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In simple words, ethno-mobilization could be defined as “closing ranks” within a single national corps in order to achieve a certain goal or perform some extraordinary work, most frequently for the purpose of “organizing defence from an enemy”, i.e. removing the causes of vulnerability.\(^1\) It means bringing members of one ethnic group in a state of readiness, mobility, which should be a prerequisite for the performance of other actions and/or an obstacle and barrier to the sudden or unannounced “attack” by another, “opposing,” ethnic group or groups.

Ethno-mobilization can be commissioned by various stakeholders that may be internal (within one nation/state, one ethnic group) or external (those that act from outside, from outside territory of a single state or a single ethnic group).\(^2\) Also, ethno-mobilization is a phenomenon that may have either a latent or manifest nature - it may be conducted under the name of affirming the nation (ethnicity), but with the purpose of creating the mindset among the members of the particular ethnic group that assumes the necessity of homogenization (latent) or it may directly and openly agitate and set the goal of ideologically and politically homogenizing members of a single nation as a necessity (manifest). Those who conduct mobilization may belong to various categories of people (such as politicians, members of the military, intellectuals, “ordinary” people, etc.) and they typically make up a very small percentage of an ethnic group. Still, one would not be wrong to define ethno-mobilization as essentially (although this view may be considered reductionistic) and without regards to political correctness, a strategy of the political elite that entices ethnic nationalism among citizens. Causes of ethnic mobilization may vary - political, social, economic, legal, etc. Ethno-mobilization is in most part organized through the media where the individuals/porte-paroles of an ethnic group openly criticize the other ethnic group/s, while defining their group as the one opposing the other group.

The subject of this analysis will be the various causes and reasons of ethno-mobilization in Bosnia and Herzegovina during late 1980s and early 1990s (legal, political, social, ethnic, poleomological...), which has had a fundamental effect on the creation of conditions for conflict generation.

The various causes of ethno-mobilization are mutually inseparable, so an approach to studying ethno-mobilization as a primary origin of the conflict that was

---

\(^1\) The very term “mobilization” is primarily of military origin and it means “transition of the nation’s armed forces from peace-time status into mobile status and reaching full battle readiness” (Bratoljub Klaić, *Veliki rječnik stranih riječi*, Zora, Zagreb, 1972.). The same dictionary describes a broader sense of the term “mobilization” as “attracting certain groups of population [...] to perform some tasks that are required by the current circumstances”, and “put in motion (for instance, popular masses) for the purpose of performing some extraordinary work”. The term “ethno-mobilization” would mark the last case: “mobilizing masses for the purpose of performing some extraordinary work, which would, in the eve of war in former Yugoslavia, be defense of jeopardized nation (in the broadest meaning of the word).

\(^2\) One should emphasize right in the beginning the distinction between the terms *national group* and *ethnic group*. In the western countries, the national interest means interest of the whole nation (state), therefore the national interest is equal to the state interest, while here, the notion national interest describes the interest of one of three constituent peoples (Bosniaks, Croats, Serbs), and this is in fact, viewed from the prism of international public law and international relations, interest of the ethnic group (ethnic (not national!) interest).
the basis of the dissolution of Yugoslavia will be polyvalent, but at the same time also holistic. A symbiosis of the gradual analytical layering of facts and of the comprehensive synthesis of reasons will lead us to the goals we had set: an interdisciplinary report on the pre-war generation of conflict as a condition for beginning of the conflict in BiH.

In this context, it is completely clear that any consideration of causes of ethno-mobilization in Bosnia and Herzegovina necessarily requires the inclusion of an analysis of the external influences on ethno-mobilization and radical ethnohomogenization in BiH, beginning firstly with influences by the neighbouring countries of Serbia and Croatia. However, before we attempt to define the key political conflicts that were brewing in Yugoslavia (1989-1992), one must develop an insight into possible causes of unresolved conflicts within the Yugoslav community. According to our insights, the following factors were at work there: the weakened legitimacy of Yugoslavia; conflict between pro-European and pro-Eastern political orientations; “happening of peoples” - conflict generation by media; triumph of the nationalistic spectacle; the formal dissolution of Yugoslavia; the reflection of political conflicts on BiH; exposure to the media from Serbia; and authoritarian political culture. In this research, when establishing a stratification of the factors of conflicts, we are primarily interested in those among them that are most closely related to BiH, as well as in the subjects who developed such factors by representing them as real and objective, beyond any political artificiality. This process of “infecting” Bosnia and Herzegovina with realities of evil was possible, first of all, because of the over-arching contagious Argus at that time (late eighties and early nineties) still called Yugoslav Peoples Army (JNA). This militaristic Leviathan concentrated its weapons and men in BiH with the intention to produce fear in supporters of independent Bosnia and Herzegovina in an organized way, thus affirming itself as a force in its own capacity and as an (in)transparent Serbian ethno-national force.

In terms of “masking” the Serbian essence of the JNA, the position of the member of the Academy Mihajlo Markovic, ideologist of the Milošević’s SPS, is very illustrative. He stated:

Formation of a Serbian army would be catastrophic policy, because it would bring Serbia in position of committing aggression against another republic, it would mean that it is conquering that territory, with its own army. Much wiser is the strategic decision to put that defence of Serbia into the hands of the Yugoslav Peoples Army, because only that army, Army of Yugoslavia, which still exists and whose affirmation and strivings and existence we have been trying to prove all the time, it is the only army that had legitimacy to move all over Yugoslav territory. This will prevent judgment against Serbia as a country that has committed invasion, as would most

---

3 The term “conflict” is here used as genus proximum of war (armed conflict), in accordance with the newly promoted Conflict Resolution Theory that marks the different forms of conflict (wars, aggression of one country at another, and similar destructive sociological occurrences) by generic and axiological neutral term „conflict“ for the purpose of creating conditions for analyzing them by scientific methods, in accordance with the principle sine ira et studio. Unfortunately, the theory of conflict resolution has been replaced by the practice of so-called „conflict management“. This practice, as a form of resolving (finalizing) war in former Yugoslavia, has obviously inspired uninformed, biased, ineffective and uninterested international community that had, marked by the discourse of hyper-objectivity, succeeded in „conflict management“ to this date, maintaining in BiH situation of neither war nor peace.
certainly be the case if the opposition happened to be in power at that time.\textsuperscript{4}

In fact, the JNA was determining the political framework in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that is why we agree that it was a force of its own, one of the political entities most responsible for organizing and conscientiously generating violence in BiH as a method of survival in the “truncated” Yugoslav federation. In such an environment, processes have been progressing on the political field that have lead to tectonic disturbances in the lives of the BiH people.

