needless to say, I could go on enumerating people who know about that, well-respected intellectuals and writers. I harped on and on about this for years, knowing what would happen. I also knew, when I was involved in the war in Croatia in Sunja, I told Pesa and a lot of other witnesses about this as well. Besides, I was well familiar with the plans being hatched by the JNA. Those plans, as we are about to see, based on books produced by JNA generals, envisaged, as one of their most

- 12 important objectives, to advance towards the sea through the Neretva
- 13 River valley from Kupres, the Kupres Plateau, having taken the Kupres
- 14 Plateau and Livno.
- 15 As someone who clearly and unequivocally made himself available
- when Croatia was created as a state and as someone who is willing to
- 17 contribute to the resistance against the aggressor, my departure for
- 18 Herzegovina was nothing if not a logical conclusion of my moral views,
- 19 above all.
- 20 Q. Thank you very much. If I may just go back to some details. In
- 21 the indictment, your nickname is stated as well. Can you please tell the
- 22 Court if you have a nickname and what that nickname would be?
- 23 A. I've had quite a number of nicknames throughout my life,
- Zeleni -- when I went to school in Mostar, they called me "Zeleni," which
- 25 means the green one. I used to wear a green shirt, which is why they

- 1 called me "Green" or "Zeleni." At university, they called me "George"
- for a while. Back at Sunja, they called me "Hemingway." In Siroki
- 3 Brijeg, because I have a serious injury to my right leg and therefore I
- 4 limped, therefore they called me "Limpy Sljakota." And then they called
- 5 me "The Beard," "Brada," during the war. This is a perfectly common
- 6 nickname for someone who supports a beard.
- 7 Q. What about this last name, "Brada" or "The Beard," is that a
- 8 much-used nickname? What about your close associates and friends, do
- 9 they call you "Brada"?
- 10 A. No.

- 11 Q. Is that therefore something, a nickname that one only comes
- 12 across very seldom?
- 13 A. I don't really know. The nickname may have been used every now
- 14 and again. It wasn't one that I liked or accepted, for that matter, but
- people can do what they like. I didn't really put up a fight when they
- 16 called me that. They called me "Caca," "Sefer," "Stari," simply because
- 17 I was older than most of the lads there; therefore they called me
- "Stari," which means "Oldie."
- 19 Q. General, the Trial Chamber should maybe hear something about your
- 20 education, where it started, where it finished, about your degrees, what
- 21 you did as a student, and then we will move on to what you did after you
- 22 graduated. Maybe you can start with your education, for everybody's
- 23 benefit.
- 24 A. If I provided thorough information, it would take too long. I
- 25 completed the first four years of elementary education in Rama and

- 1 Prozor, where my father was a civil servant in the Communist Yugoslavia.
- $\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,\,$ He had been a partisan, both him and my mother, and then he went on
- 3 working in the State Security Services. We moved a lot, so the first
- 4 four years I completed in Rama, and then the next six years in
- 5 Siroki Brijeg. That was the time when I acquired my first friends, when
- 6 I forged my first friendships, and when I found my footing in a town
- 7 where I lived. I went to school with Gojko Susak, who would then go on
- 8 to become a minister in the Republic of Croatia, a defence minister, and
- 9 for three or four years we shared the same bench. We were very good

10 friends, and I believe that they separated us because we were 11 mischievous. They moved me forward to the front bench. 12 After that, I completed two years of grammar school in Mostar. After that, I went to Zagreb, like a lot of students then because there 13 14 was no higher education in Mostar at the time, and all of my friends from Siroki Brijeg went to university in Zagreb. I enrolled at the School of 15 16 Electrical Engineering, and I graduated from that school with a GP -grade point average of 4, and my graduate thesis was about the correction 17 18 of chromatic image in the main of an electrical signal, which belongs in 19 the area of telecommunications, and especially television work. JUDGE TRECHSEL: Mr. Praljak, it would be helpful if you would 20 tell us 4 out of how much is for the maximum, or is 5 the maximum, or 1, 21 or 6? 22 23 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Well, that's why I'm saying that my 24 life has been rather rich and complicated. Your Honour Judge Trechsel, the study of electrical engineering lasts eight semesters, and the ninth 25 Page 39494 semester is graduate semester. It took me three years to complete 1 2 three years to complete three -- the first -- the third and the fourth 3 year, and then one to complete the second year. In the second year of my 4 studies, for very clear reasons --5 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Excuse me, please. I seem to have badly 6 expressed myself. The question --7 MR. KOVACIC: Your Honour, it wasn't your fault, it was the 8 translation.

9 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Anyway, I'm not -- the important thing is I'm 10 not blaming Mr. Praljak. 11 The only question was: You said "Grade 4." Your notes, your 12 result, was number 4. Now, number 4 only has a content if one knows what the scale was, 1 to 100, or 1 to 10, or 1 to 5. 13 1 to 5, you show with a show of hands. Thank you. 14 15 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] The misunderstanding was due to 16 interpretation. THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Maximum, excellent, was 5. My 17 graduate thesis was graded with grade 5 and my grade point average was 4. 18 In 1966, I enrolled in the School of Philosophy, because in the 19 second year of my electrical engineering studies, I realised that I 20 didn't want to be an electrical engineer all my life, and for many other 21 22 reasons I had fallen apart. If you ask me, you Judges or somebody else, 23 why that happened, I can say that my education and knowledge that I picked up in my parents' home was diametrically contrary to what I later 24 on learned in Zagreb. The objective reality and the perception of 25 Page 39495 Communism that I received in my parents' home was completely contrary to 1 2 everything that I encountered later on in my life. There were some other 3 reasons, but for those reasons I had fallen apart. It lasted for two years, and for the two years I did not go to lectures. And then I 4 5 started studying again in 1966, when I enrolled in the School of

Philosophy, studying philosophy and sociology; and that was a

precondition for enrolling in the Academy of Theatre Studies that I

6

7

8 wanted to study. The necessary precondition was for one to have

9 completed four years of studying at the School of Philosophy in Zagreb,

10 and only then could you become a student at the Academy.

In 1968, when I was in the second or the third year of the School of Philosophy, there was a reform of education and the curriculum of the Academy was from then on lasting four years. And as of that year, 1968, over 125 students who applied for three places at the Academy, I was one who had -- who was admitted.

In the meantime, I worked, I drank a lot of the time, I went to sweden to work there for three or four months, I washed dishes, and I worked in the Akla [phoen] company in the street that the interpreter cannot repeat the name of. So in any case, my life was a typical student life. I worked, I worked hard, and I was rather confused at the time.

I graduated from the School of Electrical Engineering at the beginning of 1970. I graduated from the School of Philosophy in 1971, and then I graduated from the film Academy in 1972 with a grade of 5. My graduate thesis at the School of Philosophy was the possibility of establishing ethics within the philosophy of Karl Marx. That was the

Page 39496

essential question as to whether a system that perceived history only as a necessary evil for the development of production forces, would it be possible to establish any ethnic issue in such a system, and such issues obviously implied the issue of choice. And the issues of the possible establishment of morality and the philosophical branch deals in morality,

i.e., ethics, is something I've been interested in ever since with more or less success. However, this would take me too far.

Upon the graduation from the School of Electrical Engineering, I had to find employment, so first I started teaching at a technical school, and I was the head of the laboratory for electronics there, and that's how I earned a living.

In 1972, upon graduating from the Film Academy, I became a film director. I resigned from that school, and then I became a professional artist without permanent employment. I was a freelance film director. I directed some 20 theatre plays. I also directed two television films, one television series, one feature movie that was presented at several film festivals, one of them being in Mannheim, where I was invited to present my film.

