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Chapter 1: Introduction

The breakup of the former Yugoslavia was a bloody ordeal which spanned four years and killed just under one hundred thousand people. The conflict was given a great deal of attention while it was unfolding, but after peace was established in 1995 study of the region was in large part abandoned. The Croatian and Bosnian wars are both relevant and important to studies of conflict today, but because little attention has been paid to them since the mid-1990s they remain largely misunderstood. This paper seeks to rectify the situation, setting forth a thorough investigation of the causes of violence in the former Yugoslavia by examining events in the region before, during, and after the conflict. The Yugoslav wars may have ended eleven years ago, but it is precisely this distance and its accompanying hindsight which allow the Balkan example to be so instructive for future conflicts.

The Yugoslav dissolution began as a war of secession. In 1991, Croatia opted to declare independence and leave Yugoslavia because it felt that Serbs were overly dominant in the federation. Serb and Yugoslav troops moved into Croatia to compel it to reenter the union, but by 1992 it became clear that Croatia’s independence was nonnegotiable. At this point, fighting between Serbs and Croats moved to Bosnia where both nations claimed territory because of the presence of their respective ethnic groups in the region. The Bosnian War pitted neighbors against neighbors and friends against friends as this formally multi-ethnic society was fractured along ethnic and religious lines. Soon three distinct groups emerged: the Bosnian Serbs, supported by Serbia, the Bosnian Croats, supported by Croatia, and the Bosnian Muslims. As the war spread and intensified, so did the violence. It soon became clear that the wars in the former Yugoslavia would be the most brutal that Europe had seen since World War II.
During the conflict, ethnic groups were targeted for elimination via military tactics and concentration camps. The term “ethnic cleansing” was coined in May 1992 in reference to Serb attacks on Bosnian Muslims which were aimed at driving the Muslims from their home territories.\(^1\) As many as six thousand Bosnian Muslims were incarcerated by Serbs at the Omarska camp where guards “regularly and openly killed, raped, tortured, beat, and otherwise subjected prisoners to conditions of constant humiliation, degradation, and fear of death.”\(^2\) Tragically, this behavior is not shocking to readers today because it is reminiscent of the Holocaust. In fact, Goran Jelisic, commander of one notorious Serb concentration camp in Bosnia, actually described himself as the Serbian Adolf.\(^3\) However, the intense brutality exhibited in the former Yugoslavia went beyond ethnic cleansing and forced labor camps, reaching extremes that may actually have surpassed the grave crimes of the Nazis.

As just one example of such unprecedented and inhumane behavior, rape was used as a weapon in Bosnia. This crime was committed by actors on all sides of the conflict, but most often Serb paramilitary officers were the perpetrators and Muslim women the victims.

The rapes were intended to induce families to flee and never come back, not just for their lives but for the honor of their women…Interviewed women described how they were gang raped, taunted with ethnic slurs, and cursed by rapists who stated their intention to forcibly impregnate women as a haunting reminder of the rape and an intensification of the trauma it inflicts. The forcible impregnating of Muslim women and in some cases the incarceration of pregnant women in order to compel them to carry the pregnancy to term was part of the torture to which they were subjected. All this so that the women would bear “little Chetniks.”\(^4\)

The importance of female purity among Muslims makes these actions particularly abhorrent, as many of these women would not be welcomed back into their homes and families after

\(^{2}\) Ibid., 160.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., 166.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., 167-168.
they had been sexually abused. Perhaps most disturbing is the insistence that these women give birth to “little Chetniks,” a reference to Serb nationalists who committed atrocities against Croats and Muslims during World War II. The Serbs did not simply want Muslims to leave the territory they saw as rightfully belonging to Serbia; they wanted to humiliate Muslims, to violate them physically and emotionally, to literally penetrate them with hatred and force them to raise a child who would theoretically loathe them to the same degree as their rapist did.

Rape was not used to express frustration by thoughtlessly hurting a stranger. Rather, it was perpetrated in an organized and premeditated way in so-called rape camps, where women were held captive and raped repeatedly throughout their stay. One 38-year-old Muslim reported that her 19-year-old former neighbor, who helped her with housework and had coffee at her kitchen table before the conflict, savagely raped her in one such camp.\footnote{Ibid., 169.} This is but one example of the atrocities committed in the former Yugoslavia, which were not at all perpetrated exclusively by Serbs or exclusively towards Muslims. Croatians, Serbs, and Muslims alike took turns playing the role of aggressor and victim, all reaching unprecedented levels of hatred and brutality.

Over a decade later, the presidents of Croatia and Serbia, Stjepan Mesic and Boris Tadic, sat side by side on the John F. Kennedy School stage at Harvard University to address students on the progress both countries have made since the war. The two expressed great happiness at having found such a supportive partner in the other, and displayed a kind of comfortable friendship. President Tadic teased President Mesic for giving an overly lengthy response to one student’s query; President Mesic teased President Tadic for side-stepping a difficult question on the subject of Kosovo. President Tadic of Serbia reminded the audience
that he traveled to Srebrenica on the tenth anniversary of the major Muslim massacre perpetrated by Serbs which occurred there. He made this trip “to show that Serbs must mourn for all the victims of ethnic cleansing because what unites us should take precedence over what divides us.” The audience left this forum feeling hopeful and optimistic. It seemed clear that the people of the Balkans had resolved their differences, and that all were operating in a partnership towards peace and cooperation in the region. This feeling is echoed by scholars who have largely abandoned study of the region since peace was established. The problem is resolved, the fighting has stopped, and for many it is time to turn their attention to more pressing problems in the rest of the world.

In looking at these two portrayals of life in the Balkans, however, one notices the unmistakable presence of an enigma. How could people who hated each other so much learn to coexist in eleven years’ time? Why did people who lived in integrated peace for four decades following World War II launch into such violent expressions of hatred in the early 1990s? Was the peace before and after the Croatian and Bosnian wars simply an illusion, or were the wars themselves typical disputes over political balance of power rather than anything originating from ethnic hatred? The events of this region seem to express a real disconnect that cannot be rationalized in any simple way.

The question then becomes, why does it matter what really happened in the former Yugoslavia? After all, the violence is over now, so why dwell on it? Unfortunately, the vindictive and brutal violence exhibited in the Balkans is not at all an isolated phenomenon. Ethnic cleansing is a technique used so often in the world today that the phrase itself has lost its shock value. To know what happened in the Balkans is to get one step closer to

---

understanding the phenomenon of ethnic feuds and genocide. Such knowledge can help to predict, control, or halt the future occurrence of mass murder for political purposes. Ethnic cleansing has happened before and will happen again. Understanding this phenomenon is essential to maintaining some degree of peace and humane behavior in our world today.

This study of the Yugoslav wars is essential not only for the broader world, but for the study of political science specifically. Political scientists have argued over the origins and nature of ethnic conflict for decades. What defines an ethnic group? When are such groups motivated to use violence? How integral is elite influence in compelling or preventing such groups from engaging in conflict? A proper and thorough study of the breakup of Yugoslavia gets to the very root of these questions and asks: does ethnic conflict really exist? Can one ever explain the outbreak of violence by saying that two groups intrinsically hate each other and will kill each other even if it is not in their best interest to do so? This explanation seems overly simplified and unfair to the people involved.

Some argue that the violence in the former Yugoslavia was wholly unrelated to ethnic hatred and instead was an expression of pure power politics. Croatia seceded from Yugoslavia for fear of Serbian dominance in the federal government. Serbia tried to compel Croatia to stay so that it could exert control over the entire region using Yugoslav institutions. When it became clear that Croatia would not re-enter the union, Serbia and Croatia fought over territory in Bosnia. Both leaders convinced the corresponding minorities in Bosnia that they were being mistreated, manipulating them into action and using this action as an excuse for both leaders to claim the right to more territory. These events are textbook balance of power politics and seem straight-forward and irrelevant to ethnic matters.
At the same time, the explanation of ethnic tension can not be wholly dismissed. After all, what explains the extreme violence in these wars? Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman may have emphasized the disadvantages of the Serb and Croatian minorities in Bosnia but no propaganda campaign can force individuals to rape, abuse, humiliate, and murder other human beings. To claim this would rob Balkan residents of their free will. Croats and Serbs do have a troubled past, particularly with the brutality and genocide exercised by the Ustashe and Chetnik groups during World War II. Is it possible that these people intrinsically hate each other and that the political circumstances surrounding the wars simply gave them an excuse to engage in the violence that they had been eager to participate in all along?

To understand ethnic conflict from a political science perspective, one must begin by questioning its very existence as a relevant motivator for action. This question is raised not to suggest that ethnicity is completely unrelated to such conflicts, but rather as an exercise in challenging the reader to face the implications and inherent problems associated with describing a conflict as ethnic. It is easy to use this term to belittle the people involved and oversimplify the problem, but to face and grapple with the true meaning of ethnic conflict is much more challenging. This thesis will attempt to tease out the implications and inherent problems of defining a conflict as ethnic as well as the ways in which such an explanation may be applicable. Additionally, this project will explain more specifically the motivations for violence in the Balkans as a nuanced combination of different factors. The wars in Croatia and Bosnia can be used to both fundamentally question the legitimacy of ethnic conflict and then to further fine tune why such a conflict might occur and what could be done to prevent a similar event in the future.
In the next chapter of this thesis, I will survey the relevant theories on the nature of ethnicity and ethnic conflict, putting forth a theoretical framework with which to further examine the case of Yugoslavia specifically. In chapter three, I will explore the history of the region before 1990 with particular focus on the twentieth century. This chapter will highlight the first Yugoslavia and its dissolution, the events of World War II, and the way in which nationality policy played out in Tito’s Yugoslavia. In chapter four, I will examine the conflict itself in detail, focusing on the war in Croatia and the war in Bosnia. I will highlight both events which indicate that the conflict was due to elite pressure and those which suggest that motivation for violence came from below.

In chapter five, I will present the events in the region from the Dayton Accords to the present. Little scholarly work has been dedicated to this time period in the Balkans, as many assume that the problem has been resolved. I will closely examine the events of the last eleven years to determine whether the conflict stemmed from undying hatred, which would be indicated by continued anger and hostility in the region, or was simply due to specific circumstances which have since been resolved, making violence no longer a relevant concern. In the sixth and final chapter, I will use my understanding of the theories of ethnic conflict to draw conclusions about the nature of the Yugoslav dissolution. Ideas regarding the motivations for this conflict, along with an evaluation of the successes and failures of the region in the wake of the violence, will be highlighted and analyzed so that they may be used to promote understanding and find solutions for similar problems elsewhere in the world.

Those who think that the events in the former Yugoslavia are no longer worth studying need only read an account of the atrocities committed to be reminded of their importance. Anything which can be done to prevent even a fraction of this suffering from
occurring ever again can and should be done with commitment and vigor. Preventing future conflicts requires a grasp of the meaning and implications of each possible motivation for conflict, as well as a comprehensive understanding of the nuanced motivations for conflict in the Balkans specifically. One must evaluate the region’s recovery from violence and then extrapolate its reasons for success and failure, applying these lessons to the prevention of similar conflicts in the future.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter, I will provide a basic summary of the major schools of thought on ethnic conflict, choosing one or two thinkers to represent each general category. One challenge in reviewing these theories is that rather than progressing from one extreme view to another, individual theories of ethnic conflict tend to approach the problem from wholly different angles. While one theory focuses on the origin of ethnic sentiment, another focuses on motivations for ethnic conflict. Both issues are relevant to the discussion at hand, but their distinct focuses must be highlighted to understand the arguments thoroughly. Rather than trying to relate all theories to each other, I have arranged theories in pairings of opposites to emphasize the unique angles with which each school of thought approaches the argument. By understanding first what one theory argues and then what its opponents have developed to counteract it, one gets an appreciation for the strengths and weaknesses of both sides without trying to force theories into an artificial construct that oversimplifies the arguments made.

A Note on Terminology

Before diving into a review of the relevant theories, it is important to highlight some discrepancies in the field regarding terminology. The terms “constructivism” and “instrumentalism” are thrown around quite a bit to refer to general categories of ethnic conflict theory, but it seems the terms have different meanings for different people. Ted Gurr uses “constructivism” to refer to his own theory that ethnic conflict arises when pre-existing ethnic tensions are exacerbated by elites. He argues that ethnic identities are enduring yet somewhat malleable. “The content and significance of group identity can and do change but
usually in response to changes in the group’s social and political environment.” 7 Gurr presents constructivism as the middle ground between primordialism and the belief that elites fabricate ethnic sentiments entirely. “Ethnic identities are not primordial but nonetheless based on common values, beliefs, and experiences. They are not instrumental but usually capable of being invoked by leaders and used to sustain social movements that are likely to be more resilient and persistent than movements based solely on material or political interests.”8

However, Stuart Kauffman uses the term “constructivism” to refer to theories which see ethnic hatreds as complete elite fabrications. For Kauffman, the constructivist position argues that ethnic identity is a set of ideas which are “generally either newly invented or newly interpreted by ethnic or nationalist intellectuals. It is therefore these intellectuals who ‘construct’ ethnic identity, sometimes by inventing group history from whole cloth.”9 Gurr and Kauffman use constructivism to refer to two entirely different ethnic theories, illustrating that there is no official definition of the term and leaving its meaning unresolved.

The same can be said for the term “instrumentalism.” In Gurr’s 1993 and 1994 publications on ethnic conflict, he presents instrumentalism as the belief that ethnic groups are rational actors. In instrumentalism “the main goals of a group are assumed to be material and political gains and cultural identity is invoked only as a means to attain those goals.”10 Furthermore, instrumentalism “interprets ethnicity as ‘an exercise in boundary maintenance’ and assumes that communal movements are an instrumental response to differential

---

8 Ibid., 5.
treatment.” However, in Gurr’s 2000 publication *People versus States*, he defines instrumentalism as the belief that ethnicity is primarily elite driven. “The instrumental view is that ethnicity is one of many alternative bases of identity. It gains social significance mainly when ethnic symbols are invoked and manipulated by political entrepreneurs in response to threats or opportunities.” Stefan Wolff agrees with Gurr’s more recent interpretation. “The instrumentalist school argues that ethnicity is by no means an indisputable historical fact. Rather, instrumentalists suggest that ethnicity is first and foremost a resource in the hands of leaders to mobilize and organize followers in the pursuit of other interests, such as physical security, economic gain, or political power.”

Clearly, the field of political science has yet to pin down the definitions of these terms. For this reason, I will not use either “constructivism” or “instrumentalism” to describe any theories which I discuss, and will include these terms only when employed by the author in a direct quote. Instead, I have developed my own ways to identify theoretical categories which provide clarity in favor of academic air.

**Modernization Theory and its Opponents**

I will begin this theoretical overview with modernization theory because it raises the fundamental question of whether ethnic conflict is a relevant problem in the modern era. Although modernization theory has largely been discredited, it is important to understand because it highlights some necessary questions about the nature of ethnic ties and groups. Gurr and Barbara Harff summarize the beliefs of modernization theory: “greater political and economic interaction among people and widespread communication networks would break

---

12 Gurr, *People versus States*, 4.
down people’s ‘parochial’ identities with ethnic groups and replace them with loyalties to larger communities such as Canada, the European Community, or an emerging pan-Africa.”

The theory argued that tribal tendencies typically associated with ethnic allegiances were part of a traditional society that was dying out. Educated elites, urban dwellers, and army officers were the most detribalized sectors of society and would lead people away from traditional ethnic loyalties.

However, since this theory was first conceptualized in the 1950s, events have served to contradict it. In the following decades, conflicts based on ethnic identities and interests increased rather than decreasing as the theory anticipated. “Ethnopolitical conflicts increased not only in modernizing societies but also in developed Western societies, which experienced an upsurge in regional separatist movements and ethnoclass protest in the 1960s.”

While modernization theory predicted that newly established elites would lead people away from ethnic affiliations, instead it was these people who were often at the forefront of ethnic conflict. “Militantly ethnic political parties sometimes had their deepest roots among educated elites.”

The very fact that violence broke out in the former Yugoslavia along ethnic lines as late as the 1990s directly contradicts modernization theory.

While it is clear that modernization has not lessened ethnic violence, many argue that it in fact exacerbates these tensions. “Whereas ethnic conflict was conceived earlier as a vestige destined to disappear and then as a vestige stubbornly resistant to change, recent theories of conflict view it as no vestige at all, but as part and parcel of the very process of

---

14 Gurr and Harff, 78.
17 Horowitz, 97.
becoming modern.”18 Gurr and Harff argue that “modernization is a threat to ethnic solidarities that prompts minorities to mobilize in defense of their culture and way of life.”19 In other words, forces of modernization actually strengthen ethnic bonds because they present a threat to the existence of the ethnic group.

Robert Melson and Howard Wolpe argue that “people’s aspirations and expectations change as they are mobilized into the modernizing economy and polity. They come to want, and to demand, more—more goods, more recognition, more power…It is by making men more alike, in the sense of possessing the same wants, that modernization tends to promote conflict.”20 Modernization also results in new benefits being unevenly distributed among ethnic groups. This is because “some groups gain a head start in the competition for the rewards of the modern world and the social classes that emerge tend to overlap and reinforce ethnic group boundaries, thereby making ethnic group confrontations more intense.”21 It seems likely, then, that modernization serves to increase the likelihood of ethnic conflict rather than decrease it. Although this particular issue is no longer hotly contested, it is important to highlight the fact that experts in the field of ethnic conflict believe the problem is very relevant in the modern day and that it may actually get worse in the future.

**Primordialism**

Primordialism is the belief that ethnic identity is innate and that one’s identification with a specific ethnic group is natural and enduring; people of the same ethnicity are drawn together because of intrinsic similarities. The implication of this theory is that ethnic hatred, like ethnic identification, is eternal and unchanging. Primordialism argues that the motivation

18 Ibid., 101.
19 Gurr and Harff, 78.
20 Robert Melson and Howard Molpe as quote in Horowitz, 100.
21 Horowitz, 102.
for ethnic conflict comes completely from individuals and is an expression of one’s allegiance to his own ethnic group and a resulting hatred for others. Ethnic ties and grievances can be manipulated by elites, but these ties are legitimately and naturally felt by the people involved and are in no way fabricated for political gain. While all primordial theories share these basic assumptions, primordialism has two distinct manifestations.

The most extreme version of this theory is biological primordialism. Sociobiology claims that “ethnic groups and nations should be seen as forms of extended kin groups, and that both nations and ethnic groups, along with ‘races’, must be ultimately derived from individual genetic reproductive drives.” Biological primordialism argues that ethnic groups are enduring because members are literally linked together by blood ties. Pierre Van den Berghe argues that caste and race “tend to be ascriptive, defined by common descent, generally hereditary, and often endogamous.” Van den Berghe traces such groups from small tribes; “linked by ties of kinship, they made ‘the tribe in fact a superfamily’. It was only the cultural inventions of the unilineal descent and lineage exogamy that permitted the ‘extension of that primordial model of social organization to much larger societies running into tens of thousands of people.’” Even Van den Berghe himself must admit that ethnic ties are in part formed by myths rather than biological reality. However, he maintains that biology is an integral element of ethnic identity.

Myth will only be believed if members of an ethnic group are sufficiently alike in physical appearance and culture, and have lived together and intermarried for a sufficient period for the myth to have developed a substantial measure of biological truth…Ethnicity or race cannot be invented or imagined out of nothing. It can be manipulated, used, exploited, stressed,

23 Pierre Van den Berghe as quoted in Smith, Nationalism and Modernism, 147.
24 Smith, Nationalism and Modernism, 147.
fused or subdivided, but it must correlate with a pre-existing population bound by preferential endogamy and a common historical experience.  

While Van den Berghe must concede that ethnic ties are somewhat cultural, he maintains that cultural ties can only be maintained on the basis of genetic links.

Anthony Smith criticizes Van den Berghe’s biological argument. “How can we know that our sentiments of ethnic kinship have a genetic basis, or that family and clan ties can be extended through large-scale nepotism on the same physical and reproductive basis to relative strangers because they happen to speak the same language and share the same religion and customs?” If the ties are psychological, based on projection and identification, then the basis of ethnic kinship would be based on psychology rather than physical genetics, leading primordiality to be a purely cultural rather than biological phenomenon. This fundamental problem has led modern political scientists to largely disregard the theory of biological primordialism.

Rather than abandoning primordialism as a viable theory, however, political scientists began to explore its cultural elements. This exploration led to cultural primordialism, first articulated by Clifford Geertz. Geertz explains this theory quite clearly in his work The Interpretation of Cultures.

By a primordial attachment is meant one that stem from the “givens” of social existence: immediate contiguity and kin connection mainly, but beyond them givenness that stems from being born in to a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. These congruities of blood, speech, custom, and so on, are seen to have an ineffable, and at times overpowering, coerciveness in and of themselves. One is bound to one’s kinsman, one’s neighbor, one’s fellow believer, ipso facto; as a result not merely of personal affection, practical necessity, common interest, or incurred obligation but at least in great part by virtue of some unaccountable absolute import attributed to the very tie itself. The general strength of such primordial bonds, and the types of them that are

25 Van den Berghe as quoted in Smith, Nationalism and Modernism, 148.
26 Smith, Nationalism and Modernism, 150.
important, differ from person to person, from society to society, and from time to time. But for virtually every person, in every society, at almost all times, some attachments seem to flow more from a sense of natural—some would say spiritual—affinity than from social interaction.27

For Geertz, ethnic groups can be bonded by assumed blood ties, similar appearance in terms of skin and hair color, language, region, and culture. Cultural primordialism, then, does not completely disregard the legitimacy of blood ties or kinship among groups of people, but rather maintains that many other characteristics serve to bond people as well. The cultural primordialist view takes the concept presented in the biological view, that of enduring and innate bonds between people, and presents it in a manner that is easier to accept in today’s modern world.

Primordialism, however, extends far beyond these basic understandings of ethnic bonds. By stating that people of the same ethnicity are naturally and even spiritually linked, this theory argues that individuals have an innate desire to protect their cultural community against outsiders. Just as bonds between group members are natural and eternal, so too are feelings of hatred toward groups which appear to threaten that way of life. Because opponents seem to threaten bonds which are so intrinsic and personal to each individual, groups will go to any lengths to protect themselves. For primordialists, ethnic bonds and hatreds are fundamental to one’s identity, meaning that conflicts between ethnic groups are inevitable. Conflicts will by definition be extremely brutal and violent because there is no room for compromise on one’s spiritual ties and cultural beliefs.

Critics like John Stack argue that Geertz’s approach “infuses a romantic dimension into the study of ethnicity” which is inappropriate for the objectives of modern social

science.” Stack also argues that Geertz comes “dangerously close to crude statements of cultural determinism. Therefore, an emphasis on primordial ties may lead one easily to the use of stereotypes or may be employed in conjunction with assessments of national character in which continents, countries, or ethnic groups have been ranked from civilized or superior to uncivilized or barbaric.” Furthermore, the primordial approach is at best static; “it fails to explain why ethnicity disappears during one historical period and reintensifies during another.” However, John Stack points out that the “non-rational, even irrational, dimensions of ethnicity are an undeniable aspect of contemporary ethnic mobilizations throughout the world.” Cultural primordialism, like all theories, has some definite flaws, but it also captures a fundamental truth about ethnic bonds and interactions; there is some dimension of ethnic conflict which is undeniably non-rational and primordialism is able to capture this quality in a way which other theories can not.

Before moving on to another cultural primordialist, it is important to understand how and why non-biological elements can bind people together so tightly. Anthony Smith helps to illustrate this fact in *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Smith explains that an ethnic community’s actual origins are not nearly as important as the myths associated with those origins. “Myths of origins and descent provide the means of collective location in the world and the character of the community which explains its origins, growth, and destiny.” A myth of descent answers questions about why people are all members of one community and how they are alike. “As they emerge from the collective experiences of successive

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
generations, the myths coalesce and are edited into chronicles, epics, and ballads, which combine cognitive maps of the community’s history and situation with poetic metaphors of its sense of dignity and identity. The fused and elaborated myths provide an overall framework of meaning for the ethnic community, a mythomoteur, which makes sense of its experiences and defines its essence.”  

A sense of common history unites successive generations and defines a population by its experience. “Historical sequences provide ‘forms’ for later experiences, channels and molds for their interpretation.” Furthermore, the shared elements of culture which Geertz highlighted bond groups together by giving them a sense that they have something unique to protect. “The desire to protect a cultural heritage and tradition inspires not only a sense of superiority and uniqueness and a belief in the rightness and value of the ethnie’s revelation and life-style.” These common cultural elements are the glue which holds the community together. When threatened, groups may do anything to protect them.

Samuel Huntington, in his 1996 work *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*, takes the theory of cultural primordialism to an entirely new level. Huntington undoubtedly echoes Geertz to a certain extent. “In coping with identity crisis, what counts for people are blood and belief, faith and family. People rally to those with similar ancestry, religion, language, values, and institutions and distance themselves from those with different ones.” However, Huntington envisions these groups extending around the globe rather than existing within a specific region. “Politicians invoke and publics

---

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid., 25.
35 Ibid., 50.
identify with greater cultural communities that transcend nation state boundaries.”37 In other words, people are drawn so strongly to those with similar values, culture, and religion that primordial ties can stretch across the planet. Huntington believes that the world consists of seven primary civilizations distinguished primarily by religion. Fault line wars are those disputes which occur between groups of people from different civilizations. “Communal wars may occur between ethnic, religious, racial or linguistic groups. Since religion, however, is the principal defining characteristic of civilizations, fault line wars are almost always between peoples of different religions.”38 In this way, Huntington extends the concept of cultural primordialism across the globe to include Western populations in a discussion of intrinsic cultural and religious ties.

Huntington uses the situation in Bosnia to illustrate his theory. He argues that Catholic Croats, Bosnian Muslims, and Orthodox Serbs are part of three different world-wide civilizations: the West, the Islamic world, and the Slavic or Orthodox world respectively.39 Huntington shows that aid for these groups during the Bosnian war always came from countries of the corresponding civilization. For example, Germany was the first to recognize Croatia after it declared independence. Austria, Italy, and the US soon followed. Even the Vatican sided with Croatia: “the Pope declared Croatia to be the ‘rampart of Western Christianity’ and rushed to extend diplomatic recognition to the state before the European Union did.”40 The United States also joined in by supporting the Croatian military. “Ignoring
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the massive Croatian violations of the UN arms embargo, the United States provided military training to the Croatians and authorized top-ranking retired US generals to advise them."\(^{41}\)

Similarly, the Slavic world rallied behind Serbia. “Russian nationalists, military officers, parliamentarians, and Orthodox Church leaders were outspoken in their support for Serbia, their disparaging of the Bosnian Muslims, and their criticism of Western and NATO imperialism.”\(^{42}\) Furthermore, one thousand or more Russians, along with volunteers from Romania and Greece, enlisted in the Serbian forces to fight what they described as the “Catholic fascists” and “Islamic militants.”\(^{43}\) In spite of the arms embargo, Orthodox countries supplied Serbia with weapons and equipment. “In early 1993 Russian military and intelligence organizations apparently sold $300 million worth of T-55 tanks, antimissile missiles, and antiaircraft missiles to the Serbs.”\(^{44}\) Russia also used its position in the UN to defend Serbian interests and oppose more stringent economic sanctions.

Bosnian Muslims found the same kind of support from their global community. “Muslim governments, most notably those of Iran and Saudi Arabia, competed with each other in providing support. Sunni and Shi’ite, fundamentalist and secular, Arab and non-Arab Muslims societies from Morocco to Malaysia all joined in.”\(^{45}\) The Organization of the Islamic Conference created a group to lobby for the Bosnian case at the United Nations and offered to provide 18,000 peacekeeping troops from Iran, Turkey, Malaysia, Tunisia, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. “In the summer of 1995 the failure of the West to defend the safe areas against Serb attacks led Turkey to approve military aid to Bosnia and to train Bosnian troops, Malaysia to commit itself to selling them arms in violation of the UN embargo, and
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the United Arab Emirates to agree to supply funds for military and humanitarian purposes.\footnote{46} Saudi Arabia and Iran contributed huge amounts of money to develop Bosnian Muslim military strength.

While Geertz maintains that ties are somewhat based on kinship, Huntington’s extension of cultural primordialism to include the entire globe necessarily precludes kinship as a basis for unity, arguing that ethnic ties are based on shared beliefs and practices rather than blood. Despite the purely cultural ties which Huntington envisions, he argues that these bonds are nonetheless very strong. “Governments and people of one civilization do not expend blood or treasure to help people of another civilization fight a fault line war.”\footnote{47} Huntington believes that the bonds of religion and culture transcend national boundaries and greatly influence the choices of political leaders, who are likely to make sacrifices for people in their civilization but not for those outside of it.

Over all, primordialism argues that individuals of the same ethnicity are intrinsically bound to one another based on a sense of kinship, whether real or imagined, as well as shared beliefs and practices. The theory argues that leaders and citizens alike make decisions based on these ties, and are therefore driven by an unspoken feeling of affinity rather than by a wholly rational political agenda. Primordialists argue that the violence in the former Yugoslavia occurred because tightly-knit ethnic groups clashed and people acted not out of concern for the state, the international community, or even themselves, but rather out of concern for the ethnic group. By this understanding, people in the former Yugoslavia fought, killed, and died to ensure the survival and supremacy of their ethnic group on the basis of intrinsic identity and natural hatreds.

\footnote{46}{Ibid., 287.}  
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**Elite Manipulation**

For the purposes of this paper, elite manipulation will refer to the theory developed in direct opposition to primordialism, which holds that ethnic ties are constructed by elites in order to manipulate groups of people into action. This theory suggests that people do not have an innate connection with those who share their culture, language, and heritage. Instead, people who would not otherwise identify with their ethnic group are convinced to do so by outside sources. In the words of Kevin Avruch, “ethnicity is socially constructed: it is not a given but rather a thing which is made and thus potentially unstable, inconstant, and negotiable.”

Paul Brass supports this theory because he believes it is consistent with one’s experience of the world. Brass concedes that people form deep emotive attachments, but argues that these attachments are not constant. “Many people are bilingual, change or shift their language, or do not think about their language at all. Religions too are subject to change by reformers and to conversions and syncretism. Even place of birth and kinship may lose their emotional significance for many people.” Brass argues that elites often politicize the culture and change “the self-definition of the community from that of an ethnic group to one of a nationality competing with others in the political arena. Hence we may infer that it is the competition between elites within a community, and between the elites of different communities, using multiple symbol selection, that mobilizes the members of communities and forms them into cohesive nationalities.”
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V.P. Gagnon, Jr. is a clear supporter of elite manipulation theory. He argues that “violent conflict along ethnic cleavages is provoked by elites in order to create a domestic political context where ethnicity is the only politically relevant identity.” Fundamentally, Gagnon argues that rather than ethnic hatred and resentment naturally leading to a security dilemma, elites construct a security dilemma by inciting fear and highlighting external threats. The individual interest of the population then becomes focused on the threat to the community defined in ethnic terms and only then do people begin to divide themselves along ethnic lines. Elites use this strategy to respond to shifts in the structure of domestic power and to fend off domestic challengers who seek to mobilize people against the status quo.

Gagnon’s argument is constructed on the basis of four basic assumptions. First, the domestic arena is the central concern for decision-makers and elites because it contains their power base; elites will therefore focus on maintaining this power. Secondly, “persuasion is the most effective and least costly means of influence in domestic politics.” One can use persuasion when appealing to the interests of politically relevant actors as members of a group. Thirdly, appeals for support within the domestic arena must be directed toward the values of the target audiences. “Ideas such as ethnicity, religion, culture, and class therefore play a key role as instruments of power and influence, in particular because of their centrality to legitimacy and authority.” Finally, the way in which ideas are framed determines the way political arguments are made and how interests are defined. “The challenge for elites is therefore to define the interest of the collective in a way that coincides with their own power
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interests. In other words, they must express their interests in the language of the collective interest.”

Gagnon also lays out a number of hypotheses regarding the conditions under which national leaders will resort to conflictual policies. If ruling elites face challenger elites who seek to mobilize the population in a way which threatens the ruler’s power or the political structure, the ruler will be willing to respond with policies that are costly to society as a whole. In addition, “threatened elites will respond to domestic threats in a way that minimizes the danger to the bases of their domestic power.” Often, they will try to shift the focus of political debate away from issues where they are most threatened by appealing to the majority in different terms, often cultural or ethnic. “Competing elites will thus focus on defining the collective interest by drawing selectively on traditions and mythologies and in effect constructing particular versions of that interest.” Using this method, elites can identify themselves with the interest of the collective while still maximizing their abilities to achieve their own goals. By reframing the issue, elites can make challengers politically irrelevant and unable to mobilize the population.

Furthermore, when elites engage in competition to define group interest in their favor, images of the outside world and alleged threats are key. “Elites must find issues of grievance unrelated to those issues on which they are most threatened, and construct a political context in which those issues become the center of political debate.” Often elites will frame the threat as applicable to the group as a whole, so that even if an individual does not feel personally in danger, he is led to believe that the group is under attack. “Moreover, if the
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threat or grievance is outside the direct experience of the majority of politically relevant actors, there is no way to verify whether the grievance is real, or indeed whether it is being addressed or not.”59 By creating the illusion of a threat, group interest is placed above that of individuals, creating a context in which ethnicity is all that counts and other interests are no longer relevant. Also, the image of overwhelming threat to the group delegitimizes the dissent of challengers, who can then be branded as traitors. “Control or ownership of mass media, especially television, bestows an enormous political advantage where the wider population is involved in politics, and is a key element in the success of such a strategy.”60

Elites tend to define the relevant collective in ethnic terms when past political participation has been so defined, when international circumstances encourage this definition, and when elites can be seen as credible defenders of ethnic interests. A majority of actors must be identifiable as members of said group, but this does not need to be their primary identity before elite involvement begins. This specific identity must be made the only one that matters; this often leads to “the impression of continuity between past conflicts and current ones.”61

The intensity of a conflictual strategy will depend on the degree to which elites feel threatened. The larger and more immediate the threat, the more willing elites are to take measures which will maintain power in the short term but be very costly in the long term. The time frame of the threat and strength of challenger elites affect the willingness of rulers to discount future costs of their policies. Elites may also use neo-fascist parties in their strategy. The advantage of giving media coverage and weapons to small extremist groups interested in ethnic hatred and violence is that “by bringing extremists into the political
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realm, the right becomes the ‘center;’ a statement that ten years earlier may have been unacceptably racist may be perceived after this kind of strategy as relatively moderate.”62

Elites must carefully monitor the internal costs of conflict and ensure that they are outweighed by the benefits so as to avoid popular mobilization against the conflictual external strategy. Rhetoric is basically costless, “but if military conflict is involved, the costs to the general population rapidly start to mount. Conflict will be undertaken with an eye toward minimizing the costs for those parts of the populations which are key for support.”63

Elites must pay close attention to international costs, which have the potential to affect status quo elites’ domestic power positions. If international threats begin to loom large, elements of the status quo coalition may defect for fear that losses in the international realm would be greater than those in the domestic realm.

Gagnon does not simply admit that elites attempt to take advantage of ethnic cleavages for personal gain. He argues that so-called ethnic conflicts are the direct and sole result of strategic policies. “The current major conflicts taking place along ethnic lines throughout the world have as their main cause not ancient hatreds, but rather the purposeful actions of political actors who actively create violence conflict, selectively drawing on history in order to portray it as historically inevitable.”64 Gagnon argues that “the violence in the former Yugoslavia was a strategic policy chosen by elites who were confronted with political pluralism and popular mobilization.”65 Violence is a good tool for eclipsing demands for change and redirecting the focus of politics towards the supposed threat. “Such violence is thus targeted at least as much against the home-state population, those defined as
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‘us,’ as it is against the direct victims of violence, since the major intended effects of the violence—demobilization and homogenization of political space—are aimed at the home population; the impact on the direct victims may even be only a secondary effect.”66 In other words, Gagnon argues that when Slobodan Milosevic encouraged Serbs to use violence against Croats and Bosnian Muslims, that violence was as much, if not more so, directed at the Serbs than it was at their alleged enemies. As a result of Milosevic’s violent policies, Serbs were formed into a nationalistic whole, therefore making it easier for Milosevic to control them.

Gagnon also explains that on the individual level, ethnicity is a fluid and complex relational mode of identification. In order to mobilize people based on an ethnic understanding, elites would need to tap into the relational senses of identity and self from which ethnicity originate. However, elites are unable to do this. “The violence of ethnic conflicts is thus not meant to mobilize people by appealing to ethnicity—that is, it does not tap into these relational processes. Rather, its goal is to fundamentally alter or destroy these social realities. Indeed, given the rootedness of such realities in peoples’ everyday lives, the only way to destroy them and to impose homogeneity onto existing, heterogeneous social spaces is through massive violence. In other words, it is the very inability of elites to ‘play the ethnic card’ as a means to mobilize the population that leads them to rely on violence.”67

Gagnon does not argue that ethnic ties are nonexistent, but rather that such ties are too complex and malleable for elites to take advantage of. For Gagnon, ethnic identification is a dynamic rather than static experience. The ideas associated with a certain ethnicity change over time and in different contexts. As a result, individuals are constantly making a choice as
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to whether they see themselves as part of an ethnic group. Ethnicity is not a state of being in which one is or is not a Serb but rather it is a choice and action, whereby one chooses to identify himself as a Serb at one point but reserves the right to choose not to do so in the future. Therefore, ethnicity as defined by elites represents a clear break with one’s own personal experience and the creation of a new ethnic reality. The elite version of ethnicity is a constant identity with clear definitions and requirements, which does not permit fluidity, uncertainty, or choice. Thus the ethnicity which is a basis for massive violence is purely an elite construct.

While elites may seem to be pushing for ethnic homogeneity, what they really want according to Gagnon is a homogeneous political space to demobilize challengers. Gagnon supports this argument by noting that during the Balkan conflict elites relied heavily on terror and violence not only in areas that were ethnically heterogeneous but also in those regions which were ethnically “pure” before the conflict or had been “cleansed” by the conflict itself. “The homogeneity being sought is thus a political homogeneity; the means to such an end is the silencing, marginalizing, and demobilization of those voices that were calling for fundamental shifts in the structures of power.” In this sense, conflicts like the Bosnian and Croatian wars are not fought between ethnic groups but between elites and those who oppose their agenda, regardless of ethnicity.

Gagnon argues that the overall goal of such a violent strategy is to redefine political space on two levels. In the short term, images of threat and violence silence and marginalize those who disagree with the people in power. In the long term, the strategy “seeks to reconfigure the borders of ‘our’ political community, to redefine them based on a ‘hard’
notion of culture or ethnicity, again based on fear, and to delegitimize other notions of political community. To do this, elites construct a threat defined in particular ways: ‘us’ versus ‘them.’ This constructed threat is not a reflection of some natural relationship, but rather is the product of fear, an image that is imposed and enforced.”  

Gagnon does not simply argue that elites use ethnic cleansing to frighten people into bonding with their ethnic group. Rather, such violent policies function to alter the demographic reality of the country to reflect the new notions of political community being communicated by elites. “Previously existing communities and bonds, which deny the reality or hardness of the newly constructed, culturally-defined political community are, in particular, targeted for destruction. Only violence and atrocities are sufficient to destroy these realities and to make real the new hard borders of the ethnic group.”  

Gagnon is perhaps the best thinker to present elite manipulation because he accounts for a common objection to the theory. Opponents often argue that elite manipulation represents the masses as mindless sheep who foolishly believe the lies crafted by their leaders in spite of the fact that their own personal experience does not support these ideas. Gagnon argues, however, that elites are unable to tap into the emotional bonds of individuals or change the way that individuals see the world. Elite manipulation has its effect “mostly in perceptions about such relations outside of their own lived experiences. The impact on their perceptions of their own community is minimal. As will be seen, this also explains why these elites had to resort to violence; it was the only way to directly impinge on the everyday lived experiences of these communities in a way that had the potential to change such
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perceptions."\textsuperscript{72} Elites paint an image of a threatening outside world through the media “in order to create a context in which they attempt to affect processes of identification as a means of influence the behavior of their population.”\textsuperscript{73}

Gagnon argues that elites are only able to change people’s perceptions of what is going on “out there” rather than convincing them that their every day experiences constitute a threat. Gagnon assumes that people are intelligent enough to see the disconnect between their own experiences and beliefs and those being shouted from the rooftops by elites. However, the image of threats “out there” and the subsequent violence to confirm these threats creates a truly polarizing situation in which people bind themselves to an ethnic group for purposes of survival and protection. There is no doubt that Gagnon represents a somewhat extreme position by arguing that ethnic bonds are a wholly artificial construct. However, he sets forth one of the most thoughtful portrayals of elite manipulation, and therefore gives it as much credibility as possible. Both primordialism and elite manipulation have strong points and weaknesses, and comparing them forces readers to examine ways in which the positive aspects of one theory draw out negative aspects of the other.

\textbf{Moderates}

The label of moderate will be used to refer to those theorists who take a page from primordialism and one from elite manipulation. These people argue that propaganda and manipulation from above, as well as structural and economic changes, can and do contribute to ethnic violence. However, they maintain that legitimate historical grievances and true ethnic ties must precede any outside changes for the latter to lead to violence. Because the
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moderates represent a melding of two theories and are, by their definition, very middle-of-the-road, this theory category will not be paired with an opposite.

Moderate theorist Michael Brown begins his argument by stating that the presence of historical grievances is not sufficient cause for conflict. While such grievances were present in Bosnia, he argues, they were also present between groups like the Czechs and Slovaks, and Ukrainians and Russians, who did not engage in conflict. “This single-factor explanation, in short, cannot account for significant variation in the incidence and intensity of internal and ethnic conflict.” Brown, therefore, proposes four clusters of factors that make an area more predisposed to violence than others: structural factors, political factors, economic or social factors, and cultural or perceptual factors.

Structural factors include weak states, intra-state security concerns, and ethnic geography. “If the state in question is very weak or if it is expected to become weaker with time, the incentives for groups to make independent military preparations grow. The problem is that, in taking steps to defend themselves, groups often threaten the security of others. This can lead neighboring groups to take steps that will diminish the security of the first group: this is the security dilemma.” In addressing the issue of ethnic geography, Brown argues that states with ethnic minorities are more prone to conflict than others, but does point out that ethnic homogeneity is no guarantee of internal harmony. If ethnic groups are highly inter-mingled, secessionist demands are less likely. However, if they do arise they are more likely to lead to brutality and violence. Countries with groups distributed along regional lines are more likely to face secessionist demands but warfare is more likely to be “conventional” in nature.
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The second set of factors is political. This group includes discriminatory political institutions, exclusionary national ideologies, inter-group politics, and elite politics. Closed, authoritarian systems are likely to generate resentment overtime, especially if the interests of some groups are recognized while others are ignored. If national identity is based on ethnic distinctions rather than political equality, then conflict is more likely as well. The odds of violence occurring also increase if groups, no matter how they are defined, “have ambitious objectives, strong senses of identity, and confrontational strategies. Conflict is especially likely if objectives are incompatible, groups are strong and determined, action is feasible, success is possible, and if inter-group comparisons lead to competition, anxiety, and fears of being dominated.”\textsuperscript{76} Included in political factors is elite manipulation. “Ethnic conflict is often provoked by elites in times of political and economic turmoil in order to fend off domestic challengers. Ethnic bashing and scapegoating are tools of the trade.”\textsuperscript{77}

The third group of factors is economic and social; this includes economic problems, discriminatory economic systems, and the trials and tribulations of economic development and modernization. Economic problems can arise even in times of economic growth if said growth is not as fast as it once was or is not fast enough to keep pace with societal demands. Unequal economic opportunities, unequal access to resources like land and capital, and large differences in living standards can lead certain members of society to see the economic system as unfair and illegitimate. Economic development, industrialization, and the introduction of new technologies bring about profound social changes including migration and urbanization, better education, higher literacy rates, and improved media coverage
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raising awareness. This places strains on existing social and political systems and can raise expectations which lead to frustration when they are not met.

Finally, Brown points to cultural and perceptual factors as predisposing an area to violent conflict. The cultural and perceptual factors include cultural discrimination against minorities and group histories that supply groups with positive perceptions of themselves and negative perceptions of others. Inequitable educational opportunities, legal and political constraints on the use and teaching of minority languages, and restrictions on religious freedom can all lead to resentment among minority groups. “Groups tend to whitewash and glorify their own histories, and they often demonize their neighbors, rivals, and adversaries…Stories that are passed down from generation to generation by word of mouth become part of a group’s lore. They often become distorted and exaggerated with time, and are treated as received wisdom by group members.”78 According to Brown and other moderates, legitimate ethnic grievances and rivalries contribute to violence but are not the sole cause of it as primordialists would argue.

Brown argues that states are especially prone to violence if state structures are collapsing due to external developments, internal problems, or some combination of the two. When state structures weaken, groups have a heightened sense of potential security problems. They are more likely to take measures to protect themselves, which, in turn generates fear among other groups. Political transitions make states more prone to violence because they often result in the emergence of exclusionary national ideologies. The rise of new groups can intensify pre-existing hostilities. “The emergence of power struggles between and among elites can be particularly problematic, because desperate and opportunistic politicians are
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particularly prone to employing divisive ethnic and nationalistic appeals.”79 Economic and social problems can result in violence when they cause discontent and unrest. Such problems include economic hardship, resource competition, income inequality, and fast-paced modernization. “States are especially prone to violence if discrimination against minorities intensifies or if politicians begin to blame some ethnic groups for whatever political and economic problems their country may be experiencing. Ethnic bashing and scapegoating are often precursors to violence.”80

Despite an emphasis on legitimate ethnic grievances and outside factors, Brown makes sure to highlight the potential responsibility of elites in creating conflict. He argues that conflict often arises because of power struggles between competing elites, which are driven by personal, political motivations. Brown argues that power struggle conflicts begin with a lack of elite legitimacy, which leads to elite vulnerability. These vulnerabilities can be brought about by weakening state structures, political transitions, pressures for political reform, and economic powers. Those in power are determined to fend off potential political challengers and devise a new formula to legitimize their rule: playing the ethnic card and proclaiming themselves the champions of ethnic groups. This results in a shift from civic nationalism to ethnic nationalism. Politicians portray other ethnic groups in threatening terms to bolster group solidarity and their own political positions; “perceived threats are extremely powerful unifying devices. When leaders have control over the national media, these kinds of campaigns are particularly effective: a relentless drum beat of ethnic propaganda can distort political discourse quickly and dramatically.”81
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While Brown may seem like a proponent of elite manipulation, he is quick to highlight his belief that the masses are only susceptible to ethnic propaganda and other manipulative devices when antagonistic group histories exist. Violent histories make ethnic bashing and threats seem plausible. He also points to economic trouble as essential in priming people to believe elite suggestions. If economic resources are short, people are more likely to accept a radical change and shift blame to one group for taking all the jobs, having the most money, etc. Brown argues that all three factors—intensifying elite competitions, problematic group histories, and economic problems—must be present for such violent ethnic conflicts to explode.  

The moderate viewpoint is also expressed by political scientist Ted Gurr. Gurr and his colleague Barbara Harff begin their book *Ethnic Conflict in World Politics* with a definition of identity groups. “Identity groups are psychological communities whose members share a persisting sense of common interest and identity that is based on some combination of shared historical experience and valued cultural traits—beliefs, language, ways of life, a common homeland.” Gurr and Harff argue that ethnic ties are based on legitimate similarities but that ethnic identities become increasingly important when actual or perceived disadvantages exist in comparison with the central government, and when members of different ethnic groups are competing for scarce resources. In other words, ethnic ties have some basis in reality but can be intensified by outside factors.

Gurr and Harff lay out a number of hypotheses for why ethnic conflict occurs. First, when people are discriminated against, they are likely to be resentful and angry. Some express anger through accommodation, others vent frustrations openly. For those people who
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express anger openly, the greater the discrimination they experience, the more likely they are to organize against the sources of discrimination. Furthermore, standing up to discrimination alone is difficult and scary. Therefore, “finding like-minded individuals with similar grievances intensifies discontent and increases willingness to take action. The more strongly a person identifies with an ethnic group that is subject to discrimination, the more likely he or she is to be motivated into action.”84 Here, Gurr and Harff suggest that one joins an ethnic group to be part of a larger whole rather than because of strong ethnic bonds.

Furthermore, conflict is more likely when groups are cohesive and have strong, unified leadership. “Cohesive groups are those that have dense networks of communication and interaction that link leaders with followers. Strong ethnopolitical leaders generate the type of climate in which people willingly subordinate personal preferences to group preferences.”85 Many groups depend on external support for financial support, weaponry, military personnel, and verbal encouragement. “The greater their external support, the greater the chances groups will use violent means to challenge authorities.”86 However, even if a group is well-supported, minor grievances do not provoke violent political action. Finally, international status is given to groups and states based on the number and value of economic resources at their disposal. “States blessed with an abundance of resources are more likely to enjoy the support of the international community which is dependent on such resources…The greater international status accorded to a state, the less it is likely that its challengers are externally supported.”87 Throughout these hypotheses, Gurr and Harff reveal a belief that while ethnic groups are held together by a legitimate sense of common values and a shared
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history, the likelihood that these groups will resort to violence depends greatly on outside factors and conditions, rather than ethnic hatreds alone.

Gurr also expresses a moderate view in his 1993 book *Minorities at Risk*. “The most basic assumption of the theory is that ethnopolitical activism is motivated by people’s deep-seated grievances about their collective status in combination with the situationally determined pursuit of political interests, as articulated by group leaders and political entrepreneurs.”88 Gurr finds that ethnic mobilization is based on both sets of factors. Grievances about differential treatment and the sense of group cultural identity are essential precursors of mobilization. If people’s grievances and group identities are weak, there is little chance that a political entrepreneur can mobilize them in opposition to an external threat. On the other hand, “the conjunction of shared grievances with a strong sense of group identity and common interest provides highly combustible material that fuels spontaneous action whenever external control weakens.”89

Gurr lays out four factors which determine the likelihood that a group will resort to violence: the extent of collective disadvantage, the salience of group identity, the extent of group cohesion and mobilization, and the degree to which dominant groups impose repressive control. Groups must also be presented with an opportunity for political action. Global processes can intensify grievances such as the expansion of the state, or the development of a global economic system. Over all, Gurr again presents the view that some legitimate ethnic ties and grievances are necessary in order for elite manipulation and other outside factors to cause ethnic conflict.
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Brown’s version of moderate theory in some ways seems to be a modified version of elite manipulation. He puts great emphasis on the role of leaders in exacerbating ethnic divisions and on other external factors in solidifying people’s feeling of allegiance toward their ethnic group. He seems to mention that ethnic ties and common history must precede violence as an afterthought to avoid the standard criticism that elite manipulation theorists portray the masses as mindless sheep. In this way, it can be argued that Brown’s moderate theory is much closer to elite manipulation than primordialism and therefore is less middle-of-the-road than Gurr’s. Gurr’s theory relies on the fact that ethnic ties are not simply present but extremely strong and coupled with legitimate and significant group grievances. As a result, Gurr presents the most wholly moderate view, which is truly a compromise between elite manipulation and primordialism.

**Emotion Theory**

I will use the term emotion theory to refer to the argument that ethnic violence is motivated by emotion rather than rationality. This theory is somewhat similar to primordialism in the sense that both support the existence of a kind of nonrational, instinctual element at work in ethnic conflict. However, emotion theory is distinct from primordialism because it does not address the origin of ethnic sentiment. Rather than arguing that ethnic bonds are innate and enduring, emotion theory argues that ethnic groups are led to violence based on emotion regardless of the nature of the ethnic ties themselves. For this reason, it is more helpful to compare emotion theory with the opposing view that ethnic violence is motivated by rationality than it is try to equate emotion theory with primordialism.

The primary advocate of emotion theory is Roger Petersen. He takes an emotion-based approach to ethnic conflict because “convincing theories of ethnic conflict must
provide some answer to the puzzling question of why any individual would go out and beat,
humiliate, or discriminate against another human being.” Peter 90 Petersen argues that the
rationality-based approach can not account for this phenomenon. First and foremost,
according to Petersen, an emotion “raises the saliency of one’s desire/concern over others; in
other words, emotion helps select among competing desires. An emotion heightens both
cognitive and physical capabilities necessary to respond to the situational challenge.”91

Petersen presents four primary emotions: fear, hatred, resentment, and rage. The first
three he categorizes as instrumental, meaning that they motivate a person to act in a way
which directly meets a pressing concern. “Fear prepares the individual to satisfy safety
concerns; hatred prepares the individual to act on historical grievance; resentment prepares
the individual to address status/self-esteem discrepancies.”92 Rage, on the other hand, “often
produces cognitive distortions that can lead to irrelevant or counterproductive actions (such
as searching for scapegoats). A primary benefit of the emotional approach is that it can
accommodate both instrumental and noninstrumental action.”93 In other words, Petersen’s
theory can explain actions taken to ensure one’s safety and to obtain what one desires, as
well as actions which provide no clear benefit to the actor himself. A theory which provides
an explanation for both types of actions is quite rare, thus giving a great deal of clout to
Petersen’s argument.

Emotion theory can also explain shifts in motivation, which Petersen believes occur
regularly in ethnic conflict. “The same individual may be driven to commit ethnic violence
by different motivations at different times. The participant in ethnic violence may be acting
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on revenge at one particular moment, on the desire to help preempt an attack on his or her own group at another time, and on the wish to ‘put members of another group in their place’ in yet another situation.”

Emotional responses naturally result from one’s cognitive beliefs. “Beliefs about threat lead to fears; beliefs about status inconsistency lead to resentments; beliefs about history and vengeance lead to hatreds.”

Petersen also provides a detailed account of how these emotions are created. He argues that a structural change leads to information, which creates a belief, which engenders an emotion. The emotion then loops back to effect what information one absorbs and what beliefs one takes from it. Emotions themselves lead to concerns for safety, historical vengeance, and group status—stemming from fear, hatred, and resentment respectively—which then affect one’s desires and lead one to act. “The emotion, once generated, produces feedback effects on information and belief. For the instrumental emotions, the beliefs that have already been formed become reinforced. For example, once one is in the grip of fear, reports about danger and threat will crowd out other information.” Instrumental emotions act to select the information that is most relevant to the elevated goal. “In the instrumental paths, emotion impacts cognition through a feedback loop. In rage, emotion dominates and distorts cognition.” In other words, instrumental emotions cause one to select the information he wants to hear, while rage causes one to change information entirely.

Petersen provides some examples of structural changes which lead to each of the instrumental emotions. In the case of fear, the collapse of weakening of the political center can eliminate institutional constraints and guarantees to create a situation of anarchy. In this
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situation, “fear heightens the desire for security. The target of ethnic violence will be the group that is the biggest threat.”98 The collapse of the center also eliminates constraints, which provides an opportunity to commit aggression and gives hatred free reign. “The target of ethnic violence will be the group that has frequently been attacked with similar justification over an extended time period.”99 In the case of resentment, the weakening of the central government can rearrange ethnic status hierarchies by changing sovereignty relations. “The predicted ethnic target will be the group perceived as farthest up the ethnic status hierarchy that can be most surely subordinated through violence.”100 If the target is lower on the status hierarchy, or higher but cannot be reduced through violence then resentment does not apply.

Fear, hatred, and resentment all involve a desire to lash out, but this desire is linked to a specific concern and embedded in the context of group relations. However, if the desire to lash out arises from multiple sources and without a clear course of action, then rage is involved and aggression may be directed arbitrarily. “If the target of aggression is not related to the conditions that created frustration, the negative emotions may continue, or perhaps only temporarily subside.”101 In the case of rage, emotion precedes cognition, which leads to distortions in information collection and belief formation. This may lead to substitute targets rather than direct ones; “if the group that is the source of frustration is unavailable for attack, another group will be found to substitute for it.”102 Rage is distinguishable by cognitive distortions in the selection of targets, clear substitute targets, incoherent justifications for violence, and difficulty identifying the source of emotion.
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Petersen also presents an argument for the superiority of the emotions-based approach over the rational choice approach. Rational choice assumes that the individual has one stable preference structure, such as a belief that safety is more important than revenge which is more important than self-esteem, and assumes that action can be predicted based on this structure. However, Petersen questions how realistically preferences relating to ethnic violence can be rank ordered. The emotion approach does not require creating such ranks, and thus in some ways can be seen as preferable to rational choice theory. “Emotions create a sense of urgency, they dramatically raise the salience of a particular desire, they explain compulsion.”  

Furthermore, Petersen maintains that “any act by an individual against a large group is inherently irrational. One individual’s action will not change the power of status position of an ethnic group.”  

There must be an explanation for why an individual participates in group action with public goods characteristics. Some theorists stretch rational choice theory to include a value of the enjoyment of participation. However, “the benefit of this participation makes no sense without reference to emotion. Why does an individual value participation for its own sake?”  

