Bosnia and Herzegovina
A multinational state

Paper within Bachelor Thesis
Author: Aida Arnautovic
Tutor: Mikael Sandberg
Jönköping January 2009
Kandidatsuppsats inom Statsvetenskap

Titel: Bosnien – Hercegovina – En multinationell stat

Författare: Aida Arnautovic

Handledare: Mikael Sandberg

Datum: Januari 2009

Ämnesord: Demokrati, Nationalism, Etnicitet, Utveckling, Internationella aktörer

Sammanfattning


Meningen med uppsatsen är att introducera läsaren för de problem Bosnien-Hercegovina upplevde i slutet på 1900-talet. Flera internationella aktörer involverades i konflikten och efter många påtryckningar på de inhemska politikerna skrevs äntligen Dayton avtalet på vil- ket satte ett slut på det inhemska kriget.

Tyvärr, som i så många fall tidigare, visar resultatet på att det är folket som får ta konse- kvenserna utav politikernas beslut.
Abstract

This bachelor thesis in political science investigates whether the ethnic groupings in Bosnia and Herzegovina will lead to a separation of the country or if the country has potentials to develop and unify. The purpose of the thesis is to see what the underlying problems to this ethnic mentality are. Bosnia and Herzegovina was known for its multiethnic characteristics with three ethnic groups living side by side, the Muslims, the Croats and the Serbs. However, in the beginning of the 1990’s everything changed. New nationalistically oriented politicians made their names known and opinions based on ethnic belongings became important within every ethnic group.

The aim with this thesis is to introduce the reader to the problems Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced in late twentieth century. Several international actors were involved in the conflict and after a lot of pressure on the native politicians the Dayton Peace Agreement which put an end to the war was signed.

Unfortunately, as in many cases before, the outcome shows that the people are the ones left with the consequences from the decisions the politicians make.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Problem

Will Bosnia and Herzegovina be able to recover from the war? The war ended in 1995 but the situation is still unsecure. The country is divided between two different entities; the Federation and Republika Srpska. Even until this day, these two entities are not especially keen on cooperating with each other.

The construction of the two units involves that there is one president, parliament and government both on national level and in both of these units. This constitution strengthens the citizens division into three ethnic groups. This means that the governments in both parts of the country have representatives from all three groups, everything according to a fixed quota. Decisions touching foreign policies, finance policies and other comprehensive areas shall be taken on national level, however most of the questions are managed by the two units. The international community has put a pressure on the country to start to function like a nation, but the country still consists of two units which do not get along with each other.

The political system in Bosnia-Herzegovina can be said to be distinguished with a struggle between politicians which together with the international association want to build a multiethnic state, and nationally oriented parties which fight for the own ethnic group rights and benefits. The three nationalistic parties (SDA, SDS and HDZ) dominate to a great extent which can be clearly seen from the past elections.

1.2 Purpose and questions

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina is now worse than ever, corruption is hugely spread and the government does not strive towards making the standards of living better for the citizens. I will try to see what the underlying problem is and also how the two entities and their specific decisions affect the country as a total. The reasons to the separation based on ethnicity will also be looked upon. Reflections regarding peoples views on international actors based on ethnicity will also be investigated. Furthermore, the international actors and their affects on the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina will be looked upon.

1.3 Method and design

The theory of the thesis is to evaluate the the ethnic problems in the country and to see why these problems occurred. To do this strategic selection is used. The two entities are compared with each other in order to see the underlying problem. When talking about strategic selection, Shively refers to purposive sampling. Shively argues that nonrandom

---

sampling ways will at occasions be chosen due to deliberate choices and not for reasons of costs or efficiency. The use of strategic selection should be provided when the interest lies in a particular independent variable for the research approach. In my example the dependent variables are the two entities and the independent variable is the relationship between these. The independent variable may vary in response to the dependent variables.

The reason to why the relationship between the entities is included in the thesis is that is an essential factor for Bosnia and Herzegovina’s future. The ethnic differences that the two entities, The Federation and Republika Srpska are built upon are huge setbacks for the development of the country. As I collected sources and material to the thesis I tried to find a fair picture. The main source I used for the thesis is the book “The war in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention” written by Steven L.Burg and Paul S.Shoup. The book provides a close review of the war in the Balkans in the beginning of the 1990’s.

Further on, there are international actors such as the European Union, NATO and the United Nations who have had huge impacts on the politicians in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the outcome of the war. Due to this, I have chosen to include these actors and their impacts in the thesis as well.

I have also chosen to use statistics from the World Values Survey². My main focus lies on the separate entities and their approaches to the European Union, NATO, United Nations and the political parties within the country. The reason that I chose those specific variables is the fact that people within the two entities have very different approaches to the variables. The charts consist of one dependent variable, for instance the European Union and the independent variables are the ethnic groups, Muslims, Serbs, Croats and “others”. These graphs are drawn on the basis of clustered sampling since they are based on the two entities and not in regard to the views from the country as a whole. However, there is one graph that is considered from the country as a total, the approach to the government, which falls within the random samples group. Random sampling is more trustworthy than the clustered sampling since it shows the average picture. The people included in the sample are randomly chosen while those in the clustered are picked within a certain area, in this case the Federation and Republika Srpska.

1.4 Sources and data

All of the sources used in this thesis are relevant and give a fair and, in my opinion true picture of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, both before the war and the after-war years.

As mentioned above, the main source used in the thesis is the book “The war in Bosnia – Herzegovina, Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention” written by L.Burg & S.Shoup. The reason that I used only one book in my thesis is the fact that his book covers the conflict from the beginning to the end. I feel that it shows a fair picture and provides all important happenings from the point that Tito died and throughout the entire war.

² World Values Survey, www.worldvaluessurvey.org
I also found two studies covering the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina which I have used in the thesis. Both of the studies are done by the Foreign Policy Initiative BiH (FPI). This organization is a politically independent organization financed by SIDA. These studies have been good to use due to the fact that they are independent and are not influenced by the different parties. A report done by the Commision of the Euopena Communities has been crucial as well in order to see how far Bosnia and Herzegovina is in the process towards joining the European Union.

There are several internet sources used in the thesis, however, these will be referred to in the reference list.

### 1.5 Disposition

The thesis consists of several divisions. The first chapter is an introduction to the thesis which provides a general idea. The second chapter describes the political background in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the ethnic conflicts that arose as the communism collapsed. The three main actors struggling to achieve separate ethnic divisions, namely, the three nationalistic parties are also described. In chapter three the two entities, the Federation and Republika Srpska that were established as the Dayton Peace Agreement was signed are closely investigated. The Dayton agreement is looked upon in this chapter as well, and the changes it brought to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the constitution, the map etc.

The fourth chapter take today’s situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina into consideration. Aspects such as the potentiality of developing into a functioning and just state and are of matter. Important international actors and their involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the war is also reflected in the chapter. Chapter five looks upon the relationship Republika Srpska has towards Serbia and Russia and how that affects the relationship Bosnia and Herzegovina has with the European Union.

The sixth chapter is a summary of the thesis and the last chapter, the seventh, is a conclusion where my reflections are shown.

---

3 http://www.vpi.ba/
2 History

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a relatively small country in central Europe, it has however experienced several wars. In this part of the thesis political history will be provided, beginning with the 1100-century. The ethnic disparities which have lead to the conflict will be put forward as well.

2.1 Political history

The first Bosnian governmental institution was set up in the end of the 1100-century and lasted until 1463. The Ottomans then conquered a bigger part of the Bosnian kingdom and made it to a province in their empire. In 1878 the Austro-Hungarian occupied the province and annexed it thirty years later. After World War I Bosnia and Herzegovina ended up in the Kingdom Yugoslavia and after World War II in the socialistic federative republic Yugoslavia. This land was mainly Josip Broz Titos construction and he was its leader until his death 1980. Titos communistic state was at the start highly centralized but developed into a loose federal system divided into several republics with equal rights. However, Tito was against several party-systems so the state was based on an authoritarian one-party system.

After Titos death the Yugoslavian construction started to break apart. The national hostilities which were hold back by Tito were now brought up to surface by political leaders such as Slobodan Milosevic in Serbia and Franjo Tudjman in Croatia.

Bosnia and Herzegovina was put into big difficulties when the shatterings accelerated in the beggining of the 1990’s. All three ethnic groups feared what was going to happen. The Bosniaks and the Bosnian Croats worried that they would have difficulties to stand up to the Serbs if Slovenia and Croatia were about to leave Yugoslavia and Serbia was to become the leading power. The Bosnianserbs on the other hand feared that independence for Bosnia and Herzegovina would involve them being deserted to a majority of Bosniaks and Croats. In the first multiparty election in 1990 most of the citizens voted for the party which represented their own ethnic group and its interests.