\textsuperscript{4} Sonja Biserko (ed.), \textit{Kovanje antijugoslovenske zavere 1} (Helsinki komitet za ljudska prava u Srbiji, Beograd, 2006), 274.
2. Causes of Ethno-Mobilization

2.1. Description of the General Situation

The prominent issue in the former Yugoslav Federation (and most certainly in present-day BiH) concerned nationalities. Their unsuccessful resolutions lead to the intensification of the international conflict and in ultima linea, to the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia. Emerging Serbian nationalism, whose ressentiment was strengthened and encouraged by the authoritarian regime that served as its legal framework, was certainly the most aggressive and had no comparison in the Balkans.

In the 1980s, some republics of the Yugoslav Federation had already started countering Serb hegemony and unitarism. Contrary to the centralistic concept of government promoted in Belgrade, in Slovenia a campaign started to reaffirm the interests of Slovenians at the legal and the political level. The campaign was primarily aimed at implementing several reforms to promote civil society and various reforms that should have resulted in immediate economic-political benefit for the participating states, but no longer to the Federation as a whole. The advocates of political decentralization, which was supposed to end in the transformation of former Yugoslavia into a confederate type of country, began to become increasingly involved in conflicts with the authoritarian-centralistic and non-democratic politics of Belgrade, personified by Slobodan Milosevic, at that time a highly positioned party (and later governmental) official.

In 1987, the Serbian government, under Milosevic’s centralistic regime, started implementing repressive measures in Kosovo. In 1990, in the first multi-party elections in the former Yugoslavia, Slobodan Milosevic was elected President of Serbia, and his factual position of the “ruler of Serbia” received an adequate legal basis. In September of the same year, a new Constitution of Serbia was adopted under which the Kosovo and Vojvodina governments were placed under direct influence of the government in Belgrade and Milosevic’s ultra-nationalistic politics. These politics were strongly characterized by denial and the violation of the civil rights and freedoms of Albanians from Kosovo, while the repressive measures implemented by the regime had important resonance, particularly from the early to late 80s in Slovenia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia. Ethnic polarization within the borders of the Republic began largely on the principle “one state - one nation”. The only republic that did not fit in to this pattern due to its specific demographic structure was BiH.

After winning the first multi-party elections in Croatia, former general of JNA Dr. Franjo Tudjman had been developing very controversial politics towards BiH both before and during the war. In his meetings with Milosevic in Karadjordjevo and Tikves, he allegedly attempted to split BiH, in spite of his declarative abstention from interference in the internal matters of BiH during the stage of pre-war build-up of the conflict. Still, the engagement of the Croatian Army in BiH, from the point of international public law, established Croatia and Serbia as “co-aggressors on BiH”\(^5\). The context in which the Tudjman’s politics towards BiH were formed was the following: the clear wish of the Serb population of BiH to join Serbia i.e. Yugoslavia, and the Muslim (Bosniak) insistence on the concept of a

\(^5\) In these elections, liberal currents of then communists won; they were characterized by reforming orientation both in domain of economy and law and politics. The same year, the elections in BiH were held (18 November 1990).

\(^6\) Admission by late general of Croatian Army, Janko Bobetko, in his book *Sve moje bitke (All my Battles)*, where he describes how he commanded in the actions on the southern front (Herzegovina front). The Hague indictment against Bobetko followed some chapters of the book.
unified BiH in “AVNOJ borders” have both contributed to the shift in his politics from merging Central Bosnia, Herzegovina and Posavina with Croatia, to the broadest decentralization of BiH (naturally, assuming that BiH survived as an independent country). In short, Croats in BiH, according to the ideas of Franjo Tudjman, had to choose between the option of dividing BiH into three national states, the option of internally reorganizing BiH into a confederation of three national states, and the option of union between the two countries where one would be the Muslim-Croatian “entity” later realized in the form of the Federation of BiH.

After the implementation of election results in 1990, a series of meetings were held between presidents of the then Yugoslav republics win which attempts were made to find solutions for the future legal organization of Yugoslavia. Serbia and Montenegro favoured a unitaristic-centralistic organization that would characterize the official politics of those countries until the Montenegrins expressed a desire for separation, which happened in 2006 when they received international recognition; Slovenia and Croatia lobbied for a confederate organization of the country, and later became champions of the block for independence. When the Croatian president was to take over the functions of the Presidency of SFRY, representatives of Serbia, Montenegro, Kosovo and Vojvodina obstructed the process, and after the declaration of a state of national emergency in March 1991, from 1991 to 27 April 2003 the Presidency operated in this incomplete form (only Serbia, Montenegro, Vojvodina and Kosovo). Meetings of the Presidents of the Yugoslav Republic that happened in the first half of 1991 failed, and this accelerated dissolution of Yugoslavia. In November 1991, the so-called Badinter’s commission was formed7 with the task of determining conditions each of the Republics of the SFRY had to meet to be recognized by the European Union. The Commission was supposed to present its report on 15 January 1992.

2.2. Fertile Ground for Ethno-Mobilization

National identity is certainly one of the most important kinds of collective identity, providing a meaningful and comprehensible picture of the social world we live in. National identities also fulfil more intimate, internal functions for individuals in communities, providing a social link connecting individuals and classes through a catalogue of shared values, symbols and traditions. When one notes that the idea of a nation in Eastern Europe is somewhat different to that of a Western one, it becomes clear why the lack of a national identity in Bosnia and Herzegovina served as a fertilizer for cultivating war in 1992. As Smith explains, “Historic territory, legal-political community, legal-political equality of members, and common civic culture and ideology are components of the standard Western model of a nation.” On the other hand, in Eastern Europe a nation is closely connected to ethnicity and “an individual is bound to their nation organically and is forever stamped by it.”8 Without this unifying thread people in Bosnia were left with multiculturalism as the only, however odd and insecure, binding agent.

Bosnia and Herzegovina inherited the key characteristic of multi-ethnicity from Yugoslavia. However, where Yugoslavia was a federal state, Bosnia and Herzegovina has always been considered a truly multicultural Republic by the

---

7 The commission got the name after its chair, French judge Robert Badinter; it was formed by the European Community. Its full name was Arbitration Commission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia (English abbreviation being used is “the Badinter Commission”).

majority of its own population, sometimes referred to as a mini-Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, this multiculturalism and the absence of a national identity would be the final undoing of Bosnia. The complex issue of nationalities that never allowed Yugoslavia to be at complete peace with itself was further complicated in Bosnia. In a nutshell, Bosnia was a republic, and today a country without a people, without Bosnians. While all other Republics had a fairly simple situation where majority living in Croatia were Croats, Serbs in Serbia, Slovenes in Slovenia and Macedonians in Macedonia, in Bosnia Serbs and Croats lived together with Muslims. The question of national identity in Bosnia and Herzegovina sparked an ongoing debate without ever being solved.