It is misleading to assign “a hate filled action a certain participatory utility or value when the emotion of hate itself is the driving and determinative force.”  

Rational choice theory, according to Petersen, is most useful under stable institutional environments. However, most violent ethnic conflicts occur in periods of state collapse and it is in this situation that emotion theory is most salient.
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Petersen also addresses critics who argue that elites are capable of creating these emotions. Petersen concedes that elites can influence ethnic relations through their grip on the media by cleverly framing the situation to their advantage and by appealing to norms. “With reference to nationalist myths and constant reminders of past and present victimizations, elites can inflame and intensify the emotions themselves.” However, if Petersen’s mass-oriented approach is able to correctly identify and explain patterns of ethnic conflict, then the role of elite influence must be questioned. “Elites must then be seen as responding to structural change and mass emotion rather than shaping it. Clearly, the influences go both ways, but it is an important matter to determine which direction is dominant.”

Finally, Petersen agrees with Ivelin Sardamov who said, “Portraying millions of individuals in many societies as mindless robots who can easily be duped into assuming fictitious identities and sacrificing their own and others’ lives for the purposes of a small group of skillful self-serving manipulators represents an extremely simplistic and condescending view.” The emotion-based approach presents people as responsible for their own actions, rather than placing the blame solely on elites who somehow tricked the masses into behaving a certain way.

Emotion theory is unique in that it embraces the “unscientific” nature of ethnic conflict as well as both the instrumental and noninstrumental actions of individuals involved. For many, a comprehensive theory on ethnic conflict must make room for emotional motivation, as this is believed to be the only way to explain the brutality of such wars. “As Chateaubriand expressed it nearly 200 years ago, ‘Men don’t allow themselves to be killed
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for their interests; they allow themselves to be killed for their passions.’ To phrase it differently, large numbers of people do not voluntarily die for things that are rational.”

Emotion theory captures an element of ethnic conflict which often eludes or is ignored by political scientists, but which is nonetheless an important element of such violence.

**Rational Choice Theory**

Rational choice theory agrees that ethnic groups form of their own volition rather than by elite manipulation, but argues that these groups are fundamentally motivated by rational concerns rather than by emotion. To a certain extent, proponents of rational choice theory treat ethnic groups as states, seeking power, security, and survival rather than carrying out vendettas against others which would not serve concrete political purpose. The premier thinkers in this category are David Lake and Donald Rothchild, who argue that ethnic conflicts are caused by collective fears of the future. “As groups begin to fear for their safety, dangerous and difficult-to-resolve strategic dilemmas arise that contain within them the potential for tremendous violence. As information failures, problems of credible commitment, and the security dilemma take hold, groups become apprehensive, the state weakens, and conflict becomes more likely.”

Lake and Rothchild maintain that ethnic groups are formed originally because of legitimate historical grievances against other groups. In the words of Vesna Pesic, a professor at the University of Belgrade and a peace activist in the former Yugoslavia, “ethnic conflict
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is caused by the fear of the future, lived through the past.\textsuperscript{112} This is in some ways consistent
with the arguments of primordialists, in that the masses choose to join ethnic groups for
personal reasons rather than being duped by elites. However, the role of emotion and fear
ends with the formation of ethnic groups. Individuals’ motivations for action, according to
Lake and Rothchild, are rational and therefore similar to those experienced by state actors.

Lake and Rothchild propose that “competition for resources typically lies at the heart
of ethnic conflict.”\textsuperscript{113} Because the state controls access to scarce resources, those groups with
more political power gain privileged access to resources, increasing their welfare and leading
to resentment from other groups. “When groups conclude that they can improve their welfare
only at the expense of others, they become locked into competitions for scarce resources and
state power.”\textsuperscript{114} Pointing to the case of Czechoslovakia, where two ethnic groups had
competing policy preferences but reached compromise to avoid violence, Lake and Rothchild
state that “competing policy preferences by themselves can not explain the resort to
violence.”\textsuperscript{115} They argue that in order for negotiations to fail, one of three strategic dilemmas
must exist: information failure, problems of credible commitment, and the security dilemma.

Lake and Rothchild begin by explaining their understanding of information failure.
“Because violence is costly, groups can be expected to invest in acquiring knowledge about
the preferences and capabilities of the opposing side and bargain hard, but eventually reach
an agreement short of open conflict.”\textsuperscript{116} This strategy, however, requires that groups reveal
information about themselves to the enemy, which they often feel uncomfortable doing. An
information failure occurs when groups cannot acquire or share the information necessary to
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reach a compromise. Groups have an incentive to misrepresent information when they feel they can gain in negotiations by bluffing. “By exaggerating their strengths, minimizing their weaknesses, and misstating their preferences, groups seek to achieve more favorable division of resources.” Misrepresentations, however, make conflict more likely. For example, groups may be truly aggressive but not want to be branded as such. These groups seek to minimize internal opposition and avoid repercussions in the broader international community and so misrepresent their character. This can lead opponents to be especially unyielding in negotiations, not knowing the likelihood that doing so will result in violence.

In conflicts where groups are negotiating and preparing for war at the same time, any attempt to facilitate compromise will require that each side explain how it plans to win on the battlefield. However, doing so would seriously compromise one’s ability to win. Without being able to tell the truth, groups can not derive accurate predictions of their success. “Concerned that private information they provide on how they intend to protect themselves or attack others will work to their disadvantage, groups may refrain from revealing the information necessary to forge a mutually satisfactory compromise.” Furthermore, “if one group believes that the other is withholding information, it too may begin to hold back crucial data or anticipate the failure of negotiations.” Even the anticipation of an information failure may drive groups to undermine attempts at peace by withholding information on the suspicion that the other side is doing the same.

The second cause of ethnic conflict according to Lake and Rothchild is the problem of credible commitment. “Ethnic conflicts also arise because groups cannot credibly commit themselves to uphold mutually beneficial agreements they might reach. In other words, at
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least one group cannot effectively reassure the other that it will not renege on an agreement and exploit it at some future date."120 The ability to uphold a peace agreement depends on the minority group, which is undoubtedly fearful of future exploitation and violence and may be reluctant to make compromises if it feels the other side will not uphold them. Lake and Rothchild are confident that “when the balance of ethnic power remains stable—and is expected to remain stable—well-crafted contracts enable ethnic groups to avoid conflict despite their differing policy preferences.”121

However, this balance does shift over time, making such agreements more difficult. For example, when multi-ethnic federations like Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union disintegrate, “the relevant political space alters rapidly and the various ethnic groups that once counted their numbers on a national scale must now calculate their kin in terms of the new, smaller territorial units, and may find themselves in a stronger or weaker position.”122 If a group believes that there is even a slight chance that it will become the target of a genocidal attack, it may choose conflict over compromise, which would involve the risk of future destruction. “To provoke conflict, one group need not believe that the other really is aggressive, only fear that it might be. With incomplete information even small changes in beliefs about the intentions of the other group can generate massive violence.”123

The final catalyst to ethnic conflict is the security dilemma. States which feel their security is threatened or may soon be threatened tend to expand their military capabilities. This in turn is seen as threatening by the opposing group, which bulks up its forces and in doing so seems to confirm the suspicion of threat of the original group. “It is the inability
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both to know with certainty the intentions and abilities of others, and to commit credibly not
to arm for offensive purposes that drives the spiral."124 Along with the security dilemma
comes the issue of preemption; if one group fears the other will preempt then it might choose
to strike first and negotiate later. "In ethnic relations, as in international relations, when there
are significant advantages to preemptions, a cycle of violence can seize previously peaceful
groups even as they seek nothing more than their own safety. By the same logic, previously
satisfied groups can be driven to become aggressors, destroying ethnic harmony in the search
for group security."125 The three precursors to ethnic violence presented here—information
failure, credible commitment, and the security dilemma—all can and have been applied to
conflicts between states. This comparison emphasizes Lake and Rothchild’s point that ethnic
groups are rational actors, as there is no actor more rational in a political system than a state.

Lake and Rothchild do recognize that ethnic conflicts are more complex than
interactions between states because ethnic groups are held together by more tenuous and
unofficial bonds than nations are. The two theorists agree that political elites can aggravate a
pre-existing problem; Lake and Rothchild coin the term “political entrepreneurs” to refer to
those who do not share the beliefs of extremists but who seek to use extreme view points to
gain political office and power. Some moderate leaders are forced to adopt more “ethnic”
positions in response to militant political challengers in a process of “ethnic outbidding.”
Political entrepreneurs can also reinforce processes of social polarization. When presenting
issues to the public, such leaders can “exaggerate the hostility of others and magnify the
likelihood of conflict—thereby distorting public debate and images of other groups and
driving co-ethnics toward them for power and support…In short, political entrepreneurs both
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reflect and stimulate ethnic fears for their own aggrandizement.” Lake and Rothchild maintain that leaders can not create ethnic hatred out of thin air. In the situation described leaders are playing on fears that primarily derive from rational safety concerns rather than emotion and hatred.

Ethnic activists also play a strong role in the polarization. “By persuading others to increase their public ethnic activity in order to maintain standing within the group ethnic activists can drive individuals to represent falsely their true preferences. While they might prefer, for instance, not to associate exclusively with members of their own group, individuals are pressed by activists and the social pressures they spawn to alter their behavior in a more ‘ethnic’ direction.” Social polarization by itself does not lead to ethnic violence, and ethnic extremists seem to be generated by significant information failure, problems of credible commitment, and security dilemmas, rather than to create them. “Ethnic activists and political entrepreneurs are as much a product as a producer of ethnic fears and are dependent for their ‘success’ upon the underlying strategic dilemmas.”

Lake and Rothchild do make room for the role of political memories and myths in exacerbating ethnic conflict. “Many analysts point to a deep psychological—perhaps even physiological—need for humans to belong to a group. In the process of drawing distinctions, however, individuals often overstate the goodness of their own group while simultaneously vilifying others.” However, Lake and Rothchild maintain that the fundamental precursors to ethnic violence are not based on emotion but rather rational security concerns. Emotion
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may intensify these concerns and the unity of the group, but it is at best a secondary
ccontributor which only has an affect when rational concerns exist previously.

Fundamentally, Lake and Rothchild are not hopeful about the prospect of preventing
ethnic conflicts in the future because “there is no form of insurance sufficient to protect
against the dilemmas that produce collective fears and violence.” In this sense, ethnic
conflict differs from those between states. While it can be hard for states to trust each other if
they have an antagonistic relationship, the international community often serves to reinforce
treaties and provide some deterrent to breaking them. For ethnic groups, these deterrents are
not as strong, making the actions of such groups unpredictable and heightening fears about
future actions.

Daniel Byman, like Lake and Rothchild, supports the rational choice theory. He
proposes four general causes of ethnic conflict, none of which are mutually exclusive. The
first is the ethnic security dilemma, whereby groups make efforts to protect themselves
because no sovereign authority can ensure their security. The second cause is a group’s status
concerns; “ethnic conflict occurs as an outgrowth of group fears of being dominated, in both
material and cultural ways, by other groups. The specific concern with regard to status is
cultural, not physical, survival.” The third is a desire of one or several groups for
hegemony. A fourth cause is the ambitions of ethnic elites who play on ethnic fears, hatreds,
and ambitions to gain or maintain power.

Byman begins with an examination of the ethnic security dilemma. While this factor
is also highlighted by Lake and Rothchild, Byman highlights a few elements which the two
omitted from their study. For example, Byman explains that the security dilemma for ethnic
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groups, as opposed to states, begins when the government becomes too weak to protect one
group from its rival. This encourages the group to arm itself and thus sets off the dilemma.

Byman also emphasizes the distinction between the structural and perceptual approaches to
the security dilemma. The structural view argues that security dilemmas are essentially
inevitable in the correct circumstances; even two states fully satisfied with the status quo may
begin a war simply because both believe that the state who strikes first will have a decisive
advantage. The perceptual approach emphasizes the role of factors like the degree of ethnic
chauvinism and level of elite manipulation in any specific situation. Even when
circumstances may be primed for a security dilemma, one will not occur according to this
understanding if groups favor peaceful means of resolving the conflict. Byman argues that in
order to emphasize the security dilemma as a legitimate cause of conflict, it is important to
use the perceptual approach which shows that the existence of the security dilemma is
meaningful as opposed to rather than always being present.

Byman also highlights the fact that preemptive action is especially likely in ethnic
conflicts because they tend to be situations of offensive dominance. This means that it is
relatively easy and costless for groups to act offensively, but dangerous and risky to act
defensively. In most ethnic conflict, killing large numbers of the enemy is cheap and easy
because defenders are unarmed civilians. Small bands of gunmen can easily create masses of
refugees and little training is required. Weapons are inexpensive and widely available.
Because of this characteristic of ethnic warfare, groups must be highly sensitive to the other’s
efforts to arm and mobilize. “Even groups that do not seek to harm their neighbors have an
incentive to mobilize and strike first before their opponent does the same to them.”

______________________________________________________________________________
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Byman’s point is also an important addition because it presents a logical explanation for action which may otherwise seem illogically aggressive and brutal.

The ease of offensive action in ethnic conflict can also be used to explain ethnic cleansing. “The settlements of rival ethnic groups in another group’s territory represent dangerous islands of potential traitors who, given arms and minimal training, will pose a serious military threat. ‘Cleansing’ such areas, from a military point of view is logical.”133 Moderate voices are quickly silenced as atrocities, real and exaggerated, discredit peaceful solutions. “Even those who reject an exclusive ethnic identity and see themselves as cosmopolitan fear hostility both from their own people and from the enemy, which seldom distinguishes the assimilated from the non-assimilated.”134 There is also pressure to keep members of the group in the group, so that moderates are polarized by force. In this way, Byman provides a rational explanation for individuals to join violent groups.

Byman also discusses ethnic status and strife as causes of conflict. “Status causes conflict when one distinguishable group blocks another’s quest for recognition or social legitimacy.”135 Nationalists glorify the dominant identity and play down rival claims to a state’s history. As a result, the minority group must organize to gain respect and recognition. “Status concerns differ from those of the security dilemma in that groups fear not only for their survival but also for their own cultural or social domination. Once a conflict begins, however, status concerns and security fears often become interwoven. Group fears of cultural extinction are reinforced by security fears that are often generated by actual violence.”136
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Modernization often aggravates status concerns by bringing previously isolated groups in contact with each other, as well as encouraging mobility and undermining the existing ethnic division of labor. “The composition of a region can change due to the migration fostered by modernization. Protecting one’s traditional space and opportunities from migrants thus becomes a preoccupation of the local population.”\textsuperscript{137} Status conflicts usually occur between an advanced and a backward group. “The advanced groups in general tend to be more tied to the modern sector of the economy. Backward groups will strive to ensure their fair share in society and government, and they fear being overwhelmed by the advanced group.”\textsuperscript{138}

Byman also attributes ethnic conflict to hegemonic ambitions of ethnic groups. While both ethnic security dilemmas and status concerns have defensive motivations, hegemonic ambitions are offensive in nature. “For members of hegemonic groups, their language must be the only official language; their religion must be followed by all citizens; and their institutions must be enshrined in government and society.”\textsuperscript{139} The hegemonic group must assert that it deserves and can achieve political and social domination. Conflicts based on these ambitions generally occur when a group is numerically superior and considers itself more socially advanced. Minority resistance to attempted hegemony becomes increasingly likely when there has been past bloodshed, a strong established culture exists, and progress on minority rights has occurred elsewhere.

Finally, Byman points to elite competition as a cause of ethnic conflict. When elites compete for power they often attempt to outbid each other. Elites try to make their interpretation of what ethnicity means the dominant political issue in order to increase their
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power. “They try to manipulate existing identities, making certain ones more politically salient and weakening national or other identities that might bring people together.”

Elite competition is far more focused on within-group tension than inter-group problems. Elites often try to convince individuals to identify themselves along ethnic lines and depoliticize other issues by emphasizing ethnicity to attract supporters. Control over information is essential for elite influence to take effect. Furthermore, elite competition can create a security dilemma by portraying aggression as more likely to succeed and other groups as more threatening than they really are. Elites even hire their own mobs or thugs to increase tension and protect themselves.

Lake and Rothchild present ethnic conflict in a very straight-forward and rational manner. Groups are all interested in protecting themselves and their interests, and they resort to violence in these pursuits. Byman take a more risky approach to rational choice theory by trying to provide explanations for aspects of ethnic conflict which can not easily be described as rational. Groups may initiate violence in situations where the opposing group does not constitute an obvious threat because, in situations of offensive dominance, it is more logical to risk initiating a war that may not have otherwise happened than to sit back and allow for the minute possibility that the other group will act first. While Lake and Rothchild focus on ethnic groups’ attempts at physical survival, Byman makes room for cultural survival and dominance as motivations for violence. Byman still argues that groups act rationally rather than emotionally, but simply applies rational considerations to aspects of ethnic conflict that are often relegated to the emotional realm.
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Conclusion

There is no question that some important scholars in the field of ethnic conflict have been omitted from this overview and that a number of theories exist which are not presented here. However, most of the absent theories propose combinations of those explored above, adding some nuances which, while intriguing, are more complex and detailed than this study permits. In examining the violence in the former Yugoslavia all theories will appear perfectly relevant at some points and completely wrong at others. A thorough examination of the events in the region will reveal that no theory is perfect but that each explains some essence of ethnic conflict which is otherwise difficult to understand. In a certain sense, it is only by recognizing the merit of each argument along with its weaknesses that a full picture of the forces behind ethnic conflict can ever be attained.
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Chapter 3: Background of the Region

This chapter will provide a historical background of the Balkans from the time that the Slavic people first migrated to the region in the sixth century to the rise of Slobodan Milosevic in the late 1980s. Focus must undoubtedly be placed on events of the twentieth century, primarily World War II, which saw great ethnic and nationalistic violence, and Tito’s Yugoslavia, the deterioration of which led to the conflicts of the 1990s. However, the fact that discussions of ethnic conflict contain endless references to “ancient hatreds” necessitates an examination of the early events of the Balkans to determine the true origins and histories of these groups, and to establish how far back mutual hatreds can reasonably be said to extend. It is impossible to truly understand and appreciate the complexities of the Croatian and Bosnian Wars without putting them in the context of fifteen centuries of life in the Balkans.

It should be noted that this chapter may at times seem to be arguing that fundamental ethnic hatreds exist in the region and at other times seem to be arguing just the opposite. My goal is to present an exhaustive and unbiased history of the Balkans rather than picking and choosing certain events to highlight in an attempt to support a specific interpretation. When appropriate, I will expand on historical facts to illustrate how they can be used to bolster one theory, but will try to balance out such statements with a counter-argument as well. This chapter, then, is meant to give the reader all the information he or she will need to develop a personal opinion on the subject without attempting to advocate one side over the other.

The Origin of Ethnic Division in the Balkans

People of Slavic descent first began emigrating to the Balkans in the sixth century. This group of migrants contained the ancestors of present-day Serbs and Croats, meaning that
the two groups have ties of kinship and were in fact originally one people. The Slavic immigrants were pagan upon arrival, but one group of Slavs settled in an area that was increasingly targeted by Orthodox missionaries from Constantinople, and another in an area which was growing increasingly Catholic.\(^{141}\) This means that the fundamental difference between Serbs and Croats is religion rather than ancestry. In the words of Robert Kaplan, “Were it not originally for religion, there would be little basis for Serb-Croat enmity.”\(^{142}\) Furthermore, this distinction developed arbitrarily when modern-day Serbs settled in a region which fell under control of the Byzantine Empire and modern-day Croats settled in land which was soon to be controlled by the Roman church. The division between Serbs and Croats did not develop naturally but rather by chance.

Before moving onto subsequent historical developments, it is important to understand how religious differences can develop into a sense of complete cultural separation. As Kaplan explains, the differences between Orthodoxy and Catholicism go beyond disagreements about religious interpretations and beliefs. The two represent fundamental opposites of East versus West, “beauty and magic” versus “ideas and deeds.” Eastern Orthodoxy is a re-creation of heaven on earth, and Catholicism, while often considered highly ritualistic in the West, is intellectual compared to Orthodoxy.\(^{143}\) Croats identify with Western Europe more so than with the Balkan region because they see themselves as distinct from the Eastern culture of Orthodoxy. In the words of one Croat, “I feel closer to Vienna than to Belgrade. Zagreb is still Europe.”\(^{144}\)
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Kaplan argues that Serbs and Croats are fundamentally divided by their religious differences, and in many ways have cultures which are at odds with one another. However, it is important to note that while Croats in Croatia cling to Western Catholicism as a defining characteristic, Croats in Bosnia tend to be more attached to their ethnicity than to their religion. Kaplan argues that Croatian Croats hold religion more highly because they are surrounded by people of their own ethnicity but are close to the Eastern Orthodox and Muslim worlds; this heightens their sense that Catholicism is important because it is the characteristic that makes them different. Similarly, Bosnian Croats live in and among other ethnic groups and therefore hold on to their ethnicity more fiercely than their religion because it defines them in their particular context.145 While this argument still describes Croats and Serbs as at odds with one another, it does suggest that one’s identity is malleable, based more on one’s context than on fundamental truths and differences. If people are able to vary the ways in which they see and understand themselves depending on their circumstances, then one can argue that ethnic and religious identities are too flexible to yield lasting and fundamental hatreds.

In keeping with the argument that ethnicity is a constantly shift phenomenon, Noel Malcolm argues that in spite of ethnically divisive rhetoric, very few people in the Balkans can actually claim racially pure ancestry. “As anyone who has lived or traveled in the Balkans will know, there is no such thing as a racially homogenous province there, let along a racially homogeneous state…Even if it were right to conduct modern politics in terms of ancient racial origins, it would simply not be possible.”146 Malcolm concludes that as of 1180, Bosnians may have had slightly closer associations to the Croats than to the Serbs in
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their religious and political history, but that this can hardly be said to translate to a kinship with modern Croat identity. “All that one can sensibly say about the ethnic identity of the Bosnians is this: they were the Slavs who lived in Bosnia.”147 Bosnians came from the same Slavic ancestors of modern-day Croats and Serbs, and were similarly molded into a different group by conquering empires.

Although the Byzantine Empire was able to exert great influence over the religious lives of Serb settlers through missionary work, Serbs were resistant to official Byzantine rule. In the tenth century, Serb tribes began organizing themselves into a loose alliance of chiefs in an attempt to oppose Byzantine forces. After many years of resistance, Serb independence became official when the first Serb monarch, King Michael, came to power in 1051.148 By 1196, Serbia had consolidated a relatively small area of territory, including parts of present day Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, and Kosovo. The Serbian empire continued to thrive and by 1355, it controlled a larger chunk of present-day Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, as well as all of Montenegro, Albania, Kosovo, Macedonia, and a large part of Greece.149 The growth and dominance of the Serbian Empire is important for the discussion at hand because for many Serbs this historical reality reflects the proper place of Serbs in the Balkans today. Some argue that Serbia’s experience with independence, and its former status as ruler of much of the region, entitles it to control of this territory and makes the idea of Serbia being equal partners with these other states unacceptable.

In spite of Serbia’s great success as an independent state, the empire began to disintegrate when its two-hundred-year-old dynasty fell from power. This created a power
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vacuum and allowed the Ottoman Turks to move in and exert dominance over the territory. Serbs took up arms in opposition to the Ottoman takeover and maintained this resistance for almost two decades. The Ottomans beat the Serbs in 1371 on the Maricsa River but the Serbs fought on until they were ultimately defeated on June 28, 1389 at the Battle of Kosovo. This date marked the official Ottoman Turkish takeover of Serbia. “After falling under Turkish rule the Serbs were to have no more independent existence until 1804.”

The Battle of Kosovo has immense importance in Serbian history. This is not because the battle was particularly significant at the time it occurred. While the Battle of Kosovo marked the official Ottoman takeover of Serbia, historians argue that the Battle of Maricsa was a much more decisive event, after which it was only a matter of time until Serbia fell to the Turkish conquerors. However, the Battle of Kosovo remains important today because of myths and legends which developed in the years which followed, primarily about Serb warrior Prince Lazar. As legend has it, Prince Lazar chose to lead a hopeless fight against the Ottoman sultan at Kosovo rather than suing for peace and compromising Serb honor. “At the start of the battle, the invading Turks offered Lazar the choice between fighting to the death and capitulation. They also offered a reward for his surrender. He refused, choosing the kingdom of heaven over worldly wealth and the betrayal of his nation to a foreign oppressor.”

Today, the Battle of Kosovo is charged with nationalistic pride and symbolism, reflecting the feelings and opinions of modern-day Serbs rather than any particular facts about the event itself. “The fact that Christians and Muslims fought on both sides of the battle—that Serbs, Croats, Albanians, and Turks could be found in both armies—was quickly
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forgotten. That the battle was probably a stand-off, a draw, and not the epiphany of a tragic defeat also disappeared in the searing light of national self-sacrifice.\textsuperscript{152} All of these facts support the theory that ethnic myths are based on present-day needs and views rather than past reality. As a result, when Serb nationalists invoke images of past Croat racism or vice versa, it is important to look at the specific events being referenced and judge whether historical facts support modern interpretations.

Almost a full century after Serbia was taken over by the Ottoman Turks, modern-day Bosnia was absorbed into the empire as well. When the Ottomans took control of Bosnian territory in 1463 they brought Islam to the region. The new rulers did not force conversions on its people but rather stated that “any Christian member of the Ottoman Empire was free to join the privileged class simply by changing his faith.”\textsuperscript{153} Very few Serbs converted to Islam after their territory was absorbed into the empire, but in Bosnia “it has been estimated that 70 percent of the people became Muslims.”\textsuperscript{154} It was at this point that the region of Bosnia became an eclectic mix of Muslim, Catholic, and Orthodox inhabitants.

Although divisions of the three major groups in Bosnia center on religious differences, scholars argue that feelings of separation originated due to economic rather than faith-related issues. Most Orthodox Serbs in Bosnia lived in the countryside, while a majority of the Muslim population lived in towns and owned the land that Serb peasants worked. This economic division was the basis for feelings of resentment by the oppressed peasant, which was experienced in much of Europe, and eventually took on religious and national dimensions. Noel Malcolm argues that the hostilities in Bosnia were malleable and not at all
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the inevitable result of mixing different religious communities together. “The main basis of hostility was not ethnic or religious but economic: the resentment felt by the members of a mainly (but not exclusively) Christian peasantry towards their Muslim landowners. This hostility was not some absolute or irreducible force: it varied as economic circumstances changed, and was also subject to political pressures which significantly altered the attitude of the landowning class during the first half of the nineteenth century.”155 While Malcolm does suggest that resentment between ethnic groups in Bosnia reaches back to their ancient past, his suggestion that these sentiments were originally economic rather than ethnic in character still brings primordialism into question. After all, by his account these groups did not bind together because of some unspoken psychological and spiritual connection but because of common logical resentment.

The Expansion of Nationalism

For hundreds of years, the Slavic groups of the Balkans were ruled by large empires; the Serbs and Bosnians lived under Ottoman rule, while the Croats were controlled by the Austrians. Because the Ottoman Empire was the first to decline and the Serbs were unusually powerful for a subjugated group, the Serbs were the first Slavic group to fight for their independence. In 1804, the Serbs rose up in revolt to protest the poor administration and oppressive acts of the local Turkish officials of the Ottoman Empire. “By 1806 the Ottoman government, worried by the progress of the revolt, offered to grant autonomy to Serbia. Meanwhile, the Serbs had been able to gain an alliance with Russia, herself at war with the Ottoman Empire, and they now demanded complete independence.”156 Russia, however,
turned out to be an unreliable ally and concluded its war with the Ottomans without the Serbs in mind. The Serbs fought the Ottomans until 1813 when they were defeated.

When the Turks reoccupied Serbia, they did so in such a violent manner that Serbs rebelled again in 1815. Because France had since been defeated and Russia was therefore a more powerful force than it had previously been, the Ottomans feared Russian intervention and thus granted Serb autonomy. The Ottoman Empire continued to levy a tribute on the Serbs and to occupy certain fortresses in Serbia, but for all intents and purposes the Serbs had secured an independent state. The agreement was solidified by the Treaty of Akkerman of 1826 and the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, making the Serbs the first Balkan ethnic group to forge their own autonomous state in the modern era.\footnote{157} This put Serbs in a powerful place vis-à-vis Croats and Slovenes who were not in a position to gain independence in the near future. This development also set the stage for later Serb claims that they were the only group fit to rule Yugoslavia as they had the most experience at self-government.\footnote{158}

Despite Serbia’s advantageous position, however, the country was still somewhat dependent on its former occupier because its supply routes ran through the Ottoman Empire. If Serbia could acquire its own outlet to the sea, the country would attain economic independence; this would lead to more autonomy and an opportunity for greater power. Because Bosnia lay between Serbia and the coast, Serbs recognized the necessity to possess Bosnia in order to gain water access and Serb leaders soon set their sights on this goal. “The idea of a Greater Serbia had been born.”\footnote{159} This historical development supports rational
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choice theory as it shows that Serb interest in Bosnia originated from strategic considerations rather than emotional impulses. Based on this knowledge, one can assert that in the 1990s Serbia coveted Bosnian territory as a means to increase its own power, rather than seeking the territory with the hopes of “saving” Bosnian Serbs from government abuse and mistreatment.

Although the Serbs had broken free from Ottoman rule, Bosnia was still occupied by the Turkish Empire. Few Bosnians felt allegiance to an Ottoman identity because the empire was a huge entity with few concrete characteristics or goals. Instead, people turned to ethnicity and nationalism for their identity. “Identity was defined in the first instance by confessional affiliation. But this was complicated by language, by social and economic considerations, and by the construction of historical myths.”160 Because ethnic groups did not have corresponding nations in this period, such identities were initially pliable but elites soon began using ethnicity to their advantage. “Lacking the dense network of social and economic relationships of a France or Britain, the young elites among both Christians and Muslims seized upon exclusivist nationalism as a means of ensuring the survival of the imagined nation. To join the national community implied subordination of class or regional interests to those of the embryonic state.”161

Misha Glenny thus argues that awareness of ethnic division within Bosnia did not develop until Bosnian elites began highlighting ethnic and religious differences in an attempt to provide people with an identity. Glenny admits that terrible atrocities were committed in the Balkans prior to the development of this identity, but argues that in the 1860s violence
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took on racial and religious dimensions which were not present previously.\textsuperscript{162} This can be used to respond to those who argue that great brutality and violence prove a conflict is ethnic: according to Glenny, groups can commit terrible atrocities even without ethnic division. However, one can also use Glenny’s idea to argue that ethnic and religious hostility has existed since the 1860s and therefore can not be eliminated quickly or easily.

In 1876, agrarian discontent led to a series of peasant uprisings in Bosnia. This was an especially exciting development for Serbia because the outbreak of violence in Bosnia made the region unstable and provided a potential opportunity for the Serbs to take control. “The basic cause of the popular discontent was agrarian but this discontent was harnessed in some parts of Bosnia by members of the Orthodox population who had been in contact with Serbia, and who now publicly declared their loyalty to the Serbian state.”\textsuperscript{163} This conflict, then, quickly moved beyond peasant grievances to encompass larger issues. “During 1876, hundreds of villages were burnt down and at least 5,000 peasants killed; by the end of the year, the number of refugees from Bosnia was probably 100,000 at least, and possibly 250,000.”\textsuperscript{164}

In 1876, this previously local crisis became international when, in July, Serbia and Montenegro declared war on the Ottoman Empire. The two agreed that upon victory Serbia would take over Bosnia and Montenegro would take over Herzegovina. Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia were all provinces in the Hapsburg Empire of Austria-Hungary rather than in the Ottoman Empire, but all felt some allegiance to their fellow Slavs. People from all three provinces offered their services to the Serbian military in its fight against the Turks due to
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“an emerging, if ill defined sense of south Slavic brotherhood.”\textsuperscript{165} However, in the midst of budding Slavic unity Serbia was pulling away from the pack very dramatically. “Given its vanguard role in challenging Ottoman power, Serbia was now developing its own great-power aspirations.”\textsuperscript{166} The Serbs believed that armed struggle was decisive in establishing state power, and were very proud of the fact that they “had fought their way, if not yet to statehood, then at least to an autonomy which was virtually indistinguishable from statehood.”\textsuperscript{167} Serbia’s ambition was increasing along with its power.

Serbia’s move towards militarization, however, “created a dangerous illusion. Sheer numbers did not make an army. Discipline, clothing, medical support, proper logistics, and above all, an abundant supply of weapons and well-trained officers did.”\textsuperscript{168} The Serbian military could meet none of these requirements, and their military inadequacy became quickly apparent during the war with the Turks. “When war broke out, the Serbian army could field only 460 poorly trained officers and a force of 125,000 undisciplined peasants.”\textsuperscript{169} The Serbs’ military weakness quickly led to a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Turks. Support from Russia prevented the complete collapse of the Serbian state and on February 17, 1877 a peace agreement was signed which enforced the status quo ante.

In 1877, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire in an attempt to take Turkish territory under its own control. Russia imposed a peace settlement in March 1878 called the Treaty of San Stefan, but this agreement drew a strong reaction from the great powers because it upset the balance of power of the international community. At the Congress of Berlin in July 1878, the great powers met and sought to mitigate Russian influence and block
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its drive to the Mediterranean by forcing Russia to accede some of the territory it had gained from the Ottomans. Some land was taken from the Russians and given to Serbia and Montenegro, while Austria-Hungary was given the right to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Sanjak of Novi Pazar, a strip of land separating Serbia and Montenegro. “While still in theory under Ottoman suzerainty, Bosnia and Herzegovina would be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary.”170 This decision unquestionably angered Serbs, who felt that it was their right to control Bosnia. The Berlin settlement was an example of major powers dictating to smaller regions in the Balkans what their reality would be. “The new elites on the Balkan periphery learnt the lesson beaten into them at the Congress: the consolidation and expansion of the state could best be achieved by finding a mighty sponsor, not by cooperating with one’s neighbors.”171

The shift of power in Bosnia re-awakened Bosnian ambition for independence. The population, although divided amongst themselves, were united in their resentment towards Austrian rule. While Austria-Hungary assumed that the Bosnian population would welcome its leadership, the Bosnians had just thrown off Ottoman rule and were not about to simply submit to a new conqueror. When Bosnia refused to give in quietly, Austria invaded on July 27, 1878.172 Although the Ottomans were losing control of the territory, they clandestinely provided arms to Bosnian rebels hoping that the Hapsburgs would at least get beaten up a bit in their occupation process. “By the time the first four divisions of the Hapsburg army finally crossed the Sava from Croatian into Bosnia, however, many Serbs and Muslims were preparing for a long war against the occupation.”173
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In spite of differences in the past, the Muslims, Serbs, and Croats of Bosnia were united in their opposition to Austrian rule. The unification of the Muslims and Serbs was unexpected and “reflected a temporary coincidence of interests between the two groups, rather than a basis for a future alliance.”\textsuperscript{174} This cooperation does, however, show that despite modern animosity between Serbs and Muslims, the two groups were able to work together when it was in the best interest of both to do so. Despite widespread opposition to Austrian rule, and the formation of a number of guerilla groups which opposed the invasion, Austria took over Bosnia incredibly quickly, spending no more than two days on any one town and finishing the entire conquest in three months on October 20, 1878.\textsuperscript{175} Bosnia was officially occupied by Austria-Hungary, but not fully annexed.

Despite the speed with which Austria took over, it did so with reluctance and uncertainty. Some worried that taking Bosnia into the fold and adding another million Slavs to the empire’s population would give more clout to Croatian demands for a larger voice in the empire or, worse yet, for their own independent state. However, as reluctant as the Austrians were, a much more pressing concern prompted them to occupy Bosnia in spite of concerns about Croatia. “For Croatia to expand into a South Slav state would be bad enough; but for Serbia to do it, first absorbing Bosnia and then undermining Austro-Hungarian rule in Croatia, would be far worse. It was Serbia’s declaration of war against the Ottomans in 1876 that had finally made the Austrians think seriously about taking Bosnia; had they been sure that the Sultan could retain power indefinitely over Bosnia, they would not have
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Yet again, concerns of power and territory rather than those of religion or ethnicity dominated fights for control of Bosnia.

Not surprisingly, Serbs reacted very strongly to the Austrian occupation of Bosnia. Serbia had long coveted Bosnia-Herzegovina because Serbia’s “most direct route to the sea—the economic obsession which was the core of modern Serbian nationalism—lay through the province.” This ambition and sense of entitlement drove Serbs to initiate a drive for Slavic unification of the region. However, Serbia insisted that it be the leader of this process; “the Croats, Serb nationalists argued, had no state with which to push forward the program of unification.” The arrogance of these Serb nationalists fueled the solidification of Croat nationalist sentiment. Croat leaders soon set their sights on creating their own Greater Croatia, which would comprise of Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. “Two expansionist programs, one Serb, one Croat, would be competing with each other for territory, above all for Bosnia and Herzegovina.”

This dispute was somewhat similar to that which occurred in the 1990s, and encountered the same puzzling question: were the Muslims in Bosnia Croats or Serbs? Bosnian Muslims originate from the same group of Slavic settlers that Croats and Serbs emerged from, but the Bosnian Muslims never developed a clear ethnic identity like the other two groups did. Bosnian Muslims can be called Slav, Bosnian, or even Serbo-Croat, but there is no way to clearly identify them with either Serbs or Croats exclusively because “no distinct ‘Serb’ or ‘Croat’ identities existed in Bosnia in the period before Islamicization.”

To call one a Muslim Serb would suggest that his ancestors were Serbs before they were
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Muslims and the same would be true for a Muslim Croat. More importantly, “when Bosnian Christians began, at a very late stage, to identify themselves as Serbs or Croats, they did so purely on grounds of religion. Thus the descendants of Catholic Hungarian or German settlers who came to Bosnia in the Austro-Hungarian period have come to identify themselves as Croats, and the descendants of Orthodox Romanian Gypsies have identified themselves as Serbs.”\(^{181}\) Without the guideline of religion with which to identify themselves with one group over another, Bosnian Muslims at this time and in the 1990s found themselves in a kind of limbo between the two groups, eventually having to develop into a force of their own.

Still, in the nineteenth century both Croat and Serb nationalistic groups fought for the allegiance of the Muslims. When Austro-Hungarian troops occupied Bosnia and announced that all faiths would be treated equally, Muslim landowners became frightened. While only 1.5% of Muslims enjoyed great privileges, Muslim peasants feared that this occupation would lead to the liberation of their inferiors, the Christian peasants, who were the last serfs in Europe. Both Serb and Croat expansionist programs played on these fears. “The Serbs warned the Muslims that if they made common cause with the Croats, they would face forced conversion to Catholicism and eventually assimilation. The Croats argued the opposite—that the Muslims could only hold on to their faith and traditions in the tolerant embrace of Croatdom.”\(^{182}\) Neither side had a real chance of winning Muslim allegiance, but the Muslim leaders took advantage of the situation, alternating allegiance between the two groups in order to gain leverage. In the end, the Bosnian Muslims were able to remain independent from the Serbs and Croats, and the latter two groups continued on their nationalistic quest to
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gain control over Bosnia-Herzegovina without the support or blessing of the region’s Muslim inhabitants.

The Balkan Wars

As fights over Bosnia continued to rage, Austria-Hungary became increasingly nervous about its own ability to maintain power in the region. Soon the empire began considering formal annexation of Bosnia. In addition to concerns about Serb and Croat nationalist groups who wished to control the region, Austria-Hungary felt threatened by the Ottomans. In 1908, an organization called the Young Turks staged a coup and overthrew the Turkish government. Austro-Hungarian leaders worried that this new Turkish government would reclaim its rights to Bosnia and take over the territory by winning the allegiance of the Bosnian people and offering a more democratic constitution. Furthermore, Austria-Hungary believed that by annexing Bosnia, it could suck Serbia into its sphere of influence and perhaps into its empire. Austria-Hungary fully annexed Bosnia on October 5, 1908.

Rather than being drawn toward Austria-Hungary, however, Serbia perceived this move “as a direct challenge to the country’s sovereignty and, indeed, its existence.”183 Barbara Jelavich further articulates the Serb reaction to this move. “Despite the fact that the Hapsburg government had taken over the administration of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbian nationalists still hoped that at some time, somehow, they would be able to acquire what they regarded as national lands. The annexation made this possibility even more remote.”184 The news of the annexation spread through Belgrade like wildfire. Within hours, cavalry units were marching through the streets of Belgrade and the population began preparing for a
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massive demonstration on October 6. “Day in and day out, the crowds screamed for
vengeance and called for Bosnia and Herzegovina to be saved ‘from the clutches of the
loathsome Black Eagle.’ Politician after intellectual after diplomat after journalist denounced
the annexation in ever more violent and emotive terms. The Hapsburg flag was burnt in
public.”

Serbia was determined to fight a war with the Hapsburgs, and appealed to Russia for
assistance. Unfortunately, Russia had just suffered defeat at the hands of the Japanese in
1905 and was in no position to help. Without Russian aid, Serbia could not stand up to the
entire Austro-Hungarian Empire and this goal was eventually abandoned. However, Russia
did encourage the Balkan states to begin negotiations for an alliance amongst themselves.
“The Russian aim was to establish a front against the Hapsburg Monarchy, not to foment a
war or the final partition of the Ottoman lands in Europe. Nevertheless, with the active
assistance of the Russian diplomatic agents, the Balkan governments concluded a series of
agreements that were in fact war alliances directed against the Ottoman Empire.” The
Balkan states could not realistically stand up to Austria-Hungary, but they could challenge
the authority of the Ottomans and attempt to reclaim some power in the region by pushing
the Turks out. In March 1912, Bulgaria and Serbia created a defense pact. In May, Greece
and Bulgaria reached a similar agreement, which was echoed in October between
Montenegro, Serbia, and Bulgaria. The Balkan states were now organized for war. On
October 8, 1912, Montenegro launched an attack on the Ottoman Empire and was soon
joined by Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia.
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The First Balkan War was a relatively easy victory of the Balkan states, whose troops numbered 700,000 versus the 320,000 troops of their adversary. “The Ottoman military power had been weakened by the domestic political controversies and the financial problems that left the army short of modern equipment.”\(^{187}\) The weakness of the Ottoman Empire was made readily apparent by this conflict, and the European powers hastened to intervene as it became clear that the empire would collapse.

In May 1913, the great European powers compelled the Balkan states to stop fighting and accept the Treaty of London. However, the Treaty of London denied Serbia and Greece the Albanian territory that each felt they deserved. As a result, the two sought compensation in the Macedonian territory given to Bulgaria in the settlement. Bulgaria was of course opposed to this demand, and although it had no great-power supporters and had incurred the jealousy of its former allies, Bulgaria launched a preventative attack on Greece and Serbia on June 29, 1913. This short-lived conflict is known as the Second Balkan War, and resulted in the complete defeat of Bulgaria on July 31, 1913.

Between the two Balkan wars, 200,000 combatants were killed, and tens of thousands of civilians fell victim to disease.\(^{188}\) “The atrocities of bayoneted babies, gouged-out eyes, and live immolations in village after village shocked Europe.”\(^{189}\) In a sense, these wars prefigured the violence of the upcoming world wars. The conflicts involved large and complex alliances facing off in trench warfare, sieges, artillery assaults of civilians, bombing raids, and pamphlet propaganda. Bulgaria and Serbia had huge success in the first war, in large part due to rhetoric and ideological fervor. The complex causes of war were simplified
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and pounded into soldiers again and again: “liberate our Christian brothers, liberate our historical lands. Simplicity was the key, and details were awkward. Nationalist romanticism, based on a dubious mixture of demographic and historical arguments, provided the justification for the war. The real aims were coldly strategic and expansionist.”\textsuperscript{190} Some say that for this reason the Balkans wars were similar to the events of the 1990s. This comparison suggests that the Bosnian War, while confused by ethnic and nationalistic propaganda, was fundamentally a conflict for strategic and territorial gain as well.

**World War I**

By the end of the Balkan Wars in 1913, Serbia had almost doubled in size territorially and its population had leapt from 2.9 million to 4.4 million. “Serbia’s stock with the monarchy’s south Slavs rose to new heights. It was no longer simply a beacon of Serb and south Slav freedom but a glorious liberating military power which demanded respect.”\textsuperscript{191} While Serbia still stood in great opposition to Austria-Hungary after the latter’s annexation of Bosnia in 1908, Serbia was still unable to engage in a fight with the fifty-million-strong empire. Still, Serbia’s strength in the wake of the Balkan Wars did cause Austria-Hungary to see it as a potential future threat. By the spring of 1913 relations between the two were extremely tense. Serbia had already managed to significantly increase its territory, and if it acquired part of the Albanian coastland, as was one of its goals, Serbia might pose a strategic threat to the Austro-Hungarians in the Adriatic.\textsuperscript{192} The increasing atmosphere of anger and distrust set the stage for the beginning of World War I.
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On June 28, 1914, Archduke Ferdinand, the heir to the Hapsburg throne, was assassinated by a Serb. While no evidence pointed to direct involvement of the Serbian government in the plot, the Austro-Hungarians were determined to use the assassination as an excuse to eliminate Serbia. The empire sent Serbia an outrageous and humiliating ultimatum, specifically written in such a way that the Serbs would be forced to reject it. The Serbian government, fearing war, accepted the ultimatum except for one point; Serbia was wiling to put the fate of the killers to arbitration but not to put them on trial and allow Austro-Hungarian delegates to take part. “This reservation was enough for Vienna to consider that the Serbs had rejected the ultimatum and war was declared on July 28, 1914.” World War I, then, was at its core a dispute between Serbia and Austria-Hungary, with the other great powers joining in simply due to previously formed strategic alliances.

When World War I began, Serbia had to decide what it wanted out of the conflict. Eventually, Serb leaders decided that they would call for the unification of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes into a single nation. “It should be noted here that the absolutely vital question of whether this should be a federal or a centralized state received very little attention.” However, one can assume that Serbia had a centralized state in mind with itself at the helm. Serbia was an independent state; it had long historical and religious traditions that were not shared with the Croats or the Slovenes and it was therefore easy for the Serbs to think in more nationalist rather than federal terms. “The greater Serbian goal was thus a state based not on strictly ethnic principles, but on the acquisition of lands that had historic associations or that had at some time been under the jurisdiction of the Serbian Orthodox church. The ideal was the territory included in the empire of Stephen Dusan, the greatest of Serbia’s
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medieval rulers.”195 Even before Yugoslavia came into existence, Serbs envisioned the state as a way for them to exert their power and dominance over a larger portion of territory, rather than an opportunity for Slavic brotherhood and unity.

As World War I began to take hold, the other Balkan states were faced with the decision of how to react. Most of the Balkan states felt no strong affinity toward either set of great powers. “The attraction for a small Balkan country in declaring war lay in the possibility of furthering its regional goals, not in the fact that it particularly sympathized with its ally. These regional goals, however, often clashed with the overarching tactics of a great power ally.”196 These areas were for the most part too small to realistically concern themselves with forming international and ideological alliances, and therefore chose to focus on the regional politics of the Balkans instead. For example, Bulgaria joined World War I not because it cared about the global balance of power but because it wanted to regain Macedonia. “The Great War in the Balkans served chiefly to underline and deepen the deadly competition which had developed since the Congress of Berlin between Bulgaria and Serbia, who were now the two main competitors in a bitter struggle for regional hegemony. In October 1915, the Bulgarians prepared to avenge themselves for the perceived betrayal by the Serbs during the Second Balkan War.”197

In Bosnia, the majority of citizens, whatever their misgivings, remained loyal to the Austro-Hungarian state. Some Muslims and even Bosnian Croats volunteered in the Serbian army, but most had no wish to see their country swallowed up in post-war Serbian expansion. Those who chose to join with Serbia did so because they saw Serb occupation as preferable
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to Austrian rule. In Croatia, two major trends developed. One group called for the unification of “Croatian lands” which were defined as Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina. “Their goal was the formation of a Croatian national state that could be associated in a federal relationship, but on an absolutely equal footing, with Austria and Hungary. These Croatian nationalists tended to have an antagonistic attitude toward Orthodox Serbs, whom some regarded merely as renegade Croats. The superiority of Hapsburg civilization over that of Orthodox, ex-Ottoman Serbia was also emphasized.”

The opposing view was advocated by the Croatian-Serbian Coalition. This group had no single program but was rooted in the belief that “Serbs and Croats within the empire should work together and not allow either Vienna or Budapest to play one against the other as had often been done in the past.” These two Croat groups prove that both exclusionary ethnic ideology and a drive for cooperation and unity existed among Croats and Serbs in the early twentieth century.

Serbia enjoyed a number of victories early in World War I. However, after Bulgaria was enticed into fighting alongside Austria-Hungary with the promise of Macedonia, Serbia was no longer able to hold back its enemies. In October 1915, the combined forces of Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Bulgaria entered Serbia. Within six weeks, the country was occupied and divided between Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria. Some 30,000 Serbs were sent to Austrian camps or used as forced labor; thousands died in desperate uprisings. “During the Balkan Wars, Serbia lost some 30,000 men. The First World War cost it 275,000 men and wartime diseases another 800,000 civilians. These losses amounted to a quarter of the
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population and two-thirds of its male population between the ages of fifteen and fifty-
five.”201 Without a doubt, Serbia suffered greatly during the First World War.

However, the tide of the war soon turned and Austria-Hungary found itself greatly
weakened. After four years of fighting it became apparent that Austria-Hungary would not
only be defeated, but would collapse under the stresses of warfare. “On October 29, 1918,
the Croatian parliament formally renounced the rule of the Hapsburgs and handed over
power to the National Council, declaring that a new sovereign state of Slovenes, Croats, and
Serbs was now in existence. This announcement, although applying only to the former
Austro-Hungarian lands, clearly signaled the imminent creation of a Yugoslav state.”202 On
November 1, the Austrian regional leader stepped down from power and the First National
Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina was formed. World War I was concluded by the
Treaty of Paris. Soon after, on December 1, 1918, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and
Slovenes was officially created, combining the territory of the present day countries of
Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia, Kosovo, and Macedonia. In
the wake of World War I, the first Yugoslav state was born.

The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes

The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes “emerged from the ashes of the
Hapsburg and Ottoman Empires.”203 However, the creation of the Kingdom was also due in
great part to Serbian military conquests of the past. “Yugoslavia was de facto created as the
result of a Serbian mini-expansion as a stage in the process which began in the nineteenth
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For this reason, the Kingdom was heavily dominated by Serbs from the start. For many Serbs, in fact, the Kingdom was to be a buffer state that housed Serbian fighters; “the creation of Yugoslavia was at the moment regarded as a simple extension of the base of this Serbian army for its eventual role in some future conflict.”

Needless to say, Croats and Slovenes did not support Serb domination of the Kingdom. However, no agreements on the nature of the state had been reached before its creation. The country was designed “with clear borders but with no clear constitutional order. Had the Kingdom of Serbia merely absorbed the south Slav regions of the Hapsburg Empire and the Kingdom of Montenegro? Or was the country a novel entity in which Croatia, Slovenia, Dalmatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Montenegro would assume equal constitutional weight with Serbia?” Naturally, politicians in Croatia, Bosnia, and Slovenia who had worked towards a Yugoslav state were anxious to balance Serbian dominance with a federal state. Croats argued that the success of a federal legal system and parliament in their country proved the effectiveness of such political models. However, the Serbs were “convinced that their heroic contribution to the First World War earned them privileges in the new state” and also that their experience with de facto independence “should give them automatic seniority.”

In spite of strong protestations by Croats and Slovenes, Serbia’s vision of the Kingdom more or less came to fruition when a centralized monarchy was established. In part, this was due to the circumstances in which each group found themselves after World War I. Serbia was on the victorious side of the war, and was trusted by international leaders who
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were comfortable with it taking centralized power. The political leaders of Croatia and Slovenia, however, were an appendage of the defeated Austria-Hungary, which made international leaders uncertain about the loyalties of such politicians. Alexander was chosen to be the Kingdom’s new leader and his role as prince-regent of Serbia’s exiled wartime government clearly proved the reality of Serb dominance in the new Yugoslav state.

The Kingdom’s constitution was created on June 28, 1921. This date marks the anniversary of the battle of Kosovo and of the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, two special events for Serbs specifically. The document did not impress the other groups in the region. “The constitution’s legality was questionable as it was passed by a simple majority and not the sixty per cent required by the Corfu Declaration, the agreement reached in 1917 by the Serbs and Croats on the establishment of a Yugoslav state. Worse still, the two most powerful opposition parties did not participate in the vote of the Constituent Assembly.”

This meant that in the first five years of the Kingdom’s existence, Croat voices were not sufficiently heard, and Serbs continued to believe that such dissension was meaningless separatism rather than an expression of legitimate grievances.

The fact that the Kingdom became a centralized state run by Alexander was not the only indicator of Serb power in the country. In fact, statistics show overwhelming Serb dominance at all levels of government in this time period. “Only one interwar government was headed by a non-Serb prime minister, and for the most part only Serbs were given the key portfolios in the governments. All seven prime ministers of the twenty-four cabinets holding office between December 1918 and January 1929, the period of parliamentary democracy, were Serbs. In the subsequent period, from January 1929 to March 1941, there
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were fifteen different cabinets of whose ministers three-fifths (73) of the total of 121 were Serbs.\textsuperscript{210}

This political situation quickly bred antagonisms between the Croats and Slovenes, on one hand, and the Serbs on the other. While nationalistic sentiment had existed on both sides prior to the creation of the Kingdom, during World War I and earlier “the popular nationalisms of the two nations were not directed against each other. At the elite level, we have anti-Croatianism and anti-Serbianism, which is the logical consequence of nation formation and consolidation in the nineteenth century. At the popular level, before the peasant masses in Croatia began to feel that Serbian domination in Yugoslavia was directed against their interest, there was no popular anti-Serbianism.”\textsuperscript{211} In other words, while nationalism was nothing new to the Balkan states, it was not until Serbs came to overwhelmingly dominate the Kingdom that any kind of popular ethnic tension and opposition came into being among the groups in the region.

Throughout the 1920s, the Kingdom “was a poor, unstable and mostly sullen country.”\textsuperscript{212} The Croats and Slovenes continued to harbor grievances against the Serbs, and discontent was very prevalent. In addition, the region was suffering economically. The Kingdom was reeling from the Great Depression, and was heavily dependent on the German and Austrian economies for the success of their own. When banking crises occurred in both countries, the Kingdom’s economy was shattered. To make matters worse, France, Britain and the United States blocked all capital credits to the area, making it impossible for the region to get out of its hopeless amount of debt.\textsuperscript{213} Poor economic performance, coupled with
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extensive and long-lasting political grievances, made the population of the Kingdom primed for violence and revolt. All of this came to a head in June of 1928, when a Radical Party delegate from Montenegro shot five Croatian Peasant Party representatives, including the beloved Stjepan Radic, during a session of the assembly. Three deaths resulted, Radic’s included. “Since official collusion in the shooting was strongly suspected by the Croatian representatives, the event ended their cooperation with the government. They withdrew from the assembly and the tenth anniversary of the founding of the state in December was marked by riots and demonstrations in Zagreb.”

King Alexander reacted by introducing an entirely new political system. In December of 1928, he initiated a royal coup, seizing full power and abolishing parliament. “Far from attempting to create a physical Greater Serbia, Alexander now launched into an attempt to create a genuine Yugoslavia—by force.” Alexander’s first symbolic act was to change the name of the state from “the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes,” to the much more unitary “Yugoslavia.” While this might seem to signal the creation of a more democratic grouping of states, in fact it signaled the end of the constitutional regime and the beginning of a personal dictatorship.

Alexander quickly set to work undermining traditional ethnic loyalties and nationalistic groupings. He abolished political parties and trade unions, viewing them as organizations which served only to exacerbate ethnic tensions. He personally chose all high officials, jailed opposition politicians, and did away with civil liberties. In addition, Alexander eliminated the traditional state boundaries on which nationalistic associations were based. “The country was divided into nine provinces, called banovinas, the boundaries
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of which were drawn with the intention of weakening or destroying traditional loyalties.”

Alexander did provide an explanation to his subjects: “he presented the dictatorship as a necessary evil, unwillingly imposed. It was, he explained, a selfless act to prevent the tension provoked by Stjepan Radic’s death from tearing the country apart.”

In spite of Alexander’s alleged intention to eliminate ethnic dissension and hostility, his actions seemed to heighten it instead. Serbs saw themselves as being held down by a greater system in which they were no longer as dominant as they should be. After all, banovinas were placed under strong centralized control and had no local autonomous rights. Meanwhile, Croats “regarded this new unitary Yugoslavia as nothing less, in essence, than the realization of Serbia’s dreams.” In fact, both Croats and Bosnian Muslims had significant grievances regarding this new situation. “The boundaries of the banovinas were gerrymandered so that Serbs formed a majority in six, Croats in two, Slovenes in one, and Muslims in none. The principal offices in the state continued to be held by Serbs from Serbia, with the Slovenes receiving an adequate share. Muslims were allotted the lowest positions, whereas the Croats remained inadequately represented.”