The unraveling of Yugoslavia was hastened by Slobodan Milosevic as his power increased in 1986. Milosevic was a Serbish nationalist and his conservative approach led to intrastate ethnic conflicts. In June 1991 both Slovenia and Croatia declared independence from Yugoslavia and in late September 1991 Radovan Karadzic, the President of Republika Srpska at that time, declared four self-proclaimed Serb Autonomous Regions in Bosnia. In October the same year the Bosnian Serbs proclaimed the formation of a Serbian Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina within Bosnia and Herzegovina which should have its own constitution and parliamentary assembly. In January 1992 Radovan Karadzic publicly announced a totally independent Republic of the Serbian People in BiH. The Bosnian Government held a referendum on independence on March 1 and in April 5, 1992 the parliament declared the republic’s independence. This was however opposed by the Serb representatives who had voted in favour of remaining in Yugoslavia in their own referendum in November 1991. The Bosnian Serbs responded to the independce with armed force in an attempt to separate the republic along ethnic lines in order to establish a greater Serbia, to their help they had the

neighbouring country Serbia. On April 7 total recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s independence by most European countries and the United States occurred, and on May 22, 1992 Bosnia and Herzegovina was admitted to the United Nations.

Bosnia and Herzegovina, is now after a tough war divided into two administrative entities and a district, the Federation Bosnia and Herzegovina, Republika Srpska and the Brcko-district. The war lasted more than three years. More than 200,000 people died and approximately a half of the inhabitants migrated to other countries. The capital Sarajevo was exposed for an Serbish siege with ongoing artilleryshooting throughout the entire war.

**Ethnic composition before the war in BiH (1991)**


---

The figure above shows the ethnic composition in Bosnia and Herzegovina before the war. As can be seen from the figure, the ethnic groups were divided between different parts in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Bosnian Serbs mainly lived in the northwestern parts, the Muslims in central Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Bosnian Croats in southwestern parts.

### 2.2 Ethnic conflicts

As the communism collapsed former Yugoslavia and its inhabitants had the possibility of establishing a liberal democracy and legislate new civil states. However, aspects such as religion, ethnicity and national identity became the new political guides. Instead of focusing on creating a democratic state people created new groups and statehoods depending on ethnicity. This separation formed a conflict between the violence of appeals and power to ethnicity as a foundation of state development on one hand, and the international standards of state sovereignty and territorial integrity on the other. The international community failed to reconcile the conflict between these mutually exclusive principles of state formation.

As the republic Bosnia descended into war and the nationalist parties and leaderships organized their communities, three major issues were contested in Bosnia. The first major contest involved the definition of the nature of rights in Bosnia, furtherly on whether the rights were seen as residing in individuals, or in the ethnic communities as cooperative entities. However, no answers could be found to this question by looking at the outlying Bosnian past nor the immediate communist-era past. The second contest touches the problem unleashed with the disintegration of Yugoslavia, namely the “national question”. This term applies to all features of interethnic relations. The most important aspect of the national question however, concerns the defining of the right to declare titular, or state-constituting status and defining the rights that accrues to “others”, namely the minority ethnic groups. To attain state-constituting position grants superior political and cultural rights on a group, including control over the state itselfs. The national question and the struggle over rights were significant for Bosnia, a multiethnic state in which none of the groups could claim titular status alone, and all three majority groups competed for the status of a state-constituting nation.

Since Bosnia and Herzegovina was bordered by two more authoritative national states of two of the groups challenging the specific issues, the Serbs and the Croats, the national question and the contests over rights within Bosnia could no be determined without Croatia and Serbia participating. As Yugoslavia fell apart and the appearance of new nationalist states, Serbia and Croatia, the conflicts in Bosnia took on international dimensions, and a new third contentious issue arised; how should the international community respond to the collapse of a multiethnic state and the conflicts beginning among its peoples. All of the parties involved in the conflict approached the contested issue differently. Each raised fun-
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damental issues for the international community as it made an effort to mediate the conflict.

The rival claims of the Muslims, Serbs and Croats as state-constituting countries and the contests in Bosnia over individual versus collective rights were at first evident as a political conflict over the definition of executive institutions and principles. This escalated to a competition over a legitimate definition of the state itself and, in time, to a war regarding the existence of the state.

When looking at the academic approach to these issues, two main formulas are used; the pluralist (integrationist approach) and the power-sharing approach. The latter can be condensed to a couple of simple ideas: Firstly, culturally originated values may be seen as the ground to ethnic conflicts, since the contact between groups may be unable to coexist. The power-sharing approach involves isolation of groups from one another by dividing networks of political and social institutions.

Secondly, all of the cultural communities and sections establish a higher degree of autonomy over their own affairs in the obvious confidence that culturally distinct groups cannot reach compromise. Thirdly, the power-sharing model advocates for proportional systems of representation with respect to decision-making on issues of common interests to all groups. This is to ensure the participation of legislative bodies of all such groups in the decisions that affect them. And fourth, all of the groups represented in authoritative decision-making processes are contracted to have veto power when the decision involves “vital interests” of the groups.

Due to the fact that intergroup contact is limited to the leaders, the group vetoes on issues concerning “vital interests” and decision-making on issues of common interests, are to be implemented by the elites of each group. The leaders of each group have a monopoly even over the definition of how common interests should be represented, and what constitutes the different “vital interests” of each of the groups. The power-sharing approach lends itself to socialist definitions of rights and group claims to state-constituting status however. The apparent weakness of such a system to intransigent the leaders behavior is circumvented by goodness between governmental elites of the ethnic sections, a condition that is vital for success.

The pluralist approach on the other hand is established from a fundamentally different view on intergroup contact and the effects from the intergroup contact. According to the pluralist view intergroup contact generates mutual cooperation and consideration under significantly important circumstances of open communications and equality, and not conflicts. Institutions are viewed as means to transform relations between groups in the pluralist approach, meanwhile the power-sharing approach see institutions above all as mechanisms of ethnic segmentation. The contact in public institutions is not seen as an instrument of cultural assimilation necessarily. However, contact that is sustained under the conditions of open communications and equality is seen as contributing factor to the appearance of a common culture of cooperation and communication, or as called in West “civic culture”. Thus, the pluralist approach is assumed on a dedication to individual rights.

The pluralist approach avoids to define either the state or state institutions in ethnic terms, this involves that little room is left to distinguish the claims of ethnic groups to state-constituting status. Behaviors based on ethnic characteristics should compete with behaviors based on nonethnic characteristics on an equal basis, from a pluralist point of view. Countries like Bosnia, where the politicization of ethnicity rules other aspects of po-
litical behavior there is a challenge in practicing a pluralist approach to the declaration of contests over status and rights due to that a balance needs to be instituted between the ethnic and nonethnic in contribution, decisionmaking and representation. To establish a power-sharing strategy during conditions such as these institutionalizes ethnic segmentations, eliminate other interests and constructs structural fundamentals for inflexible veto use and, finally, secessionism.

The international community was confronted with the challenges of reuniting power-sharing and pluralist point of views in Bosnia by authoritative opposing nationalist leaders. The government in Bosnia and Herzegovina indicated that the reason for the refusal of Croat and Serbian autonomies was based on the adhesion to the pluralist values of individual rights. The Serb and Croat nationalist on the other hand meant that their claims to autonomy, ethnic veto and finally the right to create individual states of their own were supported from their claim to status as state-constituting nations in Bosnia, and on the communal right to self-government of nations. The international community made several efforts to unite the two different approaches, however this did not end the arguments between the pluralist and collectivist approaches, and instead the division between analysts and experts involved to find ways to ease the implementation of the Dayton agreements continued.

The third key issue in Bosnia, the contradictory claims of successor states and ethnic groups and the collapse of Yugoslavia and the appropriate response from the international community, was challenged by the Bosnian population. Both Muslims, Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats, by Croatia and Serbia, and other organizations and institutions that were involved in the conflict. All of the agents had different views on this issue. The collapse of multinational states or empires was historically followed by the establishment of national states in Eastern Europe. This development began in the nineteenth century, and ended with the breakup of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, as the communism broke down in 1989-90.