Being Bosnian was never a Constitutional option for the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina throughout its existence within the Yugoslav Federation and after its dissolution. Looking at facts it could be argued that this state of affairs was intentional, as some leading party members “mainly Serb…even during consultations about the future state structure of Yugoslavia were intending to stop equal positioning of Bosnia as a federal Republic.” According to Miroslav Krelza “The whole nation and her culture were silenced”. And further, as Noel Malcolm confirms:

> Party members were put under pressure to declare themselves as one or the other. An analyses of Party officials with Muslim names in the first (1956) Yugoslav Who’s Who shows that 17% declared themselves as Croats and 62 % as Serbs - a sign, among other things, which way the wind was blowing in Bosnian political life at this time.  

Keeping in mind the notion of nationality in Eastern Europe it is easy to understand how this sort of classification enabled Serbs and Croats living in Bosnia to feel emotionally attached to their true mother countries and as Yugoslavia disintegrated align with Serbia and Croatia and claim parts of Bosnian territory. Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina, having no mother country elsewhere, were the only people truly interested in maintaining Bosnian state and its borders. This wrongly led to perception of Bosnia as a Muslim country. Since the very creation of Yugoslavia, Muslim people in Bosnia and Herzegovina could only declare themselves as either Serb, Croat or stay undecided, which actually meant that they had not decided yet “whether to call themselves Serbs or Croats”. Only in 1971 and 1974 did being Muslim and Yugoslav, respectively, become an option. The population was further set apart by the fact that Muslims are a religious group, and Serbs and Croats are ethnic ones. Thus, the Bosnian (nation) has consequently been mistaken for (and misrepresented by) the three ethnicities, very often referred to as “nations”.

Although formally all republics had equal status within Yugoslavia, in practice perceptions and actions pointed to a long-term plan whose aim was to keep Bosnia and Herzegovina divided. In addition, in the period between the end of WWII and the eruption of war in 1992, Serbs outnumbered other nationalities in the higher official posts in Bosnia, including the Communist party, military (52%), police (39,57), ministries (39%), and the educational (45,50%), legal (43,65%) and information systems (TANJUG 74,53%) 

The already insecure situation within the Republic and the development of events in neighbouring countries including the rise of Slobodan Milosevic and

---

9 Philip J. Cohen, Srpski tajni rat: propaganda i manipulacija historijom (Ljiljan, Sarajevo, 1996)
10 Ibid.
12 Ibid, 197
13 Mirsad D. Abazovic, Kadrovski rat za BiH (Savez logoraša BiH, Sarajevo, 1999).
Croatian leader Franjo Tudjman in late 1980's with obvious nationalistic policies caused a feeling of unrest in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the one hand people wanted to believe that the specific nature of their country would withstand the wave of nationalism and "even in May 1990 the majority of the Bosnian population was not in favour of national parties, considering them a threat". On the other, voices from the past of their divided country were becoming clearer and clearer. Ilija Garasanin's "Nacertanjie" from 1844, Stevan Moljevic's "Homogenous Serbia" from 1941 and the most recent SANU Memorandum from 1986 were all documents whose vision of Greater Serbia included most or all of Bosnia and Herzegovina territory.

Instead of uniting the population under the term Bosnian, division was the chosen policy, thus creating a fertile ground for hostilities, prejudices and disconnect, and severely hindering their capacities to emotionally bond with their homeland and each other.

2.3. Anachronous Populist Concept “Nation-Party-State”

The clear trend of creating (single) national states on the territory of former Yugoslavia has logically resulted in Serbia losing economic and political primacy in the former Yugoslav federation. Since the institutional, legal and political organization of former Yugoslav federation guaranteed a large degree of independence to the republics (and also autonomous provinces within Serbia), the intellectual leaders of Serbian peoples, having considered SFRY their “own” country and being aware that many Serbs live in other republics, felt the broad decentralization as a direct attack on Serbian national being and as subjecting their own to the interests of other national corps. The constitutional “right to separation”15, which was given to all Yugoslav peoples, was a thorn in the side of Serbian nationalistic, conservative and destructive political elites. Since the Serbian nationalistic forces wanted to avoid formal establishment of new states on the territory of former Yugoslavia at any cost, they intensively laboured to prevent the dissolution of the former Yugoslav federation, or, in reality, to round up the territories with a majority Serb population and unify them in a single country. This was a centuries’ long dream of the so-called “Greater Serbia”, which was to include large parts of (SR) Croatia and (SR) Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to become a bloody epilogue and failure of what is in political terms considered imaginary integral Yugoslavism. As a political idea and practice “Integral Yugoslavism” exploited a manifest form of the latent Serb desire to have “Greater Serbia”, since in that union of, declaratively “equal peoples and nationalities”16, the majority of

14 Keith Doubt, Sociologija nakon Bosne (Buybook, Sarajevo, 2003), 65
16 Constitution of Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFry) provided for equality of all citizens (Article 154), stating that „all citizens are equal as to their rights and duties, regardless of their nationality, race, gender, language, religion, education or social status“. This was so-called non-discrimination clause. The same wording could be found in Article 161 Constitution of Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (SRBiH). Practically, there was always a sharp “discrepancy between the norm and reality”. Government of BiH submitted request for recognition of sovereignty and independence (December 1991). In its Decision expressing wish to be recognized, the Government included results of 1991 census, according to which, at the time, in BiH lived 17.27 % of Croats, 43.74 % of Moslems and 31.33 % of Serbs (the same percentages are indicated in
population were Serbs, so ideologists of the “Greater Serbia” found SFRY to be a suitable transitional organizational form where they were “more equal” than the others.\textsuperscript{17}

The concept of “national states”, based on already prepared national programs,\textsuperscript{18} inevitably led to the emergence of nationalism\textsuperscript{19}, which resulted in the most radical ethno-mobilization and inter-national armed conflict on the territory of former Yugoslavia, during which genocide and the most cruel crimes against humanity, violations of laws and customs of war and of the Geneva conventions and an entire range of other crimes were committed.

2.3.1. Political Parties

The establishment of national parties - *Hrvatska demokratska zajednica* (HDZ), *Stranka demokratske akcije* (SDA) and *Srpska demokratska stranka* (SDS) - upon a manifestly ethno-nationalistic basis meant a definite breakdown of the political structure of BiH along national lines. Political pluralism was understood in BiH not as a conglomerate of various political programs and ideas but as a national-political pluralism where one party automatically meant one religion, one nation, and political and territorial exclusivity and hegemony on at least one part of BiH. As such, it inevitably finalized ethnic divisions in a society as fragile as BiH’s was before the war. Let us see how the keeper of the single-party system, the League of Communists of BiH (*Savez komunista Bosne i Hercegovine*) behaved.