In September 1931, Alexander issued a new constitution which was essentially a cover for his dictatorship. It established a bicameral legislature in which the king appointed half the members of the upper house. The elected representatives were chosen by voice vote and the assembly, once elected, did not have the power to legislate independently but merely to state its opinion. In order to run for election, a party had to demonstrate that it had sufficient support in each district. This law made it almost impossible for Croatian,
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Slovenian, or Muslim groups to present their candidates due to the overwhelming dominance of Serbs in six banovinas.\textsuperscript{220}

Alexander’s repressive tactics, which included the arrest of many opposition leaders, led many such individuals to leave the country. This emigrating group included the controversial nationalist Croat leader Ante Pavelic, who left Yugoslavia in January 1929 and headed for Italy. Pavelic soon began working with Mussolini on the creation of an extreme Croat nationalist group called the Ustashe. “The goal was the achievement of Croatian independence, if necessary by means of revolution and violence…Mussolini used the Ustashe as a weapon in his diplomatic arsenal with which to threaten Belgrade.”\textsuperscript{221} In this way, Alexander not only heightened ethnic tensions within Yugoslavia, but allowed them to expand to an international scale. The Ustashe movement still haunts the Balkan region to this day, and would not have been possible without Alexander’s policies, because they both drove nationalist leaders out and primed the Yugoslav population to look to extremist groups to air their grievances. Although Alexander claimed that his intention was to assuage the concerns of all ethnic groups, his actions simply exacerbated an already tense situation and set Yugoslavia up for the horrors of the Second World War.

\textbf{World War II}

In January of 1933, Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany. Soon after, he identified Yugoslavia and Romania as keys to the success of the German strategy. Hitler was concerned about the effect that the defense pact signed by Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Romania in February 1933 would have on his ambitions to invade Czechoslovakia. He hoped to be able to isolate Czechoslovakia by improving his relations with Yugoslavia and Romania and
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driving a wedge between the countries. Closer ties with Yugoslavia would also give Germany the agricultural and mineral resources it needed for rearmament and expansion.\footnote{222} Alexander was open to Hitler’s overtures of friendship. Trade with Germany was very important because Germany was one of the few countries which could assist Yugoslavia in its economic recovery in spite of the Great Depression. Through the German-Yugoslav Commercial Treaty of 1934, Alexander agreed to adjust Yugoslavia’s agricultural production to be weighted more heavily toward the crops Germany needed, and also gave Germany exclusive rights to trade for Yugoslav minerals. Hitler agreed to exchange finished industrial products for these minerals, and to give Yugoslavia diplomatic support.\footnote{223}

In October of 1934 Alexander was assassinated and the leadership of Yugoslavia was assumed by Prince Regent Paul. Paul “was not dictatorial in temperament” and popular criticism of Alexander’s policies further forced a relaxation of government power.\footnote{224} In June 1935 a new government was formed under the premiership of Milan Stojadinovic, which lasted three years and brought relative calm to the region. However, national conflicts continued to dominate political life. In 1937, in an attempt to appease Croats, the Yugoslav government concluded a concordat with the Vatican that defined the privileges of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia and placed it on an equal footing with the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox hierarchy opposed this agreement so violently that the concordat had to be withdrawn.\footnote{225} This illustrates the increasingly extreme and blatant nature of nationalist sentiment in Yugoslavia prior to World War II. On February 3, 1939, a Serbian minister
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made a speech in parliament about the superiority of Serbs. Exclusivist national sentiment was becoming so prevalent that it was acceptable to voice in public, even by members of the Yugoslav government.

Although domestic issues continued to plague Yugoslavia, international events presented an increasing cause for concern. German occupation of Austria in March of 1938 did not arouse official anxiety in Belgrade, but as the Nazis moved towards Prague, Yugoslavia felt increasingly threatened. Serbs were concerned that if Yugoslavia became embroiled in a conflict, which seemed increasingly likely as the Germans advanced, then the federation would fall apart. This was not in the best interest of Serbs, who would control less territory if the federation split. As a result, Serbs became much more willing to appease Croatia in the late 1930s.

In February 1939 a new ministry was formed under Dragisa Cvetkovic “with the objective of coming to an understanding with the Croatian opposition.” In August, Cvetkovic formed an agreement with Vladko Macek, the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party. “The Sporazum or agreement created an autonomous Croatia within Yugoslavia, to include not only Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia, but a large part of Bosnia. Of its population of 4.4 million, some 866,000 were Serbs. The agreement was not supposed to be the end of the matter but rather the beginning of a thoroughgoing reorganization of Yugoslavia.” Although this agreement posed problems for the future, especially with Bosnia, “it was on the whole a radical and successful means of preventing civil war between Serbs and Croats in the troubled international atmosphere of the late 1930s.”

---

226 Malcolm, 179.
227 Jelavich, History of the Balkans, 203.
228 Judah, 112.
229 Glenny, Balkans, 476.
Meanwhile, the threat from Germany continued to loom large. On September 1, 1939, Hitler invaded Poland. Two days later, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and France declared war on Germany. While Yugoslav public opinion was strongly against the Axis powers by the end of 1940, Hitler pressured leaders in Bulgaria, Turkey, and Yugoslavia to ally themselves with Germany, Italy, and Japan. Prince Paul and his ministers remained sympathetic to the Western allies, but Britain was in no position to aid Yugoslavia and Hitler continued to threaten invasion if Yugoslavia did not cooperate. Prince Paul was terrified of Communism and feared his dictatorship would suffer in refusing Hitler, so he agreed to a compromise. On March 26, 1941, Yugoslavia signed the Tripartite Pact subject to reservations which released them from its military obligation.²³⁰ As part of this agreement, Yugoslavia declared neutrality so as to deny its territory to the allies.²³¹

After the humiliating experience of occupation during World War I, many Serbs were opposed to this pact. They saw it as the first step toward submitting to Nazi rule and were in no way willing to sit back and allow such a thing to happen. In an attempt at resistance, a group of renegade Serbs organized a coup, declared 17-year-old King Peter ready to rule, and set about creating a new government that would not capitulate to the Nazis. Hitler was so enraged when he heard of this resistance that he demanded that Yugoslavia be invaded “with inexorable severity and that the military destruction be carried out in a lightning-like operation.”²³² On April 6, 1941, the Germans began their assault on Belgrade. A few hours later, the city was in ruins and 17,000 people were dead. An act of capitulation was signed on

²³¹ Judah, 114.
²³² Judah, 115.
Map 6: Europe During World War II

April 17, 1941, and “the Balkans faced four years of occupation, resistance, fratricide, and genocide.”

After the Germans and Italians began their occupation of Yugoslavia, the region was split into nine units. Slovenia was split into two, with Italy annexing the southwest and Germany administering the north east. Italy seized Dalmatia. Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina were divided into Italian and German spheres of influence. Montenegro lost some territory to Albania and became an Italian protectorate. Italy annexed part of Kosovo and western Macedonia. Bulgaria reclaimed Macedonia and parts of Serbia. The rest of Serbia was under direct German military rule. As part of this process, the Germans proclaimed a new Independent State of Croatia (NDH) on April 10, 1941, which included all of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The state was hardly independent, and was divided into occupation zones for Germany and Italy, but Croatians saw this as a cause for celebration as it signified the first independent Croatian state in history.

With the German occupation of Yugoslavia came widespread violence and destruction. Persecution of Jews began immediately upon German arrival, as did the destruction of synagogues. Internment camps were established two months into the occupation period. “By the end of the war it was calculated that out of 14,000 Jews in Bosnia nearly 12,000 had been killed.” Yugoslav citizens, however, did not simply submit to Nazi rule. Yugoslavia was taken over by the Germans so rapidly that although 375,000 soldiers and officers were captured as POWs, hundreds of thousands of other combatants simply returned home. In addition, the speed of collapse meant that much of Yugoslavia, especially rural areas, was not physically occupied and therefore was not officially disarmed. Hitler’s
failure to fully incapacitate Yugoslavia left the area in utter chaos within a matter of months. “In Serbia rebellions were breaking out and in Croatia and Bosnia fanatical Serb-hating groups were on the loose, perpetrating appalling massacres which quickly led to Serbian uprisings and the loss of control over large areas.”

When Yugoslavia was initially divided, Hitler assigned a German military commander to Zagreb, but let Mussolini choose the leader of the NDH. Officially, Croatia was ruled by Prince Aimone of Savoy, the Duke of Spoleto. This ruler, who took the name Tomislav II, was absent to say the least; in his lifetime, he did not once set foot in Yugoslavia even once. Unofficially, however, Mussolini supported Ante Pavelic as ruler of Croatia, the Ustashe leader whom he had been periodically supporting for the past twelve years. The Ustashe were a group of Nazi fanatics who supported Croat domination. This group never enjoyed mass support within Croatia, finding its roots in the nineteenth-century nationalist politics of Ante Starcevic. “The installation of the NDH regime meant that fanatics were now in power in a state where law and order rapidly collapsed and whose population was barely 50 percent Croat.”

In the early years of the twentieth century, hostility existed between Serbs and Croats but the two had also found ways to cooperate. Between 1918 and 1941 many Croats resented Serbian domination in the new Yugoslav state and welcomed the birth of the NDH, but there was no reason for Serbs—or the vast majority of Croats for that matter—to have any inkling of the fanatical hatred that was about to be unleashed by the Ustashe. Whereas there had been a long history of bloodshed between Serbs and Muslims and Serbs and Albanians, the genocidal wave begun by the Ustashe in 1941 was an aberration and a break with history. In the new Croatian state Serbs would have had good reason to suspect they would be second-class citizens but not that their lives were in danger.
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The Ustashe did not represent the views of the average Croat, nor were their actions a foreseeable extension of ethnic tension over the past half century. Even for those who argue that ethnic hostility has always existed between these groups, the acts of the Ustashe can not be seen as the next logical step in a progression of hatred. Although evidence suggests that popular thought at the time was in some ways nationalist and hostile, the Ustashe undoubtedly brought ethnic hatred to an entirely new dimension that was previously foreign to the Balkan people.

Pavelic and his Ustashe followers “launched a campaign of appalling and mindless terrorism against Jews, in deference to Nazi and Fascist anti-Semitism, and against Orthodox Serbs, in the name of the Catholic Church and in revenge for the ‘Serb imperialism’ of the inter-war years.” The Ustashe felt that they were “solving the problem of the large Serb minority (1.9 million out of a total of 6.3 million) in the territory of the NDH.”

Widespread acts of terror against Serbs began in May of 1941, with mass arrests and murders by June. “By July, even the Germans were complaining about the brutality of these attacks.”

Mile Budak, a Croatian writer who became the NDH minister of education, is alleged to have said that the Ustashe planned that “one-third of the Serbs would be killed, one-third expelled, and one-third converted to Catholicism.” The exact number who converted is unknown but is believed to be between 200,000 and 300,000. The prospect of conversion may sound relatively harmless in light of the other options, but there was no easy way to escape Ustashe brutality. On August 5, 1941, “some 1,200 Serbs dressed in their Sunday best
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were called to the church from surrounding villages to be ‘converted’ to Catholicism. Instead, they were locked inside the church and murdered.\textsuperscript{243} Government was replaced by state terror on a horrifying scale; "the Ustashe turned their territory into one great slaughterhouse."\textsuperscript{244} Some reports even describe Ustashe units in Bosnia throwing Serbian Orthodox women and children off cliffs.\textsuperscript{245}

In addition to spontaneous murders, the Ustashe government set up extermination camps as part of a plan to kill one and a half million Balkan Jews. The Ustashe, after all, was not simply a Croat nationalist group but a Nazi group as well. Some Yugoslav Jews found temporary safety in the Italian occupied areas of the Balkans, where anti-Semitic measures were put in place but were not life threatening. However, after the Italians capitulated to the Nazis, Jews had to either seek safe haven in southern Italy or go to concentration camps, as many of them did. Labor camps were numerous in the NDH, but the Jasenovac camp is most well known. After Jasenovac prisoners were worked for all the energy they had, these people were burned in brick ovens or shot in the back of the head and dumped in the Sava River.

"Being far less organized than their mentors, or lacking the technology, they often resorted in these camps to knives with which to murder Serbs, Jews, Gypsies, and undesirable Croats."\textsuperscript{246} There is no agreement as to the number killed in such camps; Serbs estimate 700,000, Croats 40,000, and independent researchers 250,000.\textsuperscript{247}

Despite these horrible atrocities, the Ustashe did gain some popular support among select Croats. When Italy surrendered to the Allies in 1943, the territory in Dalmatia that it
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had occupied was handed over to Croatia. “The Greater Croatia of this year was thus composed of all the lands, except Istria and Rijeka, to which the Croatian nationalists had previously laid claims.”\footnote{248 Jelavich, History of the Balkans, 266.} This accomplishment helped to arouse support for the regime among Croats who had long felt bullied by Serbs and now felt that they had a strong nationalist movement to rally behind. Such sentiment was by no means felt by all Croats, but was certainly felt by some.

Many people who supported the regime believed that the atrocities it committed were horrible, but felt that supporting the greater Croat nationalist cause was their duty. This is exemplified by the statement of a devout Catholic Ustashe guard when asked if he feared punishment from God for the crimes he had committed. “Don’t talk to me about that, for I am perfectly aware of what is in store for me. For my past, present, and future deeds I shall burn in hell, but at least I shall burn for Croatia.”\footnote{249 Ibid.} Without a doubt, the behavior of the Ustashe regime was completely unacceptable and not in keeping with Croat nationalist movements of the past. Still, Croat nationalist movements subsequent to World War II would never be able to escape this legacy, and for some Croats the experience of Ustashe rule redefined what behavior they found acceptable to engage in on behalf of their people.

The Ustashe, for all their aggressive behavior, were not in power throughout Yugoslavia. In fact, many Yugoslavs spent the years of World War II fighting German occupation rather than facing elimination at the hands of the Ustashe. Opposition to the German presence was prevalent among Yugoslavs and two primary groups formed in reaction to the Nazi presence. The first was the Chetniks. This group was founded in 1941 when Colonel Milhailovic and a small group of Serbian officers fled Serbia after the
Yugoslav surrender and went into the hills to organize a center of resistance. Mihailovic chose the term Chetnik to recall similar groups that had fought against Ottoman rule in the fourteenth century.250 The Chetniks were closely associated with the exiled government of King Peter, and thus attracted an almost exclusively Serbian following. “Its members tended to be both anti-Croat and anti-Communist. The Chetnik army became primarily an association of individual bands under local leaders who confined their activities to their own territories.”251

Mihailovic’s allegiance to the old regime translated to consistent support for the traditional political and social system. The Chetniks sought to build up superior power and maintain it throughout the war so that “when the occupying armies were thrown out and the quisling governments collapsed, the Chetniks would be the strongest claimant to control of the postwar Yugoslav government.”252 The Chetniks also sought the creation of Greater Serbia which, according to Dr. Stevan Moljeovic, a member of the Chetnik National Committee, required the creation of a homogenous Serbia. “Transfers and exchanges of population, especially of Croats from Serbia and of Serbs from the Croatian areas, is the only way to arrive at their separation.”253 Dr. Zivko Topalovic, another leading Chetnik, put it more bluntly: “Anti-Croatianism, anti-Muslimism, and anti-Yugoslavism, this is the ideology of the Serbian Chetniks.”254

This ideology, not surprisingly, led the Chetniks to commit a number of ethnically based atrocities during World War II. “One of the worst Chetnik outbursts against the
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Croatian population in Dalmatia took place in the first days of October 1942 at the village of Gata south of Split, in reprisal against the people of this village and other villages nearby for destroying some roads in the area. In all, about one hundred people were killed, and many homes were burned.\(^\text{255}\) In early 1943 Chetnik forces entered Sandjak in Bosnia, to undergo “cleansing actions;” thirty-three Muslim villages were burned down and 1,200 Muslim fighters as well as 8,000 elderly, women, and children were killed.\(^\text{256}\) Nearly forty years later, journalist Cornelia Sorabji spoke with Hamida, a Bosnian Muslim who survived Chetnik attacks during World War II as a child.

“I can see it before my eyes now,” she said of the burning tapers that had been applied to the roof of her family's house to burn it down. She told of family members who had escaped when the Chetniks were distracted from their task by the sight of a stash of gold ducats, and of others who did not. Her narrative involved flight to the woods, a mother's desperate thought of strangling a toddler whose cries might reveal their position, and eventual rescue by an Italian truck which drove them to the nearest town. A baby sister had been left behind in the home of a sympathetic Serb who was later forced by Chetniks to kill the baby.\(^\text{257}\)

Without question, the Ustashe regime was a more destructive force than the Chetniks. However, this does not mean that Croat nationalism was more dangerous or destructive than Serb nationalism, or that Serbs can shift all blame on to the Ustashe. Fundamentally, the Ustashe were more destructive because they were instated as a government during World War II, and therefore had greater power and opportunity to hurt people. The Chetniks, on the other hand, were a group of rebels without the far-reaching power of a state government. Both groups, however, were equally violent, destructive, racist, and fascist in their goals and behavior.
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Political scientist V.P. Gagnon Jr. points out that while both Ustashe and Chetnik groups perpetuated ethnically-based atrocities during World War II, neither enjoyed large popular support. The Ustashe were a marginal group imposed by the Germans and Italians after the popular Croatian Peasant Party refused to collaborate. In spite of some supporters, the Ustashe alienated most of the state’s population with its violence. Similarly, most Serbs in Bosnia joined the partisan forces rather than the Chetniks. “Thus the image of ‘ethnic groups’ in conflict even during World War II must be seen as part of a selective, ideological construct in which ‘ethnic groups’ are portrayed as actors by nationalist politicians and historians.”258 This is an extremely important point because to this day, accounts of Chetnik and Ustashe behavior are used to accuse members of both ethnic groups of hatred and violence. The legacy of both the Ustashe and the Chetniks still exist as a source of fear among the Balkan population, but it must be remembered that at the time these groups represented extreme points of view rather than the norm.

The other group which stood in opposition to German occupation during World War II was the Yugoslav Communist Party. On June 22, 1941, the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union; in response, Stalin appealed to communists around the globe to attack the Nazis wherever possible. This helped to unify the communists in Yugoslavia and inspire them to rise up in an attempt to overturn Nazi rule. The Yugoslav Communists soon became known as the Partisans and were organized under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito. Tito established his headquarters in western Serbia in September 1941. “Hampered too often by a sectarian devotion to Leninism and Stalin, the Yugoslav Communists nonetheless recognized that an

unhappy warrior was an unreliable one.” As a result, railways were constructed, schools functioned normally and cinemas and dance halls were opened. “The Germans’ failure to occupy the whole country and the fact that so many of their best troops had quickly been moved off to attack the Soviet Union meant that by September Tito’s Partisans were in control of Užice and a large area around it.” Still, the Germans were by no means easy to defeat. In mid October of 1941, a joint Partisan-Chetnik resistance force fought against the Germans in Kraljevo. After the Germans put down the resistance, orders were made for the arrest and execution of 300 Serbs, who were selected at random.

In spite of some discouraging defeats, Tito was committed to mobilizing popular support in Yugoslavia for reunification under a Communist government. Tito established himself in Bosnia and began recruiting on a national basis rather than based on ethnicity. “The wholesale persecution and slaughter of Serbs in Croatia and Bosnia led most of those who wished to survive to seek Partisan protection and join Partisan troops. The Ustashe in fact forced upon Tito the doctrine which he would probably have adopted anyhow—that Serbs, Croats, and Muslims must sink their racial and social differences in fighting the Germans and Italians, and the Ustashe and Chetnik allies.” In fact, this policy of advocating universal Slav ideology over national loyalties contributed greatly to Partisan success during the war. The communists were able to draw recruits from all of Yugoslavia’s Slav people, giving them a much larger pool of potential soldiers. “The Communist Party was a club anyone could join, irrespective of national origins, with a mission to mold history. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the main theatre of war, partisan units contained all three major
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national groups, Serbs, Croats, and Muslim Slavs, fighting together under the slogan ‘brotherhood and unity.’”263

Tito and his Partisans laid the foundation of their future government in November 1942 in Bihac where they established a central authority called the Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ). This organization was an assembly of fifty-four representatives from different sections of the country and was dominated by the Communist Party. “The popular-front program, which was announced at the conference, called for the establishment of a freely elected government after the war, and most important, a federal organization of the state.”264 In November 1943 AVNOJ was declared the government of Yugoslavia and Tito received the title of marshal and remained in command of the armed forces. “In 1943 Italy had collapsed, which enabled the Partisans in Yugoslavia to seize a large amount of their weaponry.”265

Although Tito and his armies liberated many areas of Yugoslavia during German occupation, this had little effect on German control of the region. “The Germans and Italians continued to control the large towns, the major roads and railways, and the mines.”266 The Allies began shifting their support from Chetnik leader Mihailovic to Tito in 1943, when it became clear that Mihailovic was reluctant to launch a large scale attack on the Germans. Tito accepted assistance from the Allies because the position of German and Italian troops made it necessary for him to do so, but he became increasingly worried that the Allies would take over Yugoslavia after the war. This would certainly lead to the restoration of the king’s government and not to a communist state. “In 1944 there were moments when Partisans
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worried less about the Germans than about the Allied landing.”

In 1944, Allied support for Tito increased, and as German troops pulled out, Soviet forces took over much of the east of the country. “Communist rule in Yugoslavia was now assured.”

With the communists in control, the extreme nationalist groups of World War II quickly fell apart. The NDH, which by the end of the war controlled very little of its own territory, was to linger on until May 9, 1945, two days after the German surrender. Tens of thousands of Croats fled, fearing that after serving in the NDH regime they would be marked for execution. The British returned these refugees and, just as predicted, between 20,000 and 40,000 were executed by the Partisans. In addition, by the end of the war Chetnik forces were reduced to between 10,000 and 12,000 troops, most of whom were subsequently caught and killed. Milahilovic himself was captured, tried, and executed in July of 1946.

Of the 40,000 Jews in Croatia, Slavonia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina, between 20,000 and 31,000 were killed by the Ustashe during World War II. Despite great suffering and death, the legacy of Nazi and ethnic war crimes was left remarkably unresolved in Yugoslavia. People spent many decades arguing over the number of people killed, but apologies were slow in coming. Suffering under Tito and the stifling of ethnic concerns further postponed the Yugoslav examination of World War II atrocities, allowing this issue to haunt the region for decades.

**Tito’s Yugoslavia**

In April and May of 1945, Partisan forces broke through the enemy fronts in Bosnia, Croatia, and Slovenia. On September 21, 1944, Tito concluded a Soviet-Yugoslav military
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agreement, calling for the entry of Soviet troops into Serbia; by October Soviet troops were
joining Partisans in suppressing Chetnik organizations and pursuing the retreating Germans.
At the end of the war, Partisan forces numbered 800,000 men and were in full military
control. The central government was in the hands of AVNOJ, with Tito at the helm, and an
effective administrative structure encompassing the entire country had been established
during the war. In March 1945 a regency of one Serb, one Croat, and one Slovene was
created; this group named Tito premier and charged him with the formation of a government.

The new unified Yugoslavia took shape as a highly centralized one-party state. In
November 1945 a constitutional assembly met, at which time the monarchy was abolished
and the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia was proclaimed. The center of political
power in 1945 was the Politburo of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY). Its main
instruments were the army and the CPY itself, operating largely through the local “people’s
committees.” A strong central government was important to preserve order. Tito went about
stripping the former middle class of all remaining strength by confiscating property of former
collaborators, nationalizing industry, and controlling rents. “The implicit assumption behind
this policy, probably held with deep conviction, was that the Yugoslav civil war was not
over. The ‘bourgeoisie’ would easily revive, and would receive backing from the Western
powers.”271 Serbia experienced widespread opposition to Tito and backing for King Peter,
but elsewhere Tito was a genuinely popular national leader. “He had fought his own war and
won his own victories. He had attracted a large number of peasants, impoverished during the
inter-war years, to the Partisan movement. He had achieved a new relationship between the
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nationalities of Yugoslavia.” Tito had put a stop to nationalist violence and driven out the German occupiers; many people were optimistic about the future changes Tito would bring.

Norman Naimark lays out two models for interpreting Tito’s contribution to the Balkans. The first is the freezer model, which praises Tito for holding separatist strivings in check and forcing inhabitants of the region to be Yugoslavs. “The proponents of this model argue that once the constraints imposed by Tito’s rule dissolved, nationalism reared its ugly head and resumed its destructive force, picking up where the World War II interethnic fighting left off.” The second model is the incubator model, which argues that Tito’s attempt to maintain a balance between nationalities ended up antagonizing all of them and exacerbating resentments. “His support for satisfying national interest up to a point in Croatia and Slovenia built up expectations for autonomy and wound up alienating local nationalists who were unwilling to accept limitations on their activities especially in the cultural realm. At the same time, this policy provoked Serb unitarists, who already thought of themselves as exploited and maligned by ungrateful Croats and Slovenes.” These models represent the two diametrically opposed interpretations of Tito’s affect on Yugoslavia, neither of which can be advocated without careful thought. In fact, this entire section will attempt to tease out the true consequences of Tito’s rule. In order to do so, one must examine Tito’s nationality policy, known as “brotherhood and unity,” to determine whether ethnic tension and hostility still existed but were kept dormant by Tito’s policies, or whether this time really did represent one of genuine ethnic harmony and cooperation in Yugoslavia.

According to Marxist-Leninist dogma, “nationalism was a feature of bourgeois society which would disappear as soon as the proletariat won power and the inequalities
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which had bred nationalism in the first place were eradicated…As far as Yugoslavia’s communists were concerned, their triumph was part of the march of history and the nationalisms which had torn Yugoslavia apart between 1941 and 1945 were sure to fade away.”275 In a speech on May 22, 1945, Tito explained his vision of Yugoslavia. “Those border lines, as I see them, must be something like the white veins in a marble staircase. The lines between the federated states in a federal Yugoslavia are not lines of separation, but of union. This community is a house, one whole, but inside, each must be master of himself and develop culturally and economically in a new federative Yugoslavia.”276 On December 5, 1945, Tito’s associate Edvard Kardelj further articulated the nationality vision.

The old system of hegemonistic greater-Serb cliques upheld by reactionary anti-national Croat, Slovene and other influences has been done away with. The Federative People’s Republic of Yugoslavia has grown out of the voluntary unification of our peoples according to the principles of self-determination and equality of rights. Our peoples have signed their act of unification with their blood and have put the principles of self-determination and equality of rights into practice by building up the federal units and the united federative state community. In this way they have created all the conditions necessary for the liquidation of the nationality problem which constantly shook and undermined the old Yugoslavia.277

Communist rhetoric told the story of a peaceful Yugoslavia where people of different ethnicities would live in harmony and cooperation. The Communists would not allow any one nation to dominate Yugoslavia the way that Serbs had dominated the Kingdom; they were determined to unite the Yugoslav people through the patriotism of a wartime struggle for national liberation. “According to the official interpretation of the Second World War, all Yugoslavia’s peoples had contributed equally to the defeat of fascism. While, strictly
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speaking, this may not have been the case, it was an attempt to wipe the national slate clean and allow all peoples to join the new state free from any historical mortgage.\textsuperscript{278}

Tito made a number of changes in Yugoslavia to help make this vision a reality. Based on the wartime decisions of the communists, the new Yugoslavia was made up of six republics and two autonomous regions. This arrangement was confirmed by the new constitution passed in January of 1946. The republics were Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro, Macedonia, and Slovenia. Serbia contained two autonomous regions, Kosovo and Vojvodina.\textsuperscript{279} The people of Yugoslavia were categorized either as nations, those people who had a corresponding home republic, or national minorities, those who did not. For example, Croats, Slovenes, Serbs, Macedonians, and Montenegrins were nations, while Hungarians and Albanians were national minorities. According to Article Twelve of the 1946 constitution, inter-republican borders could only be altered after negotiations between the republics themselves and an agreement on all sides. The new constitution also established the Yugoslav Congress. This was a bicameral body composed of the Federal Council, an all-Yugoslav chamber containing one representative for every 50,000 inhabitants, and the Council of Nationalities, representing the various People’s Republics.\textsuperscript{280} In this way, the ethnic divisions established by republic divisions were institutionalized in the operation of the central government itself.

Christopher Bennett argues that the division of Yugoslavia into republics “was not meant to divide the country but to create as equitable a balance as possible between Yugoslavia’s peoples and to prevent conflict over disputed territories. Borders between
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republics were drawn up on a mixture of ethnic and historic principles.”281 However, Gojko Vuckovic points out that Tito made these divisions based on Stalin’s precedent. This was logical from Tito’s perspective, as the Soviet Union was the only socialist country available to use as a model for the nationality problem. However, Stalin’s own policy for his national minorities was to keep them fighting amongst themselves so that they would not challenge his authority. “Stalin divided nationalities into two or more republics and also moved large numbers of people into these republics. The result has been that any former Soviet Republic attempting to secede from the larger political system must immediately confront one or more dissident minorities—a perfect formula for civil war.”282

The inherent problems of Tito’s republic division are clear from the fact that the new Yugoslav constitution assumed the existence of five component people and yet divided the country into six republics, further dividing Serbia by creating two autonomous provinces. “The new Yugoslavia was not created by integration of independent states with defined territories and internationally recognized boundaries. It was rather a partitioning of the Yugoslav state recognized by Yalta and the international community, based on the political power of members of the Communist leadership. It also reflected the intention of the political leadership to fight perceived Serbian hegemonism by partitioning Serbia.”283 In some ways, the new Yugoslav state structure emphasized ethnic divisions and kept tensions alive in spite of rhetoric to the contrary.

Although the republic divisions of Yugoslavia suggest a less than complete commitment to ethnic unity, there is no doubt that policies were put into place to mitigate national rivalries and perceived inequalities. Yugoslavia’s Council of Nationalities
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represented each of Yugoslavia’s constituent nations evenly, with slightly less representation for the autonomous regions of Vojvodina and Kosovo. “Between the new units there was at first ‘brotherhood and unity’ in the sense that they were all equally powerless vis-à-vis an energetic and highly centralized Party leadership. More positively, there was some balance within the Politburo, where Tito’s chief lieutenants were chosen roughly in accordance with the principle of nationality.” Tito’s close associates included: Mosa Pijade (Serbian Jew), Edvard Kardelj (Slovenian), Aleksandar Rankovic (Serb), Milovan Djilas (Montenegrin), Rade Koncar (Croat), and Ivo-Lola Ribar (Croat from Serbia). Beyond Tito’s inner-circle, ethnic affirmative action was used to appoint people to cabinet posts, ambassadorships, and other important federal appointments between cadres from the republics and provinces. Offices were often rotational so that every republic had equal access to positions of power. The parliament and other federal institutions made major efforts to be multilingual and these policies led to the near-equal distribution of different ethnicities in government posts.

While moves towards ethnic unity suggest Tito was a benevolent ruler, he was first and foremost a Communist leader, and as such used repressive tactics to achieve his goals. Tito wanted brotherhood and unity, and he would achieve this with or without the support of the population. “All expression of economic resentment, together with nationalist consciousness itself, came under Tito’s ban. The society marched forward, willingly or unwillingly, under the banner of ‘brotherhood and unity.’ To call yourself a Croat or Serb first and a Yugoslav second was to risk arrest as a nationalist and a chauvinist.” Although little evidence suggests that there was ethnic tension in Tito’s Yugoslavia, one might argue
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that this is less an indication that people were living in harmony and unity and more an
indication that Tito’s repressive tactics instilled people with fear of expressing their true
sentiments.

Yugoslavia operated under the principle of Roman law which states that the burden of
proof rests on the accused. Prisoners were often held in confinement for months or even
years before coming to trial, which was often private. “Once in power, the Titoists shot
thousands of actual or potential opponents. Many of these fell even prior to the formal
organization of the state. Scarcely is there a city or town in Yugoslavia where a number of
leading citizens were not summarily liquidated, many of them without benefit of judicial
process.” In addition, Tito often staged show trials to make examples of controversial
figures and to discourage national sentiments.

Tito tried to be “fair” in his repression, balancing out purges equally between all
ethnic groups. “Tito believed that only drastic measures could erase the memory of hatred.
As a consequence, until the late 1980s, if a Bosnian Serb were tried in Sarajevo for political
crimes then surely, in a few weeks, there would be a trial of a Bosnian Croat and a Bosnian
Muslim, regardless of whether the latter two had been involved in any political activity or
not...The theory assumed that a few juridical indiscretions were preferable to a fratricidal
blood-bath.” This shows both an extreme dedication to suppressing ethnic dissent, and the
existence of a constant source of ethnic tension. After all, how could an innocent Croat or
Muslim help but to be bitter toward the Serb whose guilt made it necessary for the former to
be punished out of principle? By treating people in different ethnic groups as though they
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belonged in separate categories from their fellow Yugoslavs, Tito in many ways kept ethnic hostility alive.

Tito’s repressive measures no doubt frightened people from outwardly expressing their true feelings. Yugoslavia, like all Communist countries, had its own secret police force called the Department for the Protection of the People (OZNa). Up to 250,000 people were killed by Tito’s secret police forces between 1945 and 1946 alone. OZNa existed, in Tito’s words, “to strike terror into the bones of those who do not like this kind of Yugoslavia.”

Clearly, the secret police was meant to specifically target those people who expressed ethnic nationalism rather than a sense of unity. Physical beatings were systematically organized by Communist youth leaders in the winter of 1946 to 1947. Students were told to report to school in the late evening where they would find a Communist squad waiting for them. The squad would call names one by one, providing the most generic accusations. There was no opportunity for defense; the student would immediately be beaten by the leader, who would then pass the youth to the group outside which would beat him again. “Students who dared voice any protest and even some who did not applaud the bestial actions of the Communists, were put through the same routine.”

As in the Soviet Union, people in Yugoslavia were subjected to torture to secure confessions. “Hot needles were driven under fingernails; hot irons were applied to legs; persons were forced to spend as long as three days and nights in water up to their necks; men were put on tables with heads hanging down over the edge and water poured into mouths and nostrils; in summer victims were wrapped in winter overcoats and placed near hot stoves
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later to be throw on cement floors while cold water was poured on them.”

The secret police also established a ring of informants to report on fellow citizens. As popular resistance broke down further and people faced imprisonment and economic discrimination, more and more Yugoslavs were forced to become informants. This meant that no trust existed between Yugoslavs, and a person could not feel safe revealing feelings of ethnic hostility even in his own home. This is just one aspect of Tito’s Yugoslavia that makes it incredibly difficult to judge true ethnic sentiments during this period.

In spite of the similarities between Tito’s repressive measures and Stalin’s own tactics, tensions existed between the two. Stalin did not trust the Yugoslav communists, and Russian officials penetrated the highest organs of the Yugoslav state apparatus. Tito angered Stalin when he rejected a Soviet plan for a joint-stock exchange program. Stalin was further displeased with the militancy of the Yugoslav leadership. “He found it impossible to corrupt an indigenous Yugoslav Stalinism whose leaders placed both revolutionary purity and Yugoslav national interests above Soviet strategic requirements.”

Yet the most unacceptable derivation from Stalin’s instructions was the idea of a Balkan federation, which was promoted by both Tito and the Bulgarian leader Georgi Dimitrov. Stalin accused Tito of heresy and demanded his immediate obeisance.

When Tito refused to succumb to Stalin, the great rift between the leaders grew deeper. Soon Yugoslavia was accused of slandering the Soviet Union and was denounced as having abandoned Marxism. The Soviet Union froze all trade with Yugoslavia; “Stalin was convinced he could bring the country to its knees in a matter of days.”

The economic blockade had severe consequences, but the US devised a policy to keep Tito afloat because
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he was seen as a potential ally against the Soviets. Yugoslavia agreed to this Western trade relationship but remained true to Stalinist practices domestically, reinvigorating denunciation and political persecution. In June 1948, after Tito refused to submit to Stalin’s will, Yugoslavia was expelled from the Cominform.

Despite unifying rhetoric in the mid 1940s, the issue of developing a unitary Yugoslav identity did not become a pressing concern until Yugoslavia was no longer under the Soviet wing. This situation forced Tito to develop a theory of the specifically Yugoslav road to communism, a task which would require greater national unity among the people. Clearly previous efforts at Yugoslav brotherhood had not been entirely successful. The 1948 census revealed that the number of people identifying themselves as “Yugoslav” as opposed to a more specific ethnic identity was as low as 5.1 percent of the population.  

“Accordingly, the regime launched a campaign to promote the idea of integral Yugoslavism as a common culture. The foundations for this were provided by the Partisan philosophy of brotherhood and unity which conveniently bridged the notion of the particularist identities derived from ethnic and national loyalties with a supranational Yugoslav identity into which the separate national culture would eventually merge.”

This campaign for ethnic unity was supported by extensive propaganda. From an early age Yugoslavs were indoctrinated, via their schooling and the media, with love for Tito, Yugoslavia, and Titoism. Yugoslavs were also taught to love one another. In school, children studied the histories and cultures of all Yugoslavia’s people. Education was multicultural and aimed at unifying the Yugoslav population. From the day children started school, they began to learn of the National Liberation War and the contribution that all Yugoslavia’s peoples had

---

296 Lane, 116.
297 Ibid., 117.
made to the defeat of fascism. School trips took children on visits to neighboring republics, and traditionally conscripts completed military service outside their home republic to get to know another part of the country. “All people living in Yugoslavia, including the non-Slav Albanians and Hungarians, were taught that they could be their own nationality and Yugoslav at the same time and that they should be proud of both.”298 These policies of tolerance allowed Yugoslavia’s smaller ethnic groups, like the Macedonians and Muslim Slavs, to thrive culturally and evolve a modern identity without fear of aggressive Croat and Serb nationalism.

Tito’s policies brought great hope to the Yugoslav people. “The first version of Yugoslavia, poor and riven by nationalist tensions, had failed to persuade non-Serbs within the Yugoslav community, especially Croats, that the Kingdom of Yugoslavia really was their country.”299 The new Yugoslavia, however, had the potential to get the union right and truly bring the Slavic people together as Tito worked toward removing feelings of ethnic injustice. “In this way, the Communists were able to create a broad base of support because they identified their aims with those of most of the people and without their cause being the property of any particular ethnicity.”300 The people of Yugoslavia looked forward to great things developing from Tito’s rule. “Phoenix-like, a new Yugoslavia was rising from the ashes.”301

Alex Dragnich, however, believes that Tito’s rule was a curse for Yugoslavia, aggravating the ethnic problem rather than solving it. In his opinion, Tito made it “impossible
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to discuss unresolved issues. In such an atmosphere suspicion and rumor produced anything but mutual confidence.”302 In 1954, both Serbs and Croats told Dragnich that the nationality problem had never been more acute. Norman Naimark explains these tensions by pointing out that Serbs and Croats looked at the new Yugoslavia differently. “The Serbs saw the state’s creation as a final reward for their long history of battle and sacrifice on behalf of the south Slavs and they assumed Serbs would govern and rule it as a unitary, centralist polity, as befitted their history and experience. From the very start, Croats and Slovenes, among others, contested this vision, looking to protect their interests through decentralization and confederation, an equal union of equal peoples.”303 In this sense, Tito’s Yugoslavia faced many of the same disagreements which arose during the Kingdom’s existence.

The new Yugoslav government also posed problems for Bosnia. Despite attempts to put all the people of Yugoslavia on an equal footing, Bosnia was “regarded as somehow lower in status than the other republics of Yugoslavia. This inferior treatment had come about, Bosnians felt, because Bosnia was seen as containing not a distinctive nation but merely fragments of two other nations (Serbs and Croats) and a non-nation.”304 Bosnia was not fully developed under Tito, and was left with “new and often unfinished factories established in splendid isolation from markets, roads, or skilled manpower.”305 Bosnia had the lowest rate of economic growth of all the Yugoslav republics from 1952 to 1968. With the exception of Kosovo, by the early 1970s Bosnia had the highest infant mortality rate,
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illiteracy rate, and proportion of people with only a primary school education in all of Yugoslavia.\(^{306}\)

The problems facing Bosnia in this era suggest that Tito neglected the republic in favor of others. However, in reality Tito enacted policies to try to counteract the economic disparities in Bosnia and other poor regions. Tito put in place a policy whereby the poorest republics—Macedonia, Montenegro, and Bosnia-Herzegovina—would get the most federal aid while the richest republics—Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia—would contribute the most back to the government.\(^{307}\) While this policy was in the best interest of Yugoslavia as a whole, the richer republics were incredibly resentful of the arrangement and this attempt at equality ended up exacerbating ethnic tensions further.

In the interest of healing old wounds and encouraging Yugoslav unity, Tito made an effort to acknowledge and move past the atrocities of World War II by building a memorial for all those killed at the Ustashe extermination camp in Jasenovac. However, Tito’s commemorations were very one-sided. He made no attempts to honor those Croats who were killed during World War II and this led to increased resentment. Michael Ignatieff explains why Tito’s behavior was hurtful to Croats.

If Croats cannot bear Jasenovac, it is not merely because of what was done in their name but also because of the partiality of what is remembered. At Jasenovac, Tito’s Yugoslavia remembered Croatians only as murderers, never as victims. Tito never built a memorial center at any of the mass graves of the thousands of Croatians massacred as they fled before his Communist partisans on the roads of northeastern Croatia and Slovenia in May 1945. The guilt of Jasenovac became unbearable, not merely because it was great but also because it was unjust.\(^{308}\)
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Ignatieff argues that a nation can not hope to hold together unless it comes to a common and truthful version of its past. In trying to accept the past and move on, Tito perpetuated a biased understanding of World War II which encouraged the nationalist atrocities of this period to be misinterpreted and fueled future resentment.

In April 1963, a new constitution was adopted in Yugoslavia. This legislation introduced a real measure of decentralization, changed the state name to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and introduced personnel rotation for all elective functions except the presidency. Tito effectively became president for life, as the constitution stated that no limitations of the office applied to him. This constitution encouraged a close association between nationality and territory, and the regime simply turned a blind eye to sectional national differences which began infiltrating the power structure. “It had actively discouraged all integrative forces other than Communism, and separate nationalisms were surfacing again with decentralization.”

For the most part, Tito acted as the final arbiter in the countless clashes between the ethnic groups of Yugoslavia. Tito could have resolved the national problems permanently through democratization, but his power and prestige were more important than ethnic harmony. Tito “played Zagreb against Belgrade to stir up animosities in order to consolidate his own authority.” In addition, Tito’s repressive tactics drove both Serbian and Croatian national movements underground and “when they emerged from hibernation in the mid and late 1980s, they had lost their modernizing and liberal characteristics.” In the words of Tito
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loyalist Dobrivoj Radosavljevic, “Tito committed a historical error by encouraging Albanian-Serb and Croatian-Serb conflict. Yugoslavia will pay a heavy price for it.”

It soon became clear that while no nationality dominated the government as a whole, each was developing its own niche. “During most of the 1960s and 1970s, a disproportionately influential role in the federal center was played by the cadres from the smaller republics of Macedonia and Slovenia. The same was the case with economic policy.” On the other hand Serbs and Montenegrins dominated the officer corps, and Serbs dominated the political police. Croats were routinely resentful of the police because up until 1990, Serbs formed about seventy percent of the police force but only twelve percent of Croatia’s total population. “This power arrangement was the result of Tito’s deliberate policy of trying to keep the center from being dominated by one national group and giving all a stake.” Although all groups had a stake in the government, they were not distributed evenly throughout the administration. As a result, instead of working together throughout the government, each group controlled certain state organs and was completely excluded from others. Every group felt alienated from the state organs it did not control, and used the ones it did to express resentment toward the ethnic groups it saw as having the most power.

Alienation and resentment created by ethnic imbalances in the organs of power paved the way for a rebirth of Croat nationalism in the late 1960s. In March 1967, seventeen leading cultural organizations in Croatia including the literary society Matica Hrvatska published a manifesto demanding that the constitution provide better protection for the
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literary languages of Yugoslavia, particularly the Croatian language. The group requested an affirmation of Croatian national culture due to what they saw as the dominance of Serbian literary language. The organizations also demanded that all those with official functions in Croatia speak only Croatian. This was interpreted as an anti-Serbian request because of the high proportion of Serb, albeit Croatian Serb, civil servants in employment.

In making these demands, the group essentially proclaimed that Croatian was a distinct language from Serbian and that attempts to harmonize the two languages were really attempts to Serbianize it. The absurdity of such demands becomes clear when one notes that the difference between the Croatian and Serbian dialects is “significantly less than that between British English and Scottish English.” However, Serbs were quick to respond with similarly absurd demands. Serbian intellectuals soon began to insist that Serbian children living in Croatia be taught in the Serbian language rather than the Croatian one. Serbs also demanded the use of Cyrillic script as a way to further distinguish between the two languages and be true to Serb cultural roots. “The revival of the language problem was echoed around the other parts of the country.” Nationalism had reared its ugly head and would not be quickly silenced.

Tito’s dismissal of these demands as a stab in the back of Yugoslav unity did nothing to placate the nationalists and instead led Croats to increase their requests for reform. Croat leaders pushed for a reallocation of federal funds so that the richest republics, Croatia included, would receive federal investments proportionate to their own contributions rather than allowing their wealth to benefit the poorest republics only. Croatians felt that this was only fair because they were suffering due to this lack of federal funds. During the 1960s, the
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republic of Croatia had the highest number of emigrants and one of the lowest birth rates. In 1971, over five percent of the population worked abroad; of these, fifty percent were below the age of thirty, sixty-three percent of whom were men. These statistics, according to Ann Lane, are a reflection of the lack of career opportunities in Croatia at this time.320 Croats held Serbs responsible for their less-than-ideal circumstances. “Belgrade remained the metaphor for all that was outdated, centralist, and authoritarian while the perceived extent of Serbian influence in the federal government was blamed for the fact that Croatia was not as rich as some of the small Western European states. The Croats resented the fact that the headquarters of the large banks and the most prosperous enterprises were located in Belgrade, symbolizing the centralization of Yugoslavia’s financial life away from the regions which generated much of the country’s wealth.”321

Croats pushed to restructure the federal decision-making mechanism and create conditions in which one could write about Croatian history objectively.322 They also objected to Serbian dominance in the Yugoslav Army and police force, though it must be noted that Croats were dominant in the officer corps of both the navy and air force. This upsurge of Croatian nationalism reflected the “perennial fear among Croats that they risked losing their separate national identity within a unitary Yugoslav state.”323 The more that Tito tried to dismiss these concerns as unimportant, the more intensely Croats were determined to fight for the preservation of their national identity and the implementation of economic reforms.

Croat leaders attempted to harness this nationalist upsurge for their own benefit rather than subduing it. “At the federal level Yugoslavia was divided between economic reformers
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in the wealthier republics and economic conservatives in the more backward regions, and the result was deadlock. Croatia’s leaders were prepared to use the threat of the nationalist card to back up the demands of their economic program. However, their gamble failed as the national movement rapidly gained a momentum of its own.\textsuperscript{324} Soon, ethnic resentment towards Serbs began to take on a threatening character. Riots at football matches, the destruction of signs in the Cyrillic alphabet, and inflammatory articles in the Croatian press all served to make Croatia’s Serb population increasingly nervous.

In 1968, the Matica Hrvatska published a periodical that focused on the disadvantageous position of Croat minorities in other republics, particularly Bosnia. Soon, the nationalist cause was taken up not just by non-governmental organizations but by the Croatian League of Communists itself. Tito attempted to scare the Croatian elite into obeisance with a series of threats but the party was so deeply divided that it was unable to act even in the face of intimidation. Tito became convinced that the central organization of Yugoslavia must be strengthened to combat nationalist sentiments in the republics; this was ensured with the passing of twenty-three amendments to the constitution in 1971.

Furthermore, in 1972 Tito engineered an extensive purge of the Croatian League of Communists, expelling prominent party leaders and their associates accused of nationalist sentiments. Thousands of Croats were punished. Fifty thousand Croatian communists lost their party cards, twelve thousand directors and engineers were fired, and two to five thousand people were imprisoned. “But the purge did not liquidate Croatian nationalism; it only drove it underground.”\textsuperscript{325} Judah argues that these seemingly petty arguments were an expression of the brewing disturbance in Serbo-Croat relations. “In the wake of the collapse
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of Yugoslavia, it can now be seen that many of the debates of the period 1970-1971 in Croatia were simply a dress rehearsal for those of the late 1980s. Without Tito to draw everyone back from the brink the second time around, the national questions were pushed relentlessly to their bloody conclusions.”326

Hindsight allows scholars like Judah to identify ways in which the violence of the 1990s was pre-figured by events in the 1960s and 1970s, but statistics from this period suggest the situation may have been more harmonious than some would lead you to believe. For example, from the late 1960s onward, Bosnia-Herzegovina witnessed a remarkable social and cultural renaissance focused on Sarajevo. Social and ethnic barriers began to break down in urban areas as the number of mixed marriages and the number of those who chose to identify as Yugoslavs increased. “By the 1981 census, those who for census purposes called themselves Yugoslavs constituted 7.9 percent of the population. Mixed marriages accounted for 15.3 percent of the total number of marriages in the republic in 1981.”327 Intermarriage rates were lower among Muslims than among Serbs and Croats, but if one included children of mixed marriages in 1981, “over half the population of Bosnia had a close relative of a different nationality.”328 These statistics serve to remind readers that even as ethnic resentments were stirred among elites and certain sectors of the population, such extremism did not reach all people during this period. For many, it seems, Tito’s rule really did bring a kind of natural tolerance and inter-mingling of ethnic groups. For these individuals, the violence of the 1990s was far from expected.
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In 1974 a new constitution was passed in response to the republics’ demand for greater autonomy. The Constitution of 1974 invested each Yugoslav republic and province with theoretical statehood and effectively created a semi-confederative political structure in which powerful sectional leadership emerged. This new decentralization created even more problems. “Just enough of a principle of separate national political identities was conceded to whet the appetite for more.”329 Furthermore, the new government was far from a democratic union of equal states; the ever-present government oppression in Yugoslavia worsened nationalistic antagonism. “It is easy to persuade one nation that it is being oppressed or connived against by another when the whole political system in which both nations are locked is undemocratic and intrinsically oppressive. And the natural breeding ground for all kinds of discontent is a weak and malfunctioning economy—something which was also guaranteed under the Yugoslav Communist system.”330 No amount of minor compromise would placate the demands of the growing nationalist groups in Yugoslavia.

Serbia had fewer reasons for discontent than any other Yugoslav republic during the first twenty years of Communist rule. Nonetheless, Serbian nationalism grew rapidly in this period. Macedonia had been conquered by the Serbs in 1912, but it was established as a separate region by Tito after the war. This was seen as a theft of Serbian territory and was a source of Serb resentment for many years. Ethnic tension throughout Yugoslavia led the Serbian League of Communists to fragment along ethnic lines in the 1970s. Ignatieff argues that groups based on political ideology fell apart during this period because people were never given the opportunity to develop non-ethnic political affiliations based on civic multi-party competition. People resorted to their ethnic identity not because they had strong hatred
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for other groups but rather because they knew no other ways to identify themselves. As the 1970s wore on and nationalist sentiments heightened, the state became weaker and fear more prevalent. “If Yugoslavia no longer protected you, perhaps your fellow Croats, Serbs, or Slovenes might. Fear, more than conviction, made unwilling nationalists of ordinary people.”

In this atmosphere of turmoil and discontent, it was Tito who maintained relative order in Yugoslavia. The constantly renewed and updated Yugoslav constitutions “were little more than window dressing.” Tito was in charge of all policy decisions and government structures were essentially for show; the force holding Yugoslavia together in the late 1970s was not its institutions or laws but its leader. As one can imagine, people grew concerned that after Tito’s death the country would fall apart. However, in Tito’s last years, no heir apparent emerged. “Tito was frequently likened to a great oak tree, in the shade of whose immense branches nothing else could grow.” In reality, Tito was not eager to appoint a successor because he feared such a person would threaten his power during his lifetime. As a result, Tito created a collective head of state to succeed him. This would be an eight-member presidency, comprising one representative from each of the six republics and one from each of Serbia’s provinces. The presidency would rotate annually between its members. This was explained as a mechanism to prevent any single republic or politician from accumulating too much power, but it was not a lasting solution to a leadership problem.

Tito died in Ljubljana on May 4, 1980 at the age of 87. Thanks to the opacity of the government during his life and the extreme inefficiency of the government established to
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replace him, Tito’s death left Yugoslavia in a difficult situation. The population was
devastated by the loss of the only leader many had ever known, and comforted each other
with the slogan, “After Tito—Tito.” In reality, Tito’s absence left a political void in which
the federal presidency passed from one uninspiring and little known politician to another.
“Until the second half of the 1980s these complex arrangements had produced a stable
multinational federation where, whatever else was wrong (and a great many things were
wrong), the national question seemed to be settled.” However, the system continued to
decay and the ideology which originally held party cadres together began to crumble. Soon,
republic leaders discovered that it was in their own best interest to represent the interests of
their power base, their own republics, against the center. This was a sure way for such
politicians to gain local popularity as well as a sure way to exacerbate ethnic tensions and
disputes.

In addition, Tito left Yugoslavia’s economy in shambles. The country suffered from
massive unemployment and the government responded by borrowing heavily on international
money markets. By 1982, Yugoslavia’s debt stood at $18.5 billion. Each year, the
government had to get new loans simply to finance interest payments. “The country was
littered with giant factories which would have run at a loss even without the interest
payments on the loans which had financed their creation.” The whole Titoist economic
system was in a state of terminal decline with a steep and steady fall in real wages. By 1986,
unemployment and strikes had become endemic. Inflation was incredibly problematic; it rose
120 percent in 1987 and 250 percent in 1988. By the end of 1988, Yugoslavia’s total foreign
debt totaled $33 billion. “In this way, the long-term legacy of Tito’s economic policies had
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been to create an increasingly discontented and impoverished population—the perfect place for demagogues to get to work, stirring up the politics of resentment.”338

On top of economic troubles, Yugoslavia faced great problems with corruption. By the 1980s, those who had fought the revolution were reaching retirement age. The new generation of workers had been raised under communism, and therefore had learned to kill and bribe to get to the top rather than working for what they wanted. “The disillusionment of ordinary Yugoslavs was almost universal. For many, this took the form of a withdrawal from any kind of political life.”339 Great unhappiness with an inefficient government and failing economy, coupled with a desire to find someone to blame, made the population of Yugoslavia primed for the introduction of an extremist leader in Tito’s wake.

Slobodan Milosevic’s Rise to Power

With such widespread discontent among the population, it is no wonder that the years following Tito’s death saw a surge of nationalist sentiment in Yugoslavia. In 1985, the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts met to discuss various national and social problems facing their people and put together a written statement. On September 25, 1986, a Belgrade newspaper published leaked extracts of the unfinished Memorandum. The document stated, “Except for the time under the Independent State of Croatia, the Serbs in Croatia have never before been as jeopardized as they are today. A resolution of their national status is a question of overriding political importance.”340 The document went on to say, “A nation which after a long and bloody struggle regained its own state, which fought for and achieved a civil democracy, and which in the last two wars lost 2.5 million of its members, has lived to
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see the day when a Party committee of apparatchiks decrees that after four decades in the new Yugoslavia it alone is not allowed to have its own state. A worse historical defeat in peacetime cannot be imagined.”

Up until this point, the Serbian Academy was an upstanding organization without a reputation for nationalism. To hear such a statement from an august body like the Academy was shocking and illustrates the pervasive nature of ethnic hostility in Yugoslavia at the time. “Genuine grievances suddenly became genocide, Croatia was compared to the NDH, Serbia’s leaders were apparatchiks.” The document concluded, “The Serbian people cannot stand idly by and wait for the future in such a state of uncertainty. Naturally, Serbia must not be passive and wait and see what the others will say, as it has done so often in the past.” This expression of blatant Serbian nationalism was widely condemned by the communist leadership, with the exception of one lower-level communist who remained silent: Slobodan Milosevic. “He let others speak in his place, making sure the document was condemned—this was, after all, his duty—but shied away from a public expression of his views.”