The conflict in Bosnia in 1992-95 raised nineteenth-century and Versailles-era questions regarding the formation of the state and the definition of borders in the Balkans all over again. In spite of everything that had happened meanwhile, parallels can be drawn between the efforts of the European authorities to determine the Bosnian question at the Congress of Berlin ni 1878, and the negotiations carried out at Dayton over the future of Bosnia. The international community attempted to maintain the fiction of a preobtainable status quo whilst admitting the appearance of new political realities in both cases. Bosnia ended up in limbo in both cases, in 1878 Austria was allowed to occupy Bosnia as the international community maintained the fiction that Bosnia stayed within the Ottoman empire, and in 1995 the international community maintained a mainly fictional Bosnian state meanwhile allowing Croatia ans Serbia dividing it.

The consequences that arise with the collapse of a multinational state are motivated by a mixture of territorial, ethnical and power-political motivations. The lack of previous agreements regarding the break down of the old states and the formation of new ones leads to rapid escalation of disintegration of multinational states, which due to radical elements following maximalist agendas worsens. Realist theorists of international conflict claim that such clashes can by guaranteeing a balance of military ability between the descendant states be prevented. However realist theorists do not take the fact of ethnonational conflicts and the emotions arised by this conflict into consideration. The ethnonational conflict may make each side to use newly attained means in order to pursue the maximalist agenda instead of viewing them as mechanisms of deterrence.
The path to peace lies through the electoral process for much of the literature on ethnic conflicts. Proportionality systems suggested by the advocates of the power-sharing approach guarantee representation of all groups, however ethnic alliance voting is encouraged as well. The change of electoral competition into an ethnic agreement is the outcome of proportionality rules, where ethnicity has been politicized. Donald Horowitz’ argue that other rules may be worked out which cultivate collaboration among groups in the electoral process, and create legislative bodies that see intergroup cooperation as an opportunity and not confrontation. These kind of directions, however, involve a quite strong commitment to democratic elections and to the continuous existence of the common state. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, this existence of the common state was the problem and lead to arguments.

In the literature on ethnic conflict partition is hardly ever acknowledged as a feasible solution, due to the impossibility of creating ethnically homogenous descendant states. It is close to impossible to draw a diving line between ethnic groups in most of the states. The creation of ethnically defined descendant states and the partition of multinational states tend to create internal conflicts between the “state-forming nation” in the descendant state and its minorities, conflicts arise also between successor states over territories occupied by the certain nation that are allocated to the “wrong” side of the border. Irredenta like this, could be reduced by transfers or exclusions of ethnic populations. However, disputes regarding the rights of minorities, and conflicts over borders might carry on for an indefinite period.

---

7 Burg & Shoup, 2000, p.9
The figure above shows the approaches the three ethnic groups have towards the government. When comparing the early years to the later years there is a clear distinction, the confidence towards the government has decreased significantly. The Croats have the least confidence, however, the Serbs have decreased in confidence mostly, 45.6 percent. The Serbs are tightly followed by the Muslims, who have from 1994-1999 with 76 percent confidence decreased to 34.5 percent in 1999-2004, this is a fall with 41.3 percent.

These numbers can be explained by the fact that people no longer trust in the government nor the politicians. Since corruption is widely spread in the country, and within the government as well the people do not see the governmental authorities as reliable. Another problem with the politicians in Bosnia and Herzegovna is that they are reactionaries. Milorad Dodik for example, the prime minister in Republika Srpska is not keen on cooperating with the Federation and taking unanimous decisions. All of these different facts make the government in Bosnia and Herzegovina to appear as a joke and the people do not feel that there is a strong united government that will protect them and ease the hard after-war years.

Further on, the standards of living in Bosnia are not the greatest and poverty is largely spread. This may be explained by the high unemployment rate, in 2004 the unemployment rate was 45.5 percent.⁸ This as well is something the government should focus on improving.

⁸ http://www.nationmaster.com/graph/lab_une_rat-labor-unemployment-rate
3 The political parties

In 1990 the communism fragmented in Yugoslavia and multiparty elections were held in each of the six constituent republics. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, three national parties, The Bosniac Party of Democratic Action (Stranka Demokratske Akcije, SDA), the Serbian Democratic Party (Srpska Demokratska Stranka, SDS) and the Croatian Democratic Union (Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica, HDZ) created a implicit electoral alliance. The three parties got the most votes and an attempt to create a multiparty leadership was done, however their territorial and political goals, and also the goals of their associates in Croatia and Serbia, were incompatible. The war was a fact in spring 1992, as the parliament in Bosnia and Herzegovina failed to pass a single law. As the Dayton Peace Agreement was introduced the three parties sustained their popularity, however new parties such as the Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina (Stranka za Bosnu i Hercegovinu, SBiH), the Social Democratic Party (Socijaldemokratska Partija, SDP), and the Alliance of Independent Social Democrats (Stranka Nezavisnih Socijaldemokrata, SNSD) gained chairs in the parliament as well.

3.1.1 The Party of Democratic Action

Alija Izetbegovic was the leader of The Party of Democratic Action (Stranka Demokratske Akcije, SDA) which was created in March 1990. Izetbegovic had actively supported an expanding role of Islam in both public life and politics, however he was careful in stating that he did not strive for an Islamic state in Bosnia. During Titos ruling Alija Izetbegovic was imprisoned two times due to his opinions and his book Islamic Declaration written 1970. Alija Izetbegovic represented a group within SDA that biased toward an identity largely defined in terms of Islam and an aim of securing a leading role for the Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

However, the party had a positive approach to the continuation of a Yugoslav state, it defined the state as “a community of sovereign nations and republics, within current federal borders”. Izetbegovic made it clear however that if Slovenia and Croatia managed to break out from Yugoslavia, Bosnia and Herzegovina would not be left in a distorted Yugoslavia either, a Yugoslavia struggling to become a greater Serbia.

“…there are three options for Bosnia: Bosnia in a federal Yugoslavia – an acceptable option; Bosnia in a confederal Yugoslavia – also an acceptable option; and finally an independent Bosnia. I must say here openly that if the threat that Croatia and Slovenia leave Yugoslavia is carried out, Bosnia will not remain in a truncated Yugoslavia. In other words, Bosnia will not tolerate staying in a greater Serbia and being part of it. If it comes to that, we will declare independence, the absolute independence of Bosnia and we will decide

---

9 http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/700826/Bosnia-and-Herzegovina/42674/Political-process#ref=ref476254

then in what new constellation Bosnia will find itself, as a sovereign republic that will use its sovereignty.\textsuperscript{11}

Alija Izetbegovic’s electoral speech in September.

### 3.1.2 The Serbian Democratic Party

The Serb Democratic Party (Srpska Demokratska Stranka Bosne i Hercegovine, SDS) was established in July 1990 by Radovan Karadzic. SDS is a nationalistic Serb party in Bosnia, which has had a negative approach to any form of independence for Bosnia from Yugoslavia or to any changes within Bosnia that would risk the Serb people being ruled by a leader with another ethnic background. Karadzic was a supporter of creating a greater Serbia, which in turn made him the President of Republika Srpska as it was established.

The Serb national council was founded in October 1990 in Banja Luka, the Serbian leadership affirmed there that no changes assumed by diplomatic institutions instead of the people would be accepted. Further on, decisions taken on the basis of a referendum of the Serb people would be the only ones recognized. However, even though the SDS had great power over the 1990 elections, the Serbs were internally politically fragmented.

Radovan Karadzic, who had both de facto and official power over the Bosnian Serb forces and all SDS and regime establishments, was involved in the killings of approximately 8,000 Bosnian Muslim men and boys in July 1995.\textsuperscript{12} This massacre, which took place in Srebrenica, a city in eastern Bosnia and Herzegovina, is considered to be the most violent in European history since WW II.

Radovan Karadzic is also seen responsible for the imprisonment of more than 200 UN peacekeepers and military observers in May 1995. The mediators were held in captivity for a week at locations across Bosnia and Herzegovina of strategic and military significance. By doing this Karadzic and his companions made sure that these locations were protected from NATO air campaigns.

As Karadzic resigned from politics in July 1996, he disappeared from the public and hid for years in order to avoid justice. However, on July 21\textsuperscript{th} 2008 Radovan Karadzic was arrested in Serbia, and is now awaiting a sentence under the Hague tribunal.

### 3.1.3 The Croatian Democratic Union

The Croatian Democratic Union (Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica Bosne i Hercegovine, HDZ) was established in August 1990. The arrangement of the party replicated the leadership in Croatia. The party supported the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina from

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.