SK BiH opposed the idea of establishing new parties and a multi-party system because, as the leader of communist BiH at the time - Nijaz Durakovic - put it: “the multi-party system... in our circumstances would end up with nationalistic parties. You may say that we already have something like that. But is it really wise to legalize a practice that we consider bad and a cause of many misfortunes”.\textsuperscript{20} In agreement with Durakovic’s position at that time was his counter-candidate in elections for President of CK SK BiH Đževad Tašić because “[...] we have had some tragic experiences with multiple parties both in BiH and in the country as a whole. Before the war (World War II) we had 28 of them, and all but one was more or less nationally oriented. That one was the KPJ”.\textsuperscript{21} A very different opinion on political pluralism was expressed by the member of the Presidency of the CK SK BiH Desimir

---

\textsuperscript{17} An illustration of “equality” between the most numerous peoples and other Yugoslav peoples is the piece of information presented by Dr. Omer Ibrahimagić, who used to be a judge in the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia before the war. He says that “in 28 years of existence of that court (Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia), the presidents were a Macedonian and a Slovenian for one year each, while during the remaining 26 years the function of the President was performed by Serbs from Croatia, or Montenegrins, or Serbs from Bosnia and Herzegovina, or, obviously, Serbs from Serbia”, Omer Ibrahimagić, “Agresija ili građanski rat”, *Bosna i Bošnjaci između agresije i mira* (Rijaset islamske zajednice u Bosni i Hercegovini, El Kalem, Sarajevo 1998), 199.

\textsuperscript{18} E.g. *Memorandum by Serbian Academy of Science and Arts* (Memomardnum Srpske akademije nauka i umjetnosti) and *Contributions for Slovenian National Program* (Prilozi za slovenski nacionalni program).

\textsuperscript{19} This was about the so-called “competitive nationalisms”, among which the most unscrupulous, the “trigger”, was the Serbian nationalism, of Slobodan Milošević, followed by the so called “induced nationalisms”.


\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
Međović, who thought it was the strongest “guarantor of radical transformation, very much thanks to the “danger” that will come into being because of competition,” and for that reason he was in favour of multi-party system:

SK has to have an active attitude towards multi-party system, it must not only open the door to such processes, but encourage them, not take them as a duty imposed from outside. If a transformation of the SK were at all possible, then it would be only possible in the situation of competition where the SK will be forced to make some changes and achieve political efficiency.

After the termination of the 14th extraordinary congress of SKJ, where the decision was made to terminate the monopoly of the League of Communists, CK SK BiH decided to allow a multi-party system under two important conditions. The first condition was that the emerging parties not be based on national or religious grounds (Article 4 of the Law on Association of Citizens - Zakon o udruživanju gradana), and that the newly established parties recognize the territorial integrity of the Republic of BiH and its even standing with the other Yugoslav republics. Also, the activities of parties established outside BiH were restricted, so according to the Article 8 of the Law on Association of Citizens, they would have to be registered with the BiH Republic bodies. All these were attempts to establish a multi-party system on positive reduction premises, with the goal of preventing conflicts in BiH that might lead to the disappearance of the country.

Nevertheless, after the prohibition on establishing nationalist parties, the “Constitution Court, on its own initiative”, began a procedure to “examine compliance with constitution of that article” and by that, claims Kasim Trnka, at that time President of the Constitutional Court of SR BiH, “expressed suspicion on the basis of many arguments for the suspicion. […] I want to emphasize that the decision to examine constitutionality of this article was made by the Constitutional Court unanimously”. Nijaz Duraković adds the following concerning establishing nationalistic parties:

I actually think that the issue of nationalistic party - yes or no is in fact artificial and that such legislative solutions should be strived for that would prohibit only the parties that threaten sovereignty and integrity of BiH. I do not see any particular problem in emerging purely Croat, Muslim or Serb parties provided that they agree on democratic values on which BiH and SFRY are based. However, this certainly is not the case with the parties that think of BiH as artificial and octroyed creation and that threaten its sovereignty by flirting with their “spare” homelands.

This direction-seeking on the part of League of Communists of BiH is put in context by some authors in the following way: “Incapacity and lack of readiness among the leaders of BiH communists to take active role in establishing political pluralism, and later on, their attempts to prohibit formation of nationalist parties, actually results with it promoting “nationalism as its main alternative”. Still, the question of whether the spiral of violence would have reached this deadly crescendo if there had been no ethno-national parties and if the multi-party system had remained in

23 Vlastimir Mijović, „Strah od otvorenih vrata“, Danas, 6 February 1990, 16.
25 Ibid.
27 Dejan Jović, Jugoslavija - država koja je odumrla: Uspon, kriza i pad Četvrte Jugoslavije (Samizdat B92, Beograd, 2003), 47.
the framework of political organization on basis of social interests, still remains open: Public exposition of buried political eschatologies, penetration onto the political level of exclusive nationalist ideologies has offered those ideologies a historical opportunity to ethicize and nationalize communist ideology, which has transformed from supra-national into a particularly national ideology. This “unexpected deal” between the nationalists and communists, and conceptual closeness between the nationalism and communism enabled the political registration of ethno-nationalist and nationalist parties in the multi-national political space of BiH. Through the form of partisan political organization, the space for political pluralism expanded, so the “democracy flourished” and made some positive progress also outside of institutions and parties, but there was also a “flourishing of masses”, a populist rising of nationalist flags all over Yugoslavia. A peak of negative democracy was achieved in BiH by the legislative institutionalization of ethnicity through the constitution of political parties on a solely ethnic basis.

In the purest understanding of democracy as the most desirable organization of a political community of people, prohibiting a mono-ethnic partisan organization is not appropriate. However, the following question deserves to be asked: If the majority of political, economic, cultural, social, historical and other parameters pointed (in advance) to the conclusion that the legalization and political establishment of ethnic parties was a key to open conflicts, was the suspension of democracy in that case really revolutionary violence that should be prohibited, or a reasonable provision of conditions for the subsequent development of delayed democracy? In the case of BiH, regardless of how anti-democratic it may appear, the formalization of democracy was one of the provisions that enabled the “forging of war” in BiH. This forging institutionally began in the first multi-party parliamentary assembly of the Socialist Republic of BiH, which was formed after the first multi-party elections (1990). The elections marked the end of a monistic political order. It was hoped that they had created preconditions for the development of multi-party democracy as a legitimate form of organization and parliamentary assemblies as the fora for conflicts of political interest, where parliamentary battles would take place in form of desirable expressions of politics. However, democracy made a wrong turn, and it can be concluded that postulating mono-ethnic multi-party democracy was among the important conditions that constituted what we may call a ‘promised land of BiH war’. Counting on already profiled mindsets, and with assistance of lascivious nationalist-religious rhetoric, the nationalist parties were triumphant in the first multi-party elections. SK BiH-SDP was heavily defeated, receiving only 13% of the votes. The Reformers got 8%, while the other parties (DSS, MBO, Liberals) combined received only 4.6%.