Milosevic, however, would not remain silent for long. On December 14, 1987, after dedicating many years to the party, Milosevic replaced his long-time mentor Ivan Stambolic as president of the Serbian Communist Party. In this new position, Milosevic exercised great power in the country. He had superior organizational skills and promoted people to senior positions whose main attribute was personal loyalty. He also understood the power of the media and was a skilled propaganda expert. After assuming the leadership of the Communist
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Party, Milosevic criticized his predecessor's policy on Kosovo, a region which is dominated by Albanians but contains a minority of Serbs and Montenegrins. Milosevic called for justice for the Kosovo Serbs, which in reality meant that he wanted Kosovo to become part of Serbia proper. This policy allowed Milosevic to gain the allegiance of Serb intellectuals, who were familiar with the ancient Serbian desire to possess Kosovo. The Central Committee supported Milosevic's plan and raised his nationalist demand to the top of the Serb agenda. “This was a challenge to all other republics: their choice was to recognize Serbia's seniority within Yugoslavia and by implication the dominance of a Serbian-dominated unitarist state, or to respond with a nationalist agenda of their own.”345

All the pieces of the puzzle were now in place. There was an ambitious politician in Belgrade who had learned the methods of Communist power politics as he worked his way up the system. There was general economic malaise and discontent, which made people yearn for decisive leadership. Finally, the ideology of Serb nationalism, so long frustrated, was now finding an expression in a policy which restored Vojvodina and Kosovo to Serbian control. “Two processes seemed fused into one: the gathering of power into Milosevic’s hands, and the gathering of the Serbs in a single political unit which could either dominate Yugoslavia or break it apart.”346

Milosevic took full advantage of his unique circumstances. Immediately, he began working to include Serb communities outside of Serbia proper in the nationalist goals of the region. Milosevic organized protests and rallies by encouraging businesses to support these events financially and paying unemployed young men to travel the country and participate. “The demonstrations were part of a well-organized plan designed to intimidate the non-Serb
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peoples of Yugoslavia, instill among Serbs the idea that their fellow Serbs were being widely discriminated against, but on a higher political plane, to underline Milosevic's determination to mark his territory as the undisputed master of post-Titoist Yugoslavia. Milosevic also made great efforts to radicalize the Serb population; even those who argue that true ethnic tensions existed have difficulty denying that Milosevic used the media to exaggerate threats. Every action of the Croatian government was presented as an act of Ustashe terror. Although Milosevic was the mastermind behind these Serb policies, he was always careful not to bear apparent responsibility. When a particular policy came under scrutiny or attack, “he would simply point out that as president, he enjoyed few if any executive powers so he could not accept responsibility.”

Milosevic played the role of the people’s leader well. In April 1987, he visited the sight of the epic Battle of Kosovo and pledged to aggrieved Serb protestors, “No one will ever beat this people again.” Two years later, on June 28, 1989, Milosevic returned to Blackbird Field for an official appearance at the six-hundredth anniversary of Serbia’s defeat by the Turks. “Against a backdrop of posters of himself and the fourteenth-century tsar Lazar, he gambled on going further. The audience of a million Serbs greeted him with wild cheers when he threatened, for the first time, that future ‘armed battles cannot be excluded.’” Milosevic’s ability to play with the heart strings of his people is highlighted by an appreciation of the symbols being evoked. In the words of Bishop Emilijan, “Beside the name of Christ, no other name is more beautiful or more sacred than that of Lazar.”

Milosevic used the image of Lazar and his refusal to give in to foreign rulers to encourage
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Serbs to “eat roots rather than betray their nation by accepting foreign dictates.”352 As Elizabeth Pond explains, “Milosevic’s theatrical summons at Blackbird Field touched perfectly the chord of victimization that has long coexisted with the Serbs superiority complex.”353

By 1989, Milosevic had acquired an unchallengeable personal standing in Serbia through a combination of Communist methods and nationalist rhetoric. Out of the eight votes in the federal government, he now controlled four: Serbia, Vojvodina, Kosovo, and Montenegro. “He had only to reduce Macedonia to client status as well to be able to do what he wanted with the federal government; and the federal constitution could then be rewritten to entrench the dominance of Serbia.”354 Milosevic presented himself as the defender of Yugoslavia against the secessionist ambitions of Croatia and Slovenia, as well as the avenger of wrongs done to Serbia by that very Yugoslavia.

Milosevic also worked towards a Greater Serbia. “If the other republics would not agree to a new Yugoslavia dominated by the Serbs, Milosevic was prepared to incite the Serbian minorities in Kosovo, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina to rise up and demand Serbian protection. These minorities served as Milosevic’s Sudeten Germans—pretext and justification for his expansionary design.”355 Milosevic was adamantly opposed to Yugoslavia becoming a loose confederation of sovereign states because such a situation would minimize his power. He also worked hard to prevent any states from leaving the federation because this would reduce the territory that he might control if he took over the Yugoslav federal government. “Every time Croatia and Slovenia pushed their claims for
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independence, Milosevic simply said that Croatia could go but without the regions where Serbs live.”\textsuperscript{356} By making demands of Croatia that he knew it would never accept, Milosevic made it clear that he was well-prepared to accept war as a solution to the Yugoslav problem.

Unsurprisingly, Milosevic’s authoritarian ways made the other Yugoslav republics very nervous. In spite of their differences, the republics were united in their condemnation of Milosevic’s unitarist Yugoslavia. Ignatieff believes that in spite of Croat and Slovene rhetoric supporting a loose Yugoslav confederation, the two were on a course towards independence beginning in the 1980s. As the two richest republics in Yugoslavia, Croatia and Slovenia were resentful that their economic success was used to pay for “backward Bosnia and Balkan Serbia.”\textsuperscript{357} Between Tito’s suppression of the Croatian spring in 1970 and Milosevic’s expansionist behavior, absorbing Kosovo and Vojvodina, Croatian and Slovenian leaders saw no future in a federal Yugoslavia. It is important to note that many Serbs were outraged at the prospect of Croat and Slovene independence even without the influence of Milosevic’s propaganda. Serbs felt they had fought on behalf of all the Balkan nations and yet were not rewarded for their efforts. Croats and Slovenes lived better than Serbs but still sought control of resources. “Even more galling to the Serbs was the sense that the growing nationalism of the other peoples of Yugoslavia jeopardized the life and property of Serbs who lived outside of Serbia proper.”\textsuperscript{358}

The spiral of nationalist tension continued, and as Milosevic became more extreme in his public views, so did his opponents. Milosevic’s increasingly forceful insistence that Serbs control Yugoslavia simply made the other republics more unwilling to submit to his power. Croatian nationalism increased in the face of Milosevic’s bullying, and Serb and Croat
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nationalism began to feed off each other, pushing each other to more and more extreme views. When hard nationalists won elections in Croatia and took over the media, the rhetoric only got worse. “By 1989 the nationalist disputes between Serbs and Croats had begun to metastasize at a breakneck speed that was even further accelerated by wild, jingoist campaigns in the controlled mass media.”359 Meanwhile, the most Westernized and independent-minded of the republics, Slovenia, was making arrangements to protect itself. In September and October 1989 it drafted and passed a new Slovenian constitution, giving itself legislative sovereignty—in other words, saying that its own laws would take precedence over those of the federal state—and explicitly declaring its right to secede.

To get a full picture of the nationalist Yugoslav fervor of the 1980s, one must take a step back and look at how the population itself viewed these events. Ignatieff argues that ethnic divisions in Yugoslavia arose because of elite manipulation rather than due to ethnic hostility. “Consciousness of ethnic difference turned into nationalist hatred only when the surviving Communist elites, beginning with Serbia, began manipulating nationalist emotions in order to cling to power.”360 Ignatieff maintains that by looking to the Yugoslav population, one can dispel the common misperception that people of the region are incorrigibly nationalist. “Many people bitterly lament the passing of Yugoslavia, precisely because it was a state that once gave them room to define themselves in non-nationalist ways.”361 He points to the essay “Overcome by Nationhood” by Croatian writer Slavenka Drakulic, in which Drakulic explains that until the late 1980s she had always defined herself in terms of her “education, profession, gender, and personality. It was only the maddened atmosphere of the Croatian-Serbia war of 1991 that finally stripped her of all of these defining marks of identity
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except simply being a Croatian.” 362 The nationalist rhetoric of the 1980s gave a voice only to the population’s fear and pride. “In reality, nationalism ended up imprisoning everyone in the Balkans in the fiction of ‘pure’ ethnic identity. Those with multiple identities—for example, from mixed marriages—were forced to choose between inherited and adopted families, and thus between two fused elements of their own selves.” 363

To verify Ignatieff’s claims, it is helpful to look at some opinion polls conducted in the region in the late 1980s. In Croatia in 1989, 66 percent of Croats and 72 percent of Serbs characterized ethnic relations in their community as good or mainly good. “They did, however, perceive that relations between nationalities at the level of Yugoslavia were mostly bad (77.6 percent as very bad or mostly bad).” 364 In a November 1989 survey given in Bosnia, 80 percent of the wider population surveyed considered interethnic relations in the places where they lived to be positive, and 66 percent saw interethnic relations in Bosnia-Herzegovina as the most stable in Yugoslavia. “When asked whether ethnicity should be taken into account when choosing marriage partners, 80 percent of Serbs, 77 percent of Muslims, 93.4 percent of Yugoslavs, and 66 percent of Croats replied negatively.” 365 All three ethnic groups in Bosnia were highly integrated and in many places lived side by side as friends and neighbors. This data supports an elite manipulation theory of the Yugoslav conflict, as the general populous does not exhibit the ethnic hatred expressed by leaders and institutions at the time. Such statistics support Gagnon’s theory that elite manipulation can only change people’s perceptions of what is going on “out there” but is unable to shake how people view their own personal experiences and communities.
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Map 8: Balkan Ethnic Distribution in 1990

Gagnon points out that supporters of nationalist parties in Serbia and Croatia tended to be rural Yugoslavs, pensioners, and other groups of the population who would be most negatively affected by a shift to a liberal economic system. “The support that these people provided the ruling parties could thus just as easily be attributed to their economic interests as to their ethnic identities. The other much smaller segment that actively supported and participated in the strategy of violence included those for whom war represented glory and heroism or, conversely, the opportunity to partake in looting and bloody killing.”  

Gagnon points out that most people in Yugoslavia were not mobilized for ethnic conflict, and understands this to mean that images of ethnic war did not appeal to people’s lived experiences or self-identification. “Indeed, the evidence points to the opposite: that conservative elites were using violence to demobilize people precisely because they were not able to use appeals to ethnic identity as the basis for mobilization.”

Before assuming that ethnic tensions were completely fabricated by elites, it is worth examining hard evidence which struck fear into the hearts of people throughout Yugoslavia and made nationalist rhetoric believable to many. In the 1980s, the Croat republic adopted the red-and-white checkered shield of Sahovnica as their flag. While this is an innocently traditional Croat emblem, it was also the flag used by the Ustashe during World War II; this is a connection that many Serbs had trouble viewing as meaningless. In May 1990, Croat elections removed the communists from office and installed Franjo Tudjman’s Croatian Democratic Union party which campaigned on nationalist euphoria. One of the party’s first acts was to demote Serbs, about 600,000 people and twelve percent of the population, from the Croatian constitution. “Croatia was the ‘national state of the Croatian people’ and only
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then of the other nations who lived in it.”368 The new party also dismissed Serbs from the
Croatian police and judiciary. All this helped to convince Serbs that they were witnessing the
return of an ethnic state with a genocidal past. Certainly Milosevic played on these fears, but
many Serbs were also frightened for good reason and without his encouragement. These fears
arose inevitably out of the collapse of Tito’s Yugoslavia. “Once the multi-ethnic state
disintegrated, every national group outside its republic’s borders suddenly found itself an
endangered national minority. As the largest such group, the Serbs felt particularly
vulnerable to the rise of Croatian nationalism.”369

While this evidence does provide reasons why Serbs were willing to accept
Milosevic’s rhetoric, it is important to note that such developments do not preclude elite
manipulation as a valid explanation for the conflict. Serbs may have been reasonable to fear
Croatian nationalism, but this does not mean that the Croats actually meant them harm, or
that Serbs wished to aggressively target Croats. In fact, the existence of these legitimate fears
can enforce elite manipulation theory by showing that people were primed for exploitation by
propaganda and nationalist rhetoric without necessarily wishing physical harm on members
of another ethnic group.

As the ethnic turmoil of the 1980s dragged on, it became increasingly clear that
Milosevic would not be able to gain full control of Yugoslavia under the already established
system of government and Communist Party. As the government deteriorated, the republics
began rebelling, and nationalist rhetoric took on further escalating dimensions, Milosevic
began to think seriously about a second option. “If Yugoslavia could not be controlled as a
single entity, then he would carve out of it a new entity, an extended Serbian territory, which
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would be his and his alone.” ³⁷⁰ The stage was set for all-out war. In the words of Ignatieff, “The tragedy for the Balkans was that, when democracy at least became possible, the only language that existed to mobilize people into a shared social project as the rhetoric of ethnic difference.” ³⁷¹

Conclusion

The Balkan region has a long and complex history which is by no means fully explored in the preceding pages. Still, this chapter seeks to provide a sense of the life and evolution of ethnic sentiment in the area. It is difficult to argue that the Slavic people of the Balkans have always hated each other and always will, but evidence does suggest an on-going journey of tension and distrust. This may simply prove that the population was primed to accept the propaganda and manipulation of Milosevic and Tudjman, rather than the fact that such leaders accurately reflected popular sentiments. However, no conclusions about the nature of the violence in the 1990s can be drawn without first examining the conflict itself as well as the region’s post-war transition period. This chapter provides one piece to a complex puzzle which is not yet ready to be solved.
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Chapter 4: The Breakup of Yugoslavia

The wars that took place in Croatia and Bosnia in the early 1990s were extremely destructive and brutal conflicts. Suffering went far beyond those killed in battle, extending to every facet of civilian life and leaving physical, psychological, and emotional wounds which will not heal for years to come. This chapter attempts to both capture the political events of the war and highlight the suffering endured by individuals on all sides. An examination of the nature of this conflict requires looking at it from above, in terms of elite actions and motivations, as well as from below, in terms of the civilian experience. As in the last chapter, this presentation will inform the reader about all events relating to the conflict, regardless of the theory they seem to support. Each group involved in the war counted victims and villains among its ranks, and a truthful understanding of this tragedy requires that one embrace its complexities rather than ignoring them.

Yugoslavia’s Path to War

As the 1980s came to a close ethnic tensions and fears were running rampant in Yugoslavia. The harder Milosevic and Serb nationalists pushed the other republics to submit to their rule, the more fervently other republics fought back with their own nationalist agendas. It is no surprise, then, that Croatia and Slovenia, the richest republics of the federation, soon began contemplating secession from Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, this served only to complicate matters further because the 1974 Yugoslav constitution was unclear on the legality of secession. The constitution itself stated, “The nations of Yugoslavia, proceeding from the right of every nation to self-determination, including the right to secession, have united in a federal republic of free and equal nations and nationalities and
founded a socialist federal community.” The question became: is there a difference between a republic and a nation? In the case of Slovenia, it seemed clear that they were one in the same. Slovenia had no native-born minorities and there were no pockets of Slovenes outside the republic. However, Milosevic argued that while Croats as a nation had a right to self-determination, the republic of Croatia was a different story. The Croats themselves could secede but Milosevic insisted that they would have to leave areas with Serb populations behind. Some believe that Milosevic was trying to save ethnic Serbs from abuse at the hands of the Croatian government, while others claim that Milosevic simply used the presence of Serbs in Croatia as an excuse to pressure the Croats to remain in Yugoslavia. Either way, Milosevic would not allow the Croats to leave without a fight.

As nationalist tensions grew, Milosevic became anxious to tighten his control of the Yugoslav military; violent conflict was imminent, and he was eager to prepare. Luckily for Milosevic, Serbs had made up the great majority of both soldiers and army officers in the Yugoslav National Army (JNA) for decades. This was not because Serbs were particularly militaristic but rather because of the circumstances surrounding army recruitment. The most underdeveloped areas of Yugoslavia tended to be Serb-dominated. It was these areas which had the highest unemployment and therefore the most inhabitants interested in a military career. Conversely, the most highly industrialized areas of the country, where populations were not eager to serve in the army, had small numbers of Serb inhabitants. Also, Kraina and Montenegro contributed greatly to partisan forces during World War II, so the children in these regions, mostly Serbs, had an advantage in getting admitted to military academies. All these factors led to an overwhelming dominance of Serbs in the Yugoslav army throughout
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Tito’s rule and beyond. Bogdan Denitch argues that even before Milosevic entered the scene these Serbs were not neutral representatives of Yugoslavia. They were excessively “sensitive about the policies of the new anti-Communist nationalist government in Croatia toward the Serbian minority,” which was concentrated in Kraina where many officers were from.373

These circumstances played perfectly into Milosevic hands. He sought a military force which would loyally serve Serb nationalist interests but which he could still command under the guise of seeking to preserve the Yugoslav state. If Milosevic could gain the loyalty of Serb soldiers, he could essentially have his own army and control much of the federation. The Yugoslav military was based on the concept of Total National Defense, meaning that apart from the regular army each republic had reserve forces it could call on in the event of war. These Territorial Defense Forces were meant to protect the republics even if there were a break down in communication from the center. The defense forces worked closely with the Communist Party so by substituting Serb leadership for that of the Communist Party, Milosevic was able to disarm the non-Serb Territorial Defense Forces throughout the country.374 This left the other republics unprepared to defend themselves.

Milosevic also worked toward arming Serbs throughout Yugoslavia. In late 1989 and early 1990 Serb nationalist Mil Martic set to work selecting Serb-loyal generals from the Yugoslav military to create a clandestine Serb defense network known as the Vojna Linija or Military Line. The main purpose of this group was to arm Serb populations in Croatia and Bosnia so that if the republics chose to secede, they would face resistance from within their own borders. This plan, dubbed RAM, required Serb leaders to organize all Serbs outside of

Serbia, take control of the fledgling Serb nationalist groups, and gather ammunition. In June of 1990, senior Serb police officer Mihajlo Kertes began covertly funneling arms to militant Serbs in the Krajina region of Croatia. Once armed, these rebel Serbs quickly began driving Croats off the land. In July, Radovan Karadzic established the Serb Democratic Party or SDS, which functioned as the nationalist leadership for the Serbs in Bosnia. This group was opposed to any form of Bosnian independence from Yugoslavia and to any changes in Bosnia that might subject the Serb minority to rule by another ethnicity.

In the midst of this tumultuous time, Bosnia held the first democratic elections in the history of the republic. These elections brought Alija Izetbegovic to the presidency. The electorate also voted three nationalist parties to power which claimed to represent the three ethnic communities rather than voting for either of the non-nationalist forces, democratic or former communist. While this can be interpreted as evidence of the natural ethnic divisions within Bosnia, Stephen Burg and Paul Shoup suggest that perhaps it is more a reflection of the electoral system than voter preference. “Results for the individual assemblies reveal that the non-nationalist parties secured 25 percent or more of the seats in 31 out of 109 assemblies. These results, together with available data for the elections to the Chamber of Municipalities of the republic parliament, suggest that had a proportionality rule been adopted for the republic-level elections, the non-nationalist parties would have secured a significantly greater voice in Bosnian politics in 1990.”

Even votes in support of nationalist parties may not accurately reflect support for the platforms of these organizations. Burg and Shoup argue that many of the nationalist votes were cast due to fear rather than popular support. For instance, a Serb might think that even if
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he withheld his vote from the SDS, his Muslim neighbor would still vote for the Muslim Bosniak Organization. “In the end they were afraid of weakening their own nation in an hour presaging the ultimate confrontation.” Furthermore, “the elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina were characterized by the phenomenon of ‘negative voting,’ in which a significant number of citizens voted for one party only in order to prevent the victory of some other, and not because of the quality of the program or candidate of that party.” In this sense, the victory of nationalists in Bosnia does not necessarily reflect extremist views of the population but rather the fear and tension of the time.

Croatian elections also brought nationalists to power in 1990 in the form of president Franjo Tudjman and his party the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ). Although Croatia’s Serb nationalist party was vocal during elections and no doubt frightened many Croats into giving their support to the HDZ, the majority of Serbs living in Croatia supported the civil democracy coalition rather than their corresponding nationalist party. While Tudjman could have used his position to appeal to Croatia’s cosmopolitan and liberal-minded Serbs, he instead acted as though the actions of ultra-nationalist Krajina Serbs were representative of all Croatia’s Serb people. Following in this vein, the HDZ “practiced the ‘systematic’ infringement of Serbs’ civil, property, and employment rights.” Tudjman glossed over the Ustashe’s brutality toward the Chetniks during World War II. He described the Ustashe as “not simply a quisling creation and a fascist crime, but also an expression of the historical aspirations of the Croatian people,” and then proceeded to rename Croatian streets to honor members of the Ustashe regime.
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In Michael Ignatieff’s estimation, the Croatian state’s biggest mistake was “its failure to publicly disavow the Ustashe state and what it did at Jasenovac.”  

Tudjman fought the Ustashe as a young partisan, but rather than highlighting this “he tried to unite all of Croatia’s tortured past into what was called a national synthesis. So he never came to Jasenovac…Because Tudjman did not come here, Serbs in Croatia were manipulated by Belgrade and by their local leaders into believing that the new Croatia was the fascist Ustashe come again.”  

To be fair, Tudjman was in a sense forced to embrace the Ustashe regime. He was financed by Croatians abroad, most of whom were old Ustashe. More importantly, the wartime Ustashe state was Croatia’s first experience of independent nationhood, making it difficult to disavow. “Instead, Croatians evade the issue altogether, either by dismissing tales of Ustashe atrocity as Serbian propaganda, or by attempting to airbrush atrocity into crime by playing statistical sleight of hand with the numbers who died.”  

Misha Glenny does not suggest that the Croatian state of the 1990s was actually the Ustashe regime come again, but he argues that Tudjman should have been more sensitive to Serb fears. This mistake greatly contributed to the violence that followed.  

Serbs believed they fought two world wars in order to preserve that equality and now the separatist will of the Croatian government was attempting to strip them of their hard-won prize. It does not matter how close to the truth this is. It does not matter that Tudjman’s government was not a fascist one—the point is enough Serbs believed it to be so and Tudjman bore a considerable responsibility for not allaying the fears of what is historically an almost psychotic part of the Serbian nation’s make up. Croatia had no hope of leaving Yugoslavia peacefully (regardless of the help received by the local Serbs from
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Belgrade) without striking a deal with the Serbs in Krajina, Lika, Kordun, Banija, western and eastern Slavonia.\textsuperscript{384}

Tudjman sought recognition of Croatia as a sovereign republic in a looser Yugoslav confederation and was not looking for outright independence. However, Tudjman’s actions would eventually force him to secede by fueling Milosevic’s radical claims that Croatia was being led by an anti-Serb coalition and encouraging Tudjman’s own Serb population that “the interests of Serbia must be above all others.”\textsuperscript{385}

As the Yugoslav people became more fearful of one another, ethnic violence took hold, particularly in Croatia’s Serb-dominated region of Krajina. In 1990, Martic’s Krajina Militia of Serbs took over the Plitvice National Park. On March 31, the Croatian police attempted to reassert their authority, which resulted in the death of one Croat and one Serb and eventually required the intervention of the Yugoslav Army. This established a precedent for the following months, in which Serbian rebels or Croatian police would begin a fight and the Yugoslav Army would move in to separate the parties.\textsuperscript{386} In August Krajina Serbs staged a referendum supporting an initiative to make Krajina an autonomous region. At the polls, Krajina Serbs chanted, “Kill the Ustashe!” and a number of anti-Croat acts were committed. “Serb nationalist symbols were daubed onto Croat houses; some Croat-stores were looted; Croats prudently began moving away.”\textsuperscript{387}

Hate-filled rhetoric continued to encourage a climate of fear and violence, and Milosevic was quick to take advantage of this extremist climate. By early 1991, he publicly stated that if any attempt were made to replace the federal structure of Yugoslavia with a
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looser confederal arrangement, he would seek to annex whole areas of Croatia and Bosnia.\textsuperscript{388} Bosnia had no clear allies in this ever-escalating dispute. In any debate about changing the federal structure of Yugoslavia into a looser confederation, Bosnia would be on the side of Slovenia and Croatia, as it too wanted to reduce Serb domination. However, Bosnia was not prepared to declare full independence from the Yugoslav state. Regardless of Bosnian wishes, the actions of Croatia and Slovenia put it in a difficult situation. “The prospect of those two republics actually carrying out their threat to leave Yugoslavia was deeply alarming to most Bosnians since they would then be left, together with another weak republic, Macedonia, entirely under Serbia’s thumb.”\textsuperscript{389}

The more this ethnic situation intensified, the more difficult it became for people to see the situation clearly. A trade war began between Serbia and Slovenia, along with an avalanche of nationalist propaganda and battles over the control of tax revenues. “Together these and other disputes suffocated rational political debate, opening the way for the propaganda of extremist organizations. They swamped the public arena with instrumentalized historical memories.”\textsuperscript{390} It seemed there was no turning back; war was becoming more and more a matter of certainty.

On March 9, 1991, demonstrators took to the streets to protest Milosevic’s manipulation of state television. Running battles soon broke out in the center of Belgrade. That evening Milosevic sent tanks in to Belgrade to quell the violence, however Laura Silber and Allan Little argue that “the display of force was planned well before the anti-government
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demonstration, which supposedly provoked it, got out of hand.”391 The next day hundreds of thousands gathered in Belgrade to demonstrate against Milosevic. On Sunday night, one thousand students broke through police barricades and headed for the city center where they were beaten by police armed with night sticks, tear-gas, and shields. In spite of all these obstacles, by midnight hundreds of students had reached the center. Over the next week, tens of thousands of Belgrade’s liberal elite made their last stand. “Singing ‘Give Peace a Chance,’ they re-created, fleetingly, the atmosphere of tolerance that had once been a hallmark of Belgrade, but which had disappeared from public life under Milosevic. The city seemed transformed. People would stop by to bring food and blankets to the students…Each night professors, writers, and actors would address the crowd from a platform on the fountain.”392 The students demanded democracy, which Milosevic would not give. Eventually Milosevic was able to put down protests and these tolerant voices were silenced. However, this peaceful expression in the midst of such chaos and resentment provides an important reminder that the nationalist and hateful actions of some do not always represent the opinions of many.

Ethnic violence began in Croatia in the spring of 1991, before war had officially been declared. From May onwards, Serb property in crisis regions under Croat control became the target of regular bomb attacks and the Serbs who remained were ostracized. “In Croat nationalist strongholds like Split, open intimidation was reported much earlier.”393 Serbs were soon run out of their homes by former Croat neighbors. In one woman’s words “We are almost more afraid of the people we used to call our neighbors than their special police
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units." Croats were victimized in this period as well; many were terrorized by Serbs who hoped to drive them from their homes and then take the territory for themselves. This kind of violence on both sides led ordinary citizens to become fearful and seek ways to protect themselves. Croatian civilians began enrolling in Voluntary Units of National Protection with the slogan “Everything for Croatia! All for Croatia!” On May 2, 1991, the first Serb paramilitary probe in Croatia massacred a dozen Croat policemen in Borovo Selo. “By the yardstick of the next few years, this was only a small atrocity, but it set ugly precedents. The twelve had their throats slit, their noses sliced off, and their eyes gouged out.”

In this atmosphere of fear, hatred, and violence, it is no surprise that in mid-1991 Slovenia and Croatia began taking steps to secede from Yugoslavia. On June 24, the prime minister of Yugoslavia, Ante Markovic, issued an unambiguous warning to both the Croats and Slovenes: “The federal government will counter unilateral secession with all available means.” This warning fell on deaf ears. Croatia declared independence from the federation on June 25, 1991 and Slovenia followed suit the next day. The federal government responded by declaring the acts of Croatia and Slovenia illegal and unconstitutional, and with that Yugoslavia began to crumble. Thomas Hobbes once said “when people are sufficiently afraid, they will do anything.” As Michael Ignatieff points out, “there is one type of fear more devastating in its impact than any other: the systematic fear that arises when a state begins to collapse. Ethnic hatred is the result of the terror that arises when legitimate authority disintegrates.” By this argument, the collapse of the Yugoslav state served only
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to exacerbate the fears and tensions that were pervasive before these secessions occurred. Ethnic violence had shown itself to be an ugly phenomenon, but it would only get worse.

**The War in Croatia**

The Croatian War officially began when the Yugoslav National Army entered the republic in an attempt to prevent its secession and preserve the federation. In the summer of 1991, battles in Serbian areas of Croatia broke out over control of the key seat of local power, the police station. In villages where Serb policeman had been dismissed, these same men armed themselves and set up as vigilantes. “When Croats tried to restore their authority in Serbian areas, they were fired upon and roadblocks were set up at the entrances to villages. Because Croatia was unable to control parts of its state, the Yugoslav National Army stepped in, first to restore order and then to smash Croatian independence. Croatia then had no option but to fight for its survival.”

As fighting became more pervasive, Croats and Serbs from the diaspora in Germany, Canada, and Australia returned to their homelands ready to fight. This fueled the chain reaction of revenge for the torture and death of comrades in arms, and increasingly of mothers, children, and the elderly. Groups like the Serbian volunteer military unit Arkan’s Tigers “terrorized Croats into abandoning their homes to create homogenous Serb villages—and also terrorized any local Serbs who were squeamish about killing their Croat neighbors.” As Glenny explains, ethnic cleansing often begins as a military tactic; one side sees that a group of people is in the way of their strategic goal, so they eliminate them. “Of course, as the war continues, dragging in most areas of the republic, the hostility between the nationalities reaches fever pitch. The idea of including a minority population in the
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conquered territory becomes less acceptable as the doctrine of ‘national purity’ strengthens.” By this interpretation, war does not originate from ethnic hatred, but rather ethnic hatred originates from war.

After Slovenia and Croatia seceded, Slovenes, Croats, Muslims, and Macedonians exited the army. With its two largest opponents out of the country and the army more dominated by Serbs than ever before, Serbia inherited its own army in all but name. Milosevic was eager to use this situation to his advantage and quickly set about increasing the population’s involvement in the war. One technique, called compromising the villages, involved going to a Croatian settlement, staging an incident meant to invite a crackdown or reprisal, and then distributing arms to villagers with the explanation that the police were planning to attack. “When armed police do arrive, it is easy to spark off a gun battle; and suddenly a whole village, previously uncommitted, is now on the side of the insurgents.” Milosevic also incited violent incidents and then asked the army to intervene as an impartial arbiter when it was clear that the army was acting on behalf of Milosevic and the Serbs.

Under Milosevic, the JNA engaged in “intimidation and, if necessary, liquidation of any local Serbs who refused to participate in the attack on the non-Serb population.” By forcing as many Serbs as possible to engage in the atrocities, the organizers guaranteed that a wide section of the population would be compliant and thereafter have a vested interest in denying what happened and in obstructing investigations into the violence. As the property of non-Serbs was distributed to the local Serb population, the circle of complicity and solidarity was further strengthened. Milosevic reinforced such tactics through his control of the media,
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which quickly became propagandistic and nationalist. “Whereas Hitler had told the Germans that it was Versailles which had been their undoing, Serbian nationalists said that Tito’s Yugoslavia had been a gigantic plot to keep the Serbs from their rightful place in the sun.”

The Serbian media portrayed Croatia as a fascist state, showing violent images on television and reminding people that Croatia had adopted the Ustashe symbol as its flag and that some Croats openly admired the former Ustashe regime. Nationalist rhetoric in the Serb media was met by a comparable response in the Croat media, further contributing to an atmosphere of fear and hatred.

And yet, in spite of Serbia’s convincing and aggressive media campaign, the nation’s attempt to bring men in to the army led to “one of the most massive campaigns of draft resistance in modern history.” The vast majority of young men who were called up went into hiding, spending each night in a different place in order to avoid detection by the military police. Others, by some estimates over 200,000, left the country rather than fight, fleeing to Western Europe, North America, and Australia. According to the Center for Peace in Belgrade, 85 to 90 percent of the young men of Belgrade who were called up to fight refused to serve. In Serbia as a whole, the figure was between 50 percent and 80 percent. Even those who did serve often participated in massive desertions from the battlefield. The majority of Serbs were not overcome with desire to seek bloody revenge on their ethnic enemies, but instead were so opposed to the war that they chose to break the law and risk their own well-being rather than participating. “The inability of the JNA to mobilize, train, and motivate Serb recruits from Serbia proper to fight in Croatia was critical. The notion of a
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greater Serbia was fatally flawed if Serbs would not fight for one another.\(^{408}\) This data suggests that Milosevic’s picture of the aggrieved Serb was wildly inconsistent with the actual experiences of his people.

While these statistics are remarkable, it bears repeating that in spite of this massive resistance many Serbs were more than willing to fight the Croats and to do so in an incredibly violent way. Croat Tomislav Marekovic describes a time when Serbian paramilitaries were targeting Croat houses in the city of Lipik. His parents were dragged out of their house by Serbs from their village. “That is where they left my father. There, in the street, for three weeks, before someone buried the body. And my mother, they took her to a barn and set her on fire.”\(^{409}\) This kind of hateful and cruel behavior suggests that, at least for those who actually chose to serve in the army, a genuine loathing for other ethnic groups may have been at work.

As fighting continued in Croatia, the war became more violent and destructive. In August of 1991, the JNA laid siege to the Croatian town of Vukovar. The city held out for three months, but fell in November after some 90 percent of its buildings had been destroyed. “Serb forces moved in, spirited two hundred patients out the back door of the Vukovar hospital, transported them to the Ovcara farm, beat them, murdered them, and then dumped their corpses into mass graves.”\(^{410}\) While the destruction of the city was mainly carried out by the Yugoslav National Army, the Croatians also dynamited parts of it as they withdrew, “so that the Serbs would gain nothing but rubble for their pains. The pulverization of Vukovar made no military sense…In a nationalist war, military objectives were driven by a desire to
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hurt, humiliate, and punish."411 This behavior suggests true hatred among individual citizens, reaching beyond military strategy into the realm of revenge. In October 1991, during the JNA’s six-month siege of Dubrovnik, Serb forces gratuitously shelled the beautiful and historic Croatian city but never occupied it. This too is an example of behavior designed to inflict pain and suffering without a clear military purpose.

By the end of 1991 Serb rebels had gained control of almost one-fifth of Croatia’s territory, centered in the Krajina district. Serbia eventually agreed not to support these rebels, but the region remained out of the Croatian government’s control until the summer of 1995. Although Serbia and Croatia did not reach an official peace agreement, after a year of horrific and destructive fighting it was clear that Croatia would never again re-join Yugoslavia. Too many people had died and too much destruction had been wrought for Croats and Serbs to reasonably co-exist within the same state. As this reality became increasingly clear, fighting began to shift to a new theatre: that of Bosnia.

The war in Croatia was relatively short-lived but still thought-provoking. V.P. Gagnon Jr. argues that ethnic-based hatred did not exist at all in this conflict. Both Serb and Croat forces participated in ethnic cleansing of each other’s ethnic members, but there is also evidence of both sides killing their own people when those people did not agree with government policy. After all, violence continued in Krajina even after the region had been cleansed of Croats as moderate Serbs who had criticized the Krajina leadership were harassed, threatened, and killed. “Consistently in the four years of the existence of the Krajina Republic, extremists in the ruling political parties used terror and violence against those Serbs who called for a more moderate policy that reflected the values and priorities of
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the Serb population of Croatia prior to the war. Even when the conflict moved to Bosnia, Croatian nationalists’ ethnic cleansing did not stop with non-Croats. Anti-regime intellectuals and politicians were threatened if they were suspected of speaking out against the regime, “daring to express what polling before the war indicated were the preferences of the large majority of Bosnia’s Croat population.” Nationalist groups used brutal violence against those who stood in their way, even if such individuals were part of their own ethnic group. This suggests that the war was centered on strategic political purposes rather than those of irrational ethnic hatred.

Other thinkers tend to be less extreme than Gagnon and argue that ethnically based hatred did exist during the war, but that it was caused by fear and circumstances rather than by legitimate and long-lasting hostility. As Tim Judah explains, the conflict began with Croats fleeing from Serb militias out of fear, and then taking revenge on Serbs in Croatian controlled territory as a mode of retaliation for what was done by the militias. This led the Croatian Serb populations to flee and eventually become angry and radicalized after being forced from their homes and losing their jobs. As people became more angry and bitter, the appeal of violence increased; “thousands of Serbian houses were blown up in villages and angry people demanded to know when their neighbors, to whom they had lived next door all their lives, were going to go.” Ignatieff expands on the idea of spiraling fear and anger resulting in ethnic hatred.

If your enemies call you a fascist enough times, you will begin to call yourself one too. Take your enemies’ insult and turn it into a badge of pride. How many times in the weeks ahead do I meet Croats at checkpoints who say, “They call us Ustashe. Well, then that is what we are.” And likewise, the
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Serbs: “You call us Chetniks, Well, that is what we are.” The two sides conspire in a downward spiral of mutually interacting self-degradation.415

Unlike Gagnon, Ignatieff and Judah agree that ethnic hatred existed during the wars, but they maintain that this was a result of miscommunication, anger, and distrust, rather than a reflection of undying hatred between two groups. By this logic, if violence had been stopped early and fears assuaged, these groups would have been able to go on living together peacefully.

Ignatieff expands on his argument, describing ethnic cleansing as having a “deep logic.”416 By 1990, no one in Yugoslavia could be sure who would protect them. If Serbs living in Croatia were attacked, would the Croatian police protect them? If Croats lived in a Serbian village, would their neighbors stand up for them against a paramilitary team led by a former policeman? “This is how ethnic cleansing began to acquire its logic. If you can’t trust your neighbors, drive them out. If you can’t live among them, live only among your own. This alone appeared to offer people security.”417 Warlords became a significant force in the region for the same protection concerns which led to ethnic cleansing. Ethnic minorities were no longer guaranteed protection because the state which used to enforce the inter-ethnic bargain had been eliminated. “As a result, every individual rushed, pell-mell, to the next available source of protection: the warlord. For the warlord not only offers protection, he offers a solution. He tells his people: If we cannot trust our neighbors, we must rid ourselves of them. If we cannot live together in a single state, we must create clean state of our own.”418
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Ignatieff also attempts to explain the nationalist mindset. According to this belief, no one is responsible for anything except the other side; all action is compelled by tragic necessity. “Towns must be destroyed in order to liberate them. Hostages must be shot. Massacres must be undertaken. Why? Because the other side started it first. Because the other side are beasts and understand no language but violence and reprisal.”419 Nationalism also directs the mind to higher things and offers an identity and an opportunity for self-affirmation. “Instead of the interminable politics of interest and conciliation, there are enemies within and without to defeat; there is the immortal cause, the martyrs of the past and the present, to keep faith with.”420

While Ignatieff may be able to illustrate the appeal and experience of nationalism, he still argues that its origins are in myth not fact. “Freud once argued that the smaller the real difference between two peoples, the larger it was bound to loom in their imagination.”421 Based on this logic, enemies need each other to remind them of who they really are. A Croat, thus, is someone who is not a Serb. A Serb is someone who is not a Croat. Without hatred of the other, there would be no clearly defined national self to worship and adore. The similarities between the Serb and Croat people are striking: they speak the same language give or take a few hundred words and have shared the same village way of life for centuries. “Nationalist politicians on both sides took the narcissism of minor difference and turned it into a monstrous fable according to which their own side appeared as blameless victims, the other side as genocidal killers. All Croats became Ustashe assassins; all Serbs became Chetnik beasts. Such rhetorical preliminaries, needless to say, were an essential precondition
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of the slaughter that followed.”

Although fighting concluded in Croatia after only a year, the hatred that developed there lived on in Bosnia.

**Prelude to War in Bosnia**

The war did not officially begin in Bosnia until 1992, but preparations for the conflict’s expansion began well before then. By mid-1991, the JNA was moving troops from Serbia and Montenegro into Bosnia, mobilizing Bosnian Serbs into autonomous forces under Ratko Mladic, disarming non-Serb Territorial Defense Forces, and conducting “peacekeeping” maneuvers in Bosnia. The situation was quickly becoming intolerable for the Bosnian government. The battle between Croatia and Serbia was especially threatening because Bosnia was, and had been for many decades, a hotly contested region with various actors claiming a right to control its territory. “President Izetbegovic, who had once remarked that choosing between Tudjman and Milosevic was like having to choose between leukemia and a brain tumor, declared in early October that Bosnia was neutral between Serbia and Croatia.” Because only a sovereign region can declare official neutrality, Izetbegovic thought it prudent to declare sovereignty on October 14, 1991. This declaration was not equivalent to one of independence but rather legislative sovereignty within Yugoslavia, giving Bosnia the power to override the federal army’s rights to use its territory. Yugoslavia had once provided a protective bubble for Bosnia, but now it posed a threat. “The only way for Bosnia to exit the country was to get secession approval from both Croatia and Serbia which it would never receive.” Bosnia was in a very difficult situation.
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Violence began to peter off in Croatia as it became clear that no amount of Serb bullying would convince the state to rejoin the federation. Although violence still occurred in Croatia, the two sides began discussing the resolution of another dispute, this time regarding the potential division of Bosnia. President Izetbegovic of Bosnia would gladly have accepted a loose confederation if it included all of the old Yugoslav republics, but he knew that if he maintained an association with Belgrade it would mean, in his words, “a colonial feudal status within Greater Serbia… We are not against Greater Serbia, only it cannot be achieved at our expense.”426 However, it was clear that Bosnia would not be permitted to leave Yugoslavia either. On January 9, 1992, the Serb Democratic Party declared the foundation of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina, later renamed the Republika Srpska (RS). The RS was composed of approximately half of Bosnian territory where much of the Serb population was located. This was a final threat to Bosnia, for Karadzic explained that the SDS would begin to build the institutions of its republic only if “the Croats or Muslims try to separate from Yugoslavia or if they are recognized.”427

According to Glenny, the death sentence for Bosnia-Herzegovina was passed in January of 1992 when Germany recognized Slovenia and Croatia’s independence.428 This was problematic because it undermined the European Council’s agreement not to recognize republics unless they had control over their own territory and could assure safety to their minorities, which Croatia clearly could not yet do. Germany chose to recognize Croatia and Slovenia because of strong economic ties with the region and a resulting interest in maintaining sound relationships. The United States and European Community followed suit,
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believing that recognition of Croatia would encourage the JNA to stop resisting Croat secession and end the violence once and for all.\textsuperscript{429}

However, recognition of Croatia and Slovenia put Bosnia in a difficult situation by stripping it of the “constitutional protection it still enjoyed from the territorial claims of the two regional imperia, Serbia and Croatia.”\textsuperscript{430} The international community’s decision forced Bosnia to choose between staying in the rump Yugoslavia under the control of Milosevic and Serbia, accepting the territorial division of Bosnia between Serbia and Croatia, or applying for recognition as an independent state. No matter what path Bosnia chose, it would most likely lead to war. The first option was opposed by Muslims and Croats, the second by Muslims and Yugoslavs, and the third by Serbs; none of these groups would let Bosnia make a choice contrary to their interests without a fight. “The international community sanctioned the disintegration of the Yugoslav federation without paying any heed to this system which had guaranteed peace, albeit an uneasy one, between the country’s various peoples over a forty-year period.”\textsuperscript{431}

The international community was correct; their recognition of Croatia helped to unequivocally end the violence there by highlighting the reality of the situation. “Any idea that Croatia could have been persuaded to rejoin a federal Yugoslavia after cities such as Vukovar had been reduced to rubble was utterly unreal.”\textsuperscript{432} In February 1992, a cease-fire was finally passed, officially ending the war in Croatia. The republic was left with a third of its national territory occupied by Serbian Krajina and its supply routes to the Dalmatian coast
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blockaded by Serbian paramilitaries. Some 6,000 people had been killed, 15,000 wounded, 550,000 displaced and over 700,000 left homeless. Every seventh Croat was a refugee.433

With the Croatian war over, and Croatia and Slovenia officially recognized as independent states, Bosnia was left in a dwindling Yugoslavia dominated by Serbia. Bosnia moved towards independence as indeed it had to in its current situation, but this move “was used as a pretext by Milosevic and Karadzic to begin the military phase of their carve-up of Bosnia.”434 Noel Malcolm argues that Bosnians themselves were uninterested in dividing their country into three parts; “the majority of Bosnians had in any case voted for a democratic and independent Bosnia of equal citizens.”435 However, Serb media rhetoric was fierce, insisting that the Bosnian government was an Ustashe fundamentalist coalition which discriminated against its Serb population without any supporting evidence. “But a kind of political psychosis had been created by the Serb and Serbian politicians and media, in which the defense of the rights of the Bosnian Serbs was given such absolute status that people ceased even to wonder whether they were really under attack.”436

Glenny argues that both the nationalist rhetoric and the circumstances themselves affected Bosnian identity. Bosnian Serbs and Croats began to see their Muslim neighbors differently. “Serbs and Croats under the influence of war psychosis revived their dangerous belief that Muslims remain at heart Orthodox or Catholic Christians who will at some future point return to the fold, willingly or otherwise.”437 People began identifying with their respective republics more and more as war approached, and the sense of a Bosnian community began to disappear. “Soon in Bosnia people stopped calling themselves Bosnians.
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Instead most became Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Croats, or Muslims. The Serbs and the Croats later dropped the auxiliary word Bosnian. Although this shift no doubt represented a move toward ethnic division, the fact that these ethnic self-identities were something new suggests that at one point Bosnians saw themselves as one community rather than a collection of distinct ethnicities. It can be argued that this shift represents the inevitable result of fear and propaganda, but that the existence of Bosnian unity before the war illustrates the transient nature of such divisions within the country.

In the midst of this crisis, the Croatian and Bosnian Croat leaderships tried to convince Izetbegovic to declare a federation of Bosnia and Croatia. He refused this, both because he feared eventual absorption of Bosnia into a Greater Croatia and because he thought such a move would give weight to Serb claims about the Bosnian government having Ustashe links. Fundamentally, he also believed that his government had a duty to represent Serbs, Muslims, and Croats collectively. This left Izetbegovic with one clear choice. In February of 1992, the Bosnian government conducted a referendum in which 90 percent of those who voted chose in favor of independence. While it is true that only 64 percent of the Bosnian electorate participated in the referendum, this represents a significant turnout considering that Bosnian Serbs were intimidated and pressured to stay away from the polls by nationalist groups. Many thousands of Serbs in major cities did participate in the referendum, and a poll of Bosnian students in November 1991 showed that 43.38 percent of Serbs approved of an independent Bosnia. This may not be a majority, but it does question the belief that Bosnian loyalties were determined based on ethnicity alone.
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deluge of nationalist rhetoric and propaganda, a majority of Bosnians still chose their state over their ethnicity. In March 1992, Izetbegovic officially declared Bosnian independence.

On April 6, Bosnia was recognized as an independent state by the European Community. Many argued that Bosnia could never stand on its own because it was composed of three nationalities, but Malcolm argues that “the history of Bosnia shows that, leaving aside the economic conflict between landowners and peasants, the national animosities within the country have reached the point of inter-ethnic violence only as a result of pressures coming from outside Bosnia’s borders.”441 In response to EC recognition, Milosevic officially recognized Bosnian independence. Throughout the Croatian conflict, Milosevic denied Serbia’s involvement publicly by claiming that the issue was between the Yugoslav National Army and Croatia. While this was true, Serbia’s control of the JNA made it deeply involved in this dispute. In the same way, Milosevic chose to recognize Bosnia so that “Serbia could not be accused of promoting the Bosnian Serb war effort because the Bosnian Serbs were involved in a civil war in a neighboring state.”442 In reality, however, Milosevic and Serbia would be greatly involved in the Bosnian conflict.

The day after Bosnia’s recognition by the EC, Bosnian Serb leaders in Banja Luka followed through on their threat and declared the Republika Srpska’s independence from Bosnia. The Bosnian Croats, not to be outdone, laid claim to their own swath of territory in Herzegovina, naming it the Croatian Community of Herceg-Bosnia. They saw the creation of this community as the first step toward Croatia absorbing a chunk of Bosnian territory. “Its founders saw their ultimate goal as a Greater Croatia, whose boundaries would approximate
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those of Ustashe Croatia and, as much as possible, medieval Croatia.” Bosnian Serb leaders also delineated the RS in the hopes that it would later be absorbed by Serbia proper.

While Bosnia’s independence no doubt provided great motivation for a Serb invasion, Burg and Shoup argue that “Serb preparations for war in Bosnia pre-dated the German decision.” This could be used to support a primordial argument; Serbs knew they wished to invade Bosnia early on because a sense of community and unspoken connection drove them to protect their Serb brethren. Early Serb preparations for war could also be used to support an elite manipulation argument; the Bosnian invasion was planned ahead of time because Milosevic desired power and would use any possible excuse to invade Bosnia and claim more territory. Either way, Malcolm is certain that it was pressure from Serbia which led to violence in Bosnia, rather than the desires of the Bosnian people themselves. Bosnia’s three ethnic communities were so intermingled that their separation could occur only at appalling cost. “The price demanded of ordinary Bosnians that would have enabled them to live together in peace, on the other hand, was a comparatively small contribution of normality and goodwill. The majority were happy to pay that contribution. A minority, acting under the direction of a neighboring state, were not; and they had the guns.”

The Bosnian War

Fighting began in Bosnia on March 22, 1992. By the end of the month, the country was in disarray. On April 4, Izetbegovic ordered the mobilization of all police and reservists in Sarajevo. The SDS, in turn, issued a covert call for all Bosnian Serbs to evacuate the city and two days later began shelling the capital. “On April 7 and 8, following international
recognition of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serb forces crossed the Drina from Serbia proper and lay siege to the Muslim cities of Zvornik, Visegrad, and Foca. By mid-April all of Bosnia was engulfed in war.\textsuperscript{446} The Serbs’ main aim, according to Malcolm, was to terrify the local Muslims into fleeing and to radicalize the local Serb populations. Malcolm characterizes these actions as being necessary “to convince the local Serbs that they had to ‘defend’ themselves against their Muslim neighbors.”\textsuperscript{447} Malcolm maintains that despite the involvement of Bosnian Serbs, “this was predominantly an invasion of Bosnia planned and directed from Serbian soil.”\textsuperscript{448}

Burg and Shoup, however, argue that the violence was initiated by Bosnian Serbs who sought a three-way partition of Bosnia and the ethnic domination of their territory via the cleansing of Muslims.\textsuperscript{449} Sumantra Bose also argues that the war was primarily a civil one. In a study conducted by the International Committee of the Red Cross in late 1998, it was discovered that 87 percent of Bosnian Serbs, 72 percent of Bosnian Muslims, and 70 percent of Bosnian Croats identified with their respective sides during the war. This, along with significant military mobilization among all three groups—38 percent of Serbs, 30 percent of Croats, and 26 percent of Muslims—suggests that the Bosnian war was more than just a result of interference by Serbia and Croatia.\textsuperscript{450}

Still, there is no denying that Serbia and Croatia played a role in the conflict. Croatia initially supported the division of Bosnian territory by ethnicity, and later supported full-blown independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina. After all, Croatia could only exert maximum

\textsuperscript{446} Burg and Shoup, 129.
\textsuperscript{447} Malcolm, 237.
\textsuperscript{448} Ibid., 238.
\textsuperscript{449} Burg and Shoup, 191.
influence over the Croatian population of Bosnia if the republic were independent, just as it would be easier for the Serbs to control Bosnia if it remained part of the Yugoslav federation. Izetbegovic aimed for the restoration of a unitary state with a relatively centralized government in Sarajevo. This was very much opposed to the ultimate aims of the Croats, but because both required an independent Bosnia before pursuing their final goals, Bosnia and Croatia became temporary allies. In the eyes of Bosnia, “good relations with Croatia were a matter of life and death, both as an assurance that arms would reach the Bosnian forces and as a guarantee that Bosnia would not be partitioned.”

The Serb-Croat relationship remained somewhat ambiguous at the start of the Bosnian war. Enmity between the two nations had been fueled by the great violence in Croatia and the occupation of one-third of Croatian territory by the Krajina Serbs, who were assisted by Serbia proper. At the same time, Milosevic and Tudjman were eager to exploit the breakup of Yugoslavia and the conflict in Bosnia-Herzegovina to create a Greater Serbia and a Greater Croatia. Croatia’s overriding interest was to regain control over the areas of its own territory which were still under Serb occupation. It also sought to consolidate its influence in those parts of Bosnia it considered vital to its interests, and to cultivate ties with the United States to win support for retaking the areas of Croatia under Serb control. These considerations discouraged an outright alliance with Serbia. Still, in the interest of establishing a Greater Croatia, Croats began blocking the transport of weapons to Bosnian Muslims, their supposed allies against the besieging Serbs, and expelling Muslims from the region. By the spring of 1992, Croatia was committing violence against the Bosnian Muslims, also known as Bosniaks, in tacit alliance with the Serbs.
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The Bosnian Serbs were incredibly aggressive, swiftly conquering two-thirds of Bosnia and taking over not just primarily Serb villages but also key economic, geographic, and military areas. They established more than 400 detention centers in Bosnia, at least two of which, in the Prijedor area, would qualify as death camps. They razed mosques, Catholic churches, and 47,000 homes, killing and expelling virtually all Muslims and more than half of Croats.\textsuperscript{453} Even within portions of Bosnia that were already under Serb control, violence broke out between different Serb groups who disagreed over which one was in charge; “scores of Serbian groups were out to control and rape was widespread.”\textsuperscript{454} Malcolm argues that Bosnia was led to war by Serbian leaders, who took over the media and convinced the Bosnian Serbs that they had something to fear. Malcolm applies the words of historian Richard Pipes to describe the Bosnian Serbs’ situation: “There was no retreating, no faltering, no compromising…they were inextricably bound to their leaders, and could only march with them to ‘total victory’ regardless of the cost.”\textsuperscript{455} By the end of 1992 the Republika Srpska covered almost three-quarters of Bosnian territory.

Hostility between the Serb and Muslim communities in Bosnia rose rapidly during the war. The Bosnian Muslims claimed an identity close to that of Europe, distancing themselves from the Islamic world in their dress, diet, customs, and thoughts. “Bosnian Muslims seemed unaware of what claiming their European identity meant for the Bosnian Serb. The Bosnian Serb, more rural and more oriented toward the Orthodox cultures of the East, associated European identity with the Nazis, the Italian Fascists, and the Croatian Ustashe. To them, expressing an allegiance to Europe hearkened back to the suppressed collective memories of
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World War II and Serbian suffering in general.”⁴⁵⁶ This miscommunication bred distrust, which quickly got out of control. Serbian Orthodox clergy and University of Belgrade academics soon began accusing Muslims of race-treason and Christ-killing. Elites began to claim that “contemporary Slavic Muslims are responsible for the death of the Christ-Prince Lazar and the other Serbian martyrs of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.”⁴⁵⁷

The situation took on even more outrageous proportions when Serbian religious nationalists developed Christoslavism. This doctrine argued that “Slavic Muslims suffered from a ‘defective gene’ probably inherited from North Africa that rendered them genetically incapable of reason.”⁴⁵⁸ Former dean of the Faculty of Natural Science and Mathematics in Sarajevo, Biljana Plavsic, adopted this theory with great enthusiasm. Plavsic was a formerly respected biologist who had in the past subscribed to the multi-religious ethos of Yugoslavia. However, within a few months of hearing arguments about the defective gene, Plavsic and some of her well-respected colleagues converted to “violent Christoslavism and a racialist ideology so crude and so blatant that it reveals a complete break with every aspect of the academic ideals and standards of reason they had spent their lives professing.”⁴⁵⁹ Suddenly, these former intellectuals began organizing campaigns to destroy rare books, manuscripts, and works of art. “A number of their own former students were killed as they retrieved cultural treasures in the midst of these attacks by the Serb army. The sudden conversion and subsequent acts of such people indicate just how fragile can be the thread of rationality in the
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face of a resurgent and militant religious mythology.” 460 For many, ethnic hatred was very strong, and very real.

Ethnic cleansing was carried out in Serb-held areas of Bosnia until only a few thousand Muslims and Croats were left in all Serb-occupied regions. “The Serbs, furthermore, were guilty of the complete eradication of Muslim cultural monuments—mosques, libraries, and the like—in territory under their control. The apparent scorched-earth approach of the Serbs to Muslim cultural and religious structures suggests either a total lack of control by Serb leaders over extremists, or an obsession with removing all signs of Muslim presence.” 461

Although such evidence seems to suggest that Serbs were unwavering in their opposition to the Muslim community, in reality Serb leaders went to great lengths to convince their population that Muslims were to be feared. Ejub Stitkovac recalls that Serb leaders told villagers in Bihac that Muslims were responsible for the murder of a Serb woman, who was actually the victim of Serb extremists, in an attempt to turn the tide of public opinion. 462 UN observers described another tactic used to gain the support of local Serbs. Serb militias would broadcast to Serb villagers that their Muslim neighbors were preparing a massacre. “The Serbs would be told to leave, whereupon the village would be shelled and occupied, and the atrocities against the Muslim villagers would begin.” 463 Often, militias did more than persuade local Serbs to join in persecutions. Serbs who resisted participation were subjected to ridicule, threats, and in some cases even murder. The fact that such brutal tactics were required to get Bosnian Serbs involved in these attacks suggests that
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many were quite opposed to participating in the first place. This observation brings into question the idea that these acts were approved of by the entire Bosnian Serb community.