Towards the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s, when the crisis in Yugoslavia was rampant and there was no money to be had, I again started working at a school for adult education. The education at that school lasted for four semesters, and it was for adults who were in permanent employment but still wanted to continue their education. I was teaching three subjects, the basics of electrotechnics, the theory of electrotechnics, and the theory of automatic regulation, and I also

- 1 taught a sociology subject with was the theory of communication.
- Of the theatre plays that you might be familiar with that deal
 with social issues, I directed Brecht's play, "A Man is a Man," which

concerns the transformation of a peasant into a soldier. I also directed a play by Jean-Paul Romber [phoen], "The Dreyfus Affair." The text of that drama was rewarded as the best drama text in Europe that year, and I had seen it in Komaspiel [phoen] and Munich before that with Ronald Pekni [phoen] in the main role, a very brilliant actor. I also adapted two novels for theatre. One was "The Clockwork Orange," which served the English director, a greater English director, to direct the movie. I'm trying to -- Kubrick, Stanley Kubrick. However, Stanley Kubrick put a ban on showing that movie in the States with the reign of Communism. However, the author of the novel, Anthony Burgess, gave me the copyright, and I used that to make my play in Zagreb.

I also directed a play by somebody who escaped Russia in the 1930s, and in that play he brilliantly described the functioning of the Communist system, the expulsions, and the acceptance of people to accuse their closest — their dearest friends of the gravest of crimes without any physical force because they believed that that would contribute to the improving of the world by way of the Communist idea.

After that, political preparations started in Croatia. I got involved in the political life, fully aware of what lie ahead of us and fully aware of the fact that my moral obligation was to join all that, or the truth be told, I had never had any political ambitions before that, nor did I think that in times like that politics should be discussed in

- the same way one discusses politics in organised societies.
- I call these pre-political times, because political times are the

- 3 times when governments are dealing with agriculture, taxes, and things
- 4 like that. When a state is created, this is not politics. It's a moral
- 5 obligation of every human being. These were the times that the Croatian
- 6 people had gambled several times before that, and according to all of our
- 7 analyses that was one of our last chances, if not the last chances, for
- 8 Croatians, as a people, to gain their state in which everybody would be
- 9 feeling as any other citizens of the civilised part of the world.
- 10 Q. Thank you very much. I would not dwell upon your
- 11 curriculum vitae too long, although there is a lot there that could be
- discussed. However, I would like to use the time to say a few things
- 13 about some general topics.
- 14 First of all, your time for the opening statement was cut short,
- and you wanted to say some other things. That's why I would like to use
- 16 my time to give you the floor and say something about the topics that are
- 17 close to your heart, the topics that you witnessed, and the topics that
- 18 you know a lot about.

1

- 19 First of all, let me ask you about the drinking water in Mostar
- in 1992 and 1993, and especially after the 30th of June, 1993. The
- 21 question that I'm putting to you directly arises from the indictment,
- 22 because there is a claim in the indictment that the HVO used drinking
- 23 water, i.e., the supply of drinking water for the east of Mostar, as a
- 24 means of coercion or inhuman coercion against Mostar. Could you please
- 25 say something about that? We've already heard a lot about that in this

Page 39499

courtroom, but I believe that you're in a position to fill in some gaps.

2 A. I asked to complete my former answer. While I was studying, I

3 worked as a waiter in Germany for five summers in a row. I took all of

4 my exams very early in June, and then I would go to Schwiesel, close to

5 Swiss and French border in Germany, and I would work there as a waiter,

and that's how I was able to finance my studies. I would earn quite a

lot of money. And after that, I got an official certificate from that

hotel, and that certificate entitles me to the position of a waiter; not

a bad one, I believe.

And now on to the question. The Prosecutor says that from 30th of June, 1993, there was no drinking water in the mains and accuses the HVO for that. Who was it, in 1992, who damaged the source of Radoje in Mostar and Studenac in Rastani? The sources that served to supply the city of Mostar with drinking water. Who controlled the source in Rastani and up to when? It was the BiH Army until the 24th of August, 1993. Who was it who destroyed bridges in Mostar? Who destroyed the pipes in Mostar that connected the sources of drinking water on the right bank of the Neretva with the eastern part of the city, who and where and how they did it, how they damaged the water supply network, how old that network was, and what was the technical condition of the water supply network?

All these are things that the Prosecutor doesn't mention at all.

What was the loss of water? Because of the poor state of repair of all
the pipes before the artillery attacks of the JNA on Mostar in 1992.

What was the quantity of water in those two sources in the summer, and
especially in the very hot summer of 1993? What was the pressure of the

- water in all those pipes, and why there had to be pumps to pump waters up to the highest floors of the buildings? Who and when and to what purpose took a generator pump that should have pumped water to the high -- higher levels of buildings on the eastern side of Mostar? Why is it that during the time between June 1992, when the railroad bridge was destroyed and the northern entrance of Mostar, and thus the main pipe for the supply of water to Mostar from the source in Rastani was interrupted, and August 1993, why that pipe was not replaced via a dam that was not far from there?
 - How come that the authorities in East Mostar, after the attack of the BiH Army on the 9th of May, 1993, and the cease-fire that was agreed after that, did not ask to inspect the main pipes on the boulevard and the main valves there? Why didn't they amend the pipes across the Old Bridge? After the attack of the BiH Army and the treason of the HVO on the part of the Muslim members of the HVO on the 30th of June, 1993, why didn't the authorities in East Mostar engage the UNPROFOR and present to them the problem of water, like they did the problem of the wounded, and the latter was then resolved? How come they did not ask for the procurement of a dozen of pumps? With the help of fire-fighting hoses and pipes, they would have been able to bring water to the sufficient number of places. I'm talking about the water from the River Neretva, which was good enough to drink at the time.
 - Mr. Kovacic, the Prosecutor does --

24 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Excuse me. Mr. Praljak, I cannot help noticing

that for about two pages of transcript now, you have been asking one

Page 39501

1 question after another, all sentences which end with a question mark.

2 Actually, I thought you want to deposit here as a witness, and the

3 witness doesn't ask questions. The witness gives answers. He says what

he has actually seen or heard or witnessed. So I wonder whether it would

not be preferable and more germane to the phase of the proceedings if,

instead of this way of putting questions, you would actually behave like

a witness and speak like a witness.

THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour Judge Trechsel, there are questions which are simply answers. I could answer all of my questions by just saying that was that. These are grammatical questions, but not the questions of logic. I am simply saying that all of my questions are suggesting the answer, and the answer is this: They did not ask for the procurement of some 10 pumps. They did not ask for the problem of water to be resolved in the same way as the problem of the wounded. They did not repair the main. They did not build a water work across the dam. These are not questions in the sense I could put be putting them to somebody else. These are claims shaped as questions.

All of these questions are actually claims, assertions. What I'm saying is that the Prosecutor should have asked the same questions. They should have asked the question how the water supplies filled were once it's empty, what is the technical procedure, what is the health procedure. We should have been provided an answer to the question as to who from the HVO and when issued the decision for the eastern part of

Mostar to be cut off from the water supply. Who was it who implemented

25 the decision, how this was done in technical terms. None of that were we

Page 39502

1 able to hear from anybody. We only heard that the HVO was to blame,

2 either the military part or the civilian part, or the two together. And

if we don't manage to prove our innocence, that would be the fact.

We have never been faced with facts denying things. The Defence counsel and myself were drawing a map and they were saying they had a source in Rastani, they could talk to UNPROFOR, they had a possibility to build a water main, to ask for financial aid, like they did for the supply of electricity, the telephone lines, and so on and so forth. I have used questions here to say one thing, a claim: East Mostar does not have water, the HVO is to blame, and that claim caused hours upon hours of trying to prove some technical details, who, where, what, who remained the pump from the water supply to take it to the war hospital, which of course was important and was a valid thing to do. However, it remains unclear. Why did they not ask for some ten pumps to be able to pump the

MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] If I understood your additional answer well -- Mr. Praljak, but I am not going to use the question form any more. I am going to transform them into assertions or in direct speech, if you so wish.

water from the Neretva River by using simple firefighters' hoses?