---

29 Mirko Kovač, Cvjetanje mase (Bosanska knjiga, Sarajevo, 1997)
30 Florian Bieber, Institucionaliziranje etničnosti. Postignuća i neuspjesi nakon ratova u Bosni i Hercegovini, na Kosovu i u Makedoniji (Međunarodni forum Bosna, Sarajevo, 2004)
31 Mark Thompson, Kovanje rata (Article XIX. Naklada Jesenski i Turk i Hrvatsko sociološko društvo, Zagreb, 1995)
32 Nerzuk Ćurak, Obnova bosanskih utopija: Politologija, politička filozofija i sociologija dejtonske države i društva (Synopsis, Sarajevo-Zagreb, 2006), 17-18.
33 Ante Markovic from Konjic was leading the reformists. He was the prime Minister of SFRJ from 16 March 1989 to 20 December 1991. He started an ambitious economic reform in 1989 which included stabilization of currency and privatization. This turned Markovic into one of the most popular politicians in the history of Yugoslavia. Markovic owed his popularity to his contemporary style of a western politician. He also maintained his popularity by staying out of conflicts within the Communist Union of Yugoslavia and because he actively mediated in the conflicts between the republics. However, his programme of reforms was soon
This result was made possible by the consensus of the nationalist parties to bring down communism and communists from positions of power. In addition, the election campaign was more than dirty. Firstly, the religious dignitaries of all three confessions, who had been laying dormant for a long time when it came to political issues, became involved. There were cases of burning ballot boxes, adding votes, dead men voting, etc. The election victory of the right-oriented parties in the region also affected the electorate. Inter-partisan divisions between the SK BiH SDP and DSS (Democratic Union of Socialists), and SK BiH SDP and Union of Reform Forces of Yugoslavia for BiH also contributed generally to the defeat of the left.

2.3.2. National(istic) “Political Pluralism”

The first party to register with the courts was the Party of Democratic Action - Stranka demokratske akcije (SDA). Contrary to the Croatian (HDZ, August 1990) and Serb (SDS, July 1991) parties that were registered later on, this party avoided the nationalist attribution, although its program favoured Muslims, defining itself as a party of the “Muslim-historical circle”. Alija Izetbegovic, Adil Zulfikarpasic and Muhamed Filipovic were the leaders of this party and at the time were considered to be the ones to bring about change. Alija Izetbegovic was sentenced to 14 years in prison by the communists in a dubious trial in 1983. In the meantime, his book “Islam between East and West” was published in the US. After five years in prison in Foca, Izetbegovic was freed in 1988. During his time in prison his writings “Notes from Prison 1983 - 1988” were circulated outside and later published. As a political prisoner he gained public sympathy, especially with Muslims. Adil-bey Zulfikarpasic gained popularity in a similar way, and as an immigrant who left Bosnia in 1946 he was welcomed back with huge media attention as a successful businessman in 1990. Together with Alija Izetbegovic he formed the SDA and became vice president. Muhamed Filipovic was respected as an academic, philosopher, theorist and one of the most influential historians in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The founding assembly of the SDA was held on 26 May 1990 in the Sarajevo hotel Holiday Inn. Interestingly, among the guests was Dalibor Brozović who came on behalf of the HDZ and used the opportunity to say that the “Croatian border will be defended on the river Drina”. From the media reports it can be seen that the internal split followed immediately after the foundation of the SDA BiH. Muhamed was sabotaged by the government lead by Slobodan Milosevic, while the federal government was further weakened by independence movements in Slovenia and Croatia. During the last few months of his mandate Markovic attempted to find a compromise between these two republics and also Serbia and Monte Negro who were demanding that Yugoslavia remain a centralized state. Unfortunately, his efforts were in vain despite the support from the new democratic government in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia. This was due to the fact that JNA, who was meant to be his biggest ally, aligned with Milosevic and Serb nationalistic leaders.

34 In the first multi-party elections in BiH, which were held in 1990, what dominated the political posters was mostly the national/ethnic rhetoric. “Apart from the leaders’ photographs, with emphasized characteristics, the only constant were the symbols and graphics of the parties, particularly the nationalist ones that have, lacking the rational arguments and knowledge, counted on the lascive nationalistic rhetoric, on already profiled mental (national) constructs, mythomaniac national interpretations... With poor composition, little creativity and limited marketing, they followed the line of lesser resistance and stroke at the most subtle human feelings related to the forms and shapes of primary identification through nation and religion”. (Besim Spahić, Izazovi političkog marketinga deset godina poslija kao i prije deset godina (Compact-E, Sarajevo, 2000), 130.

35 About the Croatian myth “border on the river Drina” that has existed in the radical Croatian circles, see more in: Ivo Goldstein: “Granica na Drini - značenje i razvoj mitologema”, in the Compendium: Historical Myths in the Balkans (Institute of History, Sarajevo, 2003), 109 -139.
Filipovic and Adil Zulfikarpašić left the SDA and form the Muslim Bosniak Organization (MBO) explaining that the SDA was too religious. The split occurred after the rally in Velika, held on 15 September 1990, which was full of religious iconography (many green flags with crescent, turbans on people’s heads, cries like “Long live Saddam Hussein”, etc.) Such rallies served the Serb politics of the time well by convincing their followers that “Islamic fundamentalism” was dangerous, and that that was why they should fight for the idea of staying within Yugoslavia. It was not a coincidence that the internal conflict in the SDA happened in Velika Kladusa because that affair acquired characteristics of Muslim national expression.

Since Fikret Abdic, the undisputable leader of the Cazin Krajina at that time possessed some undoubted charm, this had to be put to good use in order to make the SDA more massive. He had great public support after he realized his life and business vision by becoming the director of Agricultural Union in Velika Kladusa. He helped build “Agrokomerc”, one of the most powerful agricultural and business empires in the whole former Yugoslavia in the midst of the poor Cazin Krajina. Later it will become apparent that the dubious “Agrokomerc” affair, which would last three years during the 1980s, was politically used against Hamdija Pozderac and his position as the head of Commission for the revision of the Constitution of SFRJ. 36 Fikret Abdić was arrested and accused of counter revolutionary threats to the constitutional framework of the SFRJ according to Article 114 of the Criminal Law of the SFRJ 37. Being imprisoned and spreading word of Greater Serbia and the weakening foundations of socialism all made Fikret Abdić into a Muslim and media hero between 1987 and 1990. His political fame peaked after he left prison and especially on 15 September 1991 when he organized the biggest Muslim people’s assembly in Velika Kladusa announcing his joining the SDA. In the election for the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Fikret Abdić, as a Bosniak representative, claimed the most votes 38.

Interestingly, during the election rallies of the SDA the “Muslim intellectuals” or “Young Muslims” (Mladi Muslimani), who had been tried on several occasions, were not really in the spotlight. Only after the elections did a group of people who had been unjustly sentenced by the communist court of the former Yugoslavia for verbal delict (crime) in 1983 take leading positions in the parties. (Maybe the plan of distribution of party, and later government functions to the “Young Muslims” never existed, but the post festum analysis shows that after they had won power, almost all former convicts had leading functions in the party or in government bodies).