Yugoslavia. However, the party stated it would support the actualization of right of the Croat people to self-ruling including separation. This fact became a foundation of rivalry between those who supported the uprightness of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and nationalists, who seeked to separate the republic and connect Croat populated territories to Croatia.

The figure above shows the approaches the ethnic groups within Republika Srpska and the Federation have towards the Political parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The graph shows that there is a negative development in both entities. The reduction has been large, especially in Republika Srpska. All of the three ethnic groups have decreased in confidence by approximately 30 percent. Between the years 1999-2004 the Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats lied at a point of roughly 15 percent.

In the Federation the Muslims are the ones that have depreciated the most in percentage confidence throughout the years 1994-1999 to 1999-2004.

These outcomes can be seen as results from bad political decisions. The politicians within the parties mainly take decisions that gain themselves and do not take the people into consideration. The after-war period has not been handled in the best way by the politicians either, which may have led to the negative view from the people. The politicians promise a lot in order to get votes, but after the elections everything goes back to normal where the promises are forgotten by the political parties. As can be seen from the table the people in Bosnia and Herzegovina are dissatisfied with the situation in the country overall.
4 The entities

This chapter will include the outcomes from the war in form of the two entities, the Federation and Republika Srpska. The Dayton Peace Agreement and the changes it brought will be presented as well.

4.1 The Federation

The politics in the Federation has been characterized by clashes of opinion as well between nationalists and reformsupporters and also between the dominating ethnic groups. The Bosnian party SDA (Partiet för demokratisk handling) strengthen its power in the 2002 election and got a third of the votes, more than double than the multiethnic socialdemocratic party. After the election there was an government coalition, since the two main parties in the federation SDA and HDZ (Kroatiska demokratiska unionen) had different opinions in important questions.

The tension between the Bosnian and the Croatian citizens has been a returning theme, and in March 2001 a conflict arosed. The representatives for the nationalistic Croatian party HDZ wanted to be declared as an independent political unity, and that the area they control should be included in this independence. However this was not approved by the highest representative and the partyleader Ante Jelavic was fired.

The parliament in the Federation consists of two houses, the House of Peoples and the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives 98 members are appointed directly by the voters in proportional elections. The 58 members in the House of Peoples are appointed indirectly of the cantons’ legislate assemblies. In the House of Peoples the members shall consist of 17 Bosniaks, 17 Croats, 17 Serbs and 7 “others”. The president in the Federation is appointed by the parliament. The Federation is divided into ten quite independent cantons and 84 municipalities, general elections are held both on regional and local level.

4.2 Republika Srpska

During the chaos in Yugoslavia during the 1990’s the bigger part of the bosnianserbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina were against the fact that Bosnia and Herzegovina was about to leave the federation Yugoslavia and opposed to this by a referendum of independence. The bosnianserbs abandoned the parliament in Sarejevo and formed a bosnianserbian representative assembly in Pale.

The ninth of January in 1992 Republika Srpska declared independence. In February a constitution was adopted for Republika Srpska which declared that the states territory, in-
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cluding all Serbian autonomous regions, municipalities, and other Serbian ethnic entities in Bosnia and Herzegovina was to be a part of the federation Yugoslavia.

In Republika Srpska the nationalist party SDS (Serbian democratic party) has maintained its leading position during the afterwar years. It is the biggest party in this part of Bosnia. The founder of SDS and the leader of the bosnian serbs during the war Radovan Karadzic got arrested in July 2008 wanted for war crime. The party has had difficulties with convincing the world that it has accepted the Dayton Peace Agreement. This agreement is a contract between Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Croatia and it led to an end to the war. The negotiations for the agreement were set up in Dayton, Ohio during November 1995 and signed the 14 december 1995 in Paris.

Republika Srpska has its own government and the prime minister of Republika Srpska is called Milorad Dodik. Milorad Dodik stands for a Bosnia and Herzegovina that is systematized as a decentralized federal state, and Republika Srpska should be one federal unit. He claims further that Bosnia and Herzegovina needs a sophisticated political system as it is a multiethnic state, this system would then allocate political power equally. This is necessary to do to protect the citizens’ rights and prevent that any of the ethnic groups should have more dominating power than another. The leader of Republika Srpska continues by arguing that a introduction of a simple pluralist democracy with the complete country as one electoral unit would eventually result in the country being dominated by the Bosniaks. Dodik has been criticized several times for trying to make Republika Srpska a semi-autonomous state and also for seeking to inflict many of his views without himself being being keen to compromises.

### 4.3 The Dayton Agreement

The problems with the three parties and the Dayton agreement were characterized by the same disparities and difficulties that had characterized the international efforts earlier when trying to reach negotiations the conflict. However, they also differ in two aspects, the fact that neither the Bosnian Croats nor the Bosnian Serbs, the two groups that were the least susceptible by the pressure from the U.S., were a direct party to the negotiations. The second aspect was regarding the uncoercion by the United States to put forth extensive pressure on the parties, especially the Bosnian Muslim leadership, to agree to the negotiations. The Dayton Agreement corresponded to the continuation of the U.S. plan of uniting political and military pressure with political key dispensations, which had appeared in July and August 1995. The U.S put themselves into power position regarding the peace process at Dayton, putting the rest of the Western agents in subordinate roles.

This plan and the achievement it brought depended on the willingness of the U.S. to take on the type of commitment that the policy makers in the U.S., especially Pentagon, had been trying to avoid since the war began; the vague operation of U.S. troops settled in Bosnia to contribute in an international force to observe the accord and patrol the truce lines. This also required that the Bosnian Serbs and Croats submit to representation by Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic, respectively, who had essential influences on the partition of Bosnia and the outcome of the negotiations. Even at Dayton the conflicts of negotiation emerged between the three warring parties. The Croats and Muslims disagreed regarding the allocation of power in Bosnia, the Muslims continued advocating that power should be based on proportionality based on population, meanwhile the Croats
(represented by Croatia) insisted that power should be allocated equally between all three “constituent nations”.

The Croats argued for accommodating most state power in the Bosnian (Muslim-Croat) Federation rather than in the central government of Bosnia-Herzegovina in Sarajevo. This fact indicated the long-standing Croat goal of creating a separate entity for Croats, a goal they were already close to achieve with the help of the Croatian army. Their resistance to share power with the Muslims transformed the federation into two separate ethnic states. The Croat bias towards ethnic separation within the federation matched the Bosnian Serb bias towards strengthening the Bosnian Serb republic at the cost of the central state. The Bosnian Muslim negotiators, however, argued for a unified Bosnian state. These political differences had carried on from the beginning as international negotiators tried to establish constitutional and institutional formulas for Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In opposition to former negotiators, however, differences of huge impact arised between Bosnian Muslim leaders as an outcome of the pressure and the opportunities of the negotiations.

Haris Silajdžić, the Bosnian prime minister advocated for a federal, unified, multiethnic state. The Bosnian president, Alija Izetbegovic on the other hand, was willing to compromise the unity of the state as long as he would get an secured control over a compact territory for the Bosnian Muslims. Izetbegovic was willing to admit ethnic partition as an temporary solution at least, in order to secure Muslim power over a definable territory.

The agreement was constructed in form of a map designating the exact lines of that de facto partition which proved to be the most difficult to achieve. Media accounts involved in the Dayton process foucs mostly on the disagreements regarding the map, even though it is obvious according to insider sources of the final agreement that much time during the three weeks of negotiations was spent on discussing governance and military issues. The aspect that a distinct Bosnian Serb army was allowed by the agreement, represented a huge concession by U.S. negotiators and a major political loss for Izetbegovic and the Bosnian central government.

4.3.1 Dayton Agreement Map

The accepting of the Dayton agreement put forward some key points of contention in respect to the map compromising a familiar list: control of Sarajevo; the status of the northern passage and the Posavina region, as well as the choke point connecting eastern and western Serb territory surrounding Brcko; the territory surrounding Prijedor and Sanski Most, that was under Croatian – Muslim control, and status of the very last enduring government – held enclave in the east, Gorazde, and the passage of area by which it would be linked to government – held territory in central Bosnia.

15 Ibid. pp.362
16 Ibid.
All of these issues had been brought up earlier in previous negotiations. However this time there was one fundamental difference considering the territory. During the past negotiations the Serbs were the leading hand since they controlled approximately two-thirds of Bosnia. This time the situation was opposite, and the Serbs had control over less than 50 percent of Bosnia since Muslims and Croats cooperated and a combined offensive was established in summer 1995.