JUDGE TRECHSEL: Let me make it clear that the kind of answers that a witness is expected to give are answers that can be true or untrue. You bring forward allegations, arguments, accusations, which do

- 23 not quite respond to this. I just want to assist you to use your time in
- 24 the most effective possible way according to the rules of the procedure.
- Thank you.

- 1 Mr. Kovacic, please continue.
- 2 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] I believe that we will resolve one thing, that
- 3 is partly due to the interpretation and partly to an incomplete sentence.
- In his answer, General Praljak asked rhetorical questions that
- 5 contain assertions in themselves. This is what he was trying to tell us.
- 6 Partly, the answer was lost in translation, due to a misunderstanding.
- 7 However, I'm going to resolve the dilemma with just one question.
- 8 Q. General, we heard your evaluation of the whole problem and all
- 9 the possible problems that may have originated from that, and from that
- 10 somebody might have drawn erroneous conclusions. Let me just ask you one
- thing. Did the HVO intentionally, or in any active way, cut off East
- 12 Mostar from water supply?
- 13 A. No.
- Q. Well, that's the case, yes. Thank you very much.
- 15 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] One moment. General, let me
- 16 stray from what I promised to do earlier this afternoon. I have a
- 17 question on your curriculum vitae; nothing to do with the merits of the
- indictment, as such.
- 19 Earlier on, you told us that you studied and then you studied
- 20 electrical engineering, and then you became an artist, and as such,
- 21 that's the thing that struck me, you said that you directed several

plays. You mention a "A Man is a Man" by Bertolt Brecht. As you know, this play was written in 1925, but rewritten in 1938. It is the story of a man who changed his life, is going to forget his wife, and then is going to become a soldier in the British Army. Under special

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

Page 39504

circumstances, because there's a looting part in it, one does not want to give himself up. And then Galigay [phoen], who is the central character in the play, joins this rifle infantry unit. He changes his life. The question is whether he's going to become a wise man or a monster. When you decided to put this play on stage, did it prompt you to join the army? Did you draw a lesson from that play or not? THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour, you were able to identify my basic interest. This is exactly how I directed that play. An English unit lost a soldier someplace, and they -- well, that can't be, and then in a very short time they turn a simple fisherman into a soldier, and that unit later on destroys everything, et cetera. I am not a soldier, in the usual sense. I was a discharged from the Yugoslav Army as unable to serve. I had problems with my leg and other problems. I underwent several operations because of many accidents that happened to me. I fell a number of times, et cetera. But certainly war is one of the most severe shapes human society takes, and many interpretations by many sociologists reject that as something a humanist mustn't deal with, something vulgar. People are killed, and that isn't anything that we should deal with, that isn't our problem. It escapes sociological

analysis, because sociology only can look at things until a war and after

war. War is a point of singularity where explosions are possible, and things that happen like in the big bang, things cannot be forecast.

So at the individual level, that's something that some sociologists deal with and describe it as an incident where a personality is completely decompensated, and two things are very specially important

Page 39505

1 here. The Nobel Prize winner, Konrad Lorenz, who

participated in the First World War and studied that, says that there are too variables; the moral firmness of a man and the duration of temptation are two very different things, two very different notions, and therefore what happens often is that people who initially we think that they have a very firm moral integrity, at a certain moment simply break up, fall apart, and other people, who didn't stand out by the force of their moral conviction, live through a war and, at the most difficult moments, they live up to the situation. Well, he goes into the detail and describes how moral decomposition takes place, et cetera.

So Brecht's interpretation is something that I read about this war. I read a lot about the Second World War, about the landing. I was interested in why the French military that had three and a half million armed men and had prepared for defence for a long time could have been defeated by much smaller units, what the command system was like, the command-and -control structure, communications, et cetera; and that directed me to two great researchers of war from whom the sociology -- not only the sociology of war started, and that was from Von Scharnhorst and Klauzevic; and the Napoleonic war, the lines made up of Prussia,

Austria, England, and Spain were losing their first dozen or so battles
to Napoleon, and so these two theoreticians asked the questions: How
come that these structured armies by functioning states can possibly lose
a war. They had it is possible to lose a battle because of an
incompetent commander, but losing battle after battle is something else.

A France that had been out of a revolution, that was at the peak Page 39506

of its strength, but had a relatively untrained military staff, although Napoleon produced generals and field marshals at a more rapid pace than we did in the Croatian Army or the HVO, we had no choice but proceed that way. And if we look at the Battle of Borodin against Kutuzov, both sides lost a total of about 100 generals. That was a time when generals also got killed, and still Napoleon was able to continue the war.

And war is a -- accompanies all of human history. At schools and at universities, nobody has studied, except sporadically, how this phenomenon comes about and why we abound in war the way we do.

When the war -- or, rather, since the war started in Bosnia-Herzegovina, according to the information that we have, over ten million people got killed all over the world, including Rwanda, et cetera.

I also studied Iwo Jima and Okinawa and the dropping of the nuclear bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the ethical problem of bombing Dresden and Nuremburg and Hamburg; and I read the transcripts from the Nuremberg trials. I had a huge amount of energy. I read much more than I do now, and most of what I read, I remembered.

18 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Let me stop you here. You have 19 provided an explanation. Of course, it could be much longer, but you 20 have answered my question. 21 Please proceed, Mr. Kovacic. 22 JUDGE MINDUA: [Interpretation] Just one remark, please. I'm not really speaking to Mr. Praljak, but to Mr. Kovacic. 23 24 Mr. Kovacic, you asked the witness to speak briefly about his 25 school background and professional background, as well as university Page 39507 background, of course. He's here testifying. You did not ask him about 1 2 his military background because you wanted him to speak about the water 3 problems. There's something missing, because rightly there was a link between the play that was mentioned and the very life of the witness. 4 5 But have you planned to ask him about his military background so that we 6 may learn a little bit more about his personality? 7 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] Thank you, Your Honour, for 8 pointing this out. I just wanted to go through the CV briefly and then touch upon some issues, and then return to the CV. But given your 9 10 intervention and given the fact that there is a natural sequence here, 11 perhaps we should stick to the CV, all the more so that as General Praljak, by his previous statement, has actually returned to 12 13 that. 14 So, General, you said that you went to Bosnia-Herzegovina on your Q. own accord because it was your wish. Bearing in mind the indictment, the 15 16 points of the indictment, and let us now stick to 1992, and please

- mention the times and functions that you had there, as you went there as a volunteer.
- 19 A. Okay, let us finish this.

Then toward the end of 1988, many people in Croatia were aware that some sort of disaster was nearing, and those who were in opposition to the system started to meet and an underground political life sprang into being. In groups of five to ten people, we started preparing for what was to come. I was involved, and in February 1990 I was at the constituting assembly of the HDZ, when a declaration was to be adopted

- and when a course of action was to be determined. Those were very lively
 meetings, but we'll hear more about that.
 - In the spring of 1992, I gave up all political office that I had and I was the general secretary of a major political party, and I went to Sunja as a soldier, as a private. I had my boots, and I was ready to fight in the war. Let me be very clear about it. I would have fought and I wouldn't have surrendered whether Croatia had organised itself or not, I wouldn't have run. So in Sunja, after seven days I became a commander, and I was there until early March 1992.
 - After that, I went down there. It is true that about strategy and tactics and all the essential elements of warfare, I knew a lot due to my extensive reading. Of course, I didn't know many technical details about what a Zolja is, or an Osa. I knew about digging trenches, though, from the First World War. You had to defend yourself against artillery shells, what was very important for Croatian volunteers in the early

days, because they didn't have weapons to stand up against the enemy on an equal footing.

documents.