While the SDA was busy dealing with their internal conflicts, the distribution of government functions, and the organization of election rallies, the leaders of the SDS worked actively to destroy the social-political system of SR BiH of the time 39. Before the elections were held and the SDS leaders were elected to the

36 Hamdija Pozderac was a member of presidency of SFRJ towards the end of his political career. When he was about to become the President he was urged to resign (due to Agrokomerc affair) and withdraw from the political scene in Yugoslavia where he spent most of his working career. He died in April 1988 in Kosevo hospital in Sarajevo under unresolved circumstances.

37 He was charged with issuing shares without financial worth 400 million dollars. Since public was used to accept such things without critical judgment they readily accepted this media campaign well led by the Belgrade magazine Borba whose journalist apparently uncovered the affair.

38 Although a rightful President by the number of recieved votes he leaves the position to Alija Izetbegovic. Instead of leading the party he returns to Cazinska Krajina intending to keep his peace and ensure reestablishment of Agrokomerc.

39 “[…] You can not break apart whole Yugoslavia and leave Bosnia and Herzegovina innocent. If Yugoslavia is changing its constitutional status, so has to do Bosnia and Herzegovina, where the western Herzegovina would be allowed to remain in Yugoslavia to
government, the Bosnian Serbs gathered around the SDS had been working on setting up parallel Serbian government bodies. It was systematic and well organized preparation for the possible of division of BiH and its annexation to Serbia. The assembly of Serbian people was the first political body formed by the leaders of the Bosniak Serbs as a parallel body to the political institutions of SR BiH at the republic level.

SDS gathered already affirmed public figures: Radovan Karadžić, Biljana Plavšić, Nikola Koljević and others. Radovan Karadžić worked as a psychiatrist in the Kosevo hospital in Sarajevo. In 1989 he participated in establishment of SDS in Bosnia and Herzegovina. He had great support from the Serb public as he advocated the protection of Serb interests wherever they lived. Biljana Plavšić already had a distinguished scientific career teaching Biology at the Faculty of Natural Science and Mathematics in Sarajevo. She was a member of SDS since its foundation in 1990, when she also became a member of the Presidency of the Republic Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nikola Koljević was a university professor and an interpreter. During the first multi-party elections he was elected a Serb member of Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Stjepan Kljuic, a prominent journalist, worked on establishing HDZ BiH. Mate Boban also joins HDZ BiH and very quickly contacted the head of HDZ in Zagreb. He held public speeches for the Croatian population “warning” them of the “imminent danger” of Islamic fundamentalism endeavouring to turn Croats against Bosniaks.

During the whole of 1991, leaders of Bosnian Serbs were implementing the policy of “regionalization”, i.e. they organized areas where Serbs were relative majority using for that purpose the concept of “union of municipalities”. Having initiated formation of regional governments throughout the BiH, the SDS has started preparing rather early to take de facto power in the end on the parts of the territory of BiH inhabited by Serbs. Many of such preparations were done in conspiracy and secretly.

The core of power of the rebel (illegitimate ethnic regionalization has already represented the rebellion against the legal system of BiH) Bosnian Serbs included

the extent it wants, and in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the extent it wants, and that principle would apply to other parts of the Republic”, said Radovan Karadzic, then president of the SDS, in his statement to Tanjug. Reported by Oslobodenje, 02 March, 1992, 2.

Radovan Karadžić, together with Ratko Mladić, his superior and commander of his Army, is the most wanted war criminal in the world, accused of genocide against non Serbs in Bosnia and Herzegovina and of ordering ethnic cleansing.

On 7 April 1992 she left the Presidency and joined political leadership of Republika Srpska. Biljana Plavšić, together with radovan Karadzic and Momcilo Krjsnik was a leader of Bosnian Serbs during the war in BiH. From 1992 to 1996 she was the vice President of Republika Srpska. Everyone will remember her arrival to Bijeljina at the beginning of war when she greeted Zeljko Raznatovic Arkan by kissing him and congratulating him on the massacre he commited on Bosniaks in Bijeljina.

In April 1992 he left the Presidency and during the war against BiH he was the vice President of Republika Srpska.

President of Republic of Croatia Franjo Tudman trusts him with sesession and formation of Croat municipalities in BiH as independent from bh government in Sarajevo as possible. In February 1992 he becomes the head of HDZ through a dubious proceedure in place of the legal President Stjepan Kljuic. In Grude, on 18 November 1991 Mate Boban establishes a Croatian community Herzeg-Bosnia an autonomous territorial unit within BiH, aparently in order to better defend against Serb agression.

from as early as July 1991 Radovan Karadžić, President of the SDS and its undisputed leader; Momčilo Krajišnik - representative of the SDS in the Assembly of SRBiH and vice president of the Party, and Karadžić’s closest associates; and also Biljana Plavšić and Nikola Koljević, SDS representatives in the collective Presidency of SRBiH and top level leaders. The same people had their functions “guaranteed” in the so-called Serbian Republic of BiH. The so-called National Security Council comprised Karadžić, Koljević, Krajišnik, Plavšić and others ..., then there was the so-called three-member presidency: Karadžić, Koljević and Plavšić, and extended presidency: Karadžić, Đerić, Koljević and Plavšić45.

On 24 October 1991, the so-called Assembly of Serb People in Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted, outside of the institutions of the state and contrary to the Constitution of the Republic of BiH at the time, a decision to organize a referendum. The question was: “Do you agree with the decision made by Serbian people in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 24 October 1991 that the Serbian people should remain in the common country of Yugoslavia, together with Serbia, Montenegro, SAO Krajina, SAO Slavonija, Baranja and Western Srem?”46

As well as being contrary to the Constitution, the referendum question prejudiced solutions to the Yugoslav crisis in the direction of creating the Greater Serbia. Under the name of fighting for the preservation of Yugoslavia, the real goal was to implement the hegemonic nationalist concept of the so-called ultimate solution and round up the ethnic borders. This was a political act that had brought much insecurity and confusion to the political life of Bosnia and Herzegovina. When the Presidency of SR BiH reacted to its lack of wisdom and lack of legal grounds, the opinions of members of the Presidency of the SR BiH Biljana Plavšić and Nikola Koljević were separated - suggesting existence of ideological split in political institutions of government of BiH.

2.4. Unity of the Army and (Serbian) Peoples

Throughout the former Yugoslavia, the Serb peoples were systematically armed so that they would, in the manner of a typical blitzkrieg physically connect the “Serbian territories” and politically unite them and place under rule of the political leadership of the then Yugoslavia, i.e. Serbia and Belgrade - Slobodan Milosević personally. Of course, the Serbian peoples were told, in the manner of skillful ideological and political manipulation, that they would be “defenders” from the upcoming separatist and nationalistic concept of the former Yugoslavia.

In mid to late 1980s, Serbian expansionistic and nationalistic politics achieved their peak, while the Serbian media were trying in every way to convince the national and international public that the Serbs in Kosovo, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were persecuted and deprived of their rights since they were not majority in those parts of former Yugoslavia.