Due to the Bosnian Serb dominance on the ground agreements regarding territorial issues could not be reached in the past. Now, Milosevic and Tudjman worked together in order to solve the issues, and the United States supported their solutions. The final map, however, seems to be constructed and 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.”"\(^{17}\)

The approaches of Milosevic and Tudjman, and the imposition of territorial solutions on the Muslims, brought back previous suspicions that much of what became apparent during the struggles in 1995, did not only reflect the original convergence of Serbian and Croatian interest in the partition of Bosnia-Herzegovina but also a possible prior secret deal between the two parts. In the combined Yugoslav-Bosnian serb delegation Slobodan Milosevic was the leader, and he made all the decisions. This fact did not only reflect aspect that Milosevic was granted the formal authority by the agreement enforced on the Bosnian Serbs in August, but also the strategic reality that was taking form on the ground in Bosnia: the Bosnian Serbs and the losses suffered by them weakened the politics, and the increasing interest of Serbia (Milosevic) in reaching an agreement with Croatia. Milosevic determined the matter of Sarajevo unilaterally by yielding to Izetbegovic that the Muslims deserved to run the city and a part of the hills surrounding Sarajevo, hence transporting to Muslim control militarily, politically and symbolically significant territories that had been important and at center of the Muslim-Serb disagreement and under Serb control since the beginning of the war.

As such a transfer had been visualized earlier by U.S. policymakers as a part of an exchange where the Muslims would concede Gorazde to the Serbs, Milosevic seems to have accepted less than this in return, namely, maximal allowances at Lukavica and Pale. Tudjman on the other hand, superseded Bosnian Croat demands for the return of lands in the Posavina area to Croatian control, as he conceded the area to the Bosnian Serb republic. “His decision seemed to confirm Milosevic’s assertion that “President Tudjman and I have already agreed that the Bosnian Posavina will be part of Republika Srpska.” Close observations of the talks noted that this statement again fueled speculation about a “Zagreb-Belgrade deal” and left the Bosnian Muslim delegation “too stunned to react.””\(^{18}\)

As the corridor to Gorazde was defined it was Milosevic’s time to cede territory. The U.S. negotiators forced Haris Silajdzic to give up his demand that the Gorazde commune should be extended to the already existing Bosnian-Serbian border, a demand that was accepted by Milosevic as intended to split the Bosnian Serb republic. However, Milosevic was convinced by the Americans who insisted on a passage that would use the landscape of the territory in order to enhance security, to accept a passage that was five miles wide instead


\(^{18}\) Ibid.
of that of two miles. The establishment of the passage initiated a understandable source of future conflict between the Muslims and Serbs.

As it came to appear that Milosevic’s concessions had decreased the Serb republic to 45 percent instead of 49 percent of Bosnian territory, he insisted that the Serb territory should be increased “I was very flexible in my desire to approach peace” he argued “but I cannot go back to Belgrade with less than 49 percent.” He required to attain additional territory in the planned Posavina passage. Silajdzie suggested that the territory that was under Croat control should be transferred to the Serbs. This fact was the beginning of the egg-shaped territory in western Bosnia at Mrkonjic-Grad, gained by the croats in the September fighting, and then allocated to the Serb republic at Dayton. Franjo Tudjman had difficulties with accepting these changes but he was persuaded by President Clinton however, who advised Tudjman to be more flexible. The agreement between the parts can be seen in figure 3.1.

Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Dayton Peace Agreement and the front lines at the end of 1995

![Map of Bosnia and Herzegovina under the Dayton Peace Agreement](http://www.ohr.int/ohr-info/maps/images/bih-under-dpa-and-front-lines-1995.gif)

Fig 3.1. The map at the Dayton Peace Agreement
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The original confrontations of the Croats to conceding the area surrounding Mrkonjic-Grad to the Serbs, Mate Granic, the Croatian foreign minister declared that there was no chance that the Croatian government would accept the proposal. Granic led the United States Secretary of state Warren Christopher to demand that the Bosnian Muslim delegation must come up with dispensations of their territory in order to meet Milosevic’s demands on 49 percent, this proposal was however received willingly by the Bosnians.

The Bosnian Muslim delegation put forward a new map instead that revitalized claims to territories that had been assigned to the Serbs previously, the city of Brcko and the coke point in the north were included in the new map. This situation had occurred earlier as well, as a negotiation had occurred that the Bosnian Muslims felt were to their disadvantage, they then withdrew the previously territorial separations and brought up new demands in an attempt to secure the Serbs to bear the burden of having blocked an agreement.

The Bosnian Muslims had been able to spoil European – brokered agreements in this way earlier since they were supported by the United States, now, however, the United States was the broker of the agreement, and a bow to Bosnian pressure was not to happen. Richard Holbrooke (the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, and the chief architect of the Dayton Peace Agreement) threatened on November the 20th at Dayton to abandon the parties overall and let them come up with their own solutions for the territory.

Later that same day Warren Christopher (United States Secretary of State) distributed a draft declaration proclaiming the failure of the negotiations to Izetbegovic, this was obviously meant to be a pressure increasing move in order for the Bosnians to give in on the issue. The Bosnian foreign minister at that time, Muhamed Sacirbey, leaked this statement to the press and reports that the negotiations had failed started to surround the area. The failure was turned away, however, when Milosevic tried to convince Tudjman and the Croatian delegation to join a Croatian – Yugoslav statement blaming the Muslims for the failure of the negotiations. The Croatian delegation argued that Brcko was a concern that was too small to spoil the negotiations and meant that it should be presented to international adjudication for declaration at a later date. Milosevic agreed to this.

The Muslims faced a renewed Serb – Croat coalition in opposition to them and abandonment of their most significant international supporter, the United States, if they held out for Brcko. However, the Muslim negotiators stated that Brcko had been granted to the Bosnian government under Vance-Owen plan, a plan that implicated a separation of Bosnia and Herzegovina into ten semi-autonomous regions. The U.S. government condemned this arrangements as weak and pro-Serb.

As the Dayton process came to an end the American official’s spoke with frustration and resentment at what they saw as the indecisiveness, internal disagreements and at times, a pessimistic manipulation of Bosnian officials. In the closing hours of the Dayton process, Christopher is said to have gone off at Izetbegovic, this led to an accession regarding Brcko and the map overall from the Bosnian delegation. The consent to the Dayton agreement involved that the Bosnian Muslims had a catch on the United States, namely their previous commitment to supply military aid. This statement was acknowledged later by Holbrooke, who accounted in Senate testimony that the U.S. had given a verbal agreement to the Bosnians to “lead an international effort to ensure that the Bosnians have what they need to defend themselves adequately.”

The outcome of this resulted in an establishment of the U.S. train and
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equip program, which since has provided the Bosnian army with great quantities of equipment, such as heavy weapons. This would never had happened if the Dayton Agreement was not signed.

The Bosnian Serbs saw the final map as a political defeat, particularly in the Sarajevo territory, they felt that the map was forced on them without their participation. The Bosnian Serb members of the Yugoslav delegation are said to have gone crazy when they saw the map shortly before signing the agreement. However, to show that he supports the Dayton Agreement, Milosevic met up with the Bosnian Serb leaders in Belgrade and pressured them into agreeing to Dayton. The meeting lasted 12 hours and was unstable at time, but the next day Radovan Karadzic accepted the agreement publicly. With this the military struggles were over and all three parts would continue the battle by political means.

4.4 The constitution

The Dayton constitution redefines “the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina” as a state existing of two entities, the Federation and the Republika Srpska. This is the legal maintenance of the republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The entities have the right to create corresponding relationships with neighboring states, [Art. III.2(a)].

The constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina is contained in Annex IV to the Dayton Peace Agreement, it involves a multifaceted institutional construction. The Dayton Peace Agreement ended the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina and brought peace and stability. Swift decisionmaking and the capacity to make quick progress towards the EU are still prevented, however, some progress has been made under the existing constitutional structure. The Parliamentary Assembly in Bosnia and Herzegovina declined a set of constitutional amendments in April 2006, and since then no additional attempts to amend the constitution have been made. Bosnia and Herzegovina has to implement more sustainable and efficient institutional structures in order to make progress towards addressing the main European Partnership priorities. The political parties in the country still disagree with each other regarding the future of the constitutional reform.

Political leaders within the country have challenged the Dayton Peace Agreement and by this the constitutional order is challenged as well. The political leadership of Republika Srpska has provided the most frequent challenges since the leaders in the entity claim to the right of self-determination for the Entity. The Republika Srpska National Assembly accepted a declaration that condemned Kosovo’s independence and stated that the authorities of Republika Srpska may seek a independence referendum if the majority of UN and EU Member States acknowledges Kosovo’s self-determination. The international community rejected this declaration.