In addition to the tactic of cultural destruction, Bosnian Serb militias used concentration camps in their war effort. During the war, as many as 6,000 Bosnian Muslims were incarcerated in the notorious Omarska camp where guards “regularly and openly killed, raped, tortured, beat, and otherwise subjected prisoners to conditions of constant humiliation, degradation, and fear of death.”\textsuperscript{464} Similarly, at a camp in Keraterm some 3,000 Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Croats were interned. Here, as elsewhere, Serb guards and overseers seemed to derive pleasure from regularly beating, bloodying, and humiliating their prisoners. They hit and bludgeoned them with every imaginable implement: “wooden batons, metal rods, baseball bats, lengths of thick industrial cable that had metal balls affixed at their end, rifle butts, and knives. Night after night, the beatings would take place; young, old, men, women, boys, and girls were the victims. The beatings were sometimes so severe that those who endured them were injured for life. Many died as a result.”\textsuperscript{465}

One Bosnian Muslim man, in recounting his experience at Omarska, describes a particular incident in which 700 people were put into a four by four meter room and told to lie down while guards closed the windows and doors. “It was summer. We lay like sardines in a can. Those on top were in the best position. Every morning some on the bottom were dead. Every morning a guard came with a list and called people’s names. Those they brought out never came back.”\textsuperscript{466} Another survivor recalls a time when guards brought 174 people
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outside and started shooting at them with automatic weapons. Only three survived.\footnote{467} “The worst event was when I watched one young man as they castrated him. Right now I can hear his cry and his prayers to be killed…His executioner was his friend from school. The friend cut his body and licked his blood. The man asked his friend just to kill him and to stop all that suffering. All day and all night we heard his prayers and his crying until he died.”\footnote{468}

Serb paramilitaries were very regular and organized in their brutality in these camps. “They beat young men more than the old, men more than women. They had lists of names, ostensibly of Bosnian Army soldiers, government agents, spies, and their families, whom they beat more viciously than others.”\footnote{469} Like the Nazi policy toward German Jews in the late 1930s, Bosnian Serbs forced Muslims to systematically register their property in Banja Luka, and then took it away. Radoslav Brcanin, director of Banja Luka television, announced that no more than 2,000 elderly Muslims should remain in the area, “only enough to clean our streets and clean our shoes.”\footnote{470} The commander of the camp at Banja Luka was Goran Jelisic, a man who described himself as the Serbian Adolf.

However, Stevan Weine is wary of comparisons between the Serbs and Nazis. Auschwitz was a highly systematized death factory where Jews were brought to be killed en masse, but Bosnian concentration camps were primarily detention facilities. Civilians were brought against their will to live in harsh conditions and be subjected to starvation, illness, forced labor, physical abuse, and possibly death. “Omarska came closest to being a death camp, but none ever evolved to the degree of sophistication or mechanization of death that
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was Auschwitz.”471 This is not meant to belittle the suffering of those who lived in the Serb camps, but rather to provide a frame of reference for the type of atrocities committed.

While it is easy to paint the Serbs as the clear villains in Bosnia, as is often done, it must be emphasized that ethnic cleansing was practiced by all sides and against all sides during this conflict. For example, reports indicate a number of incidents during the war in which Croat authorities raped Muslim women.472 Muslim authorities in Sarajevo engaged in the ethnic cleansing of Serbs; these troops would block off a given area, burn down Serb homes, and then kill Serb habitants. “Serbs from the area were placed in a makeshift camp, and tortured by Croat extremist paramilitaries and Sandzak Muslims.”473 In Tarcin, Muslim authorities who wanted to minimize the number of Serb forces “arrested men of military age and placed them in a large, windowless grain silo…Prisoners might not see daylight for months at a time; some died of starvation.”474 In February 1993, a delegation to Sarajevo from Srebrenica proposed that “the Bosnian government arrest and execute a Serb from Sarajevo for every Muslim killed at Srebrenica. As a result of the mutual savagery, eastern Bosnia was largely depopulated of both Muslims and Serbs and its villages destroyed.”475

In Herzegovina, Croat authorities initiated state-sponsored ethnic cleansing of Muslims after an attack on Mostar in May 1993. Muslims were evicted from the Croat section of Mostar and eventually interned. “Detention camps were set up by the Croats to house Muslims, many of whom had at one time or another fought on the Croat side. When detainees were set free in August, they told stories of torture, abominable living conditions,
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and humiliation at the hands of the Croat prison authorities."\textsuperscript{476} Just as Serb paramilitaries destroyed Muslims monuments and historical artifacts, Croats “shelled and destroyed the graceful sixteenth-century Mostar Bridge built by Suleiman the Magnificent, just because it was a Bosniak symbol.”\textsuperscript{477} One witness describes an incident in which Croat militiamen abducted a 17-year-old Bosniak schoolgirl, and then gang-raped her before throwing her out of a top floor window.\textsuperscript{478} At the Hague Tribunal, Croat commanders were accused of using at least a dozen Bosniak POWs as human shields in the fall of 1993 when a no-man’s land developed in the middle of Mostar.\textsuperscript{479} As Burg and Shoup correctly observe, “all three parties, including the Muslims, were behaving in ways that undermined any claim to moral superiority.”\textsuperscript{480}

In spite of the horrific brutality exercised on all side of the war, some still maintain that this violence was not ethnically based. Gagnon points out that, just as in the Croatian conflict, Serbia had great difficulty finding people to join the war effort in Bosnia. Serbian leaders recruited their own citizens for the war by “hunting them down, packing them into buses, and shipping them off to the Bosnian front against their wills.”\textsuperscript{481} The fundamental claim of primordialism is based on a sense of brotherhood among ethnically similar individuals, a phenomenon that seemed in many cases absent in Bosnia.

In addition, Gagnon looks to the wartime treatment of refugees to support his argument that allies and enemies were not chosen based on ethnic distinctions in the Croatian and Bosnian wars. From 1991 onward, refugees from rural areas flooded Yugoslav cities.
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These new arrivals were “ethnically correct;” refugees in Zagreb were Croat, those in Belgrade were Serbs, and those in Sarajevo were Bosniaks.482 And yet, in all of these major cities, inhabitants complained bitterly about the newcomers. Native Zagreb people complained about Croat refugees crowding the church on Easter. Belgrade residents complained about the “Croats” and “Bosnians;” in other words Serb refugees from Croatia and Bosnia who spoke in the accents of their native regions rather than with the nasal Belgrade pronunciation. In Sarajevo, people complained about the hicks: “Bosnian Muslims from the rural regions of the country who were seen as ‘destroying’ Sarajevo.”483 These reactions show not ethnic solidarity and bonds of emotional attachment, but instead a feeling that people of the same ethnic group were actually outsiders. The idea that the wars were motivated by ethnic solidarity seem hollow when those who suffer most for the cause “by being the worst victims of the ‘evil others’ who had expelled them, were seen not as heroes by their fellow ethnics but rather as undesirable refugees who were degrading the cities in which they sought refuge.”484 People felt closer with their neighbors than other members of their supposedly natural ethnic community. Based on this evidence, ethnic solidarity seems forced and contrived, a product of elite pressure rather than popular opinion.

The elite manipulation theory is also supported by evidence that Bosnia was a place of ethnic harmony and tolerance before the war. Michael Sells maintains that in spite of suffering and violence in World War II, Bosnia shared a common cultural world “symbolized over centuries by bridges, libraries, artistic treasures, and the Catholic, Orthodox, Muslim, and Jewish houses of worship built side by side and sharing the same skyline in Mostar and
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Sarajevo.” Sells further argues that nationalists specifically targeted historical, artistic, and religious monuments for destruction because they wanted to eliminate evidence that a shared culture ever existed in Bosnia.

Weine’s accounts of Bosnian survivors and refugees also suggest a true feeling of solidarity before the war. One man explains, “We all lived together. Before the war, it was unnecessary to know if your neighbor was Serb, Croat, Muslim, or Jew. We looked only at what kind of person you were. We were all friends.” One Bosniak man tells of a time when he helped his Serb neighbor in the middle of the night when her son was sick; “only one year after that, this same person stole my apartment.” Another survivor states, “Our neighbors—we were like a family. Our flats were like one home. They had two kids. We lived together. We vacationed together. Spent holidays together. Overnight, they changed.” While the continual mention of change suggests the emergence of ethnic hatred during the war, the fact that people do not report its existence prior to violence suggests that it may have been created artificially rather than out of a natural animosity.

Many Bosnians experienced true ethnic tolerance and integration before the war. For some, this feeling continued throughout the violence. One Muslim man remembers, “The man who saved my uncle was a Chetnik officer and he probably did many things that would qualify him for the War Crimes Tribunal. But he was our neighbor for many years. And as our neighbor, he rushed to help our family.” A Bosniak woman recalls that during the war a Bosnian Serb doctor whom she had not known previously gave her a sheet of paper explaining that she and her husband must be transported to Sarajevo for urgent surgery.
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Using this slip, the woman arranged to vacate the city. “When I was leaving, the doctor told me: ‘Don’t tell anybody because my life will be in danger, but all the Muslims that remain here are meant to be shot dead.’ I just froze.” These stories show human compassion even in the midst of fear and violence. More importantly, they suggest that people did not feel drawn to each other based on ethnicity, but on friendship, history, and a sense of compassion.

Those who prescribe to emotion theory argue that such acts of decency pale in comparison to the horrific crimes committed; they insist that the latter events prove the existence of illogical ethnic hatred. As mentioned earlier, one of the most upsetting and incomprehensible methods of abuse prevalent in the Bosnian war was the use of rape as a weapon. Women, primarily Muslims, were held in concentration camps like Omarska where the Serb guards would serially rape them. “In Serb-occupied areas such as Grbavica or Vogosce, women were taken from their homes to a flat or school that was set up like a brothel for Serb forces. There Serb troops would wantonly abuse the women before killing them or sending them back to their families.” Rape was not used as a means of release for the soldiers, but as a deliberate means of punishment for the enemy. As discussed previously, Bosnian Serbs sought to intentionally impregnate Bosniak women with “little Chetniks.” Some camps even had gynecologists on staff to ensure that those women who were impregnated remained healthy enough to carry their child to term, ensuring that these women would give birth to an infant who would, in theory, hate them as much as their rapists did.

During the Hague Tribunal, women and girls testified to being held captive and serially raped between April 1992 and February 1993. This group “included one woman who reported being forced into sexual intercourse about 150 times over twenty days and one sixteen-year-
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old who was raped by a thirty-six-year-old former neighbor of the family who laughed as he deliberately humiliated her.”

For many, these stories of rape are conclusive proof that true and pervasive ethnic hatred existed. After all, this kind of behavior serves no military purpose and is exercised simply to be cruel; why would people do these things unless they felt personal hatred toward the victimized ethnic group? However, historian Todd Salzman seeks to explain the rationale behind such behavior. He points out that in Serbian patriarchal society “the female is reduced to her reproductive capacities in order to fulfill the overall objective of Serbian nationalism by producing more citizens to populate the nation. Limiting womanhood to a single physiological quality in this way proves nondiscriminatory in that not only are Serbian women thus perceived, but non-Serbian women are as well.” The traditional role of the Serbian woman is illustrated by the Mother of the Jugovici, the epic heroine from the Battle of Kosovo who, in spite of the death of her nine sons in the battle, did not weep. Her courage, self-sacrifice, altruism, and most of all, her fertility, have been used to inspire and serve as a paradigm for Serbian women and their responsibility as mothers of the nation. According to Serb belief, by reproducing, women can guarantee that Serbia will persevere against aggressors. To shirk one’s duty of reproduction amounts to anti-patriotism and treason. The assertion of a Serb woman who claimed that she planned to “fire off one baby every year to spite the aggressors” reflects the power of this myth and its message.

In the years leading up to the war, other ethnic groups in Yugoslavia were growing faster than the Serbs. Serb leaders told their people that these groups were reproducing as
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part of a political strategy to outgrow the Serbian nation. Such political rhetoric instilled the fear that the subtle, though very real, means of a shift in demography and population growth threatened the Serbian nation. This served to promote a nationalist sentiment and also singled out Serbian women and their responsibility to serve the nation through reproduction, insuring population expansion and providing future soldiers to defend the nation in times of war.\textsuperscript{495} This belief and fear help to explain the way in which rape of Muslims women could be viewed as a military strategy. If Serbs believed that Muslims were trying to win the war by increasing their population quickly, then by impregnating Muslims with Serb children Serbs were both preventing Muslims from giving birth to children of their own ethnicity and increasing the number of Serb children being born. This explanation does not excuse Serb behavior, but it does illustrate a way in which rape could be understood as a legitimate military strategy rather than simply an example of illogical cruelty.

Once rape is established as a potential military option the question becomes, was such abuse part of the official Serb strategy? The United Nations Commission of Experts looked in to this very question and determined that “the practices of ethnic cleansing, sexual assault, and rape have been carried out by some of the parties so systematically that they strongly appear to be the product of a policy.”\textsuperscript{496} This extends beyond the practice of rape to harassment of minorities and the destruction of their property. The UN found evidence that the RAM Plan in August of 1991 instructed Serbs to “target women, especially adolescents, and children, in order to cause fear and panic among the Muslims and bring about a Muslim retreat from the designated territories.”\textsuperscript{497} This evidence suggests that some of the most disturbing atrocities of the Bosnian War may have actually been motivated by official Serb
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policies. In terrorizing the enemy, Serbs were not simply acting out of individual hatred but based on military orders.

This is not to say that none of the individuals involved had the free will or human agency to choose to disobey these orders. It is not to suggest that systematic rape or abuse is excusable, or that the participants should be absolved from blame. This evidence does, however, suggest that these atrocities do not necessarily undermine the elite manipulation argument. These acts, while truly horrific, were committed with some strategic reasoning involved rather than wholly due to feelings of personal hatred. Those involved no doubt had anger and hostility, but if they were acting on orders from above then their actions may be less indicative of generalized ethnic hatred and more an illustration of what happens when aggressive and resentful soldiers are given orders and opportunities to commit heinous acts. By establishing that policies of rape and abuse were put in place, one establishes that these acts represent the aggression of some rather than the hatred of all.

If most of the population did not support this horrific violence, then why did people in Bosnian Serb held territories not take a stand to prevent massacres, rapes, and executions? Tim Judah responds, “It is a legitimate question, but one which fails to grasp the sheer terror of those times and the fact that many of the most sadistic killings were done by dangerous men who, according to many testimonies, had been on extended drinking binges.”498 The bottom line is that people were afraid that by speaking up against the violence or actively trying to prevent it they would put themselves in danger. Some groups formed in Serbia in an effort to put an end to the violence, but “they failed to rouse the righteous indignation of people who increasingly came to be concerned with how to feed their family rather than with
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the latest horror story from Bosnia."\textsuperscript{499} While it is unfortunate that such groups were unable to stop the violence, the fact that they formed at all clearly supports the theory that the Bosnian War was not truly one of ethnic division and hatred.

On May 18, 1992, Bosnia’s Muslims and Serbs signed a ceasefire agreement. However, on May 20, the war entered a new phase when General Ratko Mladic was made commander of the newly formed army of the Republika Srpska. In the next few days, a number of large-scale shelling attacks were directed at the outskirts of Sarajevo, beginning a Serb siege of the city that would last until the summer of 1995—even longer than the Nazi siege of Leningrad in World War II. The target was chosen not just because it is the capital of Bosnia but because Sarajevo represented the Bosnian ideal of ethnic groups coexisting, containing 260,000 Muslims, 158,000 Serbs and 36,000 Croats before the war.\textsuperscript{500} As Elizabeth Pond describes, the Serbs proceeded to “rain down artillery and mortar shells indiscriminately on civilian districts and deliberately hit public buildings of no military significance.”\textsuperscript{501} At one point, the UN command recorded 3,777 shells falling in the city in a sixteen-hour period.\textsuperscript{502} The presidency building, the parliament, and Muslim neighborhoods were specifically targeted. Serbs even aimed for hospitals, such as the Sarajevo University Clinical Center Kosevo, which was constantly under shell and sniper fire. Most shelling took place in the middle of the day when the hospital was busiest with visitors.

According to the Hague Tribunal, Serb snipers “display an intent to hit civilian and non-combatant targets. In many cases snipers with a clear view from high rise buildings and the surrounding hillsides have targeted the most vulnerable of civilians including: children
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(even infants); persons carrying heavy plastic containers filled with water; persons in queues; pedestrians at intersections; and rescuers attempting to come to the aid of sniping and shelling victims.”

Often Serbs would set off a bomb in a city center, and then set off another a few minutes later in the same location to target those who came to the aid of the people injured in the first blast. By the fall of 1993, not even the halfway point of the siege, “10,000 Sarajevans were dead and 56,000 wounded, of whom 15,000 were children. The total mortality figure would rise to 12,000.”

The siege of Sarajevo ended only after the massacre at Srebrenica, which will be explained subsequently.

In August of 1992, the United Nations and European Community convened the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (ICFY) in London. The international community reiterated its commitment to Bosnian sovereignty and its refusal to accept any territorial gain by force. However, the Bosnian government expected the conference to bring tough action against the Bosnian Serbs and was disappointed when this did not happen. Izetbegovic was not prepared to negotiate for political settlement without a condemnation of Serbia. Additionally, the night before the meeting, “Serb forces, in a reckless display of spite, shelled and completely gutted the National and University library in Sarajevo.”

The conference displayed how far combatants were from reaching a compromise. The ICFY did adopt a general statement which included a call for the cessation of fighting, an end to the use of force, non-recognition of gains won by force, and recognition of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states. However, this declaration contained no enforcement provisions. The subsequent violence proved that these commitments were empty. “On August 30 the
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Alipasino Polje market in Sarajevo was shelled, apparently by the Serbs. Fifteen persons were killed and 100 wounded.”

After the ICFY was unsuccessful, statesmen Vance and Owen were asked to come up with a comprehensive peace plan for the conflict, which they did late in 1992. Soon afterwards delegates came together in Geneva to debate the Vance-Owen Peace Plan (VOPP) and suggest changes. This was an incredibly complex process and the VOPP received much criticism. The plan proposed the division of Bosnia-Herzegovina into ten provinces. Nine would be under the control of a specific national group, with three provinces accorded to each nation. The tenth province, Sarajevo, would be controlled by a body representing all three national groups. Both Bosnian Croats and the Croatian government supported the plan, but Serbs could not accept the VOPP provision that Bosnian Serbs give back sixty percent of the territory they had conquered militarily. Milosevic supported the plan in an attempt to distance himself from the conflict and claim noninvolvement, but in reality the Serbs were strongly opposed to the VOPP. Additionally, the Bosnian Muslim government was not pleased with a solution which denied their central war aim of a fully unified state.

The VOPP proposed that the cantons would exercise almost all functions of government including policing; the central government of Bosnia would be concerned only with national defense and foreign affairs. After Serbs finished pressuring diplomats to adjust the VOPP, the final plan formed in January 1993 stripped even defense from the powers of the central government. The January version of the plan also gave cantons ethnic labels on the map and implied that the proposed borders were not final. “This had the entirely predictable effect of inciting renewed competition for territory. And, worst of all, it incited
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competition between Croat and Muslim forces for parts of central Bosnia where there had been a mixed Muslim-Croat population. Debate over the VOPP stimulated a genuine Bosnian civil war, and also broke down the Muslim-Croat alliance which was the only strong resistance to the Serbs. The January version of the VOPP “gave the Serbs enough to make the Muslims feel that Serbs were being rewarded for their actions, and enough also for the Serbs to feel that if they continued their actions they could press for more.”

Croatia attempted to implement the VOPP in its own areas of Bosnia, but Serb uncertainty continued to provide an obstacle. The Bosnian government signed the agreement in March 1993 but insisted on recording a list of their reservations. Milosevic was given economic incentives to back the VOPP but he stopped short of giving public support for the proposal. Burg and Shoup argue that the VOPP failed because the parties were ultimately not negotiating in good faith. In their opinion, the warring groups were not truly willing to compromise in 1993, and so would not have accepted a peace plan no matter what its provisions. Without any consensus, peace was cast aside and the violence continued.

On April 12, 1993, Serbs launched artillery barrages on Sarajevo and Srebrenica. Just hours before NATO was to begin enforcing a no-fly zone over Bosnia, General Mladic suspended ceasefire talks and began shelling the two cities. “The attack on Srebrenica was devastating. According to press reports, at least fifty-six persons were killed in the densely packed streets of the town…The Serbs’ suspension of ceasefire talks and shelling of Srebrenica seemed a deliberate act of malice with political intent.” However, UN insistence that Serbs stop shelling was eventually effective, because Serbs were not eager to
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defy the UN knowing that Muslim forces in the region were gaining strength. In spite of their former dominance, by 1994 Serb forces in Bosnia had become relatively weak compared to the Bosnian government. This was due to “the lack of political leadership, absence of clearly defined goals, demoralization of the troops, corruption on the civilian front, and the realization that territorial concessions were inevitable and would entail great political costs.”513 The Bosnian government, on the other hand, had increased its strength by 1994, due to the backing of the international community and the arms and financial support provided by the United States.

The pervasive violence in Bosnia had a strong impact on all of its inhabitants whether they participated in the war or not. With the constant fear of paramilitary attacks hanging over their heads, many people left their former homes for the relative safety of a community in which they were part of the ethnic majority. While the war forced many refugees out of the country entirely, it also created a great deal of displacement within the region, significantly altering the ethnic composition of certain areas of the country. By 1994, the distribution of ethnic groups within Bosnia had undergone immense change since the start of violence just three years prior, leading to homogenization within Bosnia’s borders.

As the international community worked toward a permanent peace plan, it was eager to see an agreement formed between Croatia and Bosnia. Tudjman and Izetbegovic had negotiated an alliance in May 1992 but it was never implemented and a number of subsequent efforts at cooperation failed. “Both the Croats and the Muslims realized that they were suffering a serious loss of credibility in the eyes of the international community while allowing the Serbs to consolidate their hold over almost three-quarters of Bosnia.
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Nonetheless, cease-fires failed to hold.” Finally, an agreement was signed on March 1, 1994 which created a Muslim-Croat federation. The agreement signaled that Croats had formally abandoned their demands to divide Bosnia into three entities: Croat, Muslim, and Serb. The new federation was based on a system of cantons, covering all areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina which had a Muslim or Croat majority population before the war. “While the Federation government would have exclusive authority over the conduct of foreign affairs, defense policy, citizenship, economic and commercial policy, finance, energy policy and inter-cantonal policing, the cantons would have responsibility for all other areas of policy.”

On March 18, 1994, Bosnia adopted a new constitution to reflect its agreement with Croatia. This ended the Muslim-Croat war in Bosnia, and restored the two groups’ alliance in the face of Serb aggression.

However, some saw this alliance as a step backwards. The relationship between the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Muslim-Croat Federation was unclear. The status of those Serbs within the borders of the Federation was also left unresolved; only Muslims and Croats were identified as constituent peoples. The constitution of the Federation did allow “others” i.e. Serbs to join at some future point, but this was purely theoretical. “The Federation agreement was seen, in the eyes of some critics, as a retrograde step, insofar as it established ethnic divisions of territory.” Another obstacle to Bosnian reunification was erected when plans were established to develop a confederation between the Federation and the Republic of Croatia. “It was hard to see how future Serb cantons of Bosnia could ever
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join in such an arrangement.”518 In April 1994 Izetbegovic told ICFY co-chairs, “To be honest, if we could we would take land by force but we don’t have the means. We are only negotiating because we don’t think we can win militarily.”519 This suggests that the alliance between Croatia and Bosnia did not reflect real harmony and friendship between the nations, but also suggests that actions were based on military estimations rather than hatred.

In March 1994, Serb forces began attacking the Gorazde enclave in eastern Bosnia in an attempt to neutralize the Bosnian forces and seize the north-south highway. The Serbs began shelling Gorazde on April 10 and the UN initiated air strikes shortly afterward in an attempt to deter continued shelling and induce a Serb retreat. However, the Serbs fired back, and began to take hostages in response to the air attacks. “Within days, some 200 UN and civilian personnel had been detained by the Bosnian Serbs.”520 Journalists noted the appalling carnage of these attacks; gunners targeted the hospital and, according to Dr. Mary McLaughlin, it seemed the Serbs were “prepared to level east Gorazde house by house in order to gain control over it.”521 One account from two UN doctors trapped in Gorazde reads as follows: “The wounded lie for hours in the debris as it is suicidal to try and bring them to the hospital…Twenty people were confirmed killed in one of the hospital apartments yesterday. The Serb excuse for targeting it is that it is a military institution. I’ve been in all pats of the hospital a hundred times in the last month and can assure the outside world that this is a lie.”522 On April 23, the shelling had tapered off and UN forces were permitted entry; by April 26, the fighting had ceased completely.523
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After four years of war and diplomatic stalemate, a shift occurred in 1995. Aside from the fact that Croatia had become well-armed, Bosnian Serb morale was dropping significantly. Serbs felt that Milosevic was interested in consolidating his own power rather than defending them. Additionally, Serbs realized that many of their other leaders were after money and power as well. “This mood of defeatism was to fatally weaken the Serbs outside Serbia and to lead tens of thousands to vote with their feet.”524 As the war entered its third year in Bosnia, fewer Serbs were interested in fighting, let alone staying in the Republika Srpska or Krajina. “Reports frequently stated that hundreds, if not thousands, of people, especially those with a good education and qualifications, were leaving every month.”525 In Judah’s words, “Worn down by poverty, hopelessness, and the very public war-profiteering of the few, morale was at rock bottom.”526

At the height of Serb nationalist euphoria in the late 1980s, Serbs could be relied upon to demonstrate for Serbian unity but Serbs now faced defeat. They were vilified throughout the world, hundreds of thousands of Serbs were refugees, and Serbia was bankrupt. “Ashamed, barely a couple of thousand Belgraders came out to demonstrate against their government, which had turned the Serbs into international pariahs and then nonetheless failed to hold on to what most of them believed was rightfully theirs.”527 The involvement of troops from Serbia was becoming deeply unpopular at home, and although professional commando and police units were still used for fighting, the increasing reluctance of ordinary Serbs to die for their brothers further hurt morale.

reported that the hospital, which had been described as virtually destroyed, had just one shell through the roof. He found no evidence of the reported 700 dead. These discrepancies illustrate the power of media and the ability to distort situations to demonize some and vindicate others.
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In spite of increasing Serb weakness, the group engaged in one final horrific act before the war’s end. In July 1995, Serb troops arrived outside the Muslim city of Srebrenica but were met with resistance by UN peacekeepers who refused to permit their entry. The Serbs responded by taking UN hostages. On July 13, peacekeeping troops decided to allow Serb entry on the condition that these individuals be returned. The Serbs entered Srebrenica, assuring its citizens that no harm would come to them and then immediately initiating a widespread and appalling massacre of the city’s inhabitants. Children and women, many of whom were raped, were loaded onto buses and moved out of the city. During the next five days, Serbs transported busloads of Muslim men and boys between the ages of twelve and seventy-seven to an athletic field in Srebrenica where they were systematically executed, their bodies stacked on top of one another to make room for more. Some sources place the death toll as low as 8,000, \textsuperscript{528} others claim it was as high as 20,000.\textsuperscript{529} No matter which statistics are correct, there is no denying that the Srebrenica murders, especially at this late date when the Serbs were slowly losing their strength and territory, were horrific and militarily unnecessary.

However, as was customary in the Bosnian conflict, just as the Serbs finished playing the role of villain they quickly adopted the role of victim. From 1991 to 1995, President Tudjman employed diplomatic negotiation and limited military action against rebel Serbs in the Krajina region of Croatia. In early 1995, Tudjman reluctantly agreed to extend an offer of substantial self-government rights to Krajina, but the agreement was rejected by its Serb inhabitants. As a result, Tudjman finally resorted to outright military action by launching an attack on the Krajina district in August of 1995. Only a few days later, the Croatian
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government had regained control over the rebel capital of Knin and almost all of the Croatian territory which had previously been under Serb control. After Croats were victorious in Krajina, there was an exodus of almost the entire Serb population of the region. By the end of August 1995, “it was estimated that between 150,000 and 200,000 Krajina Serbs—descendants of families that had first settled in Croatia over 400 years earlier—had fled the region.” Croat officials had previously announced that the Krajina Serbs were welcome to remain and that they would be fully protected by the government, but high-ranking American officials maintain that the Serbs left their homes involuntarily. The bombardment of the Serb civilian population during the military campaign against Knin and other Krajina towns and the subsequent strafing of fleeing refugees by the Croatian air force, as well as the harassment of Serb civilians by Croatian military personnel and civilians, undoubtedly sent a clear message to Serbs that they were unwelcome and hastened their departure.

Publicly Croatian officials claimed that the Serbian exodus was completely unintended and unnecessary, but a more typical sentiment expressed by Croatian officials and citizens was that “the country’s ‘Serbian question’ had been favorably resolved.” Reporters visiting the Knin area directly after its capture by Croatia witnessed “the systematic arson and razing of Serb homes, and heard versions of the representative view expressed by one Croat that the few hundred Serbian old people who remained should ‘celebrate mass to President Tudjman’ for having spared their lives.” The head of Croatia’s Roman Catholic Church, Cardinal Kuharic, condemned reports of killing and looting but by
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the fall of 1995 the Serbian population of Croatia, which before World War II had constituted over one-fifth of the region’s total population, had dwindled to under five percent.534

Events like the Srebrenica massacre and Croat harassment of the Krajina Serbs lend themselves to a primordialist interpretation of the Bosnian conflict. Technically the Slavs of the Balkans all have the same ethnic ancestors, and therefore groups are divided primarily by religion rather than race. Glenny, however, argues that religious distinctions are actually more divisive than ethnic ones, making the groups in Bosnia more hostile and incapable of cooperation. After all, there is no room for compromise on the subject of God and religion. “The Orthodox, the Catholics, or the Muslims can only claim victory when the heretics have been wiped out or expelled from their homes. Ceasefires brokered by the United Nations may come and go in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the fighters on all three sides will almost certainly ignore them.”535 While Glenny’s point is a good one, opponents are certain to argue that because the Yugoslav violence was not based on religious disagreements, the issue of having to compromise on the subject of God is irrelevant in this instance.

However, other factors contributed to the difficulty of compromise in Bosnia. Michael Sells explains the exclusive nature of the nationalist mindset by using the example of Serbia. The Serbian nationalist flag is emblazoned four Cyrillic S’s, which stand for “only unity saves the Serbs.”536 For Serbian nationalists, the term unity does not refer to a communal unity where different voices come together in harmony. “It means a homogenous unity in which the most extreme and brutal self-proclaimed defenders of Greater Serbia, such as General Ratko Mladic or those indicted for organized rape at Foca, must be supported by
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all Serbs because they are Serbs and they committed their acts in the name of Serbia.\textsuperscript{537} In the same vein, the Serbian Orthodox Church was fully supportive of the Serb war effort, regardless of the military tactics being implemented. “Serb partisanship was clear, for example, in late 1992, when Orthodox prelates issued a statement denying categorically that Serbs had organized rapes of Muslim or other women, while asserting that Muslims and Croats had raped many Serb women.”\textsuperscript{538} The Orthodox Church not only attacked the Hague Tribunal for investigating crimes committed by individual Serbs but also accused Serb dissidents who denounced the atrocities of being traitors to Serbia.\textsuperscript{539} Gagnon would argue that this is simply evidence of the strength and persistence of the elite-constructed Serb identity during the conflict. He would state that this identity is inconsistent with that of the majority of Serbs and exists only to homogenize the Serb population and demobilize those who oppose ruling elites. However, regardless of the opinions of individuals Serbs, or the origin of such Serb sentiments, the uncompromising nature of the newly constructed Serb community would make negotiating an end to violence a challenging prospect.

The international community confronted a daunting task in brokering Bosnian peace. And yet, after four years of violence, it appeared that the combatants might finally be in a position to compromise. After a series of NATO air raids further weakened Bosnian Serb forces in 1995, the newly strengthened Croatian-Muslim forces pushed their enemy back until Serb-occupied territory in Bosnia had dropped from 70 to 49 percent of the republic’s territory. A ceasefire came into effect in Bosnia on October 5, 1995. The parties met in Dayton, Ohio in November of 1995 to begin a new round of peace negotiations. The major differences between Dayton and previous peace negotiations were “the willingness of the
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United States to exert substantial pressure on the parties, especially the Bosnian Muslim leadership, to agree; and the fact that neither the Bosnian Serbs nor the Bosnian Croats—the parties least susceptible to US pressure—were a direct party to the negotiations.\textsuperscript{540} Another crucial difference was that because Serbia controlled significantly less territory at this point than it had during previous negotiations, it had less power to change peace proposals. This being said, Milosevic and Tudjman drove the negotiations for the most part. “The final map appears to have been defined largely without Muslim participation. According to one account, ‘the Bosnians ended up being badgered into agreement,’ and according to another they were simply ‘broken.’”\textsuperscript{541}

Finally, on November 21, 1995 a general agreement was reached in Dayton. It was later signed as a treaty by the presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia on December 14 in Paris. The Dayton Accords included a territorial settlement which split Bosnia between the Muslim-Croat Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Bosnian Serb Republika Srpska, giving 51 and 49 percent of Bosnian territory to each respectively. The agreement also included “a new constitution, various mechanisms for the protection of human rights, the return of refugees and the reconstruction of the economy, and a plan for the deployment of an international force, under NATO leadership, of 60,000 troops to supervise the cessation of hostilities.”\textsuperscript{542} The Dayton Agreement brought the fighting to an end but was unclear about future plans for either keeping Bosnia intact or pursuing partition. The agreement was fragile, essentially making Bosnia a military protectorate and opening it up for another war if international troops were to leave. Malcolm argues that war-weariness and a continuing sense of underlying historic Bosnian identity may lead to a lasting peace in the region. However, he
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warns that Dayton’s proximity to de facto partition may lead to the eventual secession of the Republika Srpska, “which, if contested by the Federation, would lead once again to war.”

The details of Dayton will be explored more fully in the following chapter. For the purposes of the current account, the most important part about the Dayton Accords is that this agreement brought an end to violence in Bosnia.

There is no consensus on the number of people killed during the Bosnian War. The figure of 200,000 or more dead, injured, and missing was frequently cited in media reports on the war in Bosnia as late as 1994. The October 1995 bulletin of the Bosnian Institute for Public Health of the Republic Committee for Health and Social Welfare reported 146,340 killed and 174,914 wounded on the territory under the control of the Bosnian army. In 2005, the NGO Research and Documentation Center reported a total of 93,837 soldier and civilian deaths throughout the war. The number of rapes committed during the war has also been hotly contested. “The UN commission of Experts was able to identify 1,600 actual cases of rape. A study of rape victims in hospitals in Croatia, Serbia, and Bosnia carried out by experts attached to the UN Human Rights Commission produced evidence of approximately 12,000 cases of rape, the majority of which had been committed by Serbs.”

Regardless of the actual number of people killed and raped, the extremely destructive nature of the Bosnian conflict remains most important. Nearly half of Bosnia’s 4.2 million people were displaced. Whole cities were destroyed, and countless villages disappeared from the map. In the words of one Macedonian officer in the Yugoslav army, “Once it had started the
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massacres were unstoppable. It will never end whether they have a ceasefire, peace-keeping troops or whatever. This is not a war, this is extermination.”\textsuperscript{547}

**Conclusion**

The wars in Croatia and Bosnia were truly tragic and horrific conflicts that left the populations of these regions physically, psychologically, and emotionally scarred. There is no doubt that a great deal of hatred was felt and expressed during this conflict. However, the simple fact that great atrocities were committed is not enough to prove that the Bosnian and Croatian Wars were primordial in nature, just as the existence of nationalist propaganda is not enough to prove that elite manipulation was responsible. One must take into consideration all dimensions of the conflict to produce an accurate interpretation of its causes. Such an interpretation also requires an examination of how the region has reacted to and reflected on the war in the wake of Dayton, and how radical or tolerant these populations are today. This question will be addressed in the following chapter, after which a thorough examination of the evidence thus provided will be set forth.
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Map 10: The Balkans in the Present Day

Chapter 5: Events in the Balkans Post-Dayton

This chapter will explore developments in the Balkans from the signing of the Dayton Accords to the present day. While extensive research has been published detailing events in the region prior to and during conflict, little work has been done on the Balkans in the wake of Dayton. However, an examination of events after the violence of the 1990s can actually give one a better understanding of the violence itself. If evidence indicates that people in the region have re-integrated themselves into multi-ethnic communities and are cooperating to heal the wounds of the war, then perhaps the conflict itself was not motivated by ethnic hatred but by something more akin to elite manipulation. If, on the other hand, evidence indicates that ethnic tensions and hatred are rampant eleven years after the conflict and continue to divide these societies, then not only was the violence probably ethnically motivated, but it may resurface in the future. As with all other facets of this study, there is no black and white interpretation of post-Dayton events; evidence exists to support a number of different theories.

This chapter will examine the politics and ethnic relations in both Croatia and Serbia from 1995 to the present day. However, the primary focus of this chapter will be on Bosnia-Herzegovina, including a full explanation and assessment of the Dayton Accords, a discussion on the viability of other peace options like partition, and an overview of how the government and its people have survived in the wake of this tragedy. Bosnia was a multi-ethnic society prior to the violence and is now divided into two ethnically based republics. As a result, it can be seen as a microcosm of the larger problem of ethnic tension in the region. If evidence suggests that today Bosnians are healing ethnic wounds and crossing ethnic
boundaries then this has very important implications for both the Balkan conflicts of the 1990s and other “ethnic conflicts” throughout the world.

**Croatia After the Dayton Accords**

Croatia no doubt saw its fair share of violence in the early 1990s. However, the country was able to make a relatively clean break from Yugoslavia in 1992 and did not experience nearly as much turmoil as Bosnia. The reduced severity of the Croatian experience helped the country to move past war resentments relatively quickly. Evidence suggests that as early as 1994 Croatia’s citizens were able to evaluate others based on personal experience rather than ethnicity. In his essay “Embattled Democracy: Postcommunist Croatia in Transition,” Lenard Cohen cites an opinion poll taken in Croatia in 1994 which found that 94 percent of Croats surveyed viewed Krajina Serbs unfavorably, but only 52 percent viewed Croatian Serbs from urban areas unfavorably. Although a majority of Croats viewed Serbs negatively, the vast gap between evaluations of Krajina Serbs and urban Serbs shows that many Croats were able to distinguish between groups directly involved in the violence and those implicated by their ethnicity only. While Croat leader Franjo Tudjman failed to make the distinction between radical Krajina Serbs and moderate urban Serbs before the war, Croatian citizens saw this reality even in the wake of violence. This poll also revealed that 21 percent of respondents viewed Serbs from Serbia favorably. This is remarkable given the continued tension between Serbia and Croatia in 1994 and the fact that violence had ended in Croatia only two years prior. These statistics project a very hopeful image for Croatia and its ability to move past the violence of the early 1990s.
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However, this kind of evidence must be viewed in the proper context, which in Croatia in the mid-1990s was one of rather widespread ethnic violence. For example, in May of 1995 when Croatia retook Donja Vrijeska from rebel Serbs, the United Nations received numerous reports of looting, physical abuse, and intimidations of Serbs by Croatian soldiers, police officers, and civilians. On August 9, 1995 thousands of Serbs streamed out of Croatia after a ceasefire ended the Croat offensive and made it safe for Serbs to leave. During this departure, a Danish soldier in the UN force reported seeing five elderly and handicapped Serbs pulled from a school and killed in Dvor. Angry crowds lined the exodus route to curse and jeer at the caravan of Croatian Serb families. Croatian Army soldiers hooted obscenities at the cars, while a Croatian woman heaved a stone. Men spat on the car windows and children waved the Croatian flag. These kinds of stories, which were all too common in Croatia in the mid-1990s, emphasize the fact that although some Croatians had an enlightened approach to the post-war period, others were still consumed with ethnic resentment and hostility.

By the beginning of 1996, fewer than half of the 600,000 Serbs who had lived in Croatia before the war remained there and the Croatian government seemed to be doing its part to drive out as many of the remaining Serbs as possible. Croatian government officials ignored petitions and legal proceedings brought by Serbs who wished to return to Croatia and invalidated 4,000 applications by Croatian Serbs for returnee status despite the fact that they were hand-delivered to Zagreb by the US ambassador. A Serbian member of the
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Croatian Parliament, Veselin Pejnovic, said, “All of the parties who signed the Dayton agreement know, quite cynically, that most of the refugees will never return to their homes. And the Serbs from the Krajina will now be the first to formally lose everything. President Tudjman has succeeded where the fascist government in Croatia during World War II failed. He has driven nearly all of the Serbs from the Croatian state.”

Under Tudjman’s leadership, ethnic violence in Croatia continued throughout the 1990s. From May 12 to 15, 1997, Bosnian Croat refugees rampaged through at least four Serbian villages near Kostajnica, breaking into homes, smashing property, and forcing Serbs to flee to the surrounding woods. Chris Hedges, a reporter for the New York Times, argued that the attacks were “part of a mounting campaign to drive the Serbs who have remained in Croatia since the end of the Balkan war out of the country and to block any returning Serbs from resettling in their old communities.”

Earlier in 1997, the government of Zagreb confiscated Serbian homes in Croatia and distributed them to returning ethnic Croats in spite of an outwardly tolerant policy toward the presence of Serbs in Croatia. Helsinki Watch officials cite disturbing reports of Serbs being beaten by Croats in military uniform. One Croat explains, “The Serbs forced our people out of Bosnia. And now these Serbs have the audacity to come in here like they own the place, spitting in our faces, insulting our country.” In May 1997, around one hundred Serb refugees were expelled after an attempt to return to their homes near Sisal. President Tudjman responded with an announcement that
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it was “unreasonable” to expect that all of the 200,000 exiled Serbs would be able to return.\textsuperscript{555}

In the first quarter of 1998, international observers reported an increase in incidents of harassment, threats, and evictions of Serbs in Eastern Slavonia. Nationalist demonstrations were often held with the apparent intention of intimidating local Serbs. In January 1998 the Croatian Party of Rights held a rally outside Vukovar where approximately nine hundred demonstrators sang nationalist songs and gave fascist salutes. On January 22, 1998, a law was passed in Eastern Slavonia to allow pre-war tenants to regain their properties, while in areas of Croatia, such as Krajina, where the population was primarily Serb before the war, no such laws were passed. The Eastern Slavonia law was eventually revoked after international outrage, but it sent a “clear message of intolerance” according to Human Rights Watch.\textsuperscript{556}

Throughout his rule, Tudjman and his Croatian Democratic Union party (HDZ) continued to pursue the creation of a Greater Croatia, coveting the territory in Herzegovina proclaimed Herceg-Bosna in 1992. Tudjman and the HDZ unapologetically promoted the interests of Croat nationalists and failed to meet international commitments on the protection of human rights and democratic standards, particularly with regards to the remaining ethnic Serb population of Croatia. In December 1999, however, things changed dramatically for Croatia when President Franjo Tudjman died. Under his leadership, nationalism had persisted and the country had been unable to move past the violence of the early 1990s. However, Tudjman’s death gave Croatia the opportunity to chart a new course of tolerance and unity. In addition, Tudjman passed away before he could be indicted for war crimes, which was another blessing for Croatia. Although General Gotovina was responsible for the areas in
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which the worst atrocities were committed, Tudjman was still commander-in-chief during the war. “Had he lived long enough, he too would have had to appear at the Hague, and the swell of patriotic support for Croatia’s modern founding father would have at least postponed remorse for crimes committed so recently in the name of Croatia.”\textsuperscript{557} Because of Tudjman’s premature death, rather than becoming an albatross for Croats, he “freed them from the past to look to the future.”\textsuperscript{558}

After Tudjman died “nationalism’s stranglehold on liberalism weakened; suddenly, chauvinist passions were no longer all-consuming.”\textsuperscript{559} On January 3, 2000 in parliamentary elections, Croatians voted the HDZ out of power after a decade of corruption and high unemployment. In Roland Paris’ words, popular rejection of the HDZ was “little short of a quiet revolution.”\textsuperscript{560} The newly elected regime of a coalition of liberal parties, led by newly elected President Stjepan Mesic, explicitly rejected Tudjman’s parochial nationalism and worked to eliminate legislative provisions that discriminated against non-Croat residents of the country. This new government, in fact, espoused a multi-ethnic conception of Croatian citizenship and sought to encourage the return of Serb refugees.

Paris hypothesizes that the reason Croatian elections brought moderates to power rather than solidifying ethnic division, as occurred in Bosnian post-Dayton elections, is because most Serbs had left Croatia by 2000. “With a greatly diminished (and elderly) Serb population remaining in Croatia, and the government of Yugoslavia no longer offering military or political aid, the Serbian ‘side’ in the Croatian civil war had, in effect, quit the
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This meant that Croats did not see political liberalization as quite so threatening anymore. “The residual Serbian community in Croatia did not pose a threat to the majority population within the country (unlike the situation in Bosnia, where Croats, Muslims, and Serbs continued to exist as vital communities and political actors). Under these conditions, voting for moderate candidates may have been more likely to occur.”

There was no shortage of politicians making ethnic nationalist and xenophobic appeals to the Croatian electorate during the 2000 balloting, including those who accused moderates of betraying the “heroes of the Homeland War.” However, “the de facto departure of one of the formerly warring parties in Croatia—the Serbs—seems to have reduced the political traction of ethnic nationalism.” Croats could not be convinced that Serbs posed a threat when there were so few Serbs present, and without that threat ethnic dominance lost its relevance and importance. In other words, according to Paris, Croats were manipulated into supporting ethnic nationalist positions out of fear, but when their fear was alleviated they chose to abandon such ethnically exclusive platforms.

Once in office, President Mesic actively supported the institutional shrinkage of his own presidential power and the enhancement of parliamentary power, then in the hands of newly elected Prime Minister Ivica Racan. On his inauguration day in February 2000, Mesic announced his support for allowing Hague Tribunal investigators to inspect a mass grave thought to contain the bodies of Serbs murdered by Croats. The new president and prime minister opened the country to the West and brought Croatia into NATO’s Partnership for Peace within months of entering office. Mesic and Racan halted the worst harassment of
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journalists, cut support for Croat separatists in Herzegovina, promised to cooperate with the Hague Tribunal, launched economic reforms, and initiated a rise in tourist revenues. By autumn Croatia had begun talks with the European Union on a Stabilization and Association Agreement, the Western Balkan precursor of membership negotiations.\textsuperscript{565}

However, these moderate reforms were slow in trickling down to local law enforcement officials. In July of 2000, NGOs in the coastal city of Split criticized Croatian authorities for failing to put an end to evictions of Croatian Serbs in the area. NGO representatives expressed a belief that evictions were perpetuated by remnants of the former HDZ-led law enforcement agencies intending to cause chaos in the wake of their defeat in 2000 elections. Representatives from the Democracy Center, the Altruist Center, and the Dalmatian Human Rights Committee all confirmed that an eviction’s success in Split depended on nationality; “Serbs are thrown into the street on the first eviction order, whereas attempts to evict Croats are repeated up to ten or more times, until they are provided with alternate accommodation.”\textsuperscript{566} The NGOs accused authorities of using false testimonies to secure eviction orders, and of turning a deaf ear to appeals despite human rights and democracy rhetoric among leaders. Bringing moderates to power was not a final solution to tension in Croatia and such reports show that ethnic hostility was still alive and well in the country in 2000.

As promised, once in office Mesic cooperated with the Hague Tribunal in locating those indicted for war crimes and bringing them to justice. When Serbs were the main indictees, Croats welcomed the proceedings. Even when the first indictment of Croats began there was little popular outrage since charges dealt with events in Bosnia-Herzegovina rather
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than Croatia proper. However, “disquiet grew as the tribunal moved up the chain of responsibility from the lower ranks that physically executed atrocities to senior commanders in the Bosnia-Herzegovina and then the Croatian theatres.”\textsuperscript{567} This disapproval was unequivocally expressed in August 2000 when Milan Levar, a Croat who testified at the Hague Tribunal in 1997 about mass executions of Serbs by Croats, was murdered. The government responded by arresting 62 people, including the suspected assassins, some military officers, and more war crime suspects.

When the International Criminal Tribunal of the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) began indicting heroes of the Homeland War, a storm of public demonstrations broke out headed by veterans’ associations and the HDZ. “To many Croats, the new indictments constituted ‘criminalization’ of their war of survival and was manifestly unfair in equating the helpless victims with the aggressors.”\textsuperscript{568} Croats reached the final straw in February 2001 when an Eijeka court issued an arrest warrant for ex-general Mirko Norac, who was accused of killing Serb civilians in Gospic in 1991. In response, between 100,000 and 150,000 demonstrators turned up to protest for several days. A Croat witness to the central atrocity in the case was blown up by a bomb in front of his house. Protestors constructed road blocks and yelled insults at the leaders of the ruling coalition, demanding immunity from war crimes probes for all Croatian soldiers.

This demonstration reflected both the complicated emotion of the war itself and, without a doubt, ethnic nationalism among the population. However, it must be noted that not all Croats commiserated with these demonstrators. On February 19, 2001, five thousand Croats gathered in Zagreb to oppose the views of the earlier demonstration and support the
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rule of law. One of the rally’s organizers, Vesna Terselic, told the crowd, “Many of our
defenders set out with the best of intentions. But it turns out that some of them committed
war crimes and it is of the utmost importance that these crimes be processed.”
Ethnic
tension and nationalism were no doubt present in Croatia in 2001, but one must remember
that the opinions of some can not be equated with the opinions of all.

In June 2001, Ante Gotovina was indicted for war crimes, causing a new wave of
outrage in Croatia. Within a few hours of the announcement, “hagiographic posters of
Gotovina went up around the country, the Adriatic city of Zadar made its famous son an
honorary citizen, and prominent personalities accused the Hague Tribunal of plotting to
block Croatia’s entry into the EU.” As a professional courtesy, the Hague Tribunal
confidentially informed the Zagreb government a few days beforehand that it would indict
Gotovina. This advance warning gave the Croat security services, which operated more or
less independently from Mesic and Racan, enough time to “whisk Gotovina away and
arrange a luxury globe-trotting lifestyle for their war hero for the next four years, while he
evaded capture.”

Although there is no doubt that some Croatian citizens supported the Hague’s efforts,
the indictment of major Croat leaders inspired a resurgence of nationalist sentiment and a
renewed expression of violence and resentment against ethnic Serbs. On August 27, 2001, an
Ustashe symbol was spray-painted on the entrance to a Serb Orthodox church in the southern
town of Split. A message was also painted on the door: “U, NDH—Serbs Get Out of
Croatia,” with the letters NDH referring to the Independent State of Croatia which was ruled
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by the Ustashe regime during World War II. In the town of Vukovar, segregation of Croats and Serbs became a way of life; the two groups had separate cafes, classrooms, sport clubs, and cultural societies. In 2001, the Serb population of Vukovar described ethnic relations as the worst since post-war reintegration. In this sense, the resurgence of ethnic tension in Croatia was felt even in areas where no overt violence actually occurred.

This renewal of Croatian nationalism made things very difficult for Croatian Serbs attempting to return to their pre-war homes. In September 2003, Human Rights Watch presented its sixty-page evaluation of the ethnic Serb return process to Croatia. In this report, the organization accused the Croatian government of practicing ethnic discrimination against Serbs. Lotte Leicht, director of Human Rights Watch, said that the biggest problems Serb returnees faced were repossession of property, arbitrary arrests of Serbs suspected of war crimes, and employment discrimination. Leicht agreed that Croatia had made progress by adopting laws on the protection of minority rights, but she criticized obstacles in their enforcement, blaming both state and local authorities.

The following month, the Croatian government released its own statistics about the number of returnees to Croatia since the war. The Zagreb Ministry of Public Works reported that from the end of the war to October 2003, 105,805 ethnic Serbs had returned to Croatia, 46,068 of whom had returned between January 2000 and October 2003 alone. As of October 2001, 50,993 people still needed to return to Croatia or be locally integrated into their pre-war homes. Of those people in Croatia waiting to be locally integrated, 22,058 were

---


211
in the system of care and accommodation, with 6,578 people receiving living accommodations from the organized facilities of the Ministry for Public Works, and the rest receiving other support through reconstruction and housing programs. In 2003, the Croatian Ministry for Public Works constructed eight thousand housing units, and planned to construct another nine thousand units in 2004. The majority of reconstruction beneficiaries in 2003 were ethnic Serbs, making up 75 percent of beneficiaries in 2003 and more than 80 percent in 2004.\footnote{Ibid., 40.} Although Human Rights Watch reported definite room for improvement in Croat treatment of Serb returnees, statistics show notable efforts being made to welcome Serbs back to Croatia.

In November 2003, new parliamentary elections were held in Croatia. This time it was the previously victorious Social Democrats who were worn out from the strains of office and blamed by voters for all the hardships of transition. The HDZ was the fresh face, and it comfortably defeated the Racan coalition in the Croatian parliament.\footnote{Pond, 133.} Stjepan Mesic, leader of the moderate coalition, remained president and would not be up for reelection until 2005. The new prime minister was HDZ leader Ivo Sanader. Despite the nationalist reputation of the Croatian Democratic Union, Sanader set a number of moderate goals for his government. He aimed to change the HDZ into a typical European Christian Democratic party, to bring Croatia into NATO, and to enter the EU by 2007. In a symbolic but still significant act, Sanader invited a small Serb party to join his coalition and fill one cabinet slot. On May 11, 2004, Sanader paid an unprecedented visit to a family of ethnic Serbs who fled Croatia during the war and had since returned. At the event, Sanader said that the return of refugees was at the top of his cabinet’s agenda and continued, “Croatia’s future lies in reconciliation
and tolerance…The war is behind us. There is no alternative to peace and tolerance." 578 In
November, Sanader made the first postwar visit by a Croatian prime minister to Belgrade. 579
With Sanader in the parliament and Mesic still in the presidency, the country moved along its
current path of liberalization and integration.

In mid-February 2004, the Ethnic Minorities Council of the United Nations
commended Croatia for a number of positive steps it had taken over the previous four years
toward exercising the rights of national minorities. Croatia had increased budgetary funds for
minority associations and institutions and adopted a law on the rights of national minorities,
which allowed for the use of minority languages in education. The council noted that
implementation of the education law was slow, but that a political will existed to put it into
action and the law was being implemented to the highest possible extent. Croatia was also
commended for its decision to increase funds allocated to minorities by 10 percent over
2003, and to earmark those funds for publishing activities and cultural events for minorities.
The council noted that the government had not yet achieved proportional representation of
minorities in state services and the judicial authority, or in local and regional government.
However, other positive steps, like the possibility of co-financing local media to produce
news programs in minority languages, were praised by the council. 580 The Croatian
government still had a number of kinks to work out, but it was making important steps which
were recognized by the international community.

Still, the Croatian government continued to faced nationalist sentiment among the
general public. In August of 2004, the village of Sveti Rok established a memorial plaque in
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tribute to Mile Budak, a senior official in the Ustashe regime during World War II. The plaque read “In memory of Dr. Mile Budak—a Croatian patriot, man of letters, and novel writer.” Budak was a minister in the regime of Ante Pavelic, the known architect of racial laws in the Independent State of Croatia, and the author of a number of inflammatory and racist speeches delivered during the Second World War. Supporters of the memorial argued that it was meant to commemorate his great talent as a writer, but there is no doubt that a great deal of nationalistic sentiment surrounded this act. In Vukovar, just a week prior to this memorial, Croat police spotted a Serb flag with the motto “United Serb Countries” flying in front of a private residence. The police confiscated the flag and pressed charges against the owner of the house on suspicion that he committed an offence. Although these acts did not involve violence, they no doubt prove that ethnic resentment and suspicion were still alive and well in Croatia in 2004.

As the campaign for the next presidential election heated up, Croat leaders tried to walk a fine line between pleasing the West, which saw the glorification of Croatia’s Ustashe past as evidence of a non-democratic government, and right-wing Croats, who were fiercely nationalistic. In late 2004, Croat politicians tried to please Western leaders by stifling ethnic tensions. The government ordered the removal of the statue of Mile Budak, as well as that of Ustashe hero Jure Francetic. The police ripped down posters of Gotovina that remained on the walls in the center of Zadar since the 2001 protests, and leaders continued to make every effort to show a willingness to grant equal minority rights.