But I had people skills. When I lectured the boys and later on, and after being promoted commander, I became the assistant minister of defence for psychological and information activity. This was called the Political Department of the Ministry, which was an important department. I had hundreds of people under me. I organised all activities. I had a good team of psychologists, a number of people with doctorate degrees, et cetera, because to my mind it was the most important thing to pick the right people. If you have the right people, things will work out. And

- if you only have a structure on paper, but the people you have cannot
 work in accordance with those declarations and resolutions, then it will
 amount to nothing.
- So I was in Bosnia-Herzegovina from the 10th of April, 1992, in
 the Operation Zone South-East Bosnia-Herzegovina, and then I returned and
 lead the attack operations to liberate the right and then the left bank
 of the Neretva. I left and came back. I went to pacify the situation in
 Rama or in Uskoplje. I spent an hour and -- a month and a half
 travelling from Travnik, Novi Sad [as interpreted], Travnik and Uskoplje,

 Konjic, other places, but it will become more clear once we see the
 - Much work was involved in that. I could go on for hours speaking about it, but without documents it wouldn't do, so let's not proceed that way.

- I made notes of certain things, because my mind isn't so supple
- 16 as it used to be, and there is this excellent book, "Eclipse at Noon" by
- 17 a Jewish author, Arthur Kestler. It's a book about the Stalinist system.
- JUDGE PRANDLER: I'm going to correct one particular point here.
- 19 When you speak about Kestler, he was not a -- although he was Jewish, but
- 20 he was Hungarian. It is what I would like to note for the record. Thank
- 21 you.
- 22 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] I apologise. So then he was a
- 23 Hungarian Jew who escaped from Stalin's practices and wrote a brilliant
- 24 book. Thank you, Your Honour.
- 25 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] Just a minor correction for the

- sake of the transcript, to avoid any misunderstanding.
- 2 Q. General, at the beginning of your reply you mentioned that after
- 3 Sunja "I went down there," on page 60, line 20. What did you mean?
- 4 A. I said so. South-East Herzegovina, Mostar, Capljina.
- 5 Q. And then you mentioned the rest in Bosnia-Herzegovina?
- A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Although it's implied, let me ask another concrete question to
- 8 end with. You spoke about your departure to Bosnia-Herzegovina. In what
- 9 capacity did you go there? Did anyone send you? Did they tell you,
- 10 Mr. Praljak, go there and do that, or was it of your own accord?
- 11 A. It was of my own accord, it was my own will.
- 12 Q. In the transcript, page 61, line 21, it says "Novi Sad." It
- 13 should be "Novi Travnik."

- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Good. I would like to continue about the environment. I would
- 16 like to know some basic conditions, and we will now start tackling some
- subjects and then move on to some details.
- 18 Let me hear about the telephones. Why are telephones important?
- 19 Who controlled them?
- 20 JUDGE TRECHSEL: I'm sorry, Mr. Praljak and Mr. Kovacic. I would
- 21 like to add a question on your departure for Bosnia-Herzegovina.
- 22 You had a position in Croatia. I suppose you could not simply
- 23 abandon that without telling anybody, so how was that done? Did you
- resign, or did you ask for leave of absence, or what form was used?
- 25 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour, I will tell you

- 1 exactly how it was. This is what things looked like: I didn't apply for
- 2 discharge. I didn't ask for approval. I'll tell you how it was.
- 3 According to all information coming to the staff, and me
- 4 personally, it was clear that the JNA intended to cross the Neretva and
- 5 pierce through our positions around Mostar to get to Split, and down
- 6 there, there were embryonic units, units in Croatia. When speaking
- 7 officially to Gojko Susak, I would call him "minister," but unofficially
- 8 we were on a first-name basis. I called him "Gojko."
- 9 And about March the 20th, 1993, in the evening hours, when we had
- 10 time to sit down for a while, when there was less to do, I said to him,
- Gojko, the situation down there is bad. They will pierce through our
- position and get to Split. I don't see how it can be defended. Croatia

is narrow. And he answered, But somebody - I forget the name - was down there and told me the situation isn't as bad. And then I got on the phone, and I consulted my father, too, who had fought in the Second World War for four years, and even after that war they were chasing some remnants of the Ustasha regime down there, and I asked him, Dad, what are things like down there? And he said to me, It's disastrous, things are very bad. And on the following day, I said, Listen, Susak, your information that things are good down there are contrary to the information I got that things are bad. And it went to and fro three times like this, and then I was asked to go down there and see for myself what kind of chance Croatia stood against the plans of the development of the JNA if they pierce the defence lines, and the situation down there was not good.

the interruption.

Page 39512

When I got back, we had a meeting with Gojko Susak and with the president, Franjo Tudjman, and I asked them to make it -- to allow to the people who were born down there, and in accordance with this theory of the theatre of war and the right to defence, to go down there to try to organise a defence. In much the same way, it was concluded that as a sort of assistance and also for liberating Dubrovnik, something be organised that is called in the documents the southern front, consisting of the HV, commanded by General Bobetko --

We're just looking at line 19, as it's about to move off the

page. There's a reference to March 20th, 1993, and I wonder whether the general was intending to speak about 1992 or if there was an error in the translation.

THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] No, it was not an error. It was around the 20th of March, 1993. No, sorry, it was 1992, yes, I'm sorry.

Right, and they were supposed to assist the Croats and Muslims willing to fight. On the opposing side, there were General Torbica and General Perisic and the Uzice Corps, and we heard all about that, and I was sent to the area that I know best, the south-east of Herzegovina, Mostar, Capljina, and General Roso, who was born there, went to Livno, and General Crnjac, who was also born in Herzegovina, took the central part. And I appeared there in that function on the 10th of April, 1992.

Four days later, General Petkovic arrived, who became the Chief

Page 39513

situation. And as you know, we managed to defend the Neretva Valley **and**to cope with the treason in Mostar.

of General Staff, and we started structuring a completely chaotic

The commander of Mostar, until my arrival, was a certain Mr. Perak, who at a certain moment, being a former officer of the JNA and a commander of the HVO, or, rather, of the boys who still had no name for themselves, at a certain moment he commanded that Mostar be evacuated by both armed units and civilians, stating as an explanation that the JNA was so strong that it would destroy the town, and he wanted to be seen as the saviour of Mostar.

Fortunately, the commanders of the armies or militias of

individual suburbs refused that order because they were appalled, and they stayed in Mostar. And Mr. Perak vanished into thin air, and he left for Serbia, and it became clear that he was a member of the kos, the counter-intelligence service of the army. They were very influential and very strong, and one of their operatives was this Mr. Perak. In simple terms, he wanted to give up Mostar to the JNA, but they didn't obey him.

After such an event, people no longer trust the military command. For months, the people trust no one except those who they, inside their group, made commander, so that my command over that zone was not a consequence of my having a military rank, but rather of the fact that I had to show on the ground that I wasn't afraid, that I wasn't scared to die, that I was willing to go into Mostar dozens of times, driving down a road which was being shelled and shot at, and only if I survive all that, I get the right to command. In such armies, you don't become commander by being installed commander, but you become commander by your behaviour.

Page 39514

Even in professional armies, okay, you can have a commander you must

obey, but not everybody is held in high esteem by his troops. But in an

army such as ours, after Perak's treason, for 20 days on end you had to

be seen in highly dangerous places to gain the respect of your soldiers.

JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] General, I'm not going to ask a question on the JNA, who wanted to go to Split, through the Neretva, in March of 1992 because I believe this will be one of the questions of substance that I will put later after your testimony; but I would like to come back to your resume, because the difference between the procedure

used in my country and the procedure used here is that in my country,
when somebody is being judged for crimes against humanity or crimes of
war, there is an investigation on their personality, we have a
psychologist and a psychiatrist, and we can really explore the entire
background of this person, the family background.