The politics of Serbian government has clearly sided with the extreme forces of Croatian and BiH Serbs by providing them with political and material support, announcing the later “transformation” of the legitimate armed forces of

45 Before that, on 14 October 1991, „in the memorable exchange between the Serb leader Radovan Karadžić and the Muslim Bosniak leader Alija Izetbegovic […]“, Karadžić for the first time used the explicit threat of extermination: Do not think that you will not lead Bosnia into hell, and do not think that you will not perhaps lead the Muslim people into annihilation, because the Muslims cannot defend themselves if there is war“, Unfinished Peace, Report of the International Commission on the Balkans (Aspen Institute Berlin, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, 1996), 34.
46 The slogan of this plebiscite was: “All Serbs in a Single State” (Oslobodenje, 6 November 1991), 5.
the Federation of that time into an almost mono-national army that would place itself in the exclusive service of protecting the interests of the Serbian population in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{47} In their newsletter \textit{Narodna Armija (NA)}, the Army reported on elections in BiH with a warning of “homogenization of Bosnia and Herzegovina population and its classification under national flags”\textsuperscript{48}. The first serious conflicts of interest between the Army and parts of the Government in BiH, the SDA and HDZ happened after the decision by the Presidency of BiH dated 7 August 1991 to send the privates from BiH to serve the army only on the territories of BiH and Macedonia, and a set of decisions on delaying sending the privates into the JNA. Texts in the \textit{NA} included the following titles: “Doko (then Minister of Defence of BiH) is Pushing His Own Agenda”\textsuperscript{49}, “SDA in Action Against the JNA - Dangerous Calls)”\textsuperscript{50}, “Mobilization on Target of the Parties”\textsuperscript{51} where they emphasize that the “unified armed forces are not in the interest of the party leaders of the SDA and the HDZ”, and that the “Sabotage in BiH is helped by Croatia”.\textsuperscript{52} Warnings were repeated that the “mobilization is not supported by the Party of Democratic Action and irresponsible municipal secretariats for national defence”\textsuperscript{53}/\textsuperscript{54}. The paper regularly featured texts against the HDZ BiH and the SDA accusing them of encouraging an anti-army attitude\textsuperscript{55}, and criticizing members of the SDA such as Irfan Ajanović, then vice-president of the Assembly of SFRY, who had “as a faithful member of the SDA BiH, in a forest of

\textsuperscript{47} Complying by orders of its top commanders, and with material assistance of the Serb Democratic Party of BiH, the Yugoslav National Army has formed and equipped in military terms the so-called Army of the Republika Srpska, and many para(military) formations of Bosnian Serbs and filled them with adequate commanding cadres, placing them under their immediate control and command. This has been directly admitted by then Minister of Defense of SFRY and head of the Headquarters of the JNA, General Colonel Veljko Kadijević who said, when speaking on achievements of the JNA: “In Croatia, in cooperation with the Serb people, \textit{it liberated Srpska Krajina} and forced Croatia to accept the Vans’ peace plan; in Bosnia and Herzegovina, first the JNA, and then the army of the Republika Srpska, which was helped to their feet by the JNA, assisted in \textit{liberation of Serb territories}, [...] thus creating the basis for establishing three armies: Yugoslav Army, Army of the Republika Srpska, and Army of the Republic of Srpska Krajina. Having in mind internal and international situation, this was done in a very well organized way. This was a very important task. The JNA leaders made it a priority”, see Veljko Kadijević, \textit{Moje viđenje raspada}, Beograd, 1993. navedeno prema, Arijе Nejer, \textit{Ratni zločini - brutalnost, genocid, terror i borba za pravdu}, Samizdat B92, Beograd, 2002., p. 158.) Mobilization of the Bosnian Serbs into the JNA was seen by General Kadijevic as a thing “of vital importance” for the JNA, because, as he writes, “the Serb people in Bosnia and Herzegovina, by their geographic position and size, is one of the key factors for establishing a joint state of all Serbs (Kadijević, op.cit., 144).


\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Id.}, „Doko tjera po svome”, \textit{Narodna armija}, 22 August 1991, 17.

\textsuperscript{50} M. Sinanović, „SDA u akciji protiv JNA: Opasni pozivi”, \textit{Narodna armija}, 22 August 1991, 17.


\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid}, 20-21.

\textsuperscript{53} Radovan Karadžić, SDS leader, in his statement to the “Politika” from Belgrade, says “Concerning the Serbian response to mobilization exercises, Serbs in BiH will not allow JNA be humiliated by anybody and defeated on Bosnian mountains. We shall not be blamed for disturbed national balance in that Army because others are throwing away their arms and not response when called”, \textit{Politika}, July 12 1991.


green-white flags tied in knots with the HDSZ, fiercely attacked Serbian leaders and the JNA as major culprits for Yugoslav crisis, strongly advocating independent Herzeg-Bosnia and autonomy of Sandžak within Serbia”. With increasing frequency, the Army accused members of the HDZ and the SDA of seeking the suspension of federal regulations, and that, on their orders, the Ministry of Defence of BiH “in a planned way caused chaos and anti-army campaign, attributing all kinds of things to the JNA....”. In October 1991 the JNA units in BiH were put on the status of highest battle readiness in order to “prevent expansion of civil war on BiH”, and there was much talk of winds of war around Velež and accusations against Republic of Croatia that they were pulling the threads in “a transparent game of extremist members of the SDA and the HDZ in Bosnia and Herzegovina against the members of JNA on those territories”.

Military leaders justified the mobilization of units of the Sarajevo, Banja Luka and Tuzla corps and the arrival of reserve forces from Serbia and Montenegro to the territory of BiH by their desire to prevent inter-national conflicts, while in fact the goal was to prevent any attempt for Bosnia and Herzegovina to gain independence. The reservists immediately began to create fear among the local population, as illustrated by the statement of the then head of the Centre of Security Services (Centar službi bezbjeđnosti CSB) Mostar Viktor Stajkic, who claimed that they “registered over thirty violations of the reservists a day”, mostly cases of using firearms and opening fire. Besides preventing international conflicts, some high officials in the JNA, like General Major Milan Torbica, commander of the Uzice corps (in his interview to Slobodna Bosna - authors’ remark) justify their arrival to Herzegovina by claiming the prevention genocide “of Serbian people, which had reached horrifying levels in ’41 and ’42, and is planned again by the HDZ, but also by the Headquarters”. Along the line of mytho-maniacal history of the “slaughtered nation”, the “reservists of the JNA became particularly unruly in that area during the following two months. They took part in armed conflicts with local police and members of the Croatian paramilitary forces, and they terrorized Muslims and Croats. In October 1991, the JNA forces and members of the Serbian TO attacked the village of Ravno in the hills above Dubrovnik and killed a number of its inhabitants and burned many houses there. In November 1991, the JNA reservists stationed in Mostar paraded through Sarajevo shooting into the air. The behaviour of the JNA in BiH in the fall 1991 confirmed the concerns of many non-Serbs that the JNA had become a pro-Serbian force.