The elections are still performed under requirements that are in violation of the European Convention on Human rights (ECHR) due to the failue of the constitutional reform. The
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tripartite Presidency in Bosnia and Herzegovina is in contravention of Protocol 12 of the ECHR, since citizens belonging to other groups than the three elemental peoples are not allowed to stand as candidates and it concludes the ethnicity of each candidate voted from the Entities.

The international community, on the basis of the Dayton Agreement still maintains an important presence in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Office of the High Representative (OHR) and the EU Special Representative’s office have been cooperating with the European Commission on matters connected to European integration. Matters, such as governance and facilitating reform have, to a large extent been controlled by OHR. The High Representative’s use of his decision-making powers has stayed low and a legislation has not yet been enacted. The European Court of Human Right ruled a number of applicants lodged against the decision of the High Representative as inadmissible in October 2007, in order to get rid of the applicants from the public office and block them from running for election. According to the Court the High Representative implemented legally given powers of the United Nations Security Council.

The closure of the OHR has been delayed due to the political instabilities in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the region as a whole. The Peace Implementations Council determined in February 2008, to make the closure on Bosnia and Herzegovina’s progress provisional. This decision was referred to five detailed targets and two specific conditions (a stable political situation and signing of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement). When it comes to the five targets, a little progress has been made on the matters linked to State property and the Brcko final award. The two entities, the Federation and Republika Srpska, have not completed bringing their constitutions in respect to the March 2006 ruling by the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina yet. The entity coats of arms and anthems were not in line with the State-level constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Republika Srpska has took on a provisional symbol and proposed for a new coat of arms and the Federation still considers possible symbols for the entity. In Bosnia and Herzegovina in general, nationalistic language has prevailed and the leaders have not succeeded in creating functional and affordable State structures which support the process of European integration, even though the constitutional framework has been reformed.

---
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5 Today’s Bosnia and Herzegovina

As long as Bosnia and Herzegovina has existed it has been a multinational state. Now, however, the positive aspects of being a multinational state have become negative. So, this chapter will cover the outcome the multiethnicity has had on Bosnia and Herzegovina and its inhabitants. The three main international actors, the EU, NATO and UN will be included in order to see what impact they have had on the war and creating peace in the country.

5.1 Afterwar years

Before the war broke out there were 44 percent Bosniaks living in Bosnia-Herzegovina, 31 percent were Serbs and 17 percent Croatian. Before the war the three groups lived side by side and many families were mixed. Today this situation looks totally different, the bigger amount of the Serbs live in Republika Srpska, while the Croatians and Bosniaks dominate each side of the Federation. The Croatians live in the south parts while the Bosniaks dominate the central areas.

As the Dayton Peace Agreement was introduced in 1995, a complex and tough constitutional situation arised in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The two entities, the Federation Bosnia and Herzegovina and Republika Srpska are both to a large extent independent. This politically complex situation is one of the bigger obstacles for the development of the country, however, there are several major problems regarding the development, corruption among other things.

Bosnia and Herzegovina still struggles with the problems the war brought. Of 2.2 million refugees one million have returned to their homes and unemployment and poverty are largely widespread. The economic growth has during the last years been on barely five percent. The largest growth occurs within the informal economy, which is appreciated to be 30-40 percent of the official economy.

One of the driving forces for development is an eventual future membership in the EU. Many important steps in the reformprocess remain however before a membership can become topical, a change has to be made in the constitution. The fact that leading politicians in both of the entities to a certain degree see the reformprocess as a threat to their own interests has not helped to speed up the EU approach.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina there is a tri-partite Presidency, one Bosnian-Muslim, Haris Silajdzic, one Bosnian-Croat, Zeljko Komsic and one Bosnian-Serb, Nebojsa Radmanovic, these three rotate every eight months. The decision-making division consists of the Council of Ministers as well, whose chair is chosen by the Presidency. The Ministers control and have responsibilities over a lot of fields. The governmental division consists of the Parliamentary Assembly; the House of Representative, containing 42 members designated directly from their own entity, and the House of Peoples, containing 15 members designated by the Parliamentary Assemblies of their own entities.

The national institutions have responsibilities for financial, monetary and foreign policies. Refugee, immigration and asylum policies and regulations are fields controlled on national
level as well. The tri-partite Presidency employ ambassadors and other international legislative bodies, condemns, negotiates, and with the Parliamentary Assembly’s approval, sanctions agreements of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Constitutional Court, the Central Bank and the Standing Committee on Military Matters (SCMM) are some of the institutions working on national level. The SCMM’s main job is to organize the activities of the Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in other words the Federation Army with its two separate mechanisms, the Bosnian (VF-B) and the Croat (VF-H) and the Army of Republika Srpska (VR-S). The SCMM is expected to become a future common army between the two entities.

In addition to the state institutions, the Federation and Republika Srpska have their own separate constitutions, hence, they have separate political and administrative systems. They have their own Presidents (Borjana Kristo - Federation, and Rajko Kuzmanovic - Republika Srpska), vice-presidents and all essential ministers. The lawmaking in the entities differ however distinctively. The Federation has the same system as the state institutions (House of Peoples and House of Representatives), Republika Srpska on the other hand has only a National Assembly (RSNA). The entities also have separate Constitutional Courts. Another difference between the entities is the fact that the Federation is built upon ten Cantons. The Cantons are granted autonomy to a large extent, they have their own local governments and have the opportunity to implement cantonal laws, as long as these laws do not contradict with the ones in the Federation. In Republika Srpska there are no Cantons and there are no intermediaries between the central government and the municipalities.

This complex system with two entities was required in order to end the long and brutal war. It is based on mutual compromises and agreements, for example, the three Constitutions ruling the country. In the long run, however, changes must occur. The country must form a unified ruling.

5.2 Nato

Nato started *Operation Deliberate Force* in August 1995, this operation was an air campaign by several NATO countries in order to undermine the military capabilities of the Bosnian Serb Army since the Serb army threatened to attack UN-designated “safe-areas” (Sarajevo, Zepa, Srebrenica, Gorazde and Bihac) in Bosnia. The operation was executed between the 30th of August and the 20th of September 1995.

The operation was triggered by the second bombardment on the Sarajevo market place, Markale on August 28th 1995, by the Bosnian Serb Army. On August 30th the military intervention led by the U.S. began, the targets were the Serbian artillery positions throughout Bosnia-Herzegovina. The shellings continued until October. Due to the shellings from NATO and help received from the Islamic world in form of arms shipments the Serbs lost ground to the Muslim-Croat troops, and eventually half of Bosnia was retaken.

Slobodan Milosevic had now no choice but to surrender and start cooperating. On the 1st of November, 1995, the leaders of the military groups met up in the United States for peace
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25 SFOR, [http://www.nato.int/SFOR/indexinf/125/p03a/chapter2.htm](http://www.nato.int/SFOR/indexinf/125/p03a/chapter2.htm)
talks at Wright-Patterson Air Force base in Ohio. The negotiation reached took form in the Dayton Peace Agreement.

After the agreements 60,000 NATO soldiers were send to Bosnia-Herzegovina in order to preserve the cease-fire. A multinational force led by NATO, the Implementation Force (IFOR) began its operation in December 2005. The primary mission of IFOR was to put Annex 1A (Military Aspects) into practice. The force started off good, and the main tasks of actively working on ending the hostilities were accomplished. By mid-January 1996 the Implementation force managed to separate the armed forces of the Bosnian Muslim- Bosnian Croat Entity ( The Federation) and the Bosnian-Serb Entity ( the Republika Srpska), in mid-March they succeeded with transferring areas between the two Entities, and eventually in June, heavy weapons and the parties’ forces were moved into approved sites. Since IFOR had a one-year mandate the rest of the year was spent on patrolling along the 1,400 km long de-militarised Inter-Entity Boundary Line and inspecting the sites were the heavy weapons and other equipments were contained.

Eventually IFOR was replaced by the Stabilization Force (SFOR). SFOR helped maintaining a safe environment to ease the reconstruction of the country and it supported also a reform of the Bosnian armed forces. As the situation in the country improved, and the security increased the number of peacekeepers in the country was remarkably reduced, from 60,000 in the beginning to 7000 in 2004.