Earlier, you gave us a small detail that struck me, it's the first time I heard about it, and I would like you to provide us with some details on it before the break. You said that your father had some knowledge of the army, some people in the army, and you said that after World War II -- during World War II, I'm sure you'll tell us exactly when it was, he had fought against Ustashas. This is -- you said remnants of the Ustasha system. That's exactly the words you used. So what did your father do, exactly, and did this have any influence on you?

THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] After the Second World War ended, and this is something that I prepared for the benefit of the Chamber for this trial, the summary, historical summary, not about meetings of

Page 39515

- 1 governments, and kings, or anything like that, but about the victims in
- 2 Bosnia-Herzegovina before -- well, during World War II and after
- 3 World War II as well, if we don't have that framework in mind it's very
- 4 difficult to understand anything that is part of this trial. I went for
- $\,$ an overall simplification. I worked together with a historian to prepare
- 6 a summary for this trial.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 7 As for individual destinies, my grandfather, the father of my
- father, was in prison in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia as a Croatian

9 nationalist. For that same reason, his son was rotting in jail in 10 Mostar, because he had been distributing leaflets and giving speeches, stuff like that. And my father, through an organisation called 11 Hrvatski radisa, which was then part of the greatest Croatian 12 13 political party, Stjepan Radic's party, he was sent to hone his skills and learn a trade somewhere else, and then he joined the partisans later 14 15 on. After the war, there were horrible crimes happening all over Yugoslavia; Blajburg, the road to Kalvari, and so on and so forth. 16

In Herzegovina and in Serbia, especially in Western Serbia, around places such as Foca, there were many leftovers of what any textbook would probably define as renegades. They were still fighting these new Communists, and so on and so forth, killing their officials. So my father, who at the time was an official of the State Security Service, spent the next eight years, all the way up until 1953, fighting those leftovers of the Chetnik regime in Serbia and the Ustasha regime in Croatia, fighting the remaining renegades.

In 1953, a Chetnik duke called Bjelica was killed in Foca, and

Page 39516

- 1 that put an end to it because that man had been running riot in the area.
- 2 Then my father was retired.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 3 In 1963, Aleksandar Rankovic was pursuing some very negative
- 4 policies, so he dismissed him, removed him from his post, because that
- 5 man, too, was too Croatian, in a manner of speaking, for his taste.
- 6 Nevertheless, I was 17 when I parted ways with my father, in

terms of our political views. My father and I did not share the same political views. Deep in his heart, he was in favour of Yugoslavia throughout and remained that way. I read more, I studied more, I learned more, and at one point I began to understand that this country might create some prerequisites if it was a democracy, if it was a state of the peoples, but then again it was founded on crimes against the Volksdeutscher population, the Croats, the Hungarians, the Poles, crimes against the rich, crimes against intellectuals. I inferred that a state like that could not survive, that it was a Serb creation which kept other peoples within it from evolving. So we parted ways, politically, and we had different ideas, a difference of opinion, you might say.

Nevertheless, my father was an honest man. He was not affected by Communist in any other way. I continued to communicate with him all the way up until his death in 1993. He had spent his last two or three months in a coma, after a cerebral haemorrhage. That was in the summer of 1992. He was bedridden after that and was no longer able to work.

I'm the smallest boy in our family, all the other boys in my family were bigger than me, and I was probably an example of stunted growth and that's probably why I took up art. Throughout all of these

Page 39517

tribulations, obviously, it was very difficult for me to organise for this really bulky, large man who now couldn't move to be looked after properly and to find someone who could help him move and turn his body around. He was beginning to have wounds all over his body because he was bedridden. He was unable to communicate, and my mother was far too small

- 6 and weak to manage a chore like that. Therefore, ever since I was 17,
- 7 and all the way up until the beginning of the war, I tried to explain
- 8 this to myself, and in the process I reached certain positions that where
- 9 now clear. Someone writing a book about something like that or a person
- 10 dealing with that should have no doubter about matters such as these.
- Of course, back in Herzegovina, there were a number of people who
- 12 were harmed by my father in the line of duty. Some of those people
- immediately had their backs up when they heard the name Praljak, needless
- 14 to say.
- 15 I will share with you a small anecdote illustrating the paradox
- of a state like that.
- My father is already retired. He's in Zagreb visiting me. We
- 18 meet a student. I exchange some words with a student, and please try to
- get this right to see exactly what is so absurd about this situation.
- 20 After my conversation with the student, my father comes up to me and
- 21 says, Don't go telling all sorts of things to the students, because he
- 22 works for us. So you have this student working for the secret service,
- 23 and my father, who retired from that secret service, is wanting me not to
- 24 say all sorts of things to his student because I might end up in jail for
- 25 that. Those systems are terrifyingly complex. They cause a whole lot of

- 1 frustration, an enormous amount. People find it difficult to find their
- 2 way around. As far as that is concerned, I can tell you anything you
- 3 like, because I spent at least 30 to 40 years looking into just that.
- 4 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Very well.

```
5
               Let's have a break. It's 10 to 6.00, and we'll break for 20
 6
       minutes.
 7
                             --- Recess taken at 5.51 p.m.
 8
                             --- On resuming at 6.12 p.m.
               JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] The court is back in session.
 9
               I believe Judge Prandler has a question.
10
11
               JUDGE PRANDLER: Yes, thank you. Mr. President, as a matter of
12
       fact, I have a follow-up question which I didn't want to put today,
       because I wanted to follow your advice to wait with the questions up to
13
       the -- to wait with the questions of the Judges until the end of the
14
       questioning by Mr. Kovacic and Ms. Pinter. But, on the other hand, since
15
       the last questions had been related to subject matter which also rose my
16
17
       interest, that is why I wanted to -- I would like to relate today, and
       that was -- that is related to one of your statements which is also
18
19
       included in your previous brief and declaration which you made during the
20
       first phase of our work today, before the break, the first break today.
21
               Now, it is the following, and now I do not find the exact text,
      but it was about the fact that the Croatians, during the centuries, have
22
23
       fought against a great number of enemies, starting with Hungary from the
24
       12th century, et cetera.
               Now, I would only like to recall, and it has nothing to do, in a
25
                                      Page 39519
 1
       way, with national pride, but simply for the facts of history, I would
 2
       like to say that of course that is true that from the 12th century
```

croatia has been, although officially an independent kingdom, Croatian

- 4 Kingdom, but the Hungarian king has become and continues to be always a
- 5 king of Croatia as well; and that during these centuries, as far as I
- 6 remember and as far as I know the history of our countries, this kind of
- 7 cohabitation was not so bad and, of course, apart from the friction,
- 8 which always happened when you have this kind of cooperation or forced
- 9 cooperation, quote/unquote, between states and kingdoms, et cetera, then
- of course we had some negative bad moments as well.
- As far as I recall and I know, that one of the bad moments was

 when, in the 19th century, in 1848-49, upon the request of the Court in

 Vienna and during the War of Independence for the Hungarians, at that
- time the Croatian Ban Jelacic has in a way waged war against the
- 15 Hungarians, and finally he was defeated September 29, 1848.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

Now, I am mentioning this only because I would like to go on with the enumeration of your events, when you mentioned that you were fighting against Hungarians, against the Austrians, against Venice, against various other combinations, when also Napoleon was there in part of Croatia, et cetera, and as far as the modern history in the 20th century, you did not mention an important part of our -- I would emphasise our history, common history, of Central and East Central Europe, and it was the war between 1940-1945, and then you did not mention that at that time, too, what happened, and I would like to recall that of course -- I