From November 11 to 13, 2004, an international conference on the participation of national minorities in political decision-making on the state and local levels was held in
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Zagreb under Prime Minister Sanader. The conference was organized by the Robert Schuman Institute with the support of the EU and included minority representatives from throughout the Balkan area. Sanader said that minorities were represented very well in Parliament and at all levels of government, and announced the creation of a Council of National Minorities in Croatia. He later stated, “Croatia is developing as a multicultural society into which national minorities are fully integrated. National minorities are valuable, not a problem; they are bridges which connect and not separate.”584 Yet no amount of tolerant rhetoric could completely eliminate nationalist sentiment among the population. In December, World War II veterans marched through Zadar with pictures of Ustashe leader Ante Pavelic. When President Mesic testified at Hague prosecutions, Croatian citizens accused him of being an ICTY spy.585

The fact that some members of the population responded to their government’s reforms with ethnic fear and resentment may lead some to believe that Croats would remove these leaders from power at the first opportunity. After all, it seems that in 2003 and 2004 the government continually pushed the population to accept reforms which people were not prepared for. However, on January 2, 2005 the Croatian electorate affirmed Mesic’s power yet again. On the first ballot, Mesic won 49 percent of the vote with the HDZ candidate Jadranka Kosar receiving only 20 percent. On the second ballot, held January 16, Mesic took 66 percent of the vote over Kosar’s 34 percent.586 This does not represent a landslide victory for Mesic, but it does show a great deal of support for him among the Croatian populous. The 2005 elections are perhaps more telling than those in 2000, because in the former case the
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population chose to support Mesic after witnessing and experiencing his policies of aggressive reform. While protests and exhibitions of ethnic intolerance suggest that the population was at odds with Mesic’s liberal policies, the 2005 elections prove otherwise.

In March 2005, the European Union delayed entry talks with Croatia after war crime fugitive Ante Gotovina still had not been brought to the Hague for prosecution. The international community believed that the Croatian government was hiding Gotovina based on UN reports that he was residing in the country. Croat citizens responded by showing their support for Gotovina. On March 16 and 17, 2005, posters and billboards praising the retired general were put up in Zagreb, Pula, Zadar, Split, Sibenik, Oroslavije, and Darda, primarily funded by veterans of the Serbo-Croatian War. According to the Sarajevo newspaper ONASA, most Croatians regarded Gotovina as a hero of the war of independence despite the fact that he was accused of the murder of at least 150 ethnic Serbs in a 1995 operation to remove rebel Serbs from the Krajina. Of course, a Sarajevo newspaper can not be seen as an authority on Croatian public opinion. However, these events do show the existence of nationalist sentiment in Croatia even after Mesic’s re-election.

In December of 2005, Gotovina was finally arrested and brought to the Hague for prosecution. In the wake of this event, Prime Minister Ivo Sanader was able to remain in office “despite what many in his own party deemed his betrayal of a larger-than-life Croat hero.” Tens of thousands Croats gathered in Sanader’s homeland Dalmatia to protest Gotovina’s arrest, and a journalist who had for years publicized Croat atrocities against Serb civilians was presented with a very serious death threat. However, Pond points out that the main demand in these protests was simply that the Croatian government help provide for
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Gotovina’s legal defense and support his family.\textsuperscript{589} The fact that Sanader was able to turn Gotovina in without losing his position, and that protests were relatively moderate, indicates that Croatia was moving beyond the violence and hatred of the early 1990s. “With General Gotovina in the dock, the country was well on its way to becoming the second Yugoslav successor state, after Slovenia, to reach the holy grail of membership in the European Union.”\textsuperscript{590} This prediction is supported by the experience of eight former Croatian special police officers who were acquitted in 2002 for torturing and killing Serbs because witnesses were too intimidated to appear or to give detailed testimony. Several years later at the retrial enough evidence was provided to convict them all. In March 2006 the officers were sentenced to jail terms ranging from 6 to 8 years. No major public protests resulted, further supporting a belief in Croatia’s bright future.\textsuperscript{591}

Of course, the situation in Croatia is far from perfect. Despite a December 2000 law obliging the state to ensure proportional representation of minorities in government agencies, there are still limited job opportunities for returnees. The Croatian government calls this an economic rather than a human rights issue, but Serbs claim that it becomes the latter when laws are not implemented. A joint report by Minority Rights Group International and the Center for Peace, published in January 2006, reported that Serbs were still under-represented in Croatian judicial bodies. According to Snjezana Bokulic, Europe and Central Asia program-coordinator for Minority Rights Group, “the underlying problem is that minorities in Croatia are not really wanted.”\textsuperscript{592} This mentality is confirmed by occurrences like that of
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July 15, 2006, when four houses of Serb returnees were stoned and a fire set in one yard. In early 2006, a report compiled by the Ministry of the Interior revealed that only 26 out of 65 cases of attacks on ethnic Serbs over the past year had been resolved. Jose Fuentes, the head of the OSCE Mission in Croatia stated that every three days a member of an ethnic minority is attacked in Croatia.

Government figures from April 2006 suggest that 120,549 out of 300,000 to 350,000 Serb refugees have returned to Croatia since 1995. However, the actual number is believed to be much lower, because many of those registered as returnees make only occasional visits to Croatia; only 60 to 65 percent of registered returnees are believed to reside permanently in Croatia. The rate of return has slowed significantly in recent years, with 12,478 returnees in 2004 and 4,745 returnees in 2005. A recent Croatian government assessment suggests that only 20,000 to 25,000 Serb refugees remain interested in returning to Croatia. One must remember that many refugees found durable housing after the war and have chosen not to return to Croatia for personal reasons rather than out of fear of violence.

Clearly nationalism and ethnic tension still exist in Croatia and cause problems among its population. However, Croatia has made great strides toward improving the situation of minorities and fostering a climate of tolerance in the country. There are still Croatian citizens who harbor great resentment toward Serbs, but a majority of the population support policies of unity and liberalization as evidenced by the electoral success of Mesic and Sanader. Croatia certainly has room for improvement, but the ever-growing presence of
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liberalism and tolerance in the country so soon after the violence of the 1990s provides a solid challenge to primordialist claims.

Post-Dayton Serbia

Although Croatia has made a great deal of progress since the end of the war, Serbia has been less successful in its recovery. In some ways, this is due to the situation in which Serbia found itself in the wake of Dayton. In spite of the great violence of the Croatian and Bosnian Wars, Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic was able to emerge from the conflicts with his political reputation intact. As discussed in the previous chapter, Milosevic maintained throughout the Bosnian conflict that Serbia was not in any way involved in this purely civil war. After Dayton, “the Belgrade media continued to maintain that Milosevic had taken no part in the war and that an agreement had finally been reached between the warring factions ‘thanks to the consistently peaceful politics of Slobodan Milosevic.’”\(^{598}\) After Dayton, no victor or vanquished was announced, allowing each nation to believe in the triumph of its leaders and thus keeping wartime leaders in power.

There were no doubt objections to the continued rule of Milosevic among the Serb population but they were quickly silenced. Given the strength of his propaganda support, it was a foregone conclusion that Milosevic would be proclaimed a permanent president, and although he was never awarded an unlimited mandate he behaved as though this were the case. “The majority of the Serbia people, even those who considered themselves to be members of the opposition, sincerely believed that Milosevic was irreplaceable. He was certainly not ideal, but the alternatives were even worse; he made mistakes, but others would

make worse ones.” Milosevic remained in power because no suitable replacements could be found. Unfortunately for Serbia, “as long as Milosevic and his executors were not accused of their crimes, the Serbian nation itself would be blamed for the war by the whole world.”

In spite of Milosevic’s promises of a better future, Serbia’s economy was on a steady decline in the mid-1990s. The average monthly salary was around 100 deutschmarks and inflation rendered this money almost worthless. Internationally, Serbia had been humiliated, had lost its former allies, and had used up all of its financial credit. Any political unrest led Milosevic to revive world conspiracy theories, which would then be blamed for the suffering of the masses. Vidosav Stevanovic argues that Milosevic perpetuated deception, blackmail, and plunder to prevent himself from becoming obsolete. “Milosevic still had a role to play—his method was to create problems in order to solve them publicly and thereby regain the confidence of his people. If everything ran smoothly, the peacemaker would become insignificant.”

Although Milosevic yielded to Western pressure during the Dayton negotiations, upon returning to Serbia he was much less pliable. The Hague spent two years drawing up a list of war crime suspects in Yugoslavia, which included Radovan Karadzic, Ratko Mladic, and Milan Martic. “With the excuse of desiring peace, Milosevic refused to hand over the accused. He considered the accusations an indictment of the whole Serbian nation.” This mentality would serve only to further tarnish Serbia’s international reputation.

Milosevic called for elections in 1996 to affirm his power. While Milosevic won the presidential race by an overwhelming majority, the municipal elections held at the same time
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brought the opposition coalition known as Zajedno to power. In response, Milosevic annulled the municipal elections, claiming that they had been rigged. The opposition responded by calling for demonstrations. Thousands of Belgrade citizens took to the streets to voice their discontent. The protestors soon began coming out every day, walking the streets without incident or outburst. Students began a parallel protest and the same pattern played itself out in dozens of Serbian cities. “Entirely different social groups found themselves walking in the same columns. They forgot their differences and joined together to ask for the same things: a change of regime, Milosevic’s departure, democracy, and entry to the European Union.”

Milosevic organized a number of counterdemonstrations composed of unemployed workers, poor peasants, and drunkards, but these protests were ineffective. Milosevic’s associates began preparing for their departure from Belgrade, and it was clear that they would change sides within seconds if Milosevic was overthrown.

Milosevic turned to the demonstration leaders for a way out of the problem. Unfortunately for the people of Serbia, these leaders demanded nothing more than power in the cities where they had legitimately won elections and made no attempt to articulate discontent in broader political terms. In February 1997, Milosevic absolved all parties of blame for the “rigged” elections and called off the demonstrations after allowing opposition politicians to take their rightfully earned local leadership positions. In 1997, Milosevic called for elections again. He did not stand for election this time, but instead made himself the president of Yugoslavia under the authority of the federal government.

Although the 1996 protests were relatively ineffective, their occurrence indicated a willingness among Serbians to unite against Milosevic’s nationalist policies.
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The population, however, would not remain displeased with Milosevic for long. In 1997, the issue of Kosovo took center stage as Milosevic raised concerns about the well-being of the province’s Serb minority. This issue rekindled both Serbia’s nationalist spirit and the image of Milosevic as a representative of the Serb people. On February 28, 1998, Serbia invaded Kosovo under Milosevic’s leadership. When Serb forces entered the province, Albanian soldiers and civilians began to flee after very little fighting. By the fall of 1998, several hundred thousand refugees were trying to survive in the woods and forests of Kosovo. The Serbs had clearly been successful in their move to dominate and intimidate the Albanians, and Milosevic resisted international pressure to withdraw his troops for some time. Eventually, however, he agreed to pull Serb forces out of Kosovo. “The decision was interpreted in two ways: the Serbs believed he had not flinched in the confrontation with the pro-Albanian West, and the Western allies believed that the great tactician had convinced the Serbs to withdraw.”

Mi\[605\]losevic, like leaders in Croatia, tried to walk the fine line between the nationalist sentiment of his population and the liberal views of the international community. However, Serbia’s confrontation from Kosovo was far from over.

In 1998, Human Rights Watch published a report in which it noted a blatant disrespect for human rights in Serbia. The group compiled evidence that Serb troops had targeted civilians during operations in Kosovo and even engaged in summary executions. Outside of the Kosovo conflict, Human Rights Watch found that all citizens critical of Milosevic’s policies suffered human rights violations regardless of their ethnicity, and that ethnic minorities were targeted regardless of their political views. Ethnic Albanians, Hungarians, Muslims, Turks, and Roma within Serbia proper were subjected to persecution.
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ranging from discriminatory legislation to arbitrary arrests, torture, and death in detention.\textsuperscript{606} Under Milosevic, Serbia was staunchly intolerant of minorities, and very few refugees were brave enough to try to return to their pre-war homes in Serbia.

In spite of Milosevic’s removal of troops from Kosovo, tensions between Milosevic and the province’s leadership remained very high and attempts at negotiation and compromise between the two continually failed. Western governments resolved to take action, and on March 24, 1999, NATO began a bombing campaign of Serbia, Kosovo, and Montenegro. The allies maintained that their actions were “not a war against the Serbian people but against the criminal regime of Slobodan Milosevic,” which began a war against the Kosovo-Albanians by claiming it was fighting terrorism.\textsuperscript{607} This sort of tangible threat to the safety and beliefs of the Serb people was exactly what Milosevic needed to justify the further increase of his own power and the repression of his population.

Milosevic declared a state of war and took the post of supreme commander. Ethnic cleansing then began in earnest in Kosovo. Military courts and censorship were introduced and the independent media was confined to releasing only the information that the official government news agency offered to them. Air raids continued, and Milosevic proclaimed that every man, woman, and child in Serbia was under attack. People believed that only Milosevic could secure their defense; “the cowering masses were sure of only one thing: Milosevic was Serbia.”\textsuperscript{608} And yet, as bombing continued, the situation worsened for the Serb people. Milosevic was no longer protecting them, but instead allowing the attacks to kill, injure, and maim the population by not agreeing to allied demands. The West had lost all confidence in Milosevic, and the Hague Tribunal finally brought charges of crimes against
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humanity and war crimes against Milosevic. When NATO threatened to initiate a land invasion of Kosovo, it became clear to Milosevic that the international community was steadfast in their goal of ending the violence. On June 11, 1999, Milosevic agreed to a compromise involving the continued presence of UN and NATO troops in Kosovo and the bombing campaign was halted.

In the wake of the Kosovo conflict, extensive unrest existed in Serbia. Milosevic soon accepted the fact that a multi-party system was inevitable in these tumultuous times and allowed the formation of as many as 180 political parties. Milosevic formed his own party, the Socialist Party of Serbia, which was the wealthiest, best-organized, and most efficient in the country. Milosevic, however, was primarily concerned with remaining in office rather than honing the influence and platform of his own party. Milosevic’s family controlled and directed almost everything in the country, with other loyalists occupying lower positions in the political hierarchy. The police, courts, and army supported and protected Milosevic’s mafia, and all other parties were either prepared to cooperate with Milosevic or were already collaborating, making the multi-party system essentially meaningless.

Soon, Belgrade citizens began writing letters demanding that Milosevic be removed from the presidency; letters were even written by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Serbian Orthodox Church, and the Literary Association of Serbia.609 These organizations had shown strong nationalistic views in the past, making their objection to Milosevic’s leadership even more surprising. On September 24, 2000 new elections were held and Serbia had the highest voter turnout ever witnessed by foreign observers. Milosevic’s opponent Vojislav Kostunica won the election but the government refused to make the official announcement, calling for a second round of elections, then rescinding them and postponing
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elections for another year. The opposition, however, announced its victory and once again called for demonstrations. Suddenly Serbia had two presidents and two army commanders.

On October 5, 2000, several hundred thousand Serbs assaulted Milosevic’s citadels in Belgrade. A construction worker rammed his bulldozer into the parliament building and Radio Television Serbia building; this broke the barricades and allowed the crowd to storm through. “Within a few hours, the insurgents completed what the voters began in electing Kostunica president, and the army, too, refused to save Milosevic.”610 In the streets, people joined with the police to congratulate each other on putting an end to Milosevic’s rule.

Elizabeth Pond cites four primary reasons for the overthrow of Milosevice. The first was the shattering of his aura of invincibility through his defeats in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo. Secondly, opposition factions finally found a single presidential candidate to unite behind in the person of Vojislav Kostunica, the moderate but impeccably nationalist law professor. Additionally, a deal was struck between former Belgrade mayor and DOS organizer Zoran Djindjic and the head of the Special Operations Unit the Red Berets Milorad Lukovic-Ulemek, or Legija. Legija promised to disobey Milosevic’s orders to break up dissident marches on Belgrade and clearly understood that in return Djindjic would not crack down on the security-criminal nexus once he was in office. Finally, Serb war fatigue was pervasive. It spread through provincial cities as more local sons died and more penniless Serb refugees from Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo flooded into Serbia, straining municipal budgets and patience with their demands for food and shelter.611

Although opposition to Milosevic’s rule was certainly a positive development for Serbia, it must be noted that this coup did not necessarily indicate an abandonment of
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nationalism. Pond points out that Kostunica was a less extreme and power-hungry politician than Milosevic, but still a fundamentally nationalist leader. She also emphasizes that opposition to Milosevic “did not by any means imply endorsement of the Hague Tribunal, which the church, too, regarded as an anti-Serb Western institution.”

While the removal of Milosevic from office was no doubt an important step in Serbia’s recovery from the violence of the 1990s, it must not be seen as an indication that the Serb populous was wholly tolerant and liberal-minded at this point in time.

Milošević’s removal from office quickly enhanced Serbia’s international reputation; the relationship between Serbia and Kosovo, and between Serbia and the ICTY both improved almost immediately. With Kostunica in the presidency and Djindjic in the role of Prime Minister, Belgrade let Kosovo Serbs participate in the 2000 elections in Kosovo without punishment. Djindjic’s government dismissed Legija as commander of the Red Berets in May 2001, an act that would lead to further trouble after Djindjic and Legija’s earlier agreement. In June, Djindjic delivered Milosevic to the Hague as the first Serb to be so extradited and the first head of state ever to be brought before an international court.

Milošević’s organization, the Socialist Party of Serbia, staged a protest rally in Belgrade’s Central Republic Square. At the rally, Ivica Dacic, the informal new party president, lashed out at members of ethnic minorities and then made statements in which he encouraged Serbs to “deal” with these minorities. Kostunica’s Democratic Party of Serbia strongly condemned these actions and statements. However, this was just the tip of the iceberg of ethnic intolerance in Serbia in the new millennium.
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In 2001, the day before Democratic Party of Serbia deputy Boris Tadic was scheduled to take over the Defense Ministry, Prime Minister Djindjic was assassinated. The official investigation identified three veteran Red Berets, led by Legija, as the guilty parties. Kostunica took over the role of prime minister, making Natasa Midic the acting Serbian president during the crisis. The Red Berets were disbanded and Midic declared a six-week state of emergency, during which more than 10,000 people were arrested. Tadic announced army reform, full cooperation with the ICTY, and a new goal to join NATO’s Partnership for Peace. The parliament passed new laws making it easier to remove judges, and many officials appointed by Milosevic were fired.\textsuperscript{615} This swift government response, and the moderate reforms that accompanied it, seemed a hopeful sign for Serbia.

Another positive step taken by the Kostunica government involved police reform. In contrast to the other countries in transition, where personnel and structural reforms in the secret services were initiated after Dayton, the Serbian State Security Service (SDB) was left almost intact through the 1990s. The main tasks of the SDB were not preservation of law and order but rather the preservation of Milosevic’s power. The SDB remained in essence a typical authoritarian secret service, thus perpetuating the black market, organized crime, and other illegal activities throughout Milosevic’s rule.\textsuperscript{616} The new government, however, made strides toward reforming the security services in Serbia by improving their training and integrating minorities into the police. In October of 2001, Serbia successfully completed the training of a multiethnic police force for the southern portion of the country. The Yugoslav Minister for National Minorities and Ethnic Communities Rasim Ljajic said, “After this multiethnic concept is applied to the police, it will be easier to implement it in all other
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spheres and will facilitate the full participation of minorities in the systems and state institutions of this country.\textsuperscript{617} This was no doubt an important step toward creating a more tolerant and safe society in Serbia.

However, in spite of new police reforms, security in Serbia was still poorly run and organized. In March 2002, the Special Representative of the Commission on Human Rights, Jose Cutilero, gave a report to the UN Economic and Social Council on the status of human rights in Serbia from 2000 to 2002. Cutilero noted a number of troubling incidents during this period. On March 4, 2000, two grenades exploded in front of the headquarters of the Democratic Party of Serbia.\textsuperscript{618} Just a month earlier, Nebi Nuhiu, the owner of a fuel station in Presevo, was abducted. His family claimed to be able to identify at least six police officers involved in his disappearance but two years later the authorities had failed to bring any abduction charges. Although 306 bodies had been exhumed from mass graves by March 2002, no real progress had been made in identifying the remains or investigating those criminally responsible.\textsuperscript{619} Thanks to the poor security provided by the Serbian police, as of March 2002 there were more than 400,000 refugees and 230,000 internally displaced people waiting to return to their pre-war homes in Serbia.\textsuperscript{620}

To make matters worse for Serbia, after Kostunica took Djidjic’s place as prime minister he declared that cooperation with the ICTY was not a priority. Kostunica did not campaign against the European Union, but he firmly rejected the EU conditionality of turning over war criminals in order to join; “he seemed quite willing to pay the price of forfeiting any
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claim to EU membership and its privileges.” Kostunica told ICTY prosecutor Carla Del Ponte that the ICTY was anti-Serb and manipulated politically by the United States. He argued that “Serbia had the best record of cooperation with the ICTY, as more Serbs than indictees of any other nationality had gone to the Hague,” and yet Serbs were dubbed as uncooperative.

This mentality is understandable given the attachment of people to their war-time leaders, but some argue that Serbia was unable to move past the violence of the previous decades because of this refusal to cooperate with the Hague. As Benn Steil and Susan Woodward assert, “by distinguishing between culpable leaders and the Serbian people, and between specific indictable offenses and ethnically defined guilt, the West can construct a real policy toward Serbia as a normal part of the region.” By refusing to cooperate, Kostunica kept the Serbian people inextricably bound to the crimes committed by their leaders. Kostunica was, however, fully in keeping with Serb public opinion with his refusal. From its first indictments in 1995, Serbs saw the ICTY as prejudiced against them. While the tribunal intended to lift collective guilt by establishing individual guilt, it seemed instead to fuel the 20 to 30 percent of Serbs who perceived the investigation of individual Serbs as the demonization of all Serbs. Milosevic fueled this mentality by berating the tribunal and treating his trial at the Hague as a trial of the Serb people.

In late 2004, Kostunica’s attitude toward the Tribunal and the EU began to soften, and within a few months 16 Serbs indictees were brought to the Hague. “The effective lever seemed to be the refusal of Brussels to allow Belgrade even the first step toward eventual EU
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membership, a Stabilization and Association Agreement—and NATO’s refusal to let Serbia join the Partnership for Peace—until senior suspects appeared at the court.  

However, it must be noted that in spite of this cooperation the two most-wanted Serb indictees, Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic, were not turned over. As of this writing, the two remain at large.

While it is no doubt commendable that so many Serb indictees were turned over to the Hague, the fact that people dragged their heels and required multiple incentives to agree illustrates a pervasive unreadiness to face the recent past, wars, and war crimes figures. Helsinki Committee director Sonja Biserko argues that this destructive ethnic loyalty is in many ways perpetuated by the Serbian Orthodox Church, the values of which are “marked by archaism, collectivism, anti-Western stands and xenophobia. Extreme intolerance to everything belonging to Western culture is the message the church sends to believers.” The Church argues that “those Serb soldiers who were accused of having directly committed atrocities should go to the Hague to answer the charges, and be punished if they were guilty; but that senior commanders generally should not do so, since the just defensive war they were fighting on behalf of Serbs in Croatia, Bosnia, and Kosovo must not be impugned.”

In mid-2003, some 68 percent of Serbs said they trusted the Serbian church more than any other institution in the country, illustrating the extensive influence of the church over the population.

Nationalism was alive and well in Serbia at this time, with the Serb population rallying behind its war-time leaders, and the Orthodox Church confirming these sentiments. This mindset no doubt helped to perpetuate ethnic tension and hostility in the country. The
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Helsinki Human Rights Committee in Serbia released a report in 2004 which noted a high degree of anti-Croat sentiment in the country. Tomislav Zigmanov, one of the authors of the report, wrote, “Croats in Vojvodina are not sufficiently involved in decision-making processes and they are poorly represented in public and state administration, notably in the police, the army, the judiciary, customs administration, and state-run companies.” The report stated that Croats were constantly portrayed as negative stereotypes, generating intimidation and insecurity among Croats. The group found that during the 1990s, “between 35,000 and 40,000 Croats were forced to leave Vojvodina due to strong anti-Croat propaganda.” It is easy to see how Croats could feel unwelcome in Serbia. On June 13, 2005, graffiti threatening the Croat community appeared on the wall of a high school in Subotica, a city in Northern Serbia. The messages read, “Croats, You are Lower Beings—the Serbian Kings,” and “Ustashe, you will be slaughtered.” The next month, graffiti was found on the building of Nis Television. The station’s glass façade was covered in big black letters, reading “General Mladic, Thank You for Srebrenica;” “The Only Solution is 100% Ethnic Cleansing;” “Knife, Wire, Srebrenica;” as well as a Nazi swastika.

In October of 2005, Human Rights Watch released a 52 page report on the status of ethnic minorities in Serbia. The report provided evidence of a number of crimes against minorities in 2003, including physical assaults, attacks on religious and cultural buildings, and the desecration of graves. The Hungarian minority in Vojvodina was most frequently targeted, but Slovaks, Croats, and Muslims were targeted as well. Human Rights Watch pointed to members of local minorities who reported that the police responded to attacks too
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late, in some cases allowing the attackers to escape or even openly supporting them. “The absence of legislation on crimes committed out of ethnic intolerance or hatred and light sentences for such crimes send a clear message that the Serbian government is not taking violence against national minorities seriously.”633

However, events soon transpired which would alter the Serb perception of the war and other ethnic groups’ suffering. In 1995, the Serbian Interior Minister’s paramilitary police, called the Scorpions, recorded a two-hour long videotape of the torture and execution of six Bosniaks in Srebrenica. Twenty copies of this tape, filmed by the Scorpions themselves, were available in one video store for loan exclusively to Scorpions for ten years. In 2005, word got out about the existence of these tapes and the Scorpions ordered that all copies be destroyed. However, human rights activist Natasa Kandic obtained one copy and passed it on to the Hague in May. Clips of the video were shown on independent and state television in Serbia. The tape showed uniformed Scorpions torturing Bosniaks, and opened with the blessing of an Orthodox priest who declared, “The Turks are rising again; they come to take our sacred places.” In the words of one businessman, “Most Serbs until now either believed nothing happened [at Srebrenica] or that the people who did the atrocities were Bosnian Serbs, wild guys from the mountains, or even French special forces—but this is forcing Serbs as a whole to come to grips with what happened.”634 Even the Serbian Orthodox church condemned “the cold-blooded killing of unarmed, defenseless civilians.”635

While the revelation of the Scorpion video tape forced Serbs to come to grips with what happened in the early 1990s, the country is still torn between nationalist sentiment and the need for ethnic tolerance. The Serbian Orthodox church condemned the torture of
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Bosniaks, but only a few weeks later senior clergy attended a Radical Party rally on the tenth anniversary of the Srebrenica massacre to celebrate the Serb victory there and to commemorate the victimization of Serbs in the Yugoslav wars.636 There is a general awareness that certain ethnic Serbs are indeed guilty of wartime atrocities and yet crimes of ethnic hatred still occur relatively routinely in Serbia. Today, a small Western-oriented group of elites in Belgrade argue that Serbs must move beyond their violent past just as Germans did. However, Elizabeth Pond states that “such humility born of shame was far easier for Germans, who lost completely, than for Serbs, who only partially lost their wars. Just as some Germans in the 1940s blamed all atrocities on Adolf Hitler to exonerate themselves, the temptation is strong today to blame all Serb brutality on Milosevic and ignore Serb voters’ acquiescence or even pride in lethal chauvinism as long as it was victorious.”637 In other words, part of moving beyond the war is not just embracing the guilt of Serb leaders, which has proved somewhat difficult, but also embracing the guilt of the Serb population in supporting those leaders’ decisions with nationalist fervor.

This is not to say that all Serbs are guilty while all Croats and Bosniaks are victims. Rather, Pond and others argue that each population must accept its own guilt and responsibility in the conflict in order to embrace those of other ethnic groups and move beyond the violence of the previous decade. One young Serb reveals the following account of his wartime experience.

When they mobilized us, I hid myself but my friends went to war. I always thought that I knew them as well as I knew myself, and I could not believe that they had killed whole families, but this was a fact. Now I think that I deserted not because I had feared for myself, but because I was afraid of
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myself. I am terrified at the thought that if I had gone to the front, I would have turned into a killer too. I am not sure of myself anymore.\textsuperscript{638}

This account reveals the extent to which individuals were changed by the war. This experience of change does not endorse either primordialism or elite manipulation, but is rather the result of an experience of life-altering violence which affected people in ways they could not predict. It is this complex guilt which Pond encourages individuals to embrace in order to move beyond the violence of this period.

Despite accounts which seem to suggest otherwise, it is important to note that radical nationalism is by no means wholly pervasive in Serbia. Sonja Licht of the Belgrade Fund for Political Excellence estimates that only some 15 percent of Serbians are real hard-liners, and polls in early 2006 indicated that more than half of the Serbian population would have welcomed packing Mladic off to the Hague.\textsuperscript{639} Unfortunately, moderate groups have done no more than passively survive since Milosevic’s removal. “Rather than taking initiatives of their own, Kostunica’s minority government and the Democratic Party of Serbia, in opposition, have been in defensive mode, simply reacting to the accusations of the Radicals.”\textsuperscript{640} Moderates, then, have not inspired their supporters to work for liberalism and change, instead leaving many disillusioned for the time being.

To get a clearer view of how Serbia’s politics have changed since the Bosnian War, it is helpful to take a broad look at election trends in the country from Dayton to the present.\textsuperscript{641} We will begin by looking at Serbian parliamentary elections over the past eleven years. In 1997, the Republican Legislature of Serbia was dominated by a communist coalition of the Socialist Party of Serbia, Yugoslav Left, and New Democracy, which won 110 seats, and the
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Serbian Radical Party, which took 82 seats. The communist coalition, because of its strong associations with Milosevic, represented a nationalist and ethnically exclusive force in Serbia. The Serbian Radical Party has an even more radical platform; it is a quasi-fascist advocate of Greater Serbia which was associated with the Chetniks as late as 1994.\textsuperscript{642} It is not surprising that the Serbian government was unequivocally nationalistic in the midst of Milosevic’s rule.

In 2000, the Democratic Opposition of Serbia took 58 seats in the parliament, the former communists took 44 and the Serbian Radical Party took only 5 seats.\textsuperscript{643} This shift in mentality clearly reflects the move toward more moderate politics in Serbia which accompanied the removal of Milosevic from power. Regardless of why people chose to support the non-nationalist Democratic Opposition coalition, its success indicates a willingness of the Serbian electorate to move away from exclusive and nationalist politics. In 2003, the Serbian Radical Party took 82 seats in the parliament, the Democratic Party of Serbia took 53, and the Democratic Party took 37.\textsuperscript{644} While the electorate supported liberals in 2000, the 2003 elections show a split between support for nationalists, moderates, and liberals respectively. This is a step back from the forward thinking of 2000, but one must remember that in 2003 the parties which were once highly nationalist were becoming more moderate. In voting for a previously nationalist party, Serbs were actually supporting a more moderate view. In addition, the fact that these parties chose to move away from extremist positions reflects a desire among the electorate for parties to offer more moderate options.
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Serbian presidential elections show a similarly optimistic trend. In 1997, elections brought Milan Milutinovic to the presidency on the ticket of Milosevic’s Socialist Party of Serbia. Because Milosevic was the undisputed leader of Serbia, Milutinovic’s win meant very little. However, support for the Socialist Party of Serbia indicates a support for nationalist sentiment. The second place finisher in 1997 was a candidate of the Serbian Radical Party, clearly a highly ethnically exclusive organization. Even those who chose not to vote for Milosevic’s party selected a highly nationalistic leader in Vojislav Seselj, with almost 76 percent of the electorate supporting one of two extremely ethnically exclusive and intolerant leaders.645

In the 2000 elections, as discussed previously, the Democratic Party of Serbia ousted Milosevic with their candidate Kostunica. Dragoljub Micunovic described the Democratic Party of Serbia as follows; “we are equally Serbian and as patriotic as any other party, but we are also a modern democratic party which does not take the view that people can be treated as labels.”646 Although this win did represent a softening of nationalist sentiment, Micunovic’s own description of his party reveals the importance of being seen as patriotic and nationalistic to the Serb electorate. In 2002, the Democratic Party of Serbia won again with Kostunica taking 58 percent of the vote and the Serbian Radical Party taking 36 percent, again showing a strong proclivity toward nationalist views.647

In 2003 the Serbian Radical Party candidate won 48 percent of the vote, representing a clear nationalist victory. However, the Democratic Opposition of Serbia took 37 percent of

the vote.\textsuperscript{648} This group ran as a coalition of liberal social-democratic parties which are members in the anti-nationalist Alliance for Change. The relative success of these parties in 2003 is a hopeful sign for the softening of nationalist sentiment among the Serbian electorate.

In 2004, the race was between the Serbian Radical Party’s Tomislav Nikolic and the Democratic Party’s Boris Tadic, with the latter finally winning on the second ballot. While the results were close, the victory of the social-liberal candidate shows great promise for Serbia’s future. Tadic has proved to be a tolerant leader, pursuing reconciliation with Croatia and eventual Serbian membership in the EU. On September 22, 2006, President Tadic took the stage with Croatia’s president Stjepan Mesic at the John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum at Harvard University. In his prepared remarks, Tadic stated, “Too often in our past Serbs and Croats have embraced hatred and rejected cooperation. Yet today I believe we stand before a new beginning because I believe in a better future for Serbia, for Croatia, and for all of Southeastern Europe. Our nations must put our divisive past behind us and embrace our common European and Euro-Atlantic future, a future where the region’s countries are fully democratic, fully free, fully secure, and fully prosperous.”\textsuperscript{649}

There is no doubt that Croatia has progressed further than Serbia in terms of ethnic tolerance, support for minority rights, and liberalism of society. However, in spite of the occurrence of ethnically-motivated violence and the continued support for nationalist politicians, Serbia’s experience over the past eleven years can be used to support the argument that violence in the 1990s was not ethnically motivated. The Serbian electorate continues to move toward more liberal leaders and is beginning to come to terms with both


\textsuperscript{649} Boris Tadic, Lecture at John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum at Harvard University, September 22, 2006, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
the victimization and guilt of Serbs in the conflict. Ethnic tensions are no doubt higher in Serbia than in Croatia, but there are still a significant number of Serbian citizens who express ethnic tolerance, even if the political realization of this goal is a number of years away.

The Dayton Accords

After completing a thorough investigation of events in both Croatia and Serbia over the past eleven years, it is time to turn our attention to Bosnia. However, before beginning a summary of recent events in the country, we must elaborate on the situation that Bosnia found itself in at the start of 1996. This will involve an examination of the provisions of the Dayton Accords as well as some scholarly opinions regarding the merits, or lack thereof, of the agreement. Certainly the best way to evaluate Dayton is to look at how successful Bosnia has been under its arrangements. However, it is helpful to first understand both the situation created by the Accords and the other potential options that exist for peaceful settlement, as these options could either reinforce the benefits of Dayton or highlight its weaknesses.

In the most general terms, the Dayton Accords divided Bosnia into two republics: the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, containing Croat and Muslim leadership, and the Republika Srpska, ruled by Serbs. The two groups split Bosnian territory almost in half, with the Federation getting 51 percent of the land and Republika Srpska 49 percent. Political scientist Steven Burg argues that the arrangements of Dayton “locate most of the power in the constituent units and the hands of the local, nationalist leaders.”650 The constitution of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina establishes a bicameral parliament consisting of a House of Peoples and a House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is composed of 42
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members, 28 from the Muslim-Croat Federation and 14 from the Republika Srpska; these representatives are selected by direct elections. The House of Peoples consists of 15 delegates: five Muslims, five Croats, and five Serbs, each selected by their respective regional parliament.

Many scholars argue that this arrangement institutionalizes ethnic division because it encourages Bosnians to think in ethnic terms and also excludes ethnic minorities from representation in the House of Peoples.\textsuperscript{651} Parliamentary rules are adopted by a majority vote and all legislation is to be approved by both houses with a majority vote in each. Legislation can be vetoed by a vote of two-thirds of the delegates from either entity. “One provision of the Dayton agreement appears to grant each ethnic delegation in parliament a veto over all decision making.”\textsuperscript{652} Many argue that this set-up perpetuates ethnic division in the country by encouraging Bosnian citizens and politicians to continue to think and organize themselves along ethnic lines.

The Bosnian presidency is composed of three members: one Bosniak and one Croat elected from the Federation, and one Serb elected from the Republika Srpska. Because citizens receive one vote, “this provision implies either that voters will have to ask for an ethnic ballot or that Croats and Muslim in the Federation will have to decide between candidates of their own group and those of the other, while only ethnically Serb candidates will be allowed to stand for election in the Serbian entity.”\textsuperscript{653} As with the House of Peoples, ethnic minorities are excluded from the presidency. The presidents are encouraged to make decisions based on consensus but each member of the presidency can block a decision by declaring it destructive of the vital interests of his entity; this statement must be approved by
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a legislative body to constitute a veto. Such a declaration by a Serb president is referred to the parliament of the Republika Srpska while a Bosniak objection goes to the Bosniak delegation of the House of Peoples and a Croat objection to the Croat delegation, rather than to the parliament of the Federation. “These provisions reflect the priority of the ethnic cleavage in post-Dayton Bosnia Herzegovina even within the Muslim-Croat, or Bosnian Federation.”

The Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina has the authority to oversee foreign affairs, customs, monetary policy, immigration and citizenship, civilian coordination of the military, international criminal law enforcement, and air traffic control for the whole of Bosnia. The Federation and Republika Srpska are responsible for all other governmental functions within their territory including defense, internal affairs, justice, finance, commerce, agriculture, education and culture, and public health. The Republic, then, is effectively excluded from any internal affairs of state and society. Without a doubt, Dayton represents a careful balance between majoritarian principles that support the overall integrity of the Bosnian state and principles of ethnic-based decision making which serve to please each group and reassure them that their interests will be protected. It is important to remember that Dayton was not created because it was the best possible arrangement for the rehabilitation of Bosnia but rather because it was the best possible arrangement that all sides could agree on.

Dayton was signed with two primary goals in mind. The military goal was to end the fighting and the civilian goal was to bring peace and tolerance to Bosnian society. The UN has played a major role in meeting Dayton’s military goal and keeping the peace in Bosnia. The United Nations organization UNPROFOR, which tried to regulate fighting between groups during the war, was replaced by the Implementation Force (IFOR) on December 20,
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1995. IFOR was created by the Security Council of the UN and called for an end to hostilities, the withdrawal of foreign forces, and the demobilization of warring militaries and paramilitaries. IFOR was both a peace-keeping and peace-making group. In December of 1996, IFOR was replaced by the Stabilization Force (SFOR), which worked to maintain peace and provide a secure climate within which the civilian-led rebuilding of civil society could proceed. Efforts were also made to undermine military ties created during the war between Bosnian forces and Arab states, particularly Iran.

The civilian elements of Dayton have been put into effect by a variety of international organizations. This group includes the United Nations, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the Peace Implementation Council (PIC). The PIC is composed of 52 countries and 21 NGOs and was created to replace the ICFY in 1995. In addition, the Dayton Accords established the Office of the High Representative (OHR) to manage peace in Bosnia. The High Representative (HR) is appointed by the PIC and the UN Security Council, and promotes full compliance with Dayton by all parties.

For many scholars, Dayton falls far short of an ideal solution for Bosnia in spite of the fact that it has brought peace to the region. As Francine Friedman points out, only consensus is acceptable in such a government; as a result, decision-making is incredibly difficult and the state is prone to inefficiencies. Furthermore, Dayton’s institutionalization of ethnic division is such that not only are ethnic minorities excluded from the presidency and House of Peoples, but so too are Serbs living in the Federation, Croats or Muslims living in
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Republika Srpska, and children of mixed marriages. In many ways this discourages the kind of equality and ethnic tolerance that Dayton hoped to achieve. In Jane Sharp’s opinion, Dayton is a poor agreement because it embraces two sets of contradictory goals. First of all, Dayton partitions Bosnia into two political entities with separate armies while simultaneously seeking to create a single integrated state with central institutions. Secondly, Dayton imposes arms limits on both entities despite arming and training only one. In addition, the military and civilian aspects of the agreement are poorly coordinated, leading to a law enforcement gap and fragmented aid program.

However, Sumantra Bose disagrees. He asserts that while Dayton may not be a flawless solution, thanks to the agreement and the international involvement associated with it Bosnia is better off than it would otherwise be. Bose argues that Dayton has put Bosnia in a good position to foster multi-ethnic cooperation. He admits that Bosnia’s situation and future do present some obstacles. For example, a 1997 poll found that 91 percent of Bosnian Serbs and 84 percent of Bosnian Croats opposed a united Bosnian state while 98 percent of Bosnian Muslims supported such a state. This huge discrepancy does not bode well for the future of Bosnian democracy; “political scientists generally believe that a minimal consensus on borders and national unity is necessary for sustainable democratization in any society.”

However, Bose maintains that Bosnia’s problems are due to internal problems like the dynamic of its population, unemployment, and the economy, “not because of some original sin visited on it in Dayton, Ohio in November 1995.”
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Pond is more critical of Dayton than Bose, arguing that some rules set forth by the Accords present direct obstacles to the governing of Bosnia. Foreign powers seeking to encourage democracy in the region must persuade local actors to want change and then empower them to effect such change. This can only be done by blocking criminals and helping to introduce more open politics, rule of law, and responsive institutions. Such tasks are incredibly difficult to achieve, so foreign powers are often faced with the choice of accepting stagnation in Bosnia or ruling by fiat, which disempowers local leaders and reduces the likelihood of lasting democracy in the region.661

Yet in spite of all the criticism Dayton has received, Pond willingly admits that Bosnia has achieved a great deal under its guidance. In the past eleven years, Bosnia has adopted a single currency and passport system, army command, and criminal intelligence agency, has procured the first apology by the Republika Srpska for the Srebrenica massacre, and has delivered a list of seventeen thousand perpetrators to prosecutors of the ICTY.662 Dayton may not be perfect, but it has led to eleven years of peace and has allowed Bosnia to retain its identity as one sovereign state. These achievements must not be underestimated and in many ways embody the purpose for which Dayton was created.

The Partition Debate

For some, a preferable alternative to the Dayton arrangements would be the partition of Bosnia-Herzegovina along ethnic lines. Although there is little to suggest that partition is in Bosnia’s foreseeable future, it is worth taking a brief look at this potential solution as a way to put Dayton in perspective and provide a basis for comparison. During the 1970s and 1980s, the notion that partition could be a solution to ethnic conflict was for the most part
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disregarded. By the early 1990s, partition began regaining credibility as a solution to ethnopolitical strife, but was still considered to be legitimate only when achieved by peaceful negotiation, exemplified by Czechoslovakia’s velvet divorce in 1992.\textsuperscript{663} However, in 1995 during negotiations in Dayton, some began to argue that partition was the best solution to Bosnia’s problems.

The current version of the theory argues that partition is at best a lesser evil. It is the most humane form of intervention in an ethnic conflict because it attempts to achieve through negotiation what would otherwise be achieved through war. However, these justifications for partition are based on a primordialist understanding of ethnic conflict; they assume that ancient hatred and eternal hostility prevent groups from achieving permanent peace while remaining unified. Partition is based on the principle of getting out of a conflict as quickly and cheaply as possible, and for international actors is as close to laissez faire policy as is strategically feasible.\textsuperscript{664} Yet past partitions show local leaders unenthusiastic about partition and reveal that partition in highly integrated societies like Bosnia requires a lengthy military engagement, which in some respects defeats the purpose of this solution.\textsuperscript{665}

Sumantra Bose illustrates the shortcomings of partition by examining the detailed plan for Bosnian partition developed by John Mearsheimer and Robert Pape. These two scholars begin their plan by outlining the territories each of the three ethnic groups would receive in the partition settlement, assuming that populations which now live in areas given to the other ethnic group would have to relocate to their eponymous state. “If all went well, three absolutely homogeneous states would be born through organized transfers of population, and the Serbs, Muslims, and Croats would control respectively 45 percent, 35
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percent, and 20 percent of the former republic’s territory…The actualization of the plan would require further seismic population movements among all three groups, on top of what had already occurred during the first year of war.”

Mearsheimer and Pape acknowledge that their plan would have to be implemented by the West given that several political parties in Bosnia oppose partition and the Bosnian Muslims are supportive of a multiethnic Bosnian state. Even groups like the Serbs, who generally support partition, would likely disagree with the plan because they would not be satisfied with the territorial allotments provided. In fact, Mearsheimer and Pape assume that Bosnian Serbs would not accept such a plan until their military had been sufficiently weakened. Therefore, their plan requires that the West ferry arms to Bosnian Muslim groups in preparation for large Serb offenses and engage in a bloodletting strategy to prove to Serbs that they have no alternative but to submit to the plan. Mearsheimer and Pape explain that even after the Serbs submit, there is no guarantee of lasting peace in the Balkans, “since Greater Serbia would still be the strongest state in the region and the Bosnian Muslim state would be among the weakest.” NATO would then have to issue a security guarantee to the Bosnian Muslim state.

In many ways, a simple explanation of Mearsheimer and Pape’s plan provides a criticism for partition by bringing to light the logistical reality of such an undertaking. However, Bose goes on to highlight additional problems with this plan and the idea of partition in general. Bose points out the likely extreme reluctance of the United States to commit large-scale military resources to such a conflict and the unlikelihood that NATO guarantees of protection could be reasonably ensured. He questions where the funding for
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these divisions would come from, and argues that the international community is unlikely to want to shoulder the responsibility of organizing which populations relocate when, especially with the increasing tensions and complexity of the constituent populations of the area. In the words of Chaim Kaufmann, “Separation and partition can be justified only if they save the lives of people who would otherwise be killed in ethnic violence.” It seems that Mearsheimer and Pape’s partition plan is likely to be more destructive of lives and property than integration would be.

Kaufmann, however, does believe that partition is a legitimate solution, particularly when the security dilemma makes it the only way to ensure peace. When ethnic communities cannot rely on a strong and impartial central state to protect them, they begin to mobilize for their own defense, thus posing threats to other groups which then feel obligated to mobilize as well. This situation encourages groups to cleanse mixed areas of the enemy group and create “ethnically reliable, defensible enclaves.” However, Bose points out that without exploring the origin of the security dilemma, things remain murky. How could friends, neighbors, colleagues, and lovers suddenly come to regard each other’s presence as dangerous? Bose instead argues that the security dilemma is often itself caused by the looming possibility of partition, rather than vice versa.

Kaufmann argues that partition is desirable because it has a generally “dampening effect on the renewed incidence of violence in the long run, although the precise extent of the dampening effect depends on how completely the communities are separated from each other by the lines of partition.” He argues that the more complete partition of Cyprus allows for
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its relative peace, while the patchy partition of Northern Ireland contributed to its continued violence. However, Bose maintains that Kaufmann’s argument does not hold water and his factual evidence is inaccurate and one-sided. “Academic proponents of partition like Kaufmann tend to minimize the short and long-term human costs and—more important from a realist point of view—the practical difficulties and dilemmas of drawing partition lines.”\textsuperscript{672}

Although Bose is critical of partitionist views, he does point to the arguments of partition supporter Robert Hayden as important and thoughtful. Hayden questions the “external insistence that Bosnia must continue to exist despite the wishes of the elected representatives of two of its three constituent groups.”\textsuperscript{673} Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats rejected a sovereign united Bosnia during the war, and the post-war years have provided evidence that many are still fundamentally reluctant participants in the union. Robert Schaeffer points out that “partition has never anywhere been subjected to a meaningful, indigenous electoral test,”\textsuperscript{674} but people like Hayden maintain that large numbers of Bosnian Serbs and Croats see the common state of Bosnia as an imposition.

Bose admits that Bosnia exhibits many of the characteristics of a society on the verge of partition. It is fundamentally divided along the fault-line of ethnicity and religion, and the state has lost its pre-war multi-ethnic character. However, he criticizes the simple anti-partition argument for three reasons. First of all, while Bosnia is not a single, sovereign state it has still managed to soften the borders of the immediate post-war period and encourage, if not ethnic integration, minority settlements in areas otherwise dominated by an opposing group. Secondly, events after Dayton prove that cooperation among ethnic leaders is both possible and productive; Bose points to the coordination and liberalization of trade,
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transportation, and industry by the members of Bosnia’s presidency in the face of rioting. Finally, Bose argues that it is unfair and inaccurate to demonize the Dayton settlement. Dayton has elements of partition as well as elements of federalism and consociation. “The Bosnian state has dysfunctional symptoms, as do its parts—but it could hardly be otherwise in a post-civil war context of deep distrust and economic collapse.”

In the wake of Dayton, partition has been understood to mean not just a potential division of Bosnia into three ethnically exclusive parts but also a division along the republic lines created in the Accords. In the 2006 Bosnian presidential elections, Nebojsa Radmanovic became the Serb member of the presidency after a campaign built around the demand for a referendum on RS secession from Bosnia. Although the referendum was not held, Radmanovic’s electoral success brings to the forefront the question of whether the boundaries laid out by Dayton will, or should, become lines of partition in Bosnia. For many, this is without a doubt a situation to be avoided. Such circumstances would leave Bosnia as a rump Muslim state, “resentful, aligned to Iran, prone to violence, and bent on re-conquest of its lost territories.” In addition, if the Republika Srpska were to become independent, this might prompt Serbia to make claims to its territory on the grounds of ethnic affinity, most likely leading to further violence. Finally, such a partition would represent the abandonment of democracy, as it would grant full sovereignty to undemocratic states. Still, this version of Bosnian partition remains a possibility in Bosnia’s future.

For some, partition of Bosnia remains a preferable solution to the current situation. However, the complications and pitfalls of partition along ethnic lines, as well as the potential consequences of partition along republic lines, require that one examine the
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logistics of this solution carefully before advocating it. In light of the negative aspects of partition, the Dayton Accords become more impressive in their ability to satisfy ethnic demands and desire for autonomy while still keeping the Bosnian state intact. Dayton is by no means perfect, but one can more fully appreciate the Accords after coming to understand its alternatives.

**Bosnia-Herzegovina in the Wake of Dayton**

Regardless of one’s evaluation of the Dayton Accords, there is no denying that Bosnia was in shambles at the start of 1996. Approximately one half of Bosnia-Herzegovina’s pre-war population of 4.3 million was displaced during the 43 months of war. Some one million of those displaced remained within the country, and more than 1.2 million refugees were dispersed throughout 25 host states. At the start of 1996, 80 percent of the approximately three million people remaining in Bosnia were dependent on some level of international humanitarian assistance. According to the NGO Research and Documentation center, 93,837 soldiers and civilians were killed in the Bosnian War.

While Croatia and Serbia took some time to get back on their feet after the conflict, Bosnia’s recovery proved to be much more complex because of the nature of its war experience and societal composition. Bosnian Serb Damjanac highlighted the unique problems that Bosnia would face in its war recovery by using the analogy of marriage.

It’s normal that there have been moments when we were angry with each other and didn’t understand each other. In such situations I always used to say to my wife: when you are mad at me over something, or when I make a mistake, try not to lose your temper, and I will try not to lose my temper, because tomorrow morning we have to get up together again, sit at the table together, and think about our children and what is going to happen in our
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lives. And if we have said things to hurt each other, it will be hard to overcome those words.679

Croats, Serbs, and Muslims fought a truly brutal war against each other, and in 1996, when the dust cleared and the violence was over, these people had to learn to live together in spite of the past. For some, this seemed entirely possible. In late November 1995, Sarajevo resident and Muslim Almasa Mulic expressed great happiness at the peace agreement. Her husband was killed by a shell from a Bosnian Serb in 1993 but she showed no bitterness. “I am ready to live with the Serbs again,” she said. “Why shouldn’t I?” For a great number of Bosnians, however, the past was not so easy to forget. On the same day that Mulic expressed her positive views Bosniak Mohamed Niksic said, “The evil that befell Yugoslavia will resurrect itself again. The Serbs will attempt another genocide, because that is what is in their blood. Hopefully I will be dead by then.”680 For society as a whole, reconciliation would prove difficult in the face of the atrocities of the mid-1990s.

During the war, ethnic cleansing reduced the non-Serb population in what is now the Republika Srpska from its pre-war level of 46 percent to 3 percent, and reduced the Serb population in what is now the Federation from 17 percent to 3 percent. “Color-coded maps of before and after ethnic distribution graphically illustrate the phenomenon, shifting from a Jackson Pollock splattering in 1991 to Rorschach blobs in 1995.”681 Minorities continued to be pushed out of their homes even after peace was established. In February 1996, there was a mass exodus of Serbs from Sarajevo as the city became part of the Muslim-Croat Federation. UN officials reported that Serb leaders in Sarajevo were encouraging Serbs to leave because of pressure from ethnic leaders in the Republika Srpska who were interested in achieving
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ethnic homogeneity. Kris Janowski, representative of the High Commissioner for Refugees reported, “Local Serb leaders are being threatened. A lot of them are under severe pressure. They are being told to organize an exodus.”\(^{682}\) The problem is well summarized by International Returnee Coordinator Carl Bildt who stated, “In addition to war refugees, we now have refugees from the peace.”\(^{683}\)

Under a threat by international donors to cut financial assistance if vigorous steps were not taken to restore multi-ethnicity, representatives of the state of Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Sarajevo Canton, and the international community signed the Sarajevo Declaration in 1996. This agreement called for the return of 20,000 minorities to Sarajevo within the year, the employment of more Serbs and other minorities on the police forces, the protection of human rights, the teaching of tolerance in schools, and the restoration of the capital’s position as a model of coexistence and tolerance for the rest of the country. Although these goals were first set forth in Sarajevo, they spread to other areas of the country as well. In the wake of the Sarajevo Declaration, minorities began to return to their pre-war homes throughout Bosnia and today non-Serbs make up 15 to 20 percent of the population in Republika Srpska, and Serbs make up the same percentage in the Federation.\(^{684}\) However, the simple presence of minorities did not mean that they were fully integrated into majority communities. In many cases, minorities lived in homogenous groups so that in their particular locale of each republic, they actually made up a majority of the population.
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Oftentimes, minorities were scared to move into communities dominated by a different ethnic group because immediately after the war the police did not provide proper protection and security to minority citizens. In 1996, Bosnia had 44,000 local police forces which were essentially mono-ethnic paramilitary units organized in three parallel structures. Police discriminated against, harassed, and intimidated citizens who were not of their own ethnicity. Officers blocked checkpoints along the Inter-Ethnic Boundary Line thus making freedom of movement non-existent. Security organizations were fundamentally corrupt and politically dominated.685

The lack of minority protection by Bosnian police, coupled with ethnic resentment among the population itself, led to a number of incidents in which majority populations tried to prevent minorities from returning to their pre-war homes. On April 21, 1996, one thousand Serbs marched on foot in an attempt to prevent hundreds of Muslims returnees from crossing a bridge into the town of Doboj. NATO troops were forced to intervene, using armored personnel carriers and six tanks to block the Serb protestors. The NATO troops fired warning shots after Serbs began throwing rocks at them. Also on April 21, Czech soldiers fired warning shots to hold back a crowd of Serbs trying to prevent Muslims returnees from reaching Bosanski Novi. On April 22, two busloads of Croat returnees were attacked by Serbs throwing rocks near Modrica. The same month, three busloads of Bosnian Serbs were able to visit Drvar in the Federation only after peacekeepers convinced Bosnian Croat authorities to allow the Serbs to enter without harassment.686

An official of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees explained these incidents by saying, “Nobody wants freedom of movement—nobody wants the other side’s refugees to come home.”687 However, as New York Times reporter Mike O’Connor explains, “Most of the homes to which refugees want to return are now occupied by refugees of another ethnic group. They feel they will be displaced if the refugees return and—because they are not being allowed to return to their homes either—that they will have no place to live.”688 This explanation is supported by an incident in Doboj also in April 1996 when Serbs in the town prevented a group of Muslims from returning to their pre-war homes. Following the incident, the Bosnian Serb media said that the group “heroically defended the town from Muslims who intended to occupy the town and to force Bosnian Serb refugees into the streets.”689 In this sense, incidents of blocking the entrance of returnees can be viewed not necessarily as acts of ethnic hatred, but rather of fear and self-preservation. For many refugees, their most pressing goal was to settle down to a normal life after the war and the thought of being uprooted again was more than they could bear.