In December 2004, the responsibility for maintaining security was handed over to the European Union. NATO continues however to give support to the EU operation (Operation Althea) in Bosnia-Herzegovina within the frameworks of the Berlin Plus arrangements (a package of agreements made between NATO and the EU).²⁶
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The figure above shows the peoples point of view on NATO. The figure is split between the Federation and Republika Srpska. It can clearly be seen that there are differences in opinion between the entities, in the Federation all ethnic groups are pulled towards the same percentage confidence meanwhile the numbers totally differ in Republika Srpska. In Republika Srpska the Muslims are the only ones having high confidence in NATO when compared to the two other ethnic groups, the Croats and the Serbs. The Serbs, especially, lie on a low percentage value, namely less than 20 percent.

This may be explained by the bombings Serbia has experienced from NATO. First Operation Deliberate Force and also later the bigger-scale bombing, called Operation Allied Force, which lasted from 25th March to June 10th 1999. This operation was proceeded due to Serbia’s attacks on Kosovo. NATO put up some certain goals (stop all military action, unconditional and safe returns of refugees, etc.) for Milosevic to follow in order to stop the bombings. Milosevic accepted these goals in the beginning in June and NATO stopped their attacks.

Another problem regarding NATO may be the fact that NATO works towards unifying the country meanwhile the politicians in Republika Srpska strive towards dividing the country. Republika Srpska would if it had the power, be independent from Bosnia and Herzegovina. So, this could be a reason to the negative approach towards NATO in Republika Srpska.

In NATO’s 2004 Partnershi...
who fought for the Bosnian Serbs to Hague. However, in 2006 both of the countries were invited to join the programme. This cooperation focuses mainly on institutional, democratic and defence reforms, but also realistic collaborations in other areas. Bosnia and Herzegovina was, in April 2008, invited to begin an Intensified Dialogue with NATO regarding its ambitions for membership and related improvements.\textsuperscript{27}

5.3 The European Union

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a potential candidate for European Union membership. In June 2008 the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA)\textsuperscript{28} between the EU and Bosnia and Herzegovina was established. The provisional Agreement, that has been in force since July 2008 focuses mainly on trade-related regions. However, the Dayton peace agreement and its constitutional fundamentals have been challenged by leading politicians in both Entities which has led to stagnation in the process to EU-related reforms.

In order for Bosnia and Herzegovina to move in a direction towards EU changes within the country must occur. To be able to develop a suave process of institutions, create more efficient and functional state structures and for speaking with an unanimous voice regarding EU and other international matters a public vision based on the direction of the country must be followed.

Since 1995 an international presence led by UN patronage has been positioned in Bosnia and Herzegovina. As the Office of the High Representative (OHR) phases out this patronage will end. OHR’s closure depends on Bosnia and Herzegovina’s development in approaching particular conditions and objectives that have been established by the Peace Implementation Council. The EU has sustained its organizational significant work with providing resources to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the construction of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) and the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP).

In February 2008 the regular meeting between the Members of the European Parliament and Members of the Bosnia and Herzegovina Parliamentary Assembly took place and the same month a EU-Bosnia Herzegovina troika took place at political directors’ level. The EU has continued, in addition to Community support, to provide significant resources to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and the European Security and Defence Policy. The mandate of the EU Special Representative, who offers the EU’s guidance and facilitation to Bosnia and Herzegovina and supports the political organization on the whole, has been extended until February 2009. The mandate of the EU Police Mission (EUPM) has been extended until the end of 2009, the EUPM will persist to monitor, mentor and inspect the police forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The EUFOR/Operation Althea, continues to preserve a secure and safe environment, and this will continues as long as necessary. The visa readmission and facilitation agreements between Bosnia and Herzegovina and the EU were established on the 1 of Jan-
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uary 2008. In June 2008, the first Joint Committee meetings on the Visa Facilitation Agreement and the Readmission Agreement took place. The EU opened a visa liberalisation discussion with Bosnia and Herzegovina in May 2008, which in time should lead to elimination of visas for citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina travelling to the EU. A thorough road map with clear standards that have to be fulfilled by Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to stimulate the visa regime were put forward in June 2008. In August, Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted an Action-Plan in order to execute the visa road map.

The 2008-2010 Multi-Annual Indicative Planning Document (MIPD) for Bosnia and Herzegovina was accepted in September 2008. The European Commission distributed Bosnia and Herzegovina with a total of €74.8 million under the 2008 Instrument for pre-accession assistance programme (IPA). The key areas of interference are economic and social development and democratic stabilization, strengthening the rule of law and public administration structures and support to the civil society.

As can be seen from the figure, the ethnic groups have very different approaches towards the European Union in Republika Srpska. The confidence has, however, decreased within every group, besides the “other” group. The Croats have decreased the most, with over 80 percent in 1994 to approximately 50 percent in 1999. The Muslims have most faith in the European Union and the Serbs are the ones that trust the institution the least. In the Fed-
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eration the opinions are equally distributed, there is a more united picture. All of the ethnic groups lie within a 10 percentage interval and the confidence in the European Unions has decreased however within all groups. In the Federation, in contrast to Republika Srpska, the Serbs are the ones with the highest confidence in the European Union, with approximately 65-70 percent.

The reason to this may be that the politicians in the Federation have a more positive approach to the European Union than those in Republika Srpska. So, the numbers can be an outcome from the politicians influences on the people. Another reason may be that the people just might have realized that if the country should be able to develop changes must be done.

However, on thing that is common between the entities is that the confidence has decreased in both and within all ethnic groups, with the exception of the “other” group.

5.4 The United Nations

The fightings in Bosnia and Herzegovina ended on the 11th of October 1995. Since that day and until the 20th of December 1995, United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) supervised a ceasefire arranged in order to provide the peace negotiations being launched in Dayton, Ohio.30

When signing the Dayton Agreement, the three Balkan states took on a commitment to

“conduct their relations in accordance with the United Nations Charter, fully respect the "sovereign equality of one another", settle disputes by peaceful means, and "refrain from any action against the territorial integrity of political independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina or any other State."31

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Bosnia and Herzegovina recognized one another as sovereign, independent states within their international borders. United Nations Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH) started its missions under discouraging circumstances. During the war over 200,000 people had died, 20,000 were missing, 1,2 million people were relocated and the country was divided based on ethnic classifications. The fratricidal war, where the major victims and targets were civilians, had left a legacy of extensive fear of revenge and hatred. The local police forces were paramilitary units that were divided ethnically, and organized in three different ways depending on which ethnic group it represented. The police forces discriminated and harassed citizens who were of another ethnic group than them. As the ethnic separation was strengthened, freedom of movement was non-existing, blocks were put up by police controls along the Inter-Entity boundary line and between communities in the Federation. In addition, the police forces were corrupt and politically dominated. Within these highly unstable locations the UNMIBH concentrated on civilian security in order to create a stable environment.


31 Ibid.13/11-08
In 1998 the freedom of movement improved considerably due to the introduction of uniform vehicle licence plates, a cooperative plan by UNMIBH and the Office of the High representative. With the introduction of the International Police Force (IPTF)\(^\text{32}\) organization within the UNMIBH the local police was monitored. The IPTF pushed the local police forces toward focusing on individual security instead on national security. It also helped them in reforming their institutions towards democratic, multi-ethnic and professional police forces.

By 1999, security had stabilized and displaced persons started to return to their pre-war homes. The UNMIBH drew up a conceptual model which would help reforming the police. Three levels were involved, the individual police officer, law enforcement institutions and the relationship between the police and the public. The model was planned in six central aspects and the aims with the model were; documentation of individual officers, authorization of police administrations and the creation of self-sufficient mechanisms for State and regional level inter-police force collaboration. This model became the main orientation document for the activities of UNMIBH, both with the international community and the local interlocutors.

The figure shows the relationship between the confidence in the United Nations within the entities divided between the ethnic groups. Also here, as in the case of the European Union the opinions within the Federation are more united. The ethnic groups have the same pat-

\(^{32}\) SFOR Informer Online, [http://www.nato.int/SFOR/indexinf/90/iptfbih/000623o.htm](http://www.nato.int/SFOR/indexinf/90/iptfbih/000623o.htm), 14/11-08
terns and lie within 5-10 percentage intervals. There is an approximately 20 percentage decrease among the groups within the Federation from the years 1994-1999 to 1999-2001. In Republika Srpska the picture looks different, and the opinions between the groups differ distinctly. However, all three major ethnic groups have lost confidence in the United Nations, and the “other” group, have been lying on the same value throughout the years, 50 percent. The Muslims are the ones with highest confidence in United Nations, especially in Republika Srpska where they stand out from the rest of the groups.