Page 39520

would like to know what is your opinion about -- it is the major aim of

my question. What is your opinion about this part of our and your and my

history as well, because definitely there were enemies, and of course those who fight and who fought against the enemies, and you also mentioned that period of time in which your father participated. And this very fact prompted my question to ask that your father and your mother were among the partisans at that time, so I wonder if you also agree with me or you would like to say that this part of your history was -- I mean the history of Croatia, was also an important part when the partisans fought against -- at that time called themselves and they were called Ustasha now, and the government of Ante Pavelic, so it is the crux of my question. How do you feel and what is your major evaluation of this particular period of your country and my country as well? THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour Judge Prandler, I tried to be brief, and that's why I gave an overview of history and who ruled Croatia, although ever since 1102, by the free will of the Croatian governors, Croatia was placed under the governance of the Hungarian King Koloman and we were a dual kingdom. The Croatian Parliament always had certain attributes of statehood, but the history of the relations between Croatia and Hungary must be split up in two essential parts, the first being a time when both states were threatened by the Ottoman Empire, so the social and economic relations at the time were shared. The other section of that history would be following the Hungarian Revolution in 1848, quashed by Ban Jelacic, Croatia's ban, and then it was different because the tangents were created between Croatia and Hungary and wealth was distributed.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Your Honour Judge Prandler, I'm unaware if you know that at the
2	time, there was some very determined attempts to introduce Hungarian
3	domination in Croatia. Hungarian was introduced as a language to
4	Croatian schools. Croatian citizens rebelled. Heads rolled. The
5	Hungarian language was introduced as the language used in the railway
6	system. Hungarian names were used, and then Croat names were not
7	allowed. Hungarians had part of their own state territory in the Rijeka
8	in Croatia known as the Rijeka Sred, and the territory was governed by
9	Hungary, by the Hungarian crown, and was subordinated to the Hungarian
10	crown directly.
11	Following 1848, when the Ottoman danger had long ceased, and all
12	the way up to the First World War, the relations with Hungarians
13	rather, not Hungarians, with Hungary, as it was at the time, were quite
14	tense. Hungary at the time had taken part of the Medjumurje territory
15	which today belongs to the Republic of Croatia. After World War I, there
16	was fighting over that territory. Both Croatia and Hungary Were on the
17	side of the losers in World War I. They had fought together, so the
18	problem was resolved when the victor's army, the Serb army that had
19	fought with the Allies, came in. It was then that resolved the problem,
20	the problem that Croatia was facing, and also the problem with relations
21	with Hungarians, because in a way they took control of the area and
22	established their rule.

throughout history, it was for the sake of the Chamber. Of course,

Napoleon governed Croatia as well up to Zagreb, the River Sava, and then

Page 39522

all the regions further south. It was his fault that the Dubrovnik

republic lost its independence. Its independence was crushed when

General Marmon's [phoen] troops came in. As for Croatia's islands at the

time, there were battles raging between France and Russia; for example,

the Battle of the Island of Hvar, and so on and so forth.

croatia's destiny was not an easy one to bear. And when Napoleon was defeated and Austria took control, they established their own rule over those territories, the German language, the rebellion against the German language and all of that. I'm sure you know about the famous saying adopted by the Croatia representatives in the Hungarian

Parliament, "A kingdom does not prescribe rules to another kingdom, regnum regno non prescribit leges. There was a constant struggle over Croatia's sovereignty and its rights, and obviously everybody was trying to gain the upper hand, as is always the case. Nevertheless, I'll have a better opportunity to talk about this when I get to this book that I prepared for you.

As for World War II, Your Honour Judge Antonetti, matters are very clear. Croatia split up into two halves. The best part of Croats joined the partisans, especially those in Dalmatia and Istria. Istria had been occupied by the fascists back in 1922, so they fought them;

Central Croatia as well.

At the time, the best part of the partisan movement originated from Croatia. The first uprising against Germany during the occupation occurred in Croatia, near the town of Sisak. A group came together compromising some 15 persons, and they started an armed rebellion. The

Page 39523

group included General Bobetko, who has been mentioned before. He was a

partisan right from the start. The other half of Croatia was facing a
lot of pressure, not going into this at any great length now, but there
was a lot of persecution by the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, SO that the other
half joined Nazi Germany and their forces. Something that was termed the
Independent State of Croatia came into existence, headed by Ante Pavelic.
The Ustashas quite certainly committed atrocious crimes, especially in
the two camps, Gradiska and Jasenovac. These camps are memorial centres
today, and every year there are commemorations at those former camps,
always attended by the president of Croatia, by some Cabinet members, and
as of recently, high-ranking persons or officials from Croatia's church.
This is a deep wound and a long-lasting one that's difficult to forget.
Based on my knowledge, based on my information, there are two
periods in Croatia, one until the 9th of May, 1945, when the partisans,
the anti-fascists, fought the Nazi forces and armies. Nevertheless, and
this applies in a particular way to the period following 1943 and the
fall of Italy the capitulation of Italy, I should say, the
anti-fascist partisan movement saw a new development. All the key

19 positions were taken up by Communists.

Following the end of the war, the Communist ideology gained the upper hand. It staged a fictitious democratic election, a spurious one, and committed unspeakable crimes which I will present in my book in great detail.

Following the 9th of May, 1945, if we just look at the so-called roads to Kalvari and what happened in Dragobrat and so on and so forth,

Page 39524

they killed a minimum of 150.000 Croat citizens and soldiers who were retreating towards Austria. The best part of that army surrendered to the English, General Alexander, but they refused the Croats' surrender, having previously received assurances from Tito that those people would be treated and handled in keeping with civilised standards and norms.

Up until this time, over 800 mass graves had been unearthed or

Up until this time, over 800 mass graves had been unearthed or discovered in Croatia, and in Croatia itself over 900, and it was at those places that the Communists shot people, executed people, after they came to power, a large number of priests and common people, "common people" I'm saying because there were common people retreating with the Army of the independent state of Croatia as well. Those who survived were marched down the roads all the way down south to Macedonia. They weren't given anything to eat and they were hungry, and some of them starved to death, as a matter of fact. These marches are normally referred to as the road to Kalvari because there was no meaning or sense to it.

So my view, Your Honour, is in relation to this is there were

Nazi forces, on the one hand; but on the other, and that is my deepest conviction, there wasn't really something that we might term an anti-fascist coalition. What existed was an anti-Hitler coalition. The anti-Hitler coalition had the following components: The anti-fascist component, the democratic coalition of countries such as the United States, England, the French forces under General de Gaulle and so on and so forth. Then there were the Russian units, and what the Russian units and what the partisan units did towards the end of the war was

Page 39525

not -- what they constituted was not an anti-fascist coalition but rather an anti-Hitler coalition. These two armies, the Communist Partisan Army and the Russia Army, I'm talking about the Katyn forest, about millions of Ukrainians and Chechen being killed, what they were doing amounted to the same thing as the Nazi forces. They fought Hitler, yes, but that didn't necessarily mean that they were anti-fascist armies. Hundreds of millions of victims, and I've got the book here, "The Crimes of Communist" by French authors, 100 million victims in the wake of Communism. You will see all the tables with all the statistics and figures there.

Therefore, I don't agree that following the 9th of May, 1945, what was at work in Yugoslavia was an anti-fascist government. It was a Communist government which, and I'm ready to present all the data necessary, expelled nearly half a million Volksdeutscher, many Hungarians from areas such as Vojvodina, 15.000 Poles who were still there.

Thousands of those referred to as Kulaks were killed. It was a

17 dictatorship, the garden variety.

I don't know if you share my opinion, but one thing I'm certain about is I won't change my opinion. I assert that the war had not stopped since 1918. It was a low intensity war that simply continued. Tens of thousands of people ended up abroad as emigrants. I'm ready to present data to you. I'm talking about France, Germany, and people, emigrants, who were killed there by the secret service of Yugoslavia. How many priests were murdered.

Croatia is still divided, as we speak, and this is the problem

Page 39526

that we found when we first started establishing this new country. It

was a particularly delicate and sensitive problem over in Herzegovina,

because many of those poor peasants over there, who were growing tobacco,

had joined Ante Pavelic's army, but then wanted to go back. Many of

those were killed. They didn't know any better. And the worst thing is

after World War II, all the countries opened their books, in a way, and

made it possible for innocent people to have a dignified burial, and at

least to some extent attempted to punish the perpetrators.