This being said, there is no denying that a number of troubling and violent incidents occurred in Bosnia throughout 1996. On April 29, 75 Muslim men entered Serb territory on their way to Lukavica, breaking through a Swedish IFOR roadblock and heading across mine-strewn land to visit their former homes. They were ambushed by 100 rebel Serbs who used hand grenades, automatic weapons, and sixty millimeter mortars against the Muslims, killing two and injuring five. NATO called this confrontation the most serious clash since Muslim refugees started returning to their former homes in the RS.690 Just two months later,
Serbs reacted violently to the creation of a UN bus service between Banja Luka in the RS and Zenica in the Federation. Bosnian Serbs harassed aid workers in Banja Luka in an attempt to disrupt the bus schedule. In addition, a UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) staff member was beaten by a group of Serbs in a further attempt at intimidation. On July 4, a vehicle belonging to the International Crisis Group was taken at gun point.691

There is no doubt that such incidents of violence had a dramatic effect on the number of refugees who chose to return to their pre-war homes. The UNHCR assumed at the beginning of 1996 that up to 500,000 internally displaced persons would return to their homes and 370,000 refugees would repatriate during the year. Not only did repatriation fall far short of these expectations, but during 1996 an additional 80,000 people were displaced as a result of the transfer of territories between the two entities provided for in the Dayton agreement. “The low number of returns resulted mainly from the local parties’ refusal to welcome minority refugees back into their home communities.”692

With an atmosphere of ethnic intolerance, violence, and fear taking hold throughout Bosnia, it is no surprise that the first general elections held in 1996 brought nationalist parties to power. While the international community hoped that elections would lead to more moderate Bosnian leadership, instead the electorate legitimated the most belligerent and narrowly nationalist political parties within each of the three communities at both the national and entity level: the Muslim Party of Democratic Action (SDA), the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) and the Serbian Democratic Party (SDA). As Richard Holbrooke pointed out, “The election strengthened the very separatists who had started the war.”693
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The new parliament was scheduled to hold its first meeting in October of 1996, but did not convene until January the following year because Serbian representatives refused to swear allegiance to a united Bosnia. Members of the new central bank were selected but they disagreed on the bank’s role and were unable to conduct business. Bosnian Serb and Croat leaders refused to appoint members to the new constitutional court. Similar stonewalling delayed efforts to endow the new council of ministers with effective authority. Within the Muslim-Croat Federation as well, Bosnian Croats attempted to retain their separate institutions rather than merging them into the new entity-level government. By electing three exclusive and nationalist groups, Bosnians had created a government which was inefficient and unable to cooperate on even the simplest matters.

These newly elected leaders also made efforts to obstruct the return of minority refugees and displaced people to their pre-war homes. Returns that did take place consisted mainly of people going back to areas controlled by their own ethnic group; returns across ethnic lines proved nearly impossible. Many factors hindered the repatriation process, including fear of violent attacks, poor economic prospects, and lack of suitable housing. However, political leaders were also responsible for hampering returns by “failing to provide adequate security, by maintaining discriminatory property laws, and by transferring minority-owned housing to members of their own ethnic group.” As a result, the same violence related to minority returns as seen in 1996 continued into 1997. In January, some 400 Croat civilians, led by women and children, massed on the bridge in the center of Stolac near Mostar to block the passage of two buses carrying 30 Muslims refugees. The Croat mob threw stones and eggs at the convoy for a full hour until the bus was finally forced to turn
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around. Just a few days prior, a Serb mob attacked 40 Muslims who had returned to their home village of Bajevi under a pilot UN program.696

One of the most problematic areas in Bosnia in terms of both day-to-day life and the blocking of returnees has been the city of Mostar in the Federation. Before the war, Mostar was one of the most diverse cities in all of Bosnia. In 1991, the city contained 76,000 citizens of whom 34 percent were Muslim, 29 percent Croat, and 19 percent Serb. The remaining 18 percent chose the supranational identification of Yugoslav, an unusually high local proportion compared to the Bosnia-wide proportion of 5.5 percent and the Yugoslavia-wide average of 3 percent.697 After the great brutality which occurred in Mostar during the war, the city was divided into two parts; today Croats occupy the west bank of the Neretva River, while Bosniaks occupy the east. Mostar’s politics are highly polarized and its educational system and cultural life remain segregated into two separate spheres. The few plants and factories in operation in the city “belong” to one side or the other. The city continues to have duplicate sets of almost every kind of institution and facility, including two different telecommunications networks and two public health systems. Until 1998, stores on the Muslim east bank even refused to sell Croatian beer.698

The tense situation in Mostar led to great violence in early 1997. In fact, the United Nations Security Council became so concerned about this violence that it asked the International Police Task Force and Human Rights Coordination Center to prepare a detailed report on ethnic tension in Mostar. The two organizations found that between January 1 and February 10, 1997, residents from both east and west Mostar, as well as travelers to the city, were subjected to criminal attacks. In the 28 recorded cases of threats and assaults, both
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Bosniaks and Croats were victims in equal proportion. During the 41 days of the period examined, Mostar saw more than 40 explosions and firing incidents and 6 illegal evictions. In a number of these incidents, local police were implicated either through direct involvement or failure to act.\textsuperscript{699}

On February 10, one person was killed and 20 injured when Croats and Muslims clashed in Mostar. The conflict began when 100 Muslims visiting a cemetery in the west bank came face to face with a comparable number of Croats who were holding a carnival where they intended to burn Aija Izetbegovic in effigy. Witnesses say that Croats began the conflict by throwing stones at Muslims and eventually opening fire on them.\textsuperscript{700} This incident became an excuse for further abuse; in the five hours following the incident, there were 22 cases of Croat travelers being stoned, threatened, robbed, or assaulted on the M-17 highway. In the same afternoon, 23 Bosniak families were forcibly evicted from their homes and even more attempted evictions were reported. Police were directly involved or failed to act in about half of these incidents.\textsuperscript{701}

The year 1997 brought continued ethnic violence not just in Mostar but throughout Bosnia. In March, 400 Bosniak returnees were expelled from the city of Jajce by Croat mobs. The next month a 65-year-old Muslim man was hospitalized after being severely beaten with sticks and robbed by a group of 20 Serbs on the outskirts of Brcko.\textsuperscript{702} In August, 13 Bosnian Serb refugees tried to return to their former homes in Sarajevo but were chased out by angry mobs of Muslim refugees who had moved to Sarajevo after leaving their homes in
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Srebrenica. The same month one Muslim died and more than 500 fled from Jajce when Croats set returnees’ houses on fire; arson was also used to block returns in Drvar and Gajevo. Ethnically motivated murders occurred throughout 1997 in Mostar, Jajce, Travnik, Visoko, and Sarajevo. When cases were brought to trial, which occurred rarely, sentences were very short. An official UN spokesman described the events of 1997 as “ethnic re-cleansing” and Human Rights Watch stated, “the rule of law simply does not exist in many communities.”

The lack of public order and failure to apprehend war criminals during 1996 and 1997 had a devastating impact on the process of repatriation. Suspected war criminal Radovan Karadzic was still in charge of the RS at this time and other indicted war criminals continued to control many communities throughout Bosnia, making ethnic reconciliation within local communities next to impossible. Given the situation in Bosnia, many refugees opted to stay out of the country or remain in a Bosnian community where they were part of the majority rather than returning to their pre-war homes. In October 1997, the High Representative for the Implementation of the Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina, Carlos Westendorp, informed the UN Security Council that as of that point, 80,000 refugees had repatriated to Bosnia from Europe but these returns were almost exclusively to majority areas, meaning areas administered by their own ethnic group. In 1997, efforts were made to permit more freedom of movement; airports were opened to civilian traffic, the Gradiska border between northern Bosnia and Croatia was opened, and border points between the RS and Croatia were
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opened as well. However, the problems of 1997 would not be solved so easily and ethnic tension remained.

All in all, it was immediately apparent to the international community that in Bosnia, democracy was not leading to liberalism. While Dayton’s sponsors envisioned the democratic creation of a tolerant government, the 1996 Bosnian elections “filled the new institutions with individuals who were openly opposed to cooperating with their ethnic adversaries.” Peace builders recognized that free and fair elections could impede rather than facilitate the consolidation of lasting peace in Bosnia and began to intervene in the 1997 entity-level elections on the side of more moderate candidates who lacked popular support. “Only by rigging the democratic process in favor of moderate politicians did peace builders succeed in installing a government in Republika Srpska that supported the full implementation of the Dayton Accord.”

However, in spite of heavy international involvement in supporting moderate candidates, Bosnia’s nationalist groups remained in power in 1998. In the Federation, the Party of Democratic Action and Croatian Democratic Union increased their respective share of the vote for presidency; in the RS, Nikola Poplasen, a hard-line nationalist, defeated the Pavsic-Dodik ticket that the international community had heavily supported. It seemed that Bosnians were not prepared to give their support to moderate candidates in the current circumstances of fear and violence. Ironically, by attempting to stay safe in an environment of violence, the people of Bosnia ended up perpetuating the dangerous situation.
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With nationalist leaders still in power, 1998 saw continued ethnic violence. In mid-April, rioting Croats in Drvar burned down the local UN police station, beat up the Serb mayor, and ransacked apartments belonging to Serb returnees. However, Alenko Zornija argues that this violence was not based on ethnic hatred or intolerance but rather fear. In 1998, Drvar was populated mostly by Croats who fled, were displaced, or were expelled from other areas of Bosnia during the war. Those Croats were from areas that had since come under control of Serbs. In the spring of 1998, the international community began to implement particularly draconian measures to ensure the return of Serbs to Drvar. This incited Croats to anger and violence “not due to the mere fact of the Serbs’ returning, but because of something one can hardly understand, that the very same ‘international representatives’ had not taken even remotely similar actions to provide for the return of the Croats now living in Drvar to their pre-war homes.”

In addition, Croats feared that they would once again be thrown on to the street when the Serbs returned.

Croats were also resentful of what they saw as preferential treatment for Serbs. In the spring of 1998 in Derventa, Serbs twice blocked Croats from attending church services and then trapped Sarajevo’s Cardinal Vinko Puljic inside a church for six hours. SFOR’s response showed little commitment to protecting Croats. “While in Drvar local officials were being removed from office and an effective state of emergency was being declared following the murder of two Serbs, at the same time, SFOR commanders in Derventa were claiming that their only duty was to protect their own troops, and in central Bosnia, after the murder of Croat returnees, local Bosniak officials remained in office.” Zornija’s argument takes a slightly different angle from those who claim that people blocked the return of refugees
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simply because they themselves were refugees and did not want to end up on the street again. Instead, Zornija outwardly admits the existence of ethnic resentment, which no doubt played a role in such violence. However, he points out that such resentment can still be based in fear. Groups were not simply annoyed that others were receiving preferential treatment but instead feared that such treatment would result in the abuse of themselves and their loved ones. Zornija presents a theory which allows for ethnic resentment to partially explain violence against returnees but also remains consistent with the belief that such acts do not illustrate ethnic hatred but rather residual fear after the great abuses of the war.

In August of 1998, the UNHCR reported that 500,000 refugees had returned to Bosnia since the end of the war but most had not moved back to their pre-war homes. As of 1998, a total of 15,045 refugees had returned to an entity not controlled by their ethnic group; only 1,829 of those returnees included Muslims and Croats returning to the Republika Srpska. By mid-1998, 11,583 Muslims had returned to Croat-controlled areas and 26,210 Croats had returned to Muslim-controlled areas.714 There is no doubt that returnee-centered violence played a large role in deterring people from returning to their pre-war homes.

Regardless of the motivation for ethnically divisive behavior, it was prevalent in Bosnia in the years following Dayton. Some interesting examples of such refusal to integrate occurred, oddly enough, between the apparent Muslim and Croat allies of the Federation. When the Federation was created in March of 1994 it put an end to Croat-Muslim fighting. In building the Federation, local governments were often created under great pains; the two groups had trouble compromising and were constantly suspicious that if the other group had too much power it would become abusive. The Federation faced a great deal of trouble in creating a joint army from the Bosniak-dominated Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the

Croatian Defense Council. While a law was passed in 1997 that the two must officially integrate, this had not occurred at the lower levels as of 1998. In June 1998, the US briefly suspended aid to Federation forces until they agreed to fly the Federation flag at their installations and wear Federation insignia on their uniforms instead of using Bosniak or Herceg-Bosnia symbols.\textsuperscript{715} The refusal of soldiers to wear joint Croat-Muslim symbols displays a nationalism not based on self-preservation but on a feeling of ethnic divisiveness. Between March and August 1998 in the Croat-controlled town of Stolac, more than 50 houses of Muslims hoping to return to the town were burned before they could be reclaimed.\textsuperscript{716} Croats did not try to keep Muslims out because they feared people of their own ethnicity would be evicted; rather, they destroyed much needed property rather than letting Muslims rejoin the community. These actions undoubtedly represent feelings of nationalism and ethnic exclusivity rather than simply fear.

To a certain extent, Muslim-Croat tension still exists in Bosnia today. In fact, some Croats insist that the very survival of their people depends on the creation of a third Bosnian entity for Croats that excludes Muslims. These fears of cultural dominance are supported by the fact that Bosniaks outnumber Croats by at least four to one in the Federation; this has been further aggravated by Croat emigration after the war.\textsuperscript{717} The hostility between Croats and Muslims is illustrated by the fact that as of 2000, no communication or cooperation existed between the police of west and east Mostar. The east Mostar police stations have their
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autopsies, as well as blood and DNA analyses done in Sarajevo while the west Mostar stations send their specimens to Split, the nearest large Croatian city. 

In May 2001, the 1,200 Croat inhabitants of four mountain villages near Maglaj demanded that their area become part of the Zepce municipality, which has a Croat majority. This move, however, would cut off the Muslim majority town of Novi Seher from the rest of its municipality. Inhabitants of this town staged a protest on May 29. One Muslim involved in the protest stated, “I simply do not trust Croats any more. They betrayed us by joining with the Serbs in 1993.” One Croat in support of the move explained his opinion by saying, “We feel safer being with our ethnic group.” While this was not a major incident in Bosnian history, the opinions expressed within its context are representative of people throughout Bosnia who clung to their ethnic group out of concerns for safety.

In 2000, the Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia engaged in a confrontation with the international community. Despite great dissatisfaction among the Croat electorate with the corruption and self-enrichment of the party elite, the Croat community overwhelmingly supported the party. The party organized a referendum asking for the endorsement of its demand that the international community concede full political and cultural equality for Croats in Bosnia. This was code for the “third entity” demand. Although this referendum was declared illegal by several international bodies, 71 percent of the Bosnian Croat electorate participated in the referendum and 99 percent of those who voted endorsed the HDZ stand. While it can be argued that some wanted to create their own entity for reasons of ethnic resentment or even hatred, one can speculate that many, like the Croat man in Maglaj, simply
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felt safer with their own ethnic group. This conception of safety does not necessarily indicate a feeling of nationalism but rather a reasonable response to the violence of the 1990s and an attempt to ensure one’s physical safety in tumultuous times.

In spite of this move for separatism, the 2000 elections brought Bosnia closer to democracy. The near monopolies of the SDS and HDZ were reaffirmed in their respective ethnic areas, but a full half of Muslim votes were cast for a change coalition that pledged to carry out reforms.\textsuperscript{722} Refugee return rates in 1998 and 1999 were much lower than expected, but in 2000 the number of returnees jumped from the 40,000 mark of the previous two years to 67,000, including almost 19,000 Serbs who returned to the Federation, 7,500 of whom returned to Bosniak-controlled Sarajevo. Also in 2000, 25,000 Bosniaks returned to the Republika Srpska, a majority of whom returned to Prijedor, Doboj, Bijeljina, and Zvornik, all areas with odious wartime reputations.\textsuperscript{723} More than 5,000 Bosniaks returned to Croat-controlled municipalities, while over 4,000 Croats settled in Bosniak-controlled areas, including 1,477 Bosniaks who returned peacefully to their homes in west Mostar.\textsuperscript{724}

Without a doubt this upsurge of returns in 2000 was in large part due to a program introduced by the UN Mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina (UNMIBH) to encourage minority representation in police forces. According to a report delivered by Under Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations of the UNMIBH Bernard Miyet, as of August 2000 nearly 450 minority officers were attending or had graduated from the two police academies, and 130 minority officers were prepared for redeployment across entity lines.\textsuperscript{725} On June 27 the Joint Entity Task Force on Illegal Immigration and Organized Crime was established. This

\textsuperscript{722} Pond, 154.
\textsuperscript{723} Bose, \textit{Bosnia After Dayton}, 34.
\textsuperscript{724}Ibid., 115.
organization promoted inter-entity police cooperation and helped to ensure that the five year anniversary of the Srebrenica massacre was memorialized peacefully. More than three thousand people attended the ceremony and no violence erupted.

On June 6, 2000, the State Border Service entry point was inaugurated at the Sarajevo airport. This was a significant step toward building state institutions because it enabled authorities and the UNMIBH to gather reliable data on movements through the Sarajevo airport and the use of the airport as a point of entry for illegal migration into Europe. These changes helped to ensure that in the first half of 2000, over 19,500 minority returns were registered in Bosnia, compared to two thousand returns during the same period in 1999.\footnote{Ibid., 3.} In 2001, minority returns were similarly optimistic, totaling over 43,000. This figure includes 19,500 Serb returnees to the Federation of whom 10,000 returned to Sarajevo. This figure also includes 14,000 Bosniaks who returned to the Republika Srpska, often to many of the same cities with poor war reputations as refugees returned to in 2000. By the end of 2001, minority returns across Bosnia-Herzegovina since the end of the war had reached 250,000.\footnote{Bose, \textit{Bosnia After Dayton}, 35.}

In spite of these hopeful statistics, incidents of ethnic violence continued into the new millennium. On April 28, 2001, the barn of a Bosniak returnee in Knezina was set on fire by Serbs in the area. Earlier in the day, a Bosniak family traveling to Kaljina was harassed at the entrance to the village by a group of five men who verbally abused them and tried to physically prevent them from entering the village.\footnote{“OHR Condemns Attacks on Bosniak Returnees in Serb Republic,” \textit{Sarajevo ONASA}, May 3, 2001.} In May 2001, a memorial plaque for members of the Bosnian Serb Republic Army killed in the war was damaged. Additionally,
headstones in a cemetery for Croats and Serbs were damaged in Lukavac. In Janja, the houses of returning Muslim families were stoned.729

A particularly upsetting event occurred in Banja Luka in the spring of 2001. In 1992, Banja Luka had sixteen mosques including the Ferhadija mosque, built in 1578. In May 1993, extremist Bosnian Serbs razed the Ferhadija mosque and by the end of the war, all sixteen Banja Luka mosques had been destroyed. On the eighth anniversary of the mosque’s demolition on May 7, 2001, a ceremony was held to lay the first stone of the new foundation for a mosque to be built in place of the Ferhadija. On the day of the ceremony a mob of Serb demonstrators, between 2,000 and 4,000 in total, disrupted the event by chanting Serb nationalist slogans and anti-Muslim taunts, throwing rocks, stones, bottles, and eggs, and gesticulating menacingly at those gathered to commemorate the new mosque. Some Bosniaks were physically attacked by Serbs and prayer carpets were set on fire. The green flag of the Islamic community center building was torn down and set ablaze and the Repulika Srpska flag was hoisted in its place. Demonstrators even brought a pig to the demonstration as an affront to Muslim religious sentiment, encouraging it to uproot the ground by the new cornerstone of the mosque.730 A number of UN officials and Western diplomats were trapped by Serb protesters who threw teargas and grenades. Buses which brought Muslims to the ceremony were set on fire.731 The Banja Luka demonstrations followed the pattern of those which occurred two days earlier during a ceremony to inaugurate the reconstruction of the Osman Pasha mosque in Trebinje. The Trebinje incident involved a few hundred rather than
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a few thousand demonstrators, but was essentially just a smaller version of the events in Banja Luka.\textsuperscript{732}

On May 9, a crowd of 1,500 nationalist Muslims marched to Sarajevo to protest the violence in Banja Luka. Protestors waved Islamic flags and chanted “God is great” as they brought traffic to a halt. They also waved flags of the Party of Democratic Action which led Muslims through the war; one banner read “We shall rebuild Ferhadija.” The crowd also shouted “Arrest war crimes suspects” in protest of the fact that Karadzic and Mladic remain at large. One protestors, Samir Beganovic said, “I fought for four years and I am ready for fight another 200 years against the Serbs.”\textsuperscript{733} Six weeks later, in June 2001, the Ferhadija ceremony was held again, with nearly all top RS officials in attendance. Once again, between one and two thousand Bosnian Serb demonstrators arrived to disrupt the ceremony. They were held at bay by police, but fought against officers in riot gear in order to protest “the reconstruction of a mosque in ‘their’ city.”\textsuperscript{734} Without a doubt ethnic intolerance and hatred was expressed by these protests. However, the fact that the ceremony was eventually held, and that top Republika Srpska officials thought it important enough to show their support in spite of the danger of angering their constituents, must be seen as a somewhat hopeful sign.

This optimistic view was confirmed by Jacques Paul Klein, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and Coordinator of United Nations Operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, when he gave a status report on Bosnia to the United Nations Security Council in June 2001. Klein argued that in spite of acts of violence in the months prior to his presentation in Mostar, Trebinje, and Banja Luka, he believed that things were looking up for
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Bosnia in 2001. He pointed out that “the decisive test of Dayton is whether the necessary conditions exist on the ground for people to return to their homes” and argued that many people were returning and those who were not often made their decision based on economic rather than political reasons.\textsuperscript{735} Klein argued that it is far more “prudent and effective to work on the integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina than its disintegration,” and highlighted the fact that towns which were once ethnically cleansed, like Drvar, were becoming mixed in 2001. Inter-ethnic trade and commerce were re-established and ethnic partitionists were losing popularity.\textsuperscript{736}

While ethnic tension still existed in Bosnia in the latter half of 2001, it began to take on subtler, less violent characteristics. In Brcko, the district assembly was liberal-minded enough to introduce a regimen of multiethnic education to the school system in an attempt to integrate children of different ethnicities in the classroom. The plan allowed language, modern European history, and some elements of music teaching to be studied separately because of cultural differences, but mandated that all other subjects be studied jointly. Serbs in the community objected because their children would not be taught in their mother tongue; the Serb Education Club even recommended that Serb children boycott school for one year in protest of the law.\textsuperscript{737} However, no violence ensued and the law was put into practice.

In January 2002, a multi-ethnic museum was opened in Sarajevo displaying artifacts donated by Serbs from centuries of Ottoman Turk rule, as well as art created by Muslim craftsman. The museum is located in a church from the fifth century and its altar includes oriental ornaments under Islamic influence, as well as stars of David and crosses. One

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{735} United Nations Security Council, \textit{4330\textsuperscript{th} Meeting: The Situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina}, June 15, 2001, S/PV.4330, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{736} Ibid, 3.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Sarajevo Serb commended the creation of a museum celebrating the ethnic diversity of the city. “This means the continuation of a joint life, a general reconciliation without which there can be no progress for any people,” she said. Mirko Pejanovic, head of the Serb Civic Council and former Serb member of Bosnia’s multi-ethnic presidency, also praised the opening of the museum.

However, in January a Serb terrorist organization sent death threats to Pejanovic and nine other Sarajevo Serbs who advocated tolerant co-existence by supporting the museum and other projects centered on integration. The terrorist group is named after Gavrilo Princip, the Bosnian Serb who assassinated Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914. Those targeted by the threats were denounced as “Muslim servants” and “Serb traitors.” The Orthodox Church also reacted strongly to the museum opening by threatening to withdraw altogether from the Muslim-Croat Federation because, according to figurehead Metropolitan Nikolaj, “the Serb Orthodox Church does not want to participate in the creation of a fake multi-ethnic image of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” Nikolaj refused to send a televised Christmas message to Orthodox believers in the Federation and forbade a televised broadcast of the Christmas prayer. For some Bosnians, ethnic integration and unity proved threatening and problematic.

However, ethnic intolerance could not stand in the way of the positive developments occurring in Bosnia at this time, reflected not only in Brcko education reform and the Sarajevo museum, but also in refugee returns. In March 2002, Special Representative of the Commission, Jose Cutilero, presented a status report on Bosnia to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. According to the Office of the UNHCR, 2001 saw the highest
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number of returns since Dayton with over 92,000 registered minority returns, including 47,156 Bosniaks, 34,189 Serbs, and 9,587 Croats. It must be noted that this number does not distinguish between those who returned permanently and those who returned only to reclaim and sell their property. Cutilero also reported on property legislation implementation rates in Bosnia. These rates refer to the amount of territory in which reforms designed to ensure that property is returned to pre-war owners regardless of their ethnicity have been implemented. At the end of 2001, the RS had a property legislation implementation rate of only 30.64 percent, although this was a definite improvement over the 2000 rate of 13.21 percent. The Federation’s implementation rate in 2001 was 49.40 percent.\footnote{Cutilero, 2}

Of course, Bosnia continued to face obstacles in its post-war recovery. The International Crisis Group observed, “War crimes in one entity or canton are still hailed as acts of heroism in another.”\footnote{Friedman, 77.} In spite of improved security throughout Bosnia, when the UN announced that SFOR troops would be cut from 19,000 to 12,000 by the end of 2002, Muslims in Voljevica said, “If they leave, all of us will leave.”\footnote{“Bosnians Returning to Eastern Bosnia Threaten to Leave if SFOR Pulls Out,” Sarajevo ONASA, May 13, 2002.} Even at this late point, Bosnian citizens did not feel safe without international protection. Mark Wheeler of the International Crisis Group confirmed this sentiment by noting that the Serb-controlled municipality of Bratunac saw almost no non-Serb returnees before a US base was set up near the city in 2001.\footnote{Ibid.} Even as late as 2002, minorities in Bosnia felt that they required international protection to be safe in their own communities.

On December 24, 2002, Bosniak Muamer Topalovic perpetrated what Herzegovina Neretva Canton Interior Minister Goran Bilic described as “the gravest crime committed
since the signing of the Dayton peace agreement."\textsuperscript{744} Topalovic entered the home of a Croat family that had recently returned to the village of Kostajnica and opened fire on them with an automatic gun. Three family members were killed and a fourth wounded. Muamer stated that his motive was to intimidate the Croat family and draw the attention of the public to injustice done to Muslims.\textsuperscript{745} Topalvoic was a member of the Active Islamic Youth organization which is believed to be connected with a series of incidents aimed against Croat returnees in Central Bosnia at this time. Leaders of the organization encouraged its members to commit violent acts against Croats to discourage them from returning to their pre-war homes at Christmas time. Another member of the Active Islamic Youth was suspected of setting a nativity scene on fire in Mostar.\textsuperscript{746}

Although the murders perpetrated by Topalovic make this difficult to believe, most ethnic tension and incidents in 2003 and 2004 were becoming increasingly mild. In Bocinja, a remote hamlet in central Bosnia, the Serb and Muslim communities butted heads throughout 2004. A car was set on fire by Serbs during a prayer, and Muslims began a fight with Serbs who they alleged were trying to provoke them by cooking pork. Enes Imamovic, a Muslim chief, said that Serbs should convert to Islam if the two communities are to live together, which was of course viewed as an incredibly offensive and inflammatory remark.\textsuperscript{747} Although these events were relatively minor, they were still reported in the international media; this suggests that such minor events were becoming noteworthy and therefore that more destructive ethnic violence was becoming much less frequent. Similarly, on September
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11, 2004, fifty Muslims surrounded fifty Serbs as they prepared to enter a Serb Orthodox church near Bratunac. Reports suggest that violence broke out because of Muslim anger about the illegal construction of the Orthodox church on land belonging to a Muslim refugee. Several cars were damaged, but no injuries were reported.\textsuperscript{748} The appearance of this story in the news again suggests that even minor incidents of ethnic violence were becoming unusual and noteworthy.

Evidence also suggests that in 2003 and 2004 the Bosnian leadership was becoming increasingly sensitive to racial tensions, appearing eager to smooth over ethnic rifts to avoid violence and anger. On August 11, 2003, ethnic Serb Nihad Masic went to the home of his Muslim neighbor, hit the elderly woman in the head with a hard object, then raped and robbed her. At the victim’s funeral, Gorazde Mufti Hamed Efendic stated that “the old woman was killed by the people who expelled her in 1994, sending the message to villains to leave the Bosniak land.”\textsuperscript{749} Efendic was then charged with the criminal act of provoking racial and religious hatred. This clearly illustrates that preventing ethnic tension is becoming a government priority. It also shows a concerted effort to punish those who express intolerance, a clear sign that Bosnia is moving toward a more egalitarian society.

On November 17, 2004, ethnic Serb Bogdan Gigovic was arrested on the suspicion of murdering Croat priest Kazimire Viseticki in Gradiska, located in Republika Srpska. Although the alleged motive was robbery rather than a hate crime, Bosnian Serb President Dragan Cavic quickly condemned the attack and called on the Catholic minority in the region to remain calm. He said that the murder should not be seen as “an attack on the national
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status of Croats and Catholics in Republika Srpska.\textsuperscript{750} Even though evidence suggested that this murder was not ethnically motivated, Cavic was quick to reassure everyone that the problem would be addressed. This extreme sensitivity to such a potentially irrelevant event shows a newfound concern among the Bosnian leadership over maintaining ethnic peace, cooperation, and even integration.

Of course these improvements are not enough to solve all of Bosnia’s problems. In January 2005 the Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Bosnia and Herzegovina released its report on the status of human rights in the country during 2004. The report gave a number of optimistic returnee statistics, highlighting the fact that 2004 saw the one millionth refugee return to Bosnia. In addition, the first ten months of 2004 saw 16,500 refugees return to their pre-war homes, 12,000 of which were located in areas where the group represented an ethnic minority. However, many returnees who regained their property sold it, exchanged it, used it only as a weekend living space, or simply rented it out; these people did not take up residence in their pre-war homes. In Srebrenica, 4,000 refugees had returned by 2004 but a full 60 percent of them stayed there only periodically. Realistically, total returnees at the end of 2004 totaled only 30 percent of the 2.2 million refugees.\textsuperscript{751} As a result, the ethnic distribution in Bosnia at the close of 2004 was still very different from its pre-war situation. Only 20 municipalities in pre-war Bosnia had an ethnic composition such that one group was absolutely dominant over the other two. However, in 2004, Tuzla was the only area in which the majority population was below 90 percent of the total; in all other communities the


dominant group was between 92 and 99 percent of the community.\textsuperscript{752} Bosnia made progress in the realm of refugee returns during 2004, but it still was nowhere near full integration.

The Helsinki Committee also highlighted a number of ethnic incidents which occurred in 2004. In March, the roof of the Orthodox Church of Birth of the Most Holy Virgin was set on fire, the seat of the Islamic religious community in Banja Luka was stoned, and two hand grenades were thrown into a mosque near Gradiska in the RS. In October, offensive graffiti appeared on a Catholic church in Kakanj, presumably written by Muslims in the area. More than ten attacks on mosques were reported during Ramadan in the RS. Also in October, Orthodox priest Zoran Perkovic was physically assaulted in Sarajevo by Bosniaks. In November, a fight occurred between Croat and Bosniak students in Gornji Vakuf; three pupils were injured by knife and baseball bat.\textsuperscript{753} Clearly legitimate ethnic violence was still a concern in 2004, in spite of signs that ethnic tensions were softening.

The Helsinki Committee, however, did praise the Law on Protection of the Rights of National Minorities, adopted in 2003. This legislation allowed minority languages to be used in the administration, judiciary, or education of a given area, and gave minority groups the opportunity to have their own printed media in their home town. The law had not yet been fully implemented in 2004, but its passing was no doubt a positive development. In addition, on August 14, 2004, the country-wide television station TV Bosnia-Herzegovina began broadcasting on its own network, which covered 97 percent of the country’s territory. Previously, the only television stations were either RS or Federation affiliated, and this was a step in the direction of Bosnian consolidation and unity.\textsuperscript{754}
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In October of 2004, a series of opinion polls were conducted in Bosnia on the subject of the Bosnian War as well as current views on ethnic relations within the country. Among Bosnian residents, a majority of Muslims blame the Serbs for starting the war, a majority of Serbs blame the United States, and a majority of Croats say that no one takes responsibility for beginning the conflict, although a large number of Croats blame the Serbs as well. Croats list Bosniaks as the sixth most important cause of war, while Bosniaks list Croats as the eleventh. These statistics show mixed feelings about the culpability of other ethnic groups, indicating that while some hold on to ethnic resentment, others have gained perspective in the years after the war and can evaluate the causes of the conflict with a cooler head.

When asked what factors are most responsible for problems in inter-ethnic relations, most respondents said “lack of financial support for returnees,” with “ethnic stereotypes and prejudices are still very strong” coming in second. People cited “personal hatred and revenge” as the fifth most important factor, and “local communities do not want returnees” came in last. These statistics suggest that Bosnians believe prejudice and hatred exist in other people rather than feeling it within themselves. It is not that local communities do not want refugees to return but rather that hatred exists “out there.” In addition, while the second most popular response cited stereotypes and prejudices, it is important to note that these terms connote that such negative opinions are inaccurate and unfair. When Bosnians responded that ethnic stereotypes and prejudices were the second most significant cause of ethnic tension, they were exhibiting a belief that ethnic hatred and resentment are unjustified and perhaps even wrong.
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The same opinion poll taken in October 2004 asked Bosnian citizens to evaluate options for improving inter-ethnic relations and designate each option as essential, desirable, acceptable, tolerable, or unacceptable. A full 90 percent of respondents agreed that it was either essential or desirable for all people to become equal citizens of Bosnia. Eighty-four percent thought it was essential or desirable to acknowledge the wrongs done by all groups involved in the war, and 72 percent agreed that there should be some dedicated reconciliation process. Although some categories were predominantly ranked as simply “acceptable,” no more than 3 percent of respondents rated any one option as “unacceptable.” There is no doubt that it is different to deem change desirable in an opinion poll than to support its actual implementation, but these statistics suggest that Bosnians are truly interested in reaching peace and finding some accord between the groups. Such a conclusion supports the theory that the violence of the 1990s was not about undying ethnic hatred, but rather confusion and misunderstanding that can be resolved.

In 2005, another opinion poll was conducted in Bosnia to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Dayton Accords. According to this poll, 66 percent of Republika Srpska citizens agree that “the sustainability of the Republika Srpska is the only guarantee for the sustainability of Serbs in Bosnia-Herzegovina,” while just under 26 percent believe that Bosnian integration into the EU is a guarantee of Serb protection in the region. This suggests that Serbs are still fearful of being abused if ruled by other ethnic groups, although this is not surprising given Bosnia’s recent past and is probably true of other ethnic groups in Bosnia as well. The poll also reported that almost 54 percent of Serbs would not support
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surrendering Karadzic to the Hague even if this were a condition for Bosnia to join NATO and the EU. A majority of Bosnian Serbs, then, retain a sense of ethnic loyalty and do not put great importance on joining Western European institutions. However, the flip side of this poll is that 46 percent of Bosnian Serbs are undecided or would support Karadzic’s surrender which, given the extreme nationalism of the events just ten years earlier, is somewhat impressive.

In another hopeful development, an official Republika Srpska commission admitted in November of 2004 for the first time that Serbs had massacred thousands of Muslims in Srebrenica. The RS handed over 600 war-related documents to the Hague Tribunal, provided a list of 17,000 Serbs who took part in the massacre, and made an official apology to the Muslim community for the Srebrenica killings. In July of 2005, on the tenth anniversary of the massacre, Serbian president Boris Tadic laid a wreath at the commemoration. A few hundred Serbs held a counter commemoration and held signs reading “Long live Karadzic,” but the protest did little to disrupt the ceremony itself. Of course no ceremony can make up for what happened during the war and Srebrenica is still reeling from the violence. The city that used to contain 37,000 is now home to less than 7,000 people, predominantly Serb. In the midst of the Srebrenica commemorations, the Red Cross still reported 16,600 Bosniaks missing, their bodies never identified from the war.

While the situation in Bosnia is by no means perfect, symbolic efforts by government officials are beginning to have a real effect on Bosnian society. At the time when Tadic appeared in Srebrenica, technically qualified Bosniaks were being hired by Serb business in Banja Luka, illustrating the easing of ethnic division and tension. As of January 31, 2005,
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1,005,958 people had returned to their pre-war homes in Bosnia, 448,880 of whom were minority returns. Government and international affairs professor Gerard Toal considers this “a remarkable achievement” given the brutality of the Bosnian War, pointing out that people often made urban connections when they were refugees and therefore consciously chose not to return to their rural pre-war homes. Bosnia is slowly but surely moving along the road to recovery.

Although many people in the RS were reluctant to join the European Union, Bosnia faced increasing international pressure to pursue entry in 2005. That year Croatia began negotiating a Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA) with the EU. When Serbia began such talks as well, it appeared that the stubbornness of Bosnian Serbs would isolate Bosnia as the only country in the Western Balkans not pursuing EU membership; this was a label that Bosnian leaders did not wish to assume. After the RS legislature approved High Representative Paddy Ashdown’s police reforms, the EU invited Bosnia-Herzegovina to begin negotiating its own SAA. These talks opened in January of 2006 and Bosnia’s agreement is expected to be signed in the summer of 2007, making a significant step in Bosnia’s journey toward recovering from its great war.

On January 17, 2006, the Helsinki Human Rights Committee presented its report on the human rights situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina in 2005. According to the report, discrimination on the basis of ethnicity throughout 2005 practically prevented employment, adequate education, adequate health and social protection, and realization of the right of pension for certain Bosnians. Inter-ethnic relations were also burdened by nationalist parties.

---

765 Ibid., 15.
766 Pond, 166.
trying to preserve ethnic homogeneity such as the Party of Democratic Action, the Croat Democratic Union, and the Serb Democratic Party. However, it should be noted that all three highly nationalistic parties were defeated in presidential elections in October 2006. In addition, while ethnic minorities no doubt still face discrimination in Bosnia, the message of unity coming from the Bosnian leadership is a very hopeful development.

Evidence even suggests that the parties which were highly nationalistic in the mid-1990s may no longer be so. On May 26, 2005, the Muslim Party of Democratic Action held its congress and reelected Sulejman Tihic as president. The SDA presented a new party profile at the congress, focusing on Europe and the Bosnian identity and expressing commitment to reforms, EU membership, and a strong international presence in Bosnia. There were no extremist chants, religious flag-waving, representations of the Islamic community, or hate speeches at the event. The SDA also showed a commitment to multiethnic candidate lists in the 2006 elections.

In fact, a number of events in 2006 displayed an increased ethnic tolerance among the Bosnian people. For the first time a Bosniak became the acting RS police chief. Additionally, the new Bosnian youth group Dosta, meaning “enough,” staged a concert of twenty bands to call for moving beyond the fixation on ethnic clashes to the real issue of jobs. This illustrates a shift among the Bosnian populous of focusing on other issues facing the country rather than obsessing over ethnic squabbles. Also in 2006, the film Grbavica was released. This film is about the plight of Muslim women raped by Serbs during the Bosnian War and
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won the Golden Bear prize for best picture at the 56th Berlin Film Festival. Cinemas in the Republika Srpska have been unable to show the film because the entity’s only film distributor withheld it on fears it could provoke unrest, but DVD copies of the film have sold well at street stalls in Banja Luka. One vendor reports that Grbavica is his best seller, and another admits that the DVD is sold primarily to Serbs.\textsuperscript{770} This development shows a real curiosity among Bosnian Serbs to learn about the crimes committed against other ethnic groups and therefore begin to accept that all Bosnians, regardless of their ethnicity, were victims in the war.

As always, a number of events in 2006 displayed nationalistic sentiment among the Bosnian population. On March 24, a local nationalist-oriented magazine gave Radovan Karadzic an award for his “lifetime literary work,” which includes plays, a political satire, and children’s books. The magazine described Karadzic, alleged participant in the Srebrenica massacre, as a “paradigm of a civilization which has lost its compass.” Karadzic’s brother Luka, who accepted the award on his behalf, said, “This is more proof that the Serbs are not traitors and remember their heroes who have done something good for their people.”\textsuperscript{771} In October several Muslim places of worship in the Republika Srpska were attacked on the Muslim holiday of Eid-ul-Fitr. A mosque in Visegrad was slightly damaged by stone-throwing youths on October 24, and a mosque in Prijedor, along with the house of an Imam, were stoned on October 23.\textsuperscript{772}

Perhaps the most disturbing development in 2006 involved Bosnian Serb leaders calling for the secession of the Republika Srpska from Bosnia. In the months before the new
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elections, Bosniak and Croat leaders came out in favor of abolishing the two Bosnian entities
and creating a centralized country. Serbs responded defensively, threatening to leave Bosnia
entirely if such a plan were put into effect. In the words of political analyst Slobodan
Vaskovic, “Serbs accept Bosnia only in one way and that is that within it there is Republika
Srpska.”
Bosnian Serb Prime Minister Milorad Dodik led the push toward organizing a
referendum on RS independence. Bosnian Serbs even signed an agreement on economic and
social cooperation with Serbia in September to show their commitment to remaining a Serb
entity and maintaining ethnically homogeneous ties. While this could be written off as
merely the ravings of another nationalist leader trying to incite fear for his own purposes, the
Bosnian Serb electorate showed support for this platform. In the 2006 elections, the Alliance
of Independent Social Democrats’ candidate Nebojsa Radmanovic won almost 55 percent of
the vote for the Serb presidential position after a campaign built on the secession
referendum.

While these recent developments certainly must not be ignored, they do not
necessarily indicate an impending break up of Bosnia. Not all Serbs support secession and
both the Federation, international community, and a number of leaders in the RS are
dedicated to keeping Bosnia as a single integrated state. The overall temperament of the
Bosnian population can be gauged by looking at the most recent returnee statistics, which
show that the situation is not ideal, but neither is Bosnia about to collapse. According to the
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as of October
31, 2006, a total of 442,687 refugees and 572,707 displaced people had returned to their pre-
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war homes in Bosnia. Statistics suggest that this figure still represents less than half of the 2.2 million refugees created by the war. The Federation has registered higher rates of return than the RS, with 387,608 refugee returns and 348,620 displaced person returns in comparison to Republika Srpska’s 53,115 refugee returns and 204,669 displaced person returns since January 1, 1996.775

In 2006, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation conducted an opinion poll in Bosnia regarding the situation of returnees in the country. The study found that more than 90 percent of returnees say their return was voluntary while 10 percent say their choice was initiated by authorities. Ninety-five percent of refugees who returned to Bosnia report returning to their pre-war homes. Forty-one percent of former refugees have received assistance after their return, with higher percentages in rural areas. Approximately 90 percent of respondents feel safe from violent threats based on inter-ethnic tensions, a truly remarkable and hopeful statistic. Twelve percent of returnees fear such threats, compared to 8 percent of domiciles. Around 80 percent of respondents believe that members of minority groups can pursue cultural and religious beliefs without facing problems. More than 70 percent of people believe that the rights and opportunities of people to shape their lives are not equally distributed, although non-minorities believe in this inequality more so than minorities do.776 This illustrates a very hopeful trend of majority ethnic groups supporting equal rights for minority groups.

The study goes on to reveal that 54 percent of minority respondents believe that they face discrimination in job seeking, and 26 percent believe they face discrimination in public services. However, only 8 percent of minority respondents in the RS and 3 percent of minority respondents in the Federation report personal experiences of discrimination. This suggests that while people perceive discrimination to exist, it is much less prevalent than they imagine. Similarly, more than 40 percent believe that election processes are not fair and correct, but less than 2 percent of respondents report being personally hampered in exercising electoral rights and political freedoms. In addition, more than 60 percent of respondents report regular and voluntary contacts with people of other ethnic backgrounds. There is no denying that ethnic tension, hostility, and discrimination still exist in Bosnia. However, it seems that tolerance and unity are beginning to take hold.

Before concluding the section, it is helpful to look at election results in Bosnia from Dayton to the present day in order to gauge the evolving opinions of the population. We will begin with the Bosniak presidency. In 1996, 1998, and 2002, the Bosniak president came from the Party of Democratic Action. This party was led by Muslim war-time leader Alija Izetbegovic. It called for the creation of an Islamic state in the 1970s, and has been dubbed “the party of the Muslim cultural historical circle.” However, in spite of its Muslim make-up it espouses the creation of a unitary Bosnia. The Party of Democratic Action won more than 80 percent of the Bosniak vote in 1996 and 1998, but in 2002 the SDA took only 37 percent of the vote with the Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina taking 35 percent.
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The latter party campaigned on the slogan “Bosnia without entities”\(^781\) and is dedicated to “reconstructing a multi-ethnic rather than nationalist state.”\(^782\) The strong support for the Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina shows a movement among Bosnian Muslims to support more moderate and unifying politicians.

In 2006, the Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina finally defeated the Party of Democratic Action in the race for the Bosniak presidency, receiving 62.1 and 28.1 percent of the vote respectively.\(^783\) The winning candidate Haris Silajdzic called for the abolition of the RS and Federation and the reunification of Bosnia. This may be interpreted either as a hopeful shift toward unity in Bosnia or a reintroduction of ethnic antagonism in the region, as this platform is in some ways a deliberate jab against the Serb community. The latter interpretation is supported by the fact that in 2006 the Party of Democratic Action highlighted its multi-ethnic and pluralist characteristics, rather than highlighting its exclusively Muslim background, and yet lost the elections by a significant margin.\(^784\) However, even if Silajdzic’s victory did represent the Muslim community’s attempt to anger Serbs, the over all trend of voting does support the gradual liberalization of this electorate.

For Bosnian Croats, presidential elections have consistently resulted in great majorities in favor of the Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia Herzegovina. This party is related to the Croatian Democratic Union of Croatia and is therefore highly nationalistic. It participated in declaring the Croatian republic of Herceg-Bosnia in 1993 and helped to create the Muslim-Croat Federation of present-day Bosnia. It was also was accused of violating the
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Dayton Accords in 2001 by asking for Croat self-administration. It is widely accepted that the HDZ of Bosnia is pursuing political separation of Croats in Bosnia and the group describes itself as “the only party which protects the rights of Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina.” The slightly less nationalist Economic Bloc for Progress Party won just over 17 percent of the vote in 2002, but the Croatian Democratic Union won by a strong margin and its success suggests a strong nationalist bent to Croats in Bosnia. However, in 2006, the Croatian Democratic Union was defeated by the Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which took 40.8 percent of the vote over the Croatian Democratic Union’s 25.1 percent. The Social Democratic Party is a multi-ethnic, anti-nationalist party whose victory indicates a shift away from the nationalism of the previous ten years and movement toward a more unitary mentality in the Bosnian Croat community.

The Bosnian Serb electorate consistently supported the Serb Democratic Party in presidential elections in the years following the war. The SDS is Karadzic’s party, a highly nationalist organization which purged its moderate elements and then nominated its leader for president even after he was indicted for war crimes. The SDS received 67 percent of the vote in 1996, but lost to the Socialist Party of the Serb Republic by a small margin in 1998. The Socialist Party of the Serb Republic is a social democratic party associated with those in Europe; its victory indicated a major change from the hard-line nationalists of the Serb Democratic Party. The Socialist Party of the Serb Republic was victorious yet again in 2002, winning 35 percent of the vote. However the Alliance of Independent Social Democrats (SNSD), an increasingly nationalist party, was close behind.
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victorious in 2006, bringing Sulejman Tihic to the presidency. As mentioned previously, in 2006 the SNSD campaigned with nationalist rhetoric and the promise of a referendum for RS secession from Bosnia. Although Bosnian Serbs removed the highly-nationalist Serb Democratic Party from office, their approval of the SNSD in 2006 suggests that this particular community may be experiencing a resurgence of nationalist sentiment.

To conclude this analysis, one must examine the elections for the Bosnian House of Representatives over the past ten years. In 1996 and 1998, elections for the House of Representatives were held separately for the Federation and the RS. The Federation elected the Party of Democratic Action and Croatian Democratic Union in 1996, the two most highly nationalistic parties of the Muslim and Croat communities respectively. Federation voters elected the Coalition for a Single and Democratic Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Croatian Democratic Union in 1998. Although the Party of Democratic Action was removed from power, the Coalition was still a primarily Bosniak party and the 1998 Federation elections showed a tendency among both Croats and Bosniaks to remain loyal to their ethnic group rather than voting for the entire Bosnian community. In the RS, the highly nationalistic Serb Democratic Party came out on top in 1996 and in 1998, although it lost some seats between the two elections.

In 2000 all Bosnians voted together for the House of Representatives. In this election, the Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina won the most seats. This party is a multi-ethnic, anti-nationalist organization which absorbed the former communist party and its success is a hopeful sign for future moves toward Bosnian unity. Close behind it were the Party of Democratic Action and the Serb Democratic Party, which of course are very nationalist organizations. In 2002, the Party of Democratic Action came out on top with the
Serb Democratic Party close behind, again showing nationalist sentiment. In 2006, the Party of Democratic Action and Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina were the top two finishers. This almost even split between nationalist parties and parties like the latter which support multi-ethnic unity, shows a move toward liberalism in the Bosnian electorate, but also illustrates that the country has much room for improvement.

**Conclusion**

On the whole, it can be concluded that Croatia has been most successful in its post-war transition toward liberalism, Serbia least successful, and Bosnia-Herzegovina somewhere in the middle. However, it seems that this ranking is more a reflection of the political challenges each nation has faced in the post-war period than it is of the ethnic sentiment of each population. Croatia has a relatively small Serb minority living within its borders, making ethnic violence less frequent and less threatening. Its leaders and people are fully supportive of the pursuit of EU membership, which is a goal that unifies the country behind liberal reforms. Serbia, on the other hand, dealt with violence and military engagements as late as 1999, meaning that it has had significantly less time to peacefully recover than either Croatia or Bosnia. Serbia also contains a huge variety of ethnic minorities, which cause problems beyond those deriving from the violence of the early 1990s. Especially in the wake of Milosevic, Serbia’s current state is entirely understandable, and in many respects the progress that the state has made is even more impressive given the additional challenges that it has faced. Bosnia has not dealt with additional violence, but it has been presented with the challenge of healing a multi-ethnic society in a way which Croatia has not. Bosnia has faced more obstacles than Croatia so that like Serbia, Bosnia’s
advancements and progress are remarkable given what it has had to deal with in the past eleven years.

It seems that in many ways analyzing post-conflict events is more helpful in understanding the violence of the 1990s than looking at events leading up to the wars. It is difficult to gauge the true opinions of the Balkan people under Tito; were they peaceful because of authoritarian threats or because of true ethnic harmony? In the 1980s, it is hard to know how much clout to give to nationalist sentiment. After all, many of the Yugoslav people were lost without Tito, the economy was in shambles and, like populations throughout history, people began turning toward leaders who incited resentment, told them who to blame, and gave them a purpose; this could be seen as ethnic hostility or just the natural reaction to an unstable situation. However, the developments in the former Yugoslavia over the past eleven years show a clearer picture of societies dealing with tragedy, moving beyond nationalistic leaders toward more tolerant futures, and coming to understand other ethnic groups and the suffering that all sides endured during the war. The situation in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia today is by no means perfect, but these countries have made remarkable progress in the past eleven years, suggesting that primordialist interpretations of the Croatian and Bosnian Wars must be reevaluated.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this chapter, one of the theories of ethnic conflict presented in chapter two will be selected as the most appropriate and helpful way to understand the Croatian and Bosnian wars. The choice of theory will be justified in terms of the general nature of modern conflict and in terms of the details surrounding the Yugoslav dissolution specifically. Seemingly contradictory events will be highlighted and explained in relation to the selected theory. The chapter will then explore the lessons to be learned from these conflicts, examining the ways in which these lessons can be applied to future outbreaks of violence in general and the current war in Iraq specifically.

The conclusions drawn from this study will not be clear-cut or indisputable. In fact, the unbiased design of this work will allow readers to go back to earlier chapters and construct an argument to challenge the one presented here. However, the study of political science is based on digesting and learning from historical events regardless of their complexity and this chapter will do just that. I do not maintain that the ideas presented here are the only logical ways to understand the wars of Yugoslav dissolution. However, after many months of thought and research, I firmly believe that the conclusions presented here accurately describe what happened in the Balkans and realistically set forth the proper way to apply the lessons of this conflict to other outbreaks of violence.

Can a Conflict Ever Be Truly Ethnic?

As a means of supporting this chapter’s choice of ethnic conflict theory, the first question to be posed deals with ethnic conflict as a broad concept. However, before delving into the issue at hand the definition of the term must be clarified. An ethnic conflict is one in which groups of people engage in violence because of mutual, deep-seated, and historical
hatreds for one another. To call a conflict ethnic implies that there are no strategic reasons for violence, or that such reasons exist but are incidental; the overriding motivation for violence is hatred for an entire ethnic group. A true ethnic conflict is one in which sides are divided neatly along ethnic lines. Violence is directed at members of the other ethnic group exclusively and people of one ethnicity do not have feelings of friendship or compassion for any individuals of the opposing ethnicity regardless of past experiences together.

In an ethnic conflict, the groups involved have a kind of natural and enduring hatred for one another based on ethnicity alone. The implication is that these groups always have and always will hate each other. Because hatred is the basis for violence, and this hatred is eternal, one ethnic conflict will inevitably lead to another violent incident in the future. The groups will never be able to peacefully coexist and violence will persist until they are separated by means of partition. Even then, the persistence of hatred means that there are no guarantees of peace. The notion of ethnic conflict thus sets forth a deterministic view of history that eliminates individual choice and free will. First of all, it implies that an individual of one ethnicity will naturally hate all people of another regardless of his own personality, thoughts, or experiences. Secondly, it suggests that no individual leaders, groups, democratic ideals, or reforms can ever change the course of history and stop ethnic violence from rearing its ugly head in the future.

In light of this definition, the question becomes: can a conflict ever truly be ethnic? By simply reading the previous chapters, it is clear that the Bosnian and Croatian wars do not satisfy these criteria. Croats, Serbs, and Muslims peacefully coexisted before and after the conflict, making it an example of temporary rather than enduring violence. Evidence suggests that even in the midst of war friendships existed between individuals of different ethnicities.
and soldiers were killing civilians of their own ethnicity. In many ways, the primary goals involved in the Croatian and Bosnian wars were strategic and therefore not driven by irrational anger and hatred.

The task in this section, however, is to examine ethnic conflict in more general terms. This thesis addresses the Balkans only and I do not claim expertise on any other regions. However, it seems clear that this question can be answered on a global scale simply by looking at the meaning and implications of the term ethnic conflict. Most, if not all, conflicts have a kind of strategic component at the heart of motivation for violence, whether it be a desire for territory, power, or even cultural dominance. Few conflicts create clean ethnic divisions, where the groups involved never intermingle and violence is used solely against people of the opposite ethnicity. In many instances, conflicts have occurred roughly along ethnic lines and have been followed by years of relative peace and no resurgence of violence. When defining ethnic conflict in these strict terms it is difficult to identify any conflict that fits these criteria.

It is my assertion, therefore, that a conflict can never truly be ethnic. This by no means suggests that ethnic divisions, histories, and resentments never play a role in violent encounters. Rather, my argument seeks to challenge the conventional understanding of incidents which have historically been characterized in such a way. Too often conflicts are written off as “ethnic” by people who do not understand the implications of this label and are not interested in grasping the intricacies of the feud in question. The term ethnic conflict is used to oversimplify and categorize violence in a way that is not helpful in explaining the problem or finding a solution. This study seeks to prove, among other things, that the term ethnic conflict is not useful; it implies a cut and dry reality that rarely if ever accurately
explains modern-day violence. As such, we must work toward building new frameworks with which to understand conflict, ensuring that any potential solutions capture the complexities and nuances involved in such violence in a fair and helpful manner.

**Elite Manipulation in the Balkans**

In light of these conclusions about conflict in general, I believe that the theory which most closely explains the Bosnian and Croatian wars is elite manipulation. Before explaining the relevance of elite manipulation, however, it is important to elucidate the ways in which the other theories presented are not helpful in understanding the Yugoslav wars. Primordialism sees violence within the framework of ethnic conflict, an understanding which is problematic for the reasons explained above. In my opinion, the strongest claim made by primordialists is that certain examples of extreme violence in Bosnia can be explained only by individual hatred. After all, propaganda can not force one man to murder another. However, the most extreme examples of war brutality in Yugoslavia, including rape camps and ethnic cleansing, can actually be understood in strategic rather than hateful terms as explained in chapter four. This makes primordialist claims largely irrelevant.

In some ways it is tempting to subscribe to moderate theory because it constructs a framework which can accommodate both events that seem ethnically motivated and those that do not. However, the same strategic explanation for rape camps and ethnic cleansing which undermines primordialism brings moderate theory into question as well. In a certain sense, moderate theory is a watered-down version of elite manipulation which seeks to cover all its bases by making room within elite manipulation for the existence of hateful acts. Yet if supposed acts of hatred can be explained using logic and reason, then the caveats of moderate
theory are no longer necessary and one can embrace the full-fledged elite manipulation argument instead.

In endorsing elite manipulation, rational choice theory and emotion theory become irrelevant as well. The theories of rational choice and emotion seek to explain a group’s motivation for violence while primordialism, moderate theory, and elite manipulation seek to explore the forces which created the group in the first place. This suggests that one theory from each grouping should be chosen to come to a coherent conclusion; if one asserted that elite manipulation explained group formation, he or she would then need to choose which theory explains group decision making. However, in reality both rational choice theory and emotion theory are constructed on the assumption that groups form of their own volition rather than due to outside forces. These theories assume that people choose to bond together to address certain personal concerns, whether those be concerns of emotion or strategic survival. Elite manipulation argues that people do not choose to join together but rather are unwillingly forced into group membership. As a result, groups can not be treated as one coherent unit at any point. For this reason, an endorsement of elite manipulation necessitates a rejection of both emotion theory and rational choice theory.