The Serbs have the lowest confidence in United Nations in Republika Srpska, which they have had throughout the years included in the figure. The Croats are the ones that have decreased the most in confidence in Republika Srpska, from almost 80 percent in the years 1994-1999, to approximately 30 percent in 1999-2004. This is a reduction with roughly 50 percent.
6 European Union Vs. Russia

As NATO threatened to bomb Serbia and proceed the Operation Deliberate Force Russia allied with Serbia and opposed to NATO’s plan to use force against Serbia. Boris Yeltsin, the Russian president at that time, met up with Milosevic in Moscow. Yeltsin warned at the meeting that additional Croatian hostilities against Serb-held territory could lead to that Russia would abandon international sanctions against Serbia. As the appearance from the forced U.S. agreement to use force Yeltsin held a meeting with Milosevic in order to show that there is a political separation between the two powers. The Croatian president, Franjo Tudjman refused to attend the meeting with Yeltsin and Milosevic, perhaps as an outcome of the efforts from United States to avert the Russians from supporting a Serbian - Croatian deal at the cost of the Muslims. Boris Yeltsin failed, however, to invite the Muslims to the meeting.

Even when Operation Deliberate force was carried out the Russians sustained to claim that NATO had no authorization for such action. Yeltsin claimed that the NATO air campaign would be the origin of conflict between two military alliances in Europe, a growing NATO, and Russia and its allies. Besides criticism of the broader geostrategic inferences of cooperative U.S. – British – French battles against supposed Russian interests in the Balkans, the Russians aimed to one main aspect of the rising resolution. The Russians insisted that the Bosnian Serbs should be permitted to create relations to Serbia which would correspond to those the Federation had to Croatia. This was actually something that was a main fact in the negotiations during the Dayton Peace Agreement which ended the fighting.33

The Russians have continued to be by Serbia’s side throughout the years, Russia was, namely, one of the few countries that supported Serbia when Kosovo declared independence. Since Republika Srpska is allied with Serbia and Serbia has a positive approach to Russia, Republika Srpska is positive towards Russia as well and the anti American politics Russia is advocating.

This situation create a problem for Bosnia and Herzegovina as whole, since the entities counteract each other. The Federations focuses mainly on the European Union while Republika Srpska is influenced by Serbia and consequently Russia as well.

However, A survey made in 2004 made by the “PULS” agency showed that 88% of the citizens in Bosnia and Herzegovina were in favor of the attainment of BiH entering the European Union34. The eventual entering to EU has a representative meaning, involving stable economy and a secure and democratic framework.

However to be able to join the European Union, Bosnia and Herzegovina has to meet some certain criteria, Copenhagen political criteria35. These criteria involve stability of organizations guaranteeing democracy, rule of law, human respects and respect for and protec-


tion of minorities. Other aspects required are regional cooperation, good neighbourly relations with Member States and respect for international contracts, such as collaboration with the UN International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). To be able to meet these criteria the country must act like one united actor and not go against each other like the situation looks now.

The standards and values the European Union advocate are of integrationistical character, their ideological roots oppose to those of the exclusivistic character which are based on ethnic nationalism. This conflict is most obvious in situations where the politicians act opposing to the ambitions of the society and suppress foreign policy priorities in order to push the domestic interests ahead. In Bosnia and Herzegovinas, the Prime Minister of Republika Srpska may be seen as one of these politicians. During the election campaign, Dodik opposed to one of the main six EU key condition, namely, the police reform claiming that the police reform collided with Serb interests. Dodik meant that the Serbs would not be sufficiently protected if the Republika Srpska police arrangements were dismantled.

Milorad Dodik has been cited to say “If the road to Europe means an end to Republika Srpska, we shall then say: Goodbye, Europe!”

7 Summary

As World War II ended Bosnia and Herzegovina became a part of the Socialistic Federative republic Yugoslavia. Josip Broz Tito was the leader of Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Yugoslavian communistic chapter. Tito’s state was based on an authoritarian one-party system. When Tito died the Yugoslavian structure collapsed and national hostilities which Tito managed to hold back came up to surface by nationalists who wanted to rule the territory.

Since Bosnia and Herzegovina was the republic which was the most multiethnic, containing high percentage values of all three ethnic groups, the Muslims 44 %, the Serbs 31% and the Croats 17% all three groups feared what was going to happen. As the nationalists popped up more and more in the territory and in the politics the ethnic conflicts started to arise. None of the nationalistic politicians wanted to surrender and the war was a fact. In April 2nd 1992, the republic Bosnia and Herzegovina declared independence from Yugoslavia.

The Dayton Peace Agreement which put an end to the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was established in November 1995. As the Dayton agreement was signed two new administrative entities and a district, the Federation containing the Muslims and Bosnian Croats and Republika Srpska containing the Bosnian Serbs and the Brcko district were created in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The entities have their own separate governments and presidents. The politicians within the entities work against each other and focus only on improving the conditions within the entity and the country as a whole is not a primary matter.

On the national level the country has a tri-partite presidency consisting of one Bosnian Muslim – Haris Silajdzic, one Bosnian Croat – Zeljko Komsic and one Bosnian Serb - Nebojsa Radmanovic. These three rotate every eight months. The Council of Ministers also work on the national level, these ministers are chosen by the Presidency and are in charge of a lot of fields.

Now, 13 years later the situation still has not improved significantly much. The country still suffers from the negative consequences the war brought, unemployment is high and the living standards are disastrous when thinking about that Bosnia and Herzegovina is a country in 21st century’s Europe. There are international actors such as the European Union, NATO and the United Nations which have helped to end the war and develop the country. Bosnia and Herzegovina has a long way to go though, in order to join the European Union. Many changes have to be done, which will be hard to proceed since the entities have to cooperate and the state has to be led on national level. As mentioned before, this is not the case in the country right now. The entities have their own police forces etc. which according to the European Union standards has to be conducted on national level.

Another problem for the country is the close relationship Republika Srpska has with Serbia, this situation creates a problem due to the fact that the leaders of Republika Srpska take Serbia more into consideration when taking decisions than they take Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Federation.

Bosnia and Herzegovina has still a long way to go in order to improve the situation in the country and to make the inhabitants satisfied with the political system and trust the authorized powers.
8 Conclusion

This thesis has improved my knowledge about the situation in the Balkans in the beginning of the 1990’s. Since Bosnia and Herzegovina is situated in the middle of former Yugoslavia and consist of three majority groups, it is not that hard to predict that it was the republic that suffered the most losses during the war. As the Dayton Peace Agreement was signed and the war ended the country still has not fully recovered.

Bosnia and Herzegovina is now split between two entities, which are divided based on ethnic belongings, the Bosnian Muslim – Bosnian Croat Federation and the Bosnian - Serb Republika Srpska. These two entities have their own governments and ministers. This means, in other words, that the entities are self-governing to a large extent. This situation reduces the development of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country since the entities have hard time cooperating. In my opinion this situation would never had occurred if in the beginning of the 1990’s Bosnia and Herzegovina was surrounded by politicians who wanted to create a democratic state. However, politicians who based their beliefs and actions on ethnic belongings were the ones conquering the country.

This situation has unfortunately not changed until this day, the leaders in Republika Srpska still ignore the Federation and Bosnia and Herzegovina when taking decisions. Republika Srpska also refuses to accept the police reform, which in order for Bosnia and Herzegovina to join the European Union must be implemented.

The European Union, NATO and United Nations have been the three main conflict solvers and their main task, to stop the war, is done. Now, however, there is one major goal left, and that is to make the three ethnic groups cooperate and accept each other. This fact is something that will be hard to achieve. It has been 13 years since the war ended and the people still categorize themselves by their religious views and live in territories depending on ethnic belongings. As can be seen on the Dayton Agreement map the Serbs live in the northern and eastern parts of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Muslims live in the middle and the Croats in the southern parts.

Personally, I believe that as long as this dividedation exists the future and development of Bosnia and Herzegovina lies a long way ahead. There is so much left to do in order for Bosnia and Herzegovina to work as a functioning democratic state. Within most countries there is a “we” feeling, in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the other hand the “we” feeling is divided between the ethnic groups. It does not matter that it is the same people, born in the same country and speaking the same language, the groups still look at the situation as “us” and “them”. These factors make a united approach towards improving the country pretty impossible.

So, to sum things up, Bosnia and Herzegovina still has a long way to go in order to become a developed and growing state. All three sides must change their attitudes and focus on getting the state as a total to function properly. It has now been roughly 13 years since the war ended and it is time to move forward. However, the war should no be forgotten.
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