In Yugoslavia, every time anyone raised crimes such as Blajburg, they would end up in jail in no time at all. I only learned about Blajburg when I was 22. I was stunned and horrified by the facts that I had been unaware of up until then. The facts are truly horrific.

I have two books here, books authored by Slovene scientists, and if the Chamber is willing to have a look, we have photographs there of the blood-curdling crimes, the bones found there. A month ago -- as

recently as a month ago, a mass grave was uncovered in Slovenia in a mine where 13.000 people were dropped into the pit in that mine, and they were alive when they were dropped there. 13.000 people. They were buried there in those trenches. This is a crime without precedent, Your Honours. Those people lost their nearest and dearest. They had no right even to ask how their nearest and dearest had met their fate or where they were buried. This caused a lot of frustration and possibly gave rise to forms of extreme behaviour. Hatred lasts a long time, especially if it's something that you can't externalise.

I've been dealing with this for a very long time, and there's no

Page 39527

- way I will change my opinion, regardless of 1941 to 1945, the fair struggle against the Nazis. On the 9th of May, the Communists, at least as far as Yugoslavia was concerned, committed murder, murder of every shape and form. We're talking about the Informbiro and all that. The Communists became a criminal organisation, and they committed a great many misdeeds and crimes.
- Nations" and about Ban Jelacic who quashed to some extent the insurrection in Hungary. Karl Marx, the great thinker, the great Marxist thinker, declared Croats, and I think Serbs, too, as non-historical people, and he simply claimed that one should wipe them out, erase them from the face of history. I can show you that book.

Judge Prandler, you will remember about that book, "The Small

Dr. Franjo Tudjman, who was himself an historian, wrote a great deal about this in his own book, "Great Ideas and Small Nations." He

15	talked about how big ideas and important political decisions were
16	something for which the small nations had to foot the bill. You know
17	about how two million people remained in Romania without being able to be
18	sent back to the state or the country in which they had been up to that
19	point.

20 If there is anything else that I can add to provide further 21 clarification, please go ahead and ask.

JUDGE PRANDLER: Thank you, Mr. Praljak.

The only purpose was that when I had the paragraph, which I already quoted before, and I do not want to go into the details of your answer because we are not here, of course, for a lesson on history, a

Page 39528

history of Hungary and Croatia and that part of the world. But I simply would have liked to hear, and I'm satisfied with that part of your statement that when you speak about the Ottoman intrusion against Venice, and the intrusion of Venice and Italy and Austria and Hungary, and when you speak about Serbia and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the unitary Communist, Tito's creation, if you enumerate all those facts of life and history, then I am satisfied that you agree with me that also the period between 1940 and 1945 should be added as parts of your history against the -- I wonder if you would like to call it anti-fascist or anti-Nazi, Italian, et cetera, powers, but anyway it was a fight which has to be noted.

12 Thank you.

13 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour, before the 9th of May, 14 those were anti-fascist forces. My answer is clear. Before the 9th of 15 May, 1945, the partisan movement was an anti-fascist force which allowed Croatia to be constituted on the side of the winning forces. The Ustasha 16 17 movement of Ante Pavelic was not that. They were on the side of the Nazi Germany. They had racial laws which they implemented. In two camps, 18 19 they killed approximately 80.000 people. 20 My answer to you is really very clear. 21 JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Mr. Kovacic. MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation] Your Honour, before we proceed, 22 23 just for the record, I would like to clarify two mistakes in the record. 24 Before the break, General Praljak, please follow my words and confirm if I'm correct, page 64, line 8, it has been recorded as follows. 25 Page 39529 1 I'll go to quote in English: [In English] "... went two and from three times like this, and 3 then I was asked to go down there and see for myself what kind of ..." 4 Et cetera. 5 [Interpretation] What I heard in Croatian was that General Praljak said that he asked to be sent down there. He was the one 6 7 asking. He was not asked. 8 Q. Am I right? A. Yes, I was the one who asked to be sent or, rather, demanded to 9 10 be sent down there. 11 Q. Demanded. Well, thank you very much. And in the same

- discussion, on page 65, line 5 in English, it has been recorded as
- 13 follows:
- 14 [In English] "... and the Uzice [Realtime transcript read in
- 15 error "Ustasha"] Corps, and we heard all about that, and I was sent to
- 16 the area that I know best, the South-East Herzegovina."
- 17 [Interpretation] In Croatian, General Praljak said: "We heard
- 18 about that, and I asked to be sent to South-East Herzegovina."
- 19 Is that correct?
- 20 A. Yes, I was the one who asked to be sent to
- 21 South-East Herzegovina.
- Q. In the record, we see "Ustasha Corps," where it should be "Uzice
- 23 Corps ." General --
- 24 A. I owe Judge Antonetti a very short answer. He asked me whether
- 25 it would be necessary to have psychological and psychiatric expertise of

- such persons in your country. Your Honour, I fully expected that. I
- 2 thought that the Trial Chamber should be organised differently, in any
- 3 case, and in order to show the continuity of some of my actions, because
- 4 actions in certain points of time reveal the moral dignity of a certain
- 5 person, and that's why there have been so many witnesses and so many
- 6 witness statements that I am presenting to the court before the war in
- 7 Sunja and after that.
- 8 Those who worked with the witness did not get into lengthy
- 9 discussions with the witnesses. They asked them to give us the factual
- 10 presentation of the facts, and what I did before the war, two writers,

- 11 Kemo Music, a Muslim, and Alez Majetic [phoen], who described an event at the film festival in Pula, and it was about whether I would jump into the 12 sea, a very rough sea, in order to save a person's life, and how I 13 behaved at a cocktail party involving all the artists. One stupid person 14 15 insulted a cleaning lady, and scattered the rubbish she had collected, and there are many people who can testify to the facts. And through so 16 17 many things, through the factual basis, I wanted to show that and to show how Slobodan Praljak behaved in such situations before the war, during 18 19 the war, and after the war. I stand behind any of these facts, and I am 20 very willing to be subjected to any study or expertise, be it psychological, psychiatric, or whatever the expertise. 21
- Q. Mr. Praljak, I would like to take you back and ask you to tell us something about the telephone system in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
- A. In the spring of 1992, the artillery of the JNA destroyed a post office in Mostar and a main switchboard. The Yugoslav People's Army also

blew up all the bridges on the River Neretva south and north of Mostar,

and the ones in Mostar, except for the Old Bridge, which was damaged

together with the bridges. All the utilities were also destroyed that

ran under the bridges. The Republic of Croatia donated a small

switchboard with some hundred numbers, a coaxial cable that went from

Mostar to Siroki Brijeg, over its repeater on Mount Biokovo. It enables

a wireless transmission of the signal to Split and further afield into

the world. The hundred numbers -- the original hundred numbers were

- 9 distributed in accordance with the needs, both Croats and Muslims, to the
- 10 SDA of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to individuals and institutions. This
- same and only connection via Split was used for communication with the
- world by Tuzla, Zenica, Travnik, Bugojno, and anybody else in the
- 13 non-occupied part of Bosnia and Herzegovina who could find any hilltop
- 14 and any kind of repeater to achieve a wireless connection towards Split.
- 15 There is no single bill showing that somebody was asked to pay a single
- 16 kuna to the Croatian telecom for that. It is therefore very odd when you
- 17 read that this code for Split, **021**, was a number that was attached to the
- Banovina of Croatia. Following that logic, Zenica, Tuzla, Visoko, all of
- 19 that would be Banovina. So much for that.
- THE INTERPRETER: Microphone for the counsel.
- MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation]
- 22 Q. This was enough, and the situation is clear. I would like to
- 23 move on to the next question.
- 24 What was the situation with electric power in 1992 and 1993 in
- 25 Bosnia and Herzegovina?