However, elite manipulation was not chosen as the best theory to describe the Yugoslav dissolution due to process of elimination. Rather, it was chosen because V.P. Gagnon’s elite manipulation argument fully explains and captures the reality of the Bosnian and Croatian wars. Before delving in to the details of Yugoslav history and experience as they relate to elite manipulation, a short over view of Gagnon’s theory will be presented. For those who are interested, a more detailed account of Gagnon’s theory can be found in chapter two.
Gagnon argues that ethnic hatred and resentment do not exist prior to elite interference. A majority of people must be identifiable members of an ethnic group for elites to use this as a means of mobilization but this need not even be their primary identity prior to conflict. Gagnon believes that when power-seeking elites see an opportunity, they begin to shift the focus of political debate toward areas in which the population feels threatened. This causes people to feel as though they need said leaders for protection.\textsuperscript{789} Rather than ethnic hatred and distrust leading to a security dilemma between groups, Gagnon argues that elites fabricate the security dilemma by inciting fear through violence, and only then do ethnic divisions begin to form.\textsuperscript{790} Elites often give media coverage and weapons to small extremist groups to shift popular perception, making people believe the threat is larger than it is and changing the societal ideology so that what was unacceptably racist in the past becomes moderate in the present. Although the violence associated with these polarizing policies is directed against people of the opposing ethnic group, Gagnon argues that such violent policies are initiated for their desired effect on the home population. As people become more fearful of being victims of violence themselves, they bind together into a homogeneous whole in support of the leader.\textsuperscript{791}

Gagnon argues that in reality, ethnic relations and identities are highly complex. For example, to call oneself a Serb may mean one thing to a Bosnian Serb and another to a Serbian Serb; it may mean something else to an urban Serb and have an entirely different
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meaning for a rural Serb.\textsuperscript{792} No ethnicity has a single identity or meaning attached to it at any one time. It is therefore impossible for elites to mobilize people by tapping into their actual ethnic identities because individual understandings of ethnicity are highly variable and would not lend themselves to the homogenization of the ethnic group. Instead, elites use violence to destroy actual ethnic ties and replace those complex understandings with more simple and absolute ones. As a result, the ethnic identities which are the basis for massive violence are actually elite constructs. However, even as elites create ethnic divisions, they do not allow themselves to be restricted by these precise divisions. The goal for such leaders is political rather than ethnic homogeneity. As a result, areas which were already ethnically homogenous are targeted for violence and elites seek to remove dissidents regardless of their ethnicity.\textsuperscript{793}

Violence is used to make the concepts of ethnic bonding and homogeneity a reality, bringing people together out of fear. Bonds and communities which deny the existence of ethnic division are targeted for destruction. Gagnon argues that in spite of these efforts, elites can only affect how people see what is going on “out there” but can not change how people see their communities and their own personal experience.\textsuperscript{794} However, Gagnon does not deny that a great deal of hateful violence occurred in the former Yugoslavia. Consistent with the arguments of Tim Judah and Michael Ignatieff explored in chapter four, Gagnon would argue that elites were unable to convince people to hate their neighbors using rhetoric alone, but when people were directly victimized some became angry and vengeful. People did not fear their friends and neighbors until they had personal experience with violence and saw with their own eyes that individuals were brutalizing them because of ethnicity. Only after elites created a security dilemma through fear, destroyed ethnic ties and reconstructed them in
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exclusive ways, and began to directly alter people’s lives by inciting violence and encouraging hatred did people begin to behave in ways that could be seen as consistent with an ethnic conflict.

**Applying Gagnon’s Theory to Yugoslav History**

To illustrate the relevance of elite manipulation, Gagnon’s thoughts will be explained and supported through a high-level review of Balkan history. I will try to highlight events which otherwise seem inconsistent with elite manipulation theory in an attempt to support it further. This review will begin by examining Serbia’s early experience with statehood. For some, Serbia’s history as an independent state which in the twelfth century ruled and in the nineteenth and early twentieth coveted Bosnia is evidence of historical hatred in the region. However, it is important to note that Serbia wanted to control Bosnia for the strategic reason of gaining water access and economic independence rather than due to a sense of ethnic hatred. Furthermore, Bosnia contains ethnic Serbs as well as Croats and Muslims, so the Serb desire to rule this territory did not come from an urge to subjugate supposedly inferior ethnic groups but simply to gain more power.

Serbia’s eagerness to dominate the other states in the Balkans came from rational rather than emotional considerations as well. When Serbia had its own empire in the twelfth century, it controlled much of the region. After several centuries under Ottoman rule, Serbia secured de facto independence in 1826 and proceeded to fight and win both Balkan Wars, bringing an empire to its knees and doubling its own population. When the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was formed after World War I, Serbia sought to dominate the federation, not because of feelings of superiority or hatred towards other ethnic groups but because it felt that it had earned the right to do so. After all, Serbia had the most experience
and power of any of the nations involved. In the same way, Croats and Slovenes were resistant to Serb domination not because of ethnic hatred but due to their leaders’ desire to exert power in the Kingdom and a fear among citizens that their concerns would be ignored in a Serb-dominated entity. These tensions no doubt existed in the years leading up to World War II but were both strategic and very common between groups competing for power; such tensions can not be seen as in any way prefiguring the great violence of the war.

The events of World War II are historically very important in the Balkans and are an example of overwhelming hatred and brutality. This hatred began with the Ustashe regime of the Independent State of Croatia, a Nazi organization supported by Mussolini which was by all accounts unexpectedly fanatical and extreme. While accounts show that some Croats supported the Ustashe government, the population did not put the Ustashe in power and the great majority of Croats were disgusted by their tactics. There is no doubt that the individuals involved in the Ustashe were hateful and angry people, but this does not mean that their opinions or actions represented those of all Croats. While Hitler and the Nazi party were incredibly destructive and hateful, their existence is not used as evidence that all Germans always have and always will hate all Jews. Just as people attribute guilt for the Holocaust to the individual Nazi soldiers involved rather than the whole of the German people, so too should the guilt of the Ustashe terror be seen to rest on the shoulders of the individuals who perpetrated it rather than those they claimed to represent. The Serb Chetniks must be viewed in the same way; the horrific actions of a few can not be translated into the culpability of many. Neither the Ustashe nor the Chetniks accurately represented the sentiment of their corresponding ethnic groups. The violence of World War II should be seen not as yet another
chapter in the history of hatred between these groups but rather an aberration, a time of extreme violence which was inconsistent with the events which came before and after it.

Although in some ways Tito ushered in an era of peace after World War II, scholars often argue over what kind of effect Tito’s rule really had on the region. For instance, recall that Norman Naimark presents two possible explanations for the influence of Tito. The first is the freezer model, which praises Tito for holding separatist strivings in check and forcing inhabitants of the region to be Yugoslavs. The second model is the incubator model, which argues that Tito’s attempt to maintain a balance between nationalities ended up antagonizing all of them and exacerbating resentments. However, both of these models assume that when Tito died in 1980 great ethnic hatred existed in the region. Instead, I would argue that while Tito’s Yugoslavia had its share of ethnic uprising and violence, for the most part the sentiment among Yugoslav people was one of genuine peace and cooperation. In Bosnia in particular, areas were highly integrated and many people had friends, neighbors, and even spouses of a different ethnicity than themselves.

Problems arose primarily because of the same strategic concerns which plagued the region before Tito. While the ethnic groups of Yugoslavia were relatively tolerant of one another, the leadership of each entity retained nationalist sentiments, not because of ethnic hatred but due to their own desire for power. Serb leaders insisted that they had earned the right to rule over the entire region and Croat and Slovene leaders were determined not to be overrun by the dominant Serbs. Certainly the populations themselves were involved in these debates, especially in the Croatian language protests of the late 1960s, but it can be argued that their interest was peaked out of fear of being culturally dominated rather than out of
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hatred. National leaders, in fact, probably could have easily subdued such protests and concerns but chose instead to exacerbate them for personal gain.

In many ways, Tito’s policies also served to exacerbate such concerns rather than assuage them. For example, if a Serb was arrested and put to death for a crime under Tito, a Croat would be found and given the same punishment regardless of guilt in order to keep things “fair.” Of course, such policies led to ethnic resentment, as did policies of cracking down on protestors rather than addressing their concerns. Even more problematic was Tito’s division of Yugoslavia in such a way as to breed resentment between ethnic groups. Some view the period of Tito’s rule as the most peaceful time that Yugoslavia could hope to experience, and therefore see the incidents of ethnic resentment under Tito as indicative of an unavoidable hatred existing below the surface. However, I believe that the small number of ethnic incidents under Tito show the relative lack of ethnic hatred among the population. With Tito antagonizing ethnic groups, haphazardly dividing the country, and implementing policies of repression and misguided ethnic balance, and with ethnic leaders exacerbating strategic power and cultural concerns, it is a wonder that more nationalist protests did not occur in this period. From this perspective, the events of unrest under Tito show a very low level of ethnic hatred among the population in spite of many factors which could have contributed to extensive violence among a more hate-filled populous.

However, in the years following Tito’s death the country found itself in a more precarious position. As a communist country in the 1980s, Yugoslavia dealt with severe economic stagnation. When new and ineffectual leaders came to power in Tito’s wake, borrowing more and more money to pay off old debt, the economic situation worsened. People were unemployed and angry, faced with a weak state that was too incompetent to
address their problems. This is the classic situation in which people become “true believers,” looking for a charismatic leader who will offer them a cause to fight for and scapegoats to blame their problems on. Slobodan Milosevic fit this role perfectly. Thus the growing ethnic resentment in the Balkans during the 1980s can be explained not by actual ethnic hatred but the existence of a vulnerable and resentful population faced with a power-hungry nationalist leader. Many people in Yugoslavia felt no such resentment during this time period and often times those who chose to follow Milosevic did so for the same reasons that many Germans chose to follow Hitler: not due to pre-existing ethnic or religious hatred but because individuals were looking for a cause to fight for and someone to blame for their problems.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Milosevic saw the perfect opportunity to shift the public’s focus away from economic and social concerns to issues of ethnic fear and resentment. While people did not always primarily identify themselves by ethnicity prior to the 1980s, these identifications were still salient enough for people to know what side they fell on and therefore who they should fear. Suddenly, ethnicity was the only form of identity available to individuals, and other means of identification became obsolete. By creating hard ethnic divisions and inciting fear through propaganda and reminders about past violence, elites constructed a security dilemma in Yugoslavia and the population reacted with predictable fear, distrust, and eventually violence.

When violence began first in Croatia and then in Bosnia, it served not only to eliminate and frighten dissidents, those who would not submit to Milosevic’s rule, but also to solidify Serb identifications with their own ethnic group as they became more convinced that they needed the group for protection. People were not convinced that their ethnically distinct neighbors were the enemy, but they watched the news and saw the violence occurring “out
As more horrible incidents occurred, people became more fearful for their own safety. Governments were not providing people with protection. If, for example, Serbs had just massacred Muslims in a different city, why should Muslims trust their Serb neighbors? Fear became pervasive and as people started breaking off by ethnicity to protect themselves, violence became even more prevalent. If one group feared that the other posed a threat and would attempt to hurt them, they would often act first in an act of preemption. Soon, the ethnic divisions that elites had claimed were there from the start actually began to form.

One major argument against elite manipulation theory is that the degree of violence and brutality exhibited during the war can only be explained by personal hatred against an ethnic group. However, it must be remembered that the paramilitaries involved in fighting these wars in no way encompassed all of the region’s population. Desertion and draft dodging were a huge problem, so many of those who actually fought were hostile, aggressive, and deviant individuals before the war and simply used the conflict as an opportunity to play out sadistic desires or curiosities. Reports show that soldiers were often drunk while perpetrating atrocities. Some individuals entered the war without real ethnic resentments but saw the actions of enemy soldiers against innocent civilians and became wild with rage, vowing to take revenge and doing so in horrible ways against other innocent individuals. This, of course, simply perpetuated the cycle, angering individuals on the opposing side and motivating them to engage in vicious acts as well. In this way, it is easy to see how the actions of a few sick individuals, when seen to represent an entire ethnic group, can lead to growing hostility and anger among people who previously had no real resentments at all.
The systematic rape and impregnation of Muslim women by Serb soldiers is often cited as a particularly horrific part of the war. However, after looking at the Serb culture’s treatment of women and belief that wars could be won by producing children more rapidly than the enemy, it becomes clear how such a policy could have strategic basis. The individuals who actually perpetrated such acts must of course have either been sadistic to begin with or seeking revenge, as explained above. However, the pervasiveness of rape and insistence that women carry their children to term does have a strategic explanation and therefore can not by itself prove that ethnic hatred motivated such actions.

Horrific things happen during wartime regardless of the motivation for fighting; think of the events in Vietnam, a conflict which has never been viewed as ethnic. In addition, the culture and history of the groups involved in Bosnia dictated a more brutal type of war. Many believed that they could defeat the enemy by having more children, and that by harassing innocent civilians they could drive the enemy off desired territory. These techniques do have a military logic, just one that is difficult to see at first glance. Furthermore, the elites involved in this conflict had a strong incentive to encourage horrific brutality. By motivating people to commit atrocities, elites could scare the population into following extremist leaders and convince individuals that they were in danger and needed to cling to their ethnic group for protection. There are many ways to explain the brutality of these wars without categorizing them as ethnic in nature.

Regardless of the motivation for violence, the Bosnian and Croatian wars were brutal conflicts and the people involved were not able to bounce back from them quickly. Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic remained in power until 1999 and 2000 respectively, and the Bosnian electorate voted divisive and nationalist parties into power in 1996. However, all
countries have made great strides toward more tolerant governments and societies, encouraging the return of refugees and granting minority rights and representation. Incidents of ethnic violence still occur in all three countries with varying frequency. After such a brutal war, it is expected that just as people became resentful and sought revenge during the war, some will continue to do so even after war is over.

Most importantly, however, the governments of these countries remain committed to reform and are working to encourage a tolerant society. The anger and divisiveness of some can not be understood to represent the opinions of all, and the positive steps being made by these countries reinforce the notion that the violence of the early 1990s was motivated by elite manipulation and fear rather than by enduring hatred. These countries still have many improvements to make, but their progress has been remarkable in only eleven years. It appears that the majority of the Balkan people are moving beyond this horrible chapter in their lives rather than clinging to feelings of hatred and resentment, as would be expected if the Croatian and Bosnian wars were truly ethnic conflicts.

**Lessons of the Yugoslav Conflict**

The framework of elite manipulation theory assists not only in understanding the Bosnian and Croatian wars but also in conceptualizing the lessons to be learned from the Yugoslav violence and the ways those lessons can be applied to conflict prevention and resolution more generally. The elite manipulation framework illustrates that groups in situations similar to that of Yugoslavia are not inevitably rushing toward violence but rather are being carefully led there by power-hungry elites. This means that conflict can be prevented by taking elites out of the picture or alleviating societal problems which allow such elites to gain power. However, the example of Yugoslavia also illustrates that once elite-led
violence begins, the hatred described through propaganda and other means becomes a reality due to fear, resentment, and desire for revenge. These conflicts remain brutal and difficult to recover from despite the fact that they are not originally motivated by hatred. Thus, while violence can be stopped in its early stages, the case of Yugoslavia illustrates that once the situation progresses and fear becomes internalized in the population, there is no turning back.

Although prevention is possible, it requires considerable foresight and commitment. In Yugoslavia, ethnic resentment began to bubble up because of the confusion between strategic national goals and the goals of ethnic groups. The Serbian nation sought to dominate the federation out of strategic power concerns, but this domination was often viewed through an ethnic lens. Croatia became concerned for its cultural survival in a similarly strategic manner, but this too was understood in ethnic terms. Leaders were able to portray strategic goals as ethnic division and therefore drum up fear and encourage people to divide themselves along ethnic lines. One method of prevention, therefore, would involve clearly delineating between strategic national goals and those of ethnic groups crossing over national boundaries. In emphasizing and maintaining this distinction, it would be more difficult for leaders to use such events for their own purposes.

More specifically, prevention would involve keeping an eye on societies with growing economic, social, and political upheaval and trying to prevent the rise of antagonistic national leaders before they incite too much fear in the population. Although Michael Brown’s moderate theory is not endorsed in this study, the four problems he identifies as being central to ethnic conflict do in fact match up with the conditions that allow nationalist leaders to take control. Structural problems include weak states and security concerns, political problems include discriminatory laws and exclusionary national
ideologies, economic problems include issues of economic development and discrimination, and cultural problems include ethnic discrimination. International leaders can look to these general problem areas for signs that conditions are ripening for the rise of a manipulative nationalist leader. This asks a great deal of world leaders, as it is impossible to monitor domestic politics all over the world at all times, but this is an important and reliable way to predict future violence.

The case of Yugoslavia is also helpful in presenting a model for recovery from brutal war. Although the region still has its fair share of problems, it has moved remarkably quickly toward moderate and reform-minded leadership. This has in large part been due to the region’s desire to join the European Union. This desire is particularly strong in Croatia, where people have long felt a stronger affinity to Western Europe than to the Balkans. On September 22, 2006, Croatian President Stjepan Mesic spoke to this point at the John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum at Harvard University.

Today there is openness to the world and also awareness that we are a part of the world, of Europe in the first place. We need Europe and this is the reason why we want to become a member of the European Union. At the same time, however, we are aware that Europe needs us too, not only Croatia but all the countries of the region as well. Simply, the European integration project would not be complete and finished without us.

Furthermore, in 2004 former Bosnian prime minister Haris Silajdžic stated, “Now that we have put roofs back over most of the houses, we need to put a European roof over Bosnia.”

Without a doubt there are people in the Balkans today who are not interested in joining the EU, most notably those in the Republika Srpska region of Bosnia. However, an ever-

growing number of Balkan leaders and citizens are expressing a strong and open desire to attain EU membership.

This drive for EU membership is important because of the organization’s reform requirements prior to entry. In many ways the EU allows leaders with moderate and reform-minded policies to appear less threatening to a population which remains frightened and defensive after war. In another situation, a leader who grants extensive minority rights and preaches equality may appear so threatening to those harboring war resentment that efforts would be made to remove said politician. However, EU demands for reform prior to entry both encourage leaders to take this path and allow them to assuage a fearful population with the reassurance that reforms are being made because the EU requires them. In this sense, the EU makes reform a less dangerous path for leaders to pursue by simultaneously giving them a reason to push their populations toward tolerant policies more quickly and allowing elites to place blame for any unwanted repercussions of reforms on the EU. Croatia is much more dedicated to EU membership than either Bosnia or Serbia, and it is no coincidence that Croatia has made the greatest strides toward reform and equality.

Some may argue that if these states are introducing reforms to please the EU rather than because they believe in equality, such moderate politics are not an indication of tolerant views of the population. However, to a certain extent, the motivations for reform are irrelevant. Leaders may espouse integration and equality because they want to be welcomed into Europe, but their populations accept such statements without dissent. Children all over the country see their leaders advocating equality and are starting to learn such lessons in school as well. People may begin by accepting elite reforms for the sake of the EU, but by the time such reforms are enacted an atmosphere of tolerance in speech and in deed will have
been created and the society, regardless of its initial motivations, will be transformed. In this way, the EU acts as a catalyst for moderate politics to blossom even in the wake of great violence.

While opponents of modernization theory prove that the modern world in many ways makes conflict between ethnic groups more likely, the case of Yugoslavia illustrates the ways in which inventions of modernity like the EU can actually help to heal these conflicts. Some will no doubt argue that not all countries have a desire to join the EU, thus making the organization’s reform requirements inconsequential. However, as more countries are permitted to join the EU, the Balkan states being a prime example, those nations which are currently uninterested in membership may have an incentive to join or simply attain the approval of the international community in a similar way. While scholars often bemoan the ineffectiveness of the international community in improving other countries’ domestic problems, the EU has found a way to provide incentives for reform without forcing change on unwilling populations. The Balkan states are a prime example of the potential benefits of encouraging post-conflict states to seek EU membership.

**Yugoslavia’s Relevance to Iraq**

While the Yugoslav violence of the early 1990s can provide policymakers with general guidelines regarding conflict prevention and resolution, Bosnia’s experience can also be applied more concretely to the case of the current war in Iraq. The fact that this comparison can be made in spite of a number of differences between the two situations suggests that the Yugoslav conflict can and will be helpful in resolving other specific conflicts in the future. In this sense, the comparison between Bosnia and Iraq illustrates the broader relevance of the Yugoslav violence for conflicts throughout the world.
Before detailing the ways in which Bosnia’s experience can be applied in Iraq, it is important to get a sense of Iraq’s history and situation. As in Bosnia, Iraq’s population consists of three major groups: the Sunni Muslims, the Shiite Muslims, and the Kurds. From the sixteenth century to the fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War I, Iraq was governed by the Turks. In 1920, the British took over Iraq in an attempt to alleviate the power vacuum left by the Ottomans. The British, however, only stayed long enough to put the Sunni Muslims in control of the Iraq government; the Sunnis were the dominant group in Iraq for the better part of a century.

When US troops entered Iraq in March of 2003, the primary threats to US soldiers were the Sunni-led insurgency and violent acts of foreign terrorists. However, since the initial entry of US troops, the Iraq conflict has evolved into a different type of challenge. For the first time in nearly one hundred years, the Shiites are in control of the Iraq government. This change has led to great sectarian violence, and today feuds between the Sunni, Shiite, and Kurd populations of Iraq are leading to more deaths and destabilization than the Sunni insurgency ever did. This violence, which can only be described as ethnic cleansing, is ripping Iraq apart and has already led to the exodus of millions of Iraqi people and a growing problem with refugees.

In some ways, there are great similarities between the situation facing Bosnia in the early 1990s and that which faces Iraq today. Lieutenant Colonel Patrick Donahoe, a US army officer who served as an army captain on a peacekeeping mission in the former Yugoslavia and is now stationed in Iraq, recently noted, “You talk to people [in Iraq] and it’s literally the
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same conversations I heard in Bosnia.” Colonel Donahoe’s observation makes sense due to a number of similarities between the Iraqi and Bosnian experience.

As in Bosnia, the three communities of Iraq were deeply integrated prior to violence, with high rates of intermarriage between Shiites and Sunnis. Today, this past cooperation seems to be forgotten, and the three groups are making great efforts to separate themselves. Elders in Hamiya, a Shiite sub-district of the predominantly Sunni city Jurf as-Sakhr, now want to secede from the area despite the fact that Hamiya has been part of the city for decades. This is reminiscent of the events in Bosnia in 2001 when Croat inhabitants of Maglaj asked to be separated from their Muslim municipality and merged with the predominantly Croat municipality Zepce. In this sense, Bosnia’s unique situation of individuals fighting their former friends and neighbors is also seen today in Iraq. Furthermore, both Bosnia and Iraq pose the same challenge to international leaders: that of building a democracy in a country deeply divided by ethnic cleavage which has limited prior experience with this system of government. Nicholas Bonsor points out that in both Iraq and Bosnia, peacemakers face guerrilla war tactics and terrorist activities, tribal and ethnic hostilities, and the need to rebuild both the physical infrastructure and the political system after a major conflict.

In spite of these similarities, there are important differences between the situation in Bosnia and that in Iraq. For starters, the Iraq conflict exists on a much larger scale; Iraq is eight times the size and has six times the population of Bosnia. The US furnished only fifteen
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percent of the troops and funding in Bosnia, and spent $21 billion between 1992 and 2000. Today, the US spends the same amount on just one year of activity in Iraq.\textsuperscript{806} The circumstances surrounding international intervention in the two conflicts are also quite different. The occupation of Bosnia was carried out under UN auspices by multinational forces executing a treaty negotiated by the Bosnian people themselves; the Iraq invasion was overwhelmingly American and unwanted. As a result, Bosnia had more international and domestic legitimacy to its occupation. International troops also made a long-term commitment to see the occupation through to the establishment of a stable, peaceful, and multi-ethnic government in Bosnia rather than trying to get out as quickly as possible.\textsuperscript{807} Foreign troops entered Bosnia when the country was unstable and in need of assistance, but troops entered Iraq when the country was already stable. Furthermore, Balkan citizens had a more European outlook and culture than occupants of Iraq, making them more welcoming to such troops.\textsuperscript{808}

In spite of the differences between Iraq and Bosnia, the two conflicts have enough in common for the lessons of Bosnia to be applied in Iraq. The link between the two situations is far from perfect, but this fact simply shows how the violence of the former Yugoslavia has broad relevance today, even for conflicts that are different from the Balkan situation in distinct ways. One of the benefits of hindsight is that Bosnia provides an example of both things to emulate and avoid in Iraq. Dayton led to eleven years of peace in Bosnia but it also had its problems; the Accords institutionalized ethnic division and therefore initially resulted in stalemate. To review, Dayton established the House of Peoples, a legislative body

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{807} Bellin, 600.
\textsuperscript{808} Bonsor, 132.
consisting of five Muslims, five Croats, and five Serbs. The criterion for membership in this body is purely ethnic, as is the criterion for the three member Bosnian presidency. Such restrictions solidify ethnic divisions and encourage people to think along these lines.

Furthermore, this arrangement excludes ethnic minorities from both the House of Peoples and the presidency. The presidency also excludes Croats and Muslims from the RS, Serbs from the Federation, and children of mixed marriages. In many ways, such arrangements serve as obstacles to unity which should be avoided in Iraq whenever possible.

Bosnian experience also shows that rigidly dividing government officials and then asking them to use compromise as a decision-making tool leads only to stalemate. Recall the great disagreements between the three members of the Bosnian presidency after 1996 elections brought candidates from the three nationalist parties into power. As a result, John Lampe argues that Bosnia’s experience of executive stalemate and legislative inaction should stand as a cautionary tale for Iraq to avoid ethnic quotas for representation at every possible turn. Bosnia survived relatively unscathed, but Iraq could experience a more profound and problematic stalemate than Bosnia did, and this situation should therefore be avoided.

Furthermore, Bosnia’s failure to achieve peace with the Vance Owen Plan in 1993 can also provide leaders with guidelines for avoiding such problems in Iraq. Many scholars argue that the Vance Owen Plan was a satisfactory option for peace but that it ultimately failed to end the conflict because the combatants were not yet prepared to compromise. Each group still believed that if it kept on fighting, it could reach its ultimate goal and avoid compromise altogether. This experience shows leader that the first step toward peace in Iraq is not developing a comprehensive peace plan but rather helping each group to see that compromise is inevitable. No matter how equitable a peace treaty may be, the case of Bosnia
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illustrates that groups will not accept its terms unless they have already accepted that some sacrifices will have to be made.

Luckily, it appears that the Sunnis, Shiites, and Kurds of Iraq have already begun to come to this realization. The Shiites originally wanted complete power of the Iraq government but now realize that they can rule only with Sunni approval because they are not powerful enough to defeat a Sunni insurrection. The Sunnis were previously fighting for a strong central government because they believed that they would retake power and thus control the country. However, they now see that the greatest danger to their interests would be a highly centralized Shiite-run state and thus are more apt to agree to a federalist system. The Kurds wanted to consolidate the autonomy that they have built up over the past fifteen years by breaking away from Iraq, but they now see that they require a united Iraq as protection from the Turks.\footnote{Joseph R. Biden, “Breathing Room: Stepping Back to Move Forward in Iraq,” The National Interest, Vol. 85 (September/October 2006), 37.} It seems then, that all three groups are coming to realize that compromise is inevitable. The war in Bosnia illustrates that this is an important step toward brokering a peace arrangement, and that it is only by emphasizing these budding moves toward compromise that cooperation will become possible in Iraq.

As Iraqis begin to face the inevitability of compromise, the question becomes: what type of peace arrangement should be implemented in Iraq? Again, Bosnia provides a helpful example. While many endorse Iraq unity, the great sectarian violence and ethnic divisions in the country suggest that such a plan can not be feasibly implemented. “The Iraqis talk about national unity but their behavior suggests they want decentralization.”\footnote{Brooks.} Bosnia faced a similar challenge; when the time came for compromise, the country had to reconcile present ethnic division with future goals of unity. In Bosnia, this challenge was solved with the
Dayton Accords, suggesting that a similar plan could serve useful in Iraq as well. Such an arrangement would “create a central government with a few key powers, reinforce strong regional governments, and separate the sectarian groups as much as possible.” The Iraqi constitution already gives the provinces the power to have their own security services, send ambassadors to foreign countries, and join together to form regions, so the decentralization of a soft partition agreement would not be a huge change in Iraq.

The main objection to soft partition in Iraq is that the Sunni and Shiite populations are too intermingled in Baghdad and elsewhere to truly separate. However, the Iraq population has become much more homogeneous since the start of violence, so while mixed communities remain, much of the country is already divided by ethnicity. Furthermore, the experience in Bosnia illustrates that soft partition can be achieved without creating ethnically exclusive regions. Serbs live in the Federation just as Croats and Muslims live in the RS. Still, the desired effect remains: each group feels they have a government which represents and protects them, regardless of where in Bosnia they choose to live. For this reason, integrated populations in Iraq would not have to be separated for a Dayton-like arrangement to work, and in fact such integration would be encouraged as a step toward eventual unity.

However, it remains important for policy makers to face the reality of mixed communities; Bosnia’s experience with this issue must also be applied in Iraq. Integrated areas must be monitored and protected by international peacekeepers not only as a precaution in case violence gets out of control, but also simply to keep people feeling safe in their own homes. Recall that in 2002, when the UN announced that SFOR troops in Bosnia would be reduced from 19,000 to 12,000, Bosnian Muslims in Voljevica said that if the troops left,
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they would leave as well. This, along with other experiences where minority returns did not
begin in earnest in Bosnia until international troops were present, show the importance of
such protection in mixed areas. Iraqis must be confident that those who cooperate with the
allies will be fully protected and that they will remain safe in their homes.

In addition to providing peacekeeping troops, the international community must be
prepared to get involved in Iraq in other ways. While the prospect of future EU membership
has had great and positive effects on the Balkan region, any comparison between Bosnia and
Iraq “cannot, of course, include a conceivable path to EU membership for Iraq.” However,
Bosnia’s experience with the international community has extended beyond a Stabilization
and Association Agreement with the EU. In fact, much of Bosnia’s progress has been due to
international groups working to improve the situation in the country. Recall that the United
Nations organization UNPROFOR regulated fighting during the war, while the
Implementation Force and Stabilization Force worked to maintain peace in its wake. A
number of international groups have put great efforts toward bringing peace and tolerance to
Bosnian society. Such groups include the United Nations, the European Union, the
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the North Atlantic Treaty
Organization, and the Peace Implementation Council, as well as the Office of the High
Representative. Bosnia provides a shining example of the potential benefits of international
cooperation and the ways in which similar success can be achieved in Iraq.

The experience of Bosnia illustrates the importance not just of international
involvement in general but of multi-lateral cooperation more specifically. This suggests that
part of resolving the Iraq conflict will require the participation of more countries than are
currently involved. “The largest post-intervention lesson [the case of Bosnia] offers is that
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the United States and its international partners can work effectively together once they are
together. America will need more partners than it has in Iraq now. As a result, the case of
Bosnia reveals that the US exit strategy in Iraq must instead become a transition strategy,
aiming to hand power over to a more multi-lateral force that can ease Iraq into a peaceful
future and get it back on its feet slowly. As in Bosnia, international forces must become
involved in Iraq with a long-term agenda of facilitating peace and tolerance for years to
come, rather than one that involves leaving as soon as the violence itself is brought to an end.

Conclusion

A thorough examination of the Croatian and Bosnian wars serves not only to facilitate
a greater understanding of the region and its people but also to draw conclusions about
conflict in general. The violence in Yugoslavia illustrates that conflicts can never be purely
ethnic in nature, even if an ethnic component is present. This mandates more careful and
thorough examinations of the true motivations for conflict and will hopefully lead to more
thoughtful solutions to problems presented in the future. The wars of Yugoslav dissolution
can be explained by elite manipulation not simply because other theories are inadequate, but
because elite manipulation captures certain truths about the Balkans’ past and people which
other theories tend to ignore.

It is important to study the Balkan conflicts of the early 1990s not just in order to
understand the region itself but to understand future conflicts. Abstract lessons can be
derived from the Yugoslav experience, such as the importance of alleviating domestic
problems before they get out of hand and appreciating the power of EU membership
standards in post-conflict recovery. The lessons of the Croatian and Bosnian wars can also be
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applied to individual conflicts more specifically, as exemplified by the application of the Bosnian conflict to the current situation in Iraq. An understanding of the Balkan violence is important in understanding the region, conceptualizing conflict more generally, and dealing with the prevention and resolution of specific conflicts in the present and future.

The most important lesson to be derived from the Yugoslav experience is simply never to develop uninformed assumptions about the causes or circumstances surrounding a violent conflict. The motivation for violence is rarely simple and straight-forward, and to accept such an explanation at face value without investigating the situation for oneself is to short-change the fears and grievances of the perpetrators and cheapen the lives of the victims. The Bosnian and Croatian wars ultimately illustrate that things are not always as they seem and to assume otherwise is inaccurate, unfair, and potentially dangerous.
Historical Timeline

576: Slavic people begin migrating to the Balkans.

1051: The Serbian Empire officially comes into being when its first monarch is brought to power.

1371: The Serbs are defeated by the Ottomans at the Battle of Marica.

1389: The Serbian Empire is officially taken over by the Ottoman Turks at the Battle of Kosovo.

1463: Bosnia is absorbed by the Ottoman Empire.

1826: The Treaty of Akkerman establishes Serbian de facto independence from the Ottoman Empire.

1876: Serbia and Montenegro declare war against the Ottoman Empire.

1877: Serbia and Montenegro are defeated.

1878: Bosnia-Herzegovina is officially occupied by the Austrian-Hungarian Empire.

1908: Austria-Hungary formally annexes Bosnia-Herzegovina.

1912: The First Balkan War begins when Montenegro launches an attack on the Ottoman Empire.

1913: The Balkan states are victorious against the Ottoman Empire, and peace is established by the Treaty of London. Discontent over the details of this arrangement leads to the Second Balkan War, in which Bulgaria suffers a great defeat at the hands of Serbia and Greece.

1914: Archduke Ferdinand is assassinated by an ethnic Serb. Austria-Hungary declares war on Serbia one month later.

1915: Serbia is invaded and occupied by Austria-Hungary and Bulgaria.

1918: World War I is concluded by the Treaty of Paris and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes is officially created.

1921: The Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes creates its first constitution.

1928: The shooting of five Croatian Peasant Party delegates in the parliament leads to riots in Zagreb. Alexander responds by installing a personal dictatorship and renaming the Kingdom Yugoslavia.
1929: Croat leader Ante Pavelic leaves Yugoslavia due to Alexander’s repressive tactics and takes initial steps in the creation of the Ustashe with the help of Mussolini.

1933: Hitler comes to power in Germany.

1934: Alexander is assassinated and Prince Regent Paul assumes the leadership of Yugoslavia.

1935: A new Yugoslav government is formed under the premiership of Milan Stojadinovic.

1939: The Sporazum creates an autonomous Croatia within Yugoslavia. Hitler invades Poland and the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and France declare war on Germany.

1941: Yugoslavia signs the Tripartite Pact which commits it to support the Axis powers. Germany invades Yugoslavia and occupies it for the rest of the war. The region is divided into German and Italian occupation zones. The Independent State of Croatia is created, and the Ustashe put in power.

1942: The Anti-Fascist Council for the National Liberation of Yugoslavia (AVNOJ) is created by Tito and his Partisans.

1943: AVNOJ is declared the government of Yugoslavia. Tito receives the title of marshal and remains in command of the armed forces.


1946: A new Yugoslav constitution is passed which splits the country into federal republics.

1948: A rift develops between Stalin and Tito; Yugoslavia is expelled from the Cominform.

1963: A new constitution is adopted which increases decentralization, implements personnel rotation in elected positions, renames the state the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and appoints Tito as president for life.

1967: Seventeen leading cultural organizations in Croatia publish a manifesto demanding that the Croatian language and culture be better protected by the constitution.

1968: Muslims are officially made a nationality in Yugoslavia.

1971: The government passes twenty-three amendments to the 1963 constitution.

1972: Tito implements a series of purges against suspected Croat nationalists in the Croatian League of Communists.
**1974:** A new constitution is passed which grants theoretical statehood to each republic and province in Yugoslavia.

**1980:** Tito dies at the age of 87.

**1986:** A Belgrade newspaper publishes excerpts from the Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts which reveals shockingly extreme ethnic resentment.

**1987:** Slobodan Milosevic becomes president of the Serbian Communist Party.

**1989:** Slovenia passes a new constitution, giving itself legislative sovereignty and declaring its right to secede.

**1990:** Elections bring nationalist leaders to power in Croatia and Bosnia.

**1991:** Croatia and Slovenia declare independence from Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav National Army, under the direction of Milosevic, invades Croatia and war begins. In August the Serbs lay siege to Vukovar; the city falls in November after ninety percent of it is destroyed. By December, Serb rebels control one-fifth of Croatia’s territory.

**1992:** The Republika Srpska is founded. Germany, the European Union, and the United States recognize Croatia and Slovenia’s independence. A ceasefire is signed in February to end fighting in Croatia. Bosnia declares independence from Yugoslavia. The RS declares its independence from Bosnia and the Croatian Community of Herceg-Bosna is created. Fighting begins in Bosnia in March. In May, Ratko Mladic takes command of the RS army and by December, the RS controls three quarters of Bosnian territory.

**1993:** The Vance Owen Peace Plan is finalized in January but is never fully implemented. The Serbs attack Sarajevo and Srebrenica until UN demands compel them to cease.

**1994:** A ceasefire is signed between Bosnian Croats and Muslims and a Muslim-Croat Federation is formed. Bosnian Serb forces take 200 hostages in Gorazde.

**1995:** Serb troops murder thousands of Muslims in Srebrenica in July. In August, the Croatian government runs 200,000 Serbs out of the Krajina region. A ceasefire is reached in October, and in December the Dayton Accords are signed.

**1996:** Protests erupt in Serbia after Milosevic annuls local elections which bring opposition candidates to power; Milosevic is forced to give these politicians their rightfully earned positions but remains leader of Serbia. The Sarajevo Declaration is signed in a commitment to restore multi-ethnicity to Bosnia’s capital.

**1997:** Ethnic violence in the Bosnian town of Mostar causes international alarm.

**1998:** Serbia invades Kosovo. Bosnian elections affirm popular support for nationalist politicians.
1999: Milosevic declares war with Kosovo. The Hague Tribunal brings criminal charges against Milosevic. In June, NATO air raids halt after Milosevic agrees to a ceasefire. In December, Croatian President Franjo Tudjman dies.

2000: Croatian elections remove the Croatian Democratic Union from power in the parliament and bring Stjepan Mesic, backed by a liberal coalition, to the presidency. Vojislav Kostunica defeats Milosevic in the Serbian presidential race; by October, Milosevic is overthrown.

2001: Serb protestors disrupt mosque reconstruction ceremonies in Banja Luka and Trebinje, leading to great anger in the Muslim community.

2002: A multi-ethnic museum is opened in Sarajevo celebrating the culture and faith of all three Bosnian communities. Eleven months later, a Muslim man shoots an entire Croat returnee family.

2003: Elections bring the Croatian Democratic Union back into power in the Croatian parliament.

2004: Boris Tadic is elected president of Serbia. An official Republika Srpska commission admits that Serbs participated in the Srebrenica massacre and issues an official apology to the Muslim community. The one millionth refugee returns to Bosnia.

2005: The Croatian public re-elects Mesic as president. Croatian nationalist leader Ante Gotovina is arrested and brought to the Hague for prosecution. Croatia and Serbia both begin negotiations for Stabilization and Association Agreements with the EU.

2006: Bosnia begins negotiations for a Stabilization and Association Agreement.
**Appendix A: Balkan Opinion Polls 1994-2006**

Croatian Attitudes Toward Other Nationalities in the State and Region, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>% favorable</th>
<th>% unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serb Minorities in Croatia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krajina Serbs (occupied Croatia)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Serbs (in Zagreb and elsewhere)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs in Serbia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegrins</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian Muslims</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanians</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonians</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenians</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarians</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bosnia-Herzegovina Opinion Poll, October 2004

With regards to blame and responsibility, please indicate whose role you consider to be "Very Significant," "Significant," "Of Some Significance," "Of Little Significance," or "Of No Significance."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Serbs</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>Very Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbs role in starting the war</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>US role in the war</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>No one takes responsibility for starting the war</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one takes responsibility for starting the war</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NATO's role in the war</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Serbs role in starting the war</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The international community did not act impartially</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>The international community did not act impartially</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>The international community did not act impartially</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone blames everyone else for starting the war</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bosniaks role in starting the war</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Everyone blames everyone else for starting the war</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International community's role in the war</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>International community's role in the war</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>The international community blames all sides equally</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO's role in the war</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Europe's role in the war</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Bosniaks role in starting the war</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US role in the war</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>No one takes responsibility for starting the war</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>US role in the war</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The international community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>The international community blames all sides equally</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>The international community's role in the war</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe's role in the war</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Everyone blames everyone else for starting the war</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>UN role in the war</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN role in the war</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NATO's role in the war</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Everyone blames everyone else for starting the war</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croats role in starting the war</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>UN role in the war</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Europe's role in the war</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks role in starting the war</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Serbs role in starting the war</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Croats role in starting the war</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bosnia-Herzegovina Opinion Poll, October 2004**

With regards to inter-ethnic relations please indicate which factors you consider to be "Very Significant," "Significant," "Of Some Significance," "Of Little Significance," or "Of No Significance."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bosnia-Herzegovina Opinion Poll, October 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>———</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political impact of interference from Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial support for returnees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant numbers of people do not feel BiH is their state or homeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political impact of interference from Croatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic stereotypes and prejudices are still very strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational system based on ethnic segregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination against the members of ethnic minority groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal hatred and revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are not allowed to return back to their homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees and their neighbors do not trust each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local communities do not want returnees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to inter-ethnic relations, please indicate which options you consider to be "Essential," "Desirable," "Acceptable," "Tolerable," or "Unacceptable." For the purposes of this poll:

- **Essential** means you believe this option is a necessary part of a secure, stable and better future and should be fully implemented.
- **Desirable** means this option is not what you would consider essential, but you think this option, or something very similar to it, is a good idea and should be put into practice.
- **Acceptable** means that this option is not what you would consider to be desirable, if you were given a choice, but you could certainly "live with it."
- **Tolerable** means this option is not what you want. But, as a part of a secure, stable, and better future, you would be willing to put up with it.
- **Unacceptable** means this option is completely unacceptable under any circumstances. You would not accept it, even as part of a secure, stable and better future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Desirable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Tolerable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Become equal citizens of Bosnia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious leaders should work for peace</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become citizens of Europe</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some politicians should recognize BiH as their state</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be acknowledgement by all groups of the wrongs they have done</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce EU standards for culture of nationalities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be some dedicated reconciliation process</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bosnia-Herzegovina Opinion Poll: Ten Years After Dayton

Which of the following two opinions is closer to yours?
The sustainability of Republika Srpska is the only guarantee for the sustainability of Serbs in BiH 66.2
BiH integration into EU, together with other countries of ex Yugoslavia, is a guarantee for sustainability and prosperity of Serbs in BiH 25.9
None 3.1
Don't know/no answer 4.8

Respondents from RS only.


---

Bosnia-Herzegovina Opinion Poll: Ten Years After Dayton

If the surrender of Radovan Karadzic would be a condition for BiH to join NATO and the EU, would you support his surrender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Bosniaks</th>
<th>Serbs</th>
<th>Croats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know/refuse to say</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B: Post-Dayton Election Results

Croatia Presidential Elections, June 15, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Franjo Tudjman (Croatian Democratic Union)</td>
<td>61.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Zdravko Tomac (Social Democratic Party)</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Gotovac (Croatian Social-Liberal Party)</td>
<td>17.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Europa World Yearbook, 40 ed., s.v. “Croatia.”*

Croatia Presidential Elections, First Ballot, January 24, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Mesic (Coalition*)</td>
<td>1,100,671</td>
<td>41.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazen Budisa (Social Democratic Party/Croatian Social-Liberal Party)</td>
<td>741,837</td>
<td>27.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mate Granic (Croatian Democratic Union)</td>
<td>601,588</td>
<td>22.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaven Letic (Independent)</td>
<td>110,782</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante Djapic (Croatian Party of Rights)</td>
<td>49,288</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante Ledic (Independent)</td>
<td>228,751</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Mercept (Croatian People's Party)</td>
<td>22,672</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ante Prkacin (New Croatia)</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Zvonimir Separovic (Independent)</td>
<td>7,235</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidential Elections, Second Ballot, February 7, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Mesic (Coalition*)</td>
<td>56.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drazen Budisa (Social Democratic Party/Croatian Social-Liberal Party)</td>
<td>43.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mesic's coalition included the Croatian Peasants' Party, the Liberal Party, the Croatian People's Party, and the Istrian Democratic Assembly)*

*The Europa World Yearbook, 43 ed., s.v. “Croatia.”*
### Croatia Presidential Elections, 1st ballot, January 2, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Mesic (Coalition*)</td>
<td>1,089,398</td>
<td>48.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadranka Kosar (Croatian Democratic Union)</td>
<td>452,218</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Miksic (Independent)</td>
<td>396,093</td>
<td>17.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durda Adlesic (Croatian Social Liberal Party)</td>
<td>59,795</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaven Letica (Independent)</td>
<td>57,748</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubo Cesic (Independent)</td>
<td>41,216</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivic Pasalic (Croatian Bloc Movement for a Modern Croatia)</td>
<td>40,637</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anto Kovacevic (Croatian Christian Democratic Union)</td>
<td>19,145</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miroslav Blazevic (Party of Croatian Defenders)</td>
<td>17,847</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miroslav Rajh (Croatian Youth Party)</td>
<td>14,766</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Kosta (Independent)</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Keser (Independent)</td>
<td>7,056</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Petrak (Croatian Popular Party)</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### The Europa World Yearbook, 47 ed., s.v. "Croatia."
Croatia Chamber of Representatives Elections, October 29, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union</td>
<td>45.23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition Electoral Alliance*</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Social-Liberal Party</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Party of Rights</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Opposition Electoral Alliance included the Croatian People's Party, the Croatian Peasants' Party, the Croatian Social-Liberal Party, the Croatian Party of Rights, the Croatian Independent Democrats, the Istrian Democratic Assembly, and the Social Democratic Party.*

_The Europa World Yearbook, 40 ed., s.v. “Croatia.”_

Croatia Chamber of Representatives Elections, January 3, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Social-Liberal Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primorian-Goranian Union</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavonian-Baranian Croatian Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Peasants' Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istrian Democratic Assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Party</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian People's Party</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Social Democrats' Action</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Party of Rights</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Christian Democratic Union</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_The Europa World Yearbook, 43 ed., s.v. “Croatia.”_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party, Liberal Party, Istrian Democratic Assembly</td>
<td>22.61</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian People's Party, Croatian Party of Slavona and Baranja, Primorje Gorski Kotar Alliance</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Peasants' Party</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Party of Rights, Zagorje Democratic Party</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Social Liberation Party, Democratic Center</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Pensioners Party</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Peasant's Party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Europa World Yearbook, 47 ed., s.v. “Croatia.”*
### Serbia Presidential Elections, December 7, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milan Milutinovic (Socialist Party of Serbia,</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslav Left, New Democracy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojislav Seselj (Serbian Radical Party)</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuk Draskovic (Serbian Renewal Movement)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Serbia Presidential Elections, September 24, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vojislav Kostunica (Democratic Party of Serbia)</td>
<td>2,470,304</td>
<td>51.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slobodan Milosevic (Socialist Party of Serbia/Yugoslav Left)</td>
<td>1,826,799</td>
<td>38.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Nikolic (Serbian Radical Party)</td>
<td>289,013</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojislav Mihailovic (Serbian Renewal Movement)</td>
<td>145,019</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miodrag Vojvoic (Affirmative Party)</td>
<td>45,946</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Serbia Presidential Elections, December 8, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vojislav Kostunica (Democratic Party of Serbia)</td>
<td>1,699,098</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vojislav Seselj (Serbian Radical Party)</td>
<td>1,063,296</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borislav Pelevic</td>
<td>103,926</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Serbia Presidential Elections, November 16, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Nikolic (Serb Radical Party)</td>
<td>1,166,896</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragoljub Micunovic (Democratic Opposition of Serbia*)</td>
<td>893,906</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velimir Ilic (New Serbia)</td>
<td>229,229</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijan Risticicvic</td>
<td>72,105</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragan Tomic</td>
<td>54,703</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radoslav Avlijas</td>
<td>20,782</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coalition of 18 parties including the Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Serbia, the Civic Alliance of Serbia, the Democratic Christian Party of Serbia, New Serbia, and others.


Serbia Presidential Elections, First Ballot, June 13, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Nikolic (Serbian Radical Party)</td>
<td>954,339</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boris Tadic (Democratic Party)</td>
<td>853,584</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogoljub Kavic (Independent)</td>
<td>568,691</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragan Marsicanin (Democratic Party of Serbia/G17 Plus/Serbian Renewal Movement)</td>
<td>414,971</td>
<td>13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivica Dacic (Socialist Party of Serbia)</td>
<td>125,952</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>163,503</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presidential Elections, Second Ballot, June 27, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boris Tadic (Democratic Party)</td>
<td>1,681,528</td>
<td>53.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomislav Nikolic (Serbian Radical Party)</td>
<td>1,434,068</td>
<td>46.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Europa World Yearbook, 47 ed., s.v. “Serbia and Montenegro.”*
Republican Legislature of Serbia Elections, September 21, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party of Serbia, Yugoslav Left, New Democracy</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Radical Party</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zajedno Coalition, Serbian Renewal Movement</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Republican Legislature of Serbia Elections, September 24, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Opposition of Serbia*</td>
<td>43.86</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party of Serbia - Yugoslav Left</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian People's Party of Montenegro</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Radical Party</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Renewal Movement</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other parties</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coalition of 18 parties including the Democratic Party, the Democratic Party of Serbia, the Civic Alliance of Serbia, the Demo-Christian Party of Serbia, New Serbia, and others.


Republican Legislature of Serbia Elections, Dec 28, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Radical Party</td>
<td>27.97</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party of Serbia</td>
<td>17.96</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G17 Plus</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Renewal Movement/New Serbia</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party of Serbia/New Serbia</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bosnia State Presidency, September 14, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bosniaks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alija Izetbegovic (Party of Democratic Action)</td>
<td>730,592</td>
<td>81.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haris Silajdzic (Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
<td>124,396</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikret Abdic (Democratic People's Union)</td>
<td>25,584</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sead Avdic (Joint List for Bosnia and Herzegovina*)</td>
<td>21,254</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Croats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kresimir Zubak (Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
<td>330,477</td>
<td>89.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Komisci (Join List for Bosnia and Herzegovina*)</td>
<td>37,684</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momcilo Krajsnik (Serb Democratic Party)</td>
<td>690,646</td>
<td>67.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Ivanic (People's Alliance for Peace and Progress**)</td>
<td>307,461</td>
<td>29.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milivoje Zaric (Serb Patriotic Party)</td>
<td>15,407</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branko Latinovic (Serb Party of Krajina)</td>
<td>12,643</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Join List for Bosnia and Herzegovina is a coliation including the Union of Social Democrats of Bosnia Herzegovina, the Social Democratic Party, the HSS, and the Muslim Bosniak Organization.*

**The People's Alliance for Peace and Progress is a coalition including the Socialist Party of Serbia for the Republika Srpska, the Independent Social Democrats of the Republika Srpska, the Social Liberal Party, the Yugoslav United Left, and the New Radical Party.*

Bosnia State Presidency, September 12-13, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Alija Izetbegovic (Party of Democratic Action)</td>
<td>511,309</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikret Abdic (Democratic People's Union)</td>
<td>36,446</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefer Halilovic</td>
<td>33,680</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harija Ahililovic</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Croats</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ante Jelavic (Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia Herzegovina)</td>
<td>189,408</td>
<td>82.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradimir Gojer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kresimir Zubak (New Croatian Initiative)</td>
<td>40,811</td>
<td>17.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serbs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zivko Radisic (Socialist Party of the Serb Republic)</td>
<td>360,286</td>
<td>51.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momcilo Krajinsnik (Serbian Democratic Party)</td>
<td>315,480</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoran Tadic</td>
<td>27,427</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Europa World Yearbook, 42 ed., s.v. “Bosnia Herzegovina.”*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th>% vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia State Presidency, October 5, 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bosniaks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulejman Tihic (Party of Democratic Action)</td>
<td>192,661</td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haris Silajdzic (Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
<td>179,726</td>
<td>34.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alija Behman (Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
<td>90,434</td>
<td>17.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fikret Abdic (Democratic People's Union)</td>
<td>21,164</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32,625</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Croats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragan Corvic (Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia-Herzegovina/Croatian Christian Democratic Union)</td>
<td>114,606</td>
<td>61.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Ivankovic-Lijanovic (Economic Bloc HDU for Progress)</td>
<td>32,411</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijo Anic (New Croat Initiative)</td>
<td>16,345</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stjepan Kljuic (Republican Party)</td>
<td>9,413</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirko Sarovic (Serb Democratic Party)</td>
<td>180,212</td>
<td>35.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebojsa Radmonovic (Alliance of Independent Social Democrats)</td>
<td>101,119</td>
<td>19.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ognjen Tadic (Serbian Radical Party of the Republika Srpska)</td>
<td>44,262</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desnica Radevojevic (Party of Democratic Action)</td>
<td>41,667</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirko Banjac (Alliance for National Rebirth)</td>
<td>23,238</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Grahovac (Social Democratic Party)</td>
<td>22,852</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>52,836</td>
<td>10.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Europa World Yearbook, 47 ed., s.v. “Bosnia Herzegovina.”*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bosnia State Presidency, October 1, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosniaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haris Silajdžić (Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulejman Tihic (Party of Democratic Action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirnes Ajanovic (Patriotic Bloc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Željko Komšic (Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivo Miro Jovic (Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Božo Ljubic (Croatian Democratic Community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Ivankovic-Lijanovic (People's Party Working for Prosperity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zvonko Jurišic (Croatian Party of Rights of Bosnia-Herzegovina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebojša Radmanovic (Alliance of Independent Social Democrats)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mladen Bosic (Serb Democratic Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoran Tešanovic (Party of Democratic Progress in the Serb Republic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bosnia House of Representatives, September 14, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party of Democratic Action</td>
<td>725417</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union</td>
<td>338440</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint List of Bosnia and Herzegovina*</td>
<td>105918</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>93816</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Union</td>
<td>25562</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Rights Party</td>
<td>14879</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serb Republic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb Democratic Party</td>
<td>578723</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Democratic Action</td>
<td>184553</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Alliance for Peace and Progress**</td>
<td>136077</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb Radical Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>62409</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join List of Bosnia and Herzegovina*</td>
<td>30285</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb Patriotic Party</td>
<td>14146</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>13285</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Join List for Bosnia and Herzegovina is a coalition including the Union of Social Democrats of Bosnia Herzegovina, the Social Democratic Party, the HSS, and the Muslim Bosniak Organization.

**The People's Alliance for Peace and Progress is a coalition including the Socialist Party of Serbia for the Republika Srpska, the Independent Social Democrats of the Republika Srpska, the Social Liberal Party, the Yugoslav United Left, and the New Radical Party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th># votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for a Single and Democratic Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>455403</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>187152</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party</td>
<td>137990</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democrats of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>28740</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Croat Initiative</td>
<td>28572</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Union</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serb Republic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accord Coalition</td>
<td>214948</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>163436</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for a Single and Democratic Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>128277</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serb Radical Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>119026</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>27753</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bosnia House of Representatives, November 11, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party of Democratic Action</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party of Democratic Progress of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party of Independent Social Democrats, Democratic Socialist Party</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian People's Party of the Serb Republic</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Croatian Initiative</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People’s Union</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriotic Party of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party of Pensioners of Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bosnia House of Representatives, October 5, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party of Democratic Action</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Independent Social Democrats</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia-Herzegovina/Croatian Christian Democratic Union</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Democratic Progress of Republika Srpska</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialist Party of Republika Srpska</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian Party</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Bosnia House of Representatives, October 1, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>% votes</th>
<th># seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Party of Democratic Action</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Independent Social Democrats</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Democratic Party of Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian Democratic Party</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian Democratic Union of Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatians Together</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian-Herzegovinian Patriotic Party</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People's Party Working for Prosperity</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party for Democratic Progress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Alliance</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Union</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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