- 1 A. In 1992, the Yugoslav People's Army and the Army of
- 2 Republika Srpska destroyed the electric power-plants in Rastani, Cula and
- 3 Rudnik. They destroyed the 200 kilovolt, the 110 kilovolt and 35
- 4 kilovolt power-lines and transformers which had enabled the distribution
- 5 of electricity in Mostar, Jablanica, Konjic, Stolac, Capljina, Citluk and
- 6 Siroki Brijeg. With great but successful efforts on the part of the

HZ-HB and the HVO, and I am referring to the military part thereof, and at every possible help of the Republic of Croatia, the damages were partly repaired. Without the aid of the Republic of Croatia, this would not have been possible. With understandable difficulties, the power system was kept functioning to connect it to the electric distribution system of Croatia, and it functioned not only in the electric power industry of the HZ-HB, but also in the electric power industries of all the areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina which were not occupied by the JNA and VRS.

Let me say just one thing. We received instructions from France, and I believe that the big concerning question was Glencorn, but I'm not sure, and thanks to the skill of the engineers and the courage of soldiers of the HVO, in the summer of 1992 the functioning of the electric furnace in the aluminium factory in Mostar was successfully put out. The damage that was thus prevented is close to a billion Euros. I am saying this because of this: If the furnaces had not been put out following a procedure, it would have taken more money to put the thing right and to build a factory somewhere else.

I repeat that there was a betrayal on the part of the Muslims in

- 1 the ranks of the HVO, and that was synchronised with the attacks of the
- 2 Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina on the HVO in Mostar and the
- 3 Neretva Valley. By that moment, the Muslim side occupied all the
- 4 electric power-plants on the Neretva River and the HZ-HB was supplied

with electricity only from one small reversible power-plant from Capljina

6 and from Croatia.

Your Honour, a reversible power-plant is one that provides electricity during the day from an accumulation lake, and during the night, when there is no demand for such a large quantity of electricity, it pumps water and then uses that power the following day. That's why we call them reversible.

The question remains why the east part of Mostar did not have electricity. This was due to the fact that this was a very complex technical issue, but one thing is sure. The HVO, either its civilian or the military part, did not have anything to do with the fact that after the 30th of June, 1993, there was no electricity in East Mostar. It would be good to know who was it and when that turned the power off in East Mostar, from which electric power-plant that was not in our hands, from which electric transformer that was not in our hands, and so on and so forth.

Please, I need to continue this. What I'm saying is this: The

Law of War, which I read before the war and during the war, in order to

behave properly when in doubt, says that in a war, the enemy side may be

prevented from accessing electricity, its electrical power-plants and

transformer can be destroyed, as well as the dams and trenches on certain

Page 39534

1 conditions. I read five books of the International Law on War, and --

2 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Excuse me, Mr. Praljak. You are a witness to

3 speak on facts. Now you are pleading, you're presenting arguments. You

- say what the law says. It is for your counsel and for the Chamber to say

 what the law says.
- 6 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour Trechsel, I -- the 7 final decision is certainly up to you. However, the facts are what I 8 know, what's in my head. I simply studied the facts at the time, and I can't say anything else but one thing. As a general and a commander of 9 10 the HVO in 1993, I issued an order to destroy one of the valves on an 11 accumulation lake above Mostar, because that power-plant was under the control of the BiH Army. They closed down the electric power-plant, and 12 13 the whole field above that power-plant was flooded, and there was a 14 threat that if all the valves were opened simultaneously, the entire area south of Mostar would be flooded. In order for me to issue such orders, 15 16 I obviously had to be well abreast of the provisions of the Law on War, and that's why I'm saying I am familiar with it, I am quoting what it 17 18 says; but I am not trying to go beyond the scopes of my own knowledge. 19 My knowledge are the facts that I am aware of, and they are part of my 20 value system, the value system that I have in my head.
- 21 MR. KOVACIC: [Interpretation]

22

23

24

25

2

Q. I believe that the principal information about the electricity supply has been provided, and this is based on your knowledge and based on what is allowed and what is not. And now I would like to ask you about the media. I'm referring to the information you received in Bosnia

- and Herzegovina in 1992 and 1993 via radio, television and newspapers.
 - A. In the summer 1992, Sarajevo was attacked, besieged, held, and

3	was being destroyed by the JNA and the VRS. The post office and
4	telephone exchange were destroyed in Sarajevo. The building of Sarajevo
5	TV was badly damaged. There was no electricity, and the repeaters on the
6	surrounding hilltops were in the hands of the VRS. All coaxial cables
7	leading towards Sarajevo were out of function for numerous military and
8	technical reasons. The coaxial cables have to be maintained properly and
9	inspected every now and then. The main TV repeater on Mount Velez above
10	Mostar, which covered the area of Herzegovina, was destroyed by the JNA
11	and the VRS in the summer of 1992.
12	Outside of Sarajevo, one could, to a certain extent, listen to
13	Radio Sarajevo using middle and long wave, because the ultra-short sound
14	was not suitable for that, and there are radio amateurs with whom
15	communication was possible. Thus, people in Mostar and Herzegovina
16	followed Croatian HTV, which used the repeater on Mount Biokovo, above
17	Makarska. They also listened to Radio Split and Zagreb.
18	It was their choice. It was not imposed on them. And the same
19	is true of the newspapers that were printed in the Republic of Croatia
20	and the printed media that was printed outside of the Republic of Croatia
21	in Germany, for example. There were also satellites that were used to
22	follow BBC, Channel 5, CNN, Rai Uno, and other TV stations.

In modern times, an information blockade is impossible to impose.

In the eastern part of Mostar, since the autumn of 1992, Radio Mostar was continuously on the air, and their location was not seen as a military

23

24

- 1 target by the HVO. When I was in military command, I did not allow,
- 2 despite the provisions of the International Law, for this to become a
- 3 military target, as was Serbian Television during NATO campaigns against
- 4 Serbia.
- 5 I don't want to aggravate Judge Trechsel, although I don't know
- 6 why he should be aggravated.
- 7 Radio and TV stations are legitimate military targets, in
- 8 accordance with the International Law. I can quote some books.
- 9 JUDGE TRECHSEL: Excuse me. I cannot leave this in the room.
- 10 There's no issue of myself being aggrieved or anything, or having any
- 11 feeling. It's just that it's a task of the Chamber to see to it that the
- 12 proceedings follow the Rules, and witnesses are to speak about facts and
- not to give legal opinions. You have, Mr. Praljak, studied many,
- subjects, you have told us, but I cannot remember that you ever said that
- 15 law was a part of it, and I have not either seen that you are really an
- 16 expert. And I think it is wise to leave this to counsel and stick really
- 17 to the facts, in the interests of yourself, in the first place.
- 18 THE WITNESS: [Interpretation] Your Honour Trechsel, it is true,
- when I say something like that, irrespective of the rigidity of such
- 20 examination, I am still on the other side of the camera lens, every now
- 21 and then I will use some poetic license, even against my better
- 22 judgement. It has never occurred to me to voice my opinions about the
- 23 law. However, Judge Trechsel, it is impossible for me to say that I did
- 24 not read law. And as a person who was very much interested in ethics and
- 25 for whom ethics was a profession, I researched the relationship within

1	law and ethics, and that's why every now and then I will voice an opinion
2	that I shouldn't, but please stop me.
3	JUDGE ANTONETTI: [Interpretation] Very well. It's time, it's
4	7.00 p.m. We are sitting in the afternoon this week. We'll resume
5	tomorrow at 2.15 p.m.
6	Thank you. Have a good evening.
7	Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 7.00 p.m.,
8	to be reconvened on Tuesday, the 5th of May, 2009,
9	at 2.15 p.m.
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	