---

60 N. Stevanović, „Bosni prete belajem“, *Narodna armija*, 2 October 1991, 16.
61 “The SDS leaders in BiH supported mobilization by the JNA, while the HDZ and SDA (at different times and different levels) ignored it or opposed it. On 30 September 1991, Presidency of BiH declared the mobilization that had been ordered by the JNA the day before illegal, demanding replacement of Nikola Uzelac, Commander of the Banja Luka Corps, who had issued the order”, Biserko, *op.cit. note 4, 186*.
64 As a counterpart to the single-national Army of Bosnian Serbs, a multi-national Army of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Armija Republike Bosne i Hercegovine* - ARBiH) was created from the units of the Territorial Defense (TO) and ad hoc formed units of pro-Bosnian oriented citizens of BiH. During the war, put at many different temptations, first in battles against the JNA and the forces of Bosnian Serbs and volunteers from Serbia and
“that had, in the very eve of war, kept 68% of its 140,000 soldiers stationed in BiH”.  

Articles in the NA about Bosnia and Herzegovina became more intense in late 1991 and early 1992, when it became completely clear that BiH wanted to become an independent and sovereign state. They published texts on provocations of JNA members, reports from the “insecure bank of the lower Neretva” where over 16,000 extremist members of the HDZ were organized in “paramilitary units, while in other parts of the Republic the formations were named such titles as “Handzar Division”, “Seventh Ustasha Regiment”, “First Muslim Detachment in the Islamic Republic of BiH” [...] Throughout BiH there are agents, saboteurs and terrorists of the Croatian intelligence service at work, and the Ustasha cannons are hitting Serb settlements in BiH.

The NA, as the official newsletter of the Yugoslav Peoples Army, represented a media instrument of integrative Serb national feeling (Serbship) as Yugoslav national feeling (Yugoslavship) with the purpose of preventing the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The analysis of writings in this influential media outlet suggest the radical use of the Peoples Army as the spin tool in creating conditions to prevent Bosnia and Herzegovina from leaving Milošević’s Yugoslavia by the use of force. At the same time, one should mention that in the same way as Milošević needed the JNA, the JNA also needed Milošević, not only as a political leader, but also as a means of achieving Army interests in terms of retaining the privileged position the military elite had enjoyed during the time of Tito’s communism.

Nevertheless, not only the JNA was in charge of creating an artificial crisis and regressive ethno-mobilization. In the area of internal affairs, a very similar role was played by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Serbia, which, through special operations of the National Security Service of Serbia (Služba državne bezbjednosti - SDB) operated on the territory of BiH: Slowly, the preparations were being made in Bosnia and Herzegovina too. In November 1989, Bosnia was shaken by a police affair. SDB of Serbia evacuated the Serb population from municipalities Srebrenica and Bratunac under the pretence that this evacuation was made under the pressure of Muslim fundamentalists. For the first time, the SDB of one republic engaged in “secret works” in another Republic. There was a polarization, and conflicts in the top government of BiH and in Belgrade-Sarajevo relations. The leader of the Bosnian communists was compared in the Serb press with removed Albanian leaders, and there was a sort of “Kosovization” of BiH in progress.

The first among BiH officials to react to the operations of the SDB Serbia was the secretary to the Presidency of CK SKBiH Ivan Cvitković, who believed it was a “scenario for destabilization of SR Bosne i Hercegovine”. He also accused the nationalists of “encouraging many affairs, large and small, in particular

---

Montenegro, and then split and exhausted by its internal divide and one-year long war with the Croatian Defense Council (Hrvatsko vijeće obrane - HVO), the ARBiH failed the test of multi-ethnic military force and it fell to the process of “nationalization”, loosing its “multi” component for the sake of favorizing and putting forth only one its part - the Muslim (Bosniak) part. Although it emerged from the war as partly non-single national, the ARBiH would certainly not successfully pass all the tests of concept of a secular, multi-ethnic army.

65 Sonja Biserko (ed.), op.cit, note 4, 186.
66 Suzan Vudvard, Balkanska tragedija: Haos i disolucija nakon Hladnog rata (Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 1997), 255.
69 Ibid, 8.
70 Sonja Biserko (ed.), op. cit. note 4, 65.
71 „Na djelu igre oko BiH“, Oslobodjenje, 18 October 1989, 2. (News -TANJUG).
municipalities so that the leadership of Bosnia and Herzegovina would be kept busy resolving them and thus prevented from taking equal part in resolving crucial problems of our country [...]”72. Two days later Cvitković presented the view of the Presidency of the CK SKBiH, according to which the operations of the SDB of Serbia on the territory of BiH “represented an attack against sovereignty of BiH”.73 The opinions of officials of the SK BiH on this action were divided74, and the Federal Secretariat of Internal Affairs (Savezni sekretarijat za unutrašnje poslove - SSUP) in their report said that “SDB of Serbia had not exceeded their authority”.75

This case was read as the “Kosovization of the neighborhood”76, and the Belgrade press countered with titles such as “The secretary is inventing spies?”77, and with the opinion that “some Bosnia and Herzegovina politicians have in haste and without arguments accused the Service of national security of Serbia of violating sovereignty of Bosnia and Herzegovina by acting without authorization on its territory”.78

Clearly, the aim of the Serb political leaders was to involve the JNA and federation militia (through secret and special operations) in the BiH conflicts. This was justified by the concern for Yugoslavia, its political and territorial integrity and sovereignty, and by the necessity to fight against the “fascist” government in Croatia and “fundamentalist” government79 in Bosnia and Herzegovina 80. Still, no matter what the real causes of Serbian expansionism to Bosnia and Herzegovina were, which may generally be listed under the title of negative freedom (others are not important when creating a state, only we are important, so anything is allowed), it was difficult to distinguish such metaphysical components from legal and other causes of the ethno-mobilization of Serbs (including the Serbs in BiH) because all these conditions, like in a pandemonium, are extensively interwoven. In any case, the Serbs viewed the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia and the process of creating new states on its territory (both of which were acts of legal nature, or more precisely, these were legally relevant facts of international public law) as the beginning of the end of the Serb supremacy that had been evident in the SFRY. From the point of view of a Serb nationalist, the dissolution of the former country also meant the dissolution of the “unified Serb national corps” - that had, until then, lived in a single country, divided

---

72 Ibid.
74 Branko Ekart, member of the Presidency of SRBiH, and President of the Council for Protection of Constitutional Order, says “The fact that the RSUP of SR Serbia has not operated on the territory of SR BiH is not disputed, and in this part it has not violated the existing rules on operation of those agencies “(„E.H. „Miješanja nije bilo“, Oslobodjenje, 19 October 1989, 3.
79 The “fundamentalism” is in Serbia, but also in most Western-European countries and the US, exclusively put in the context of Muslim faith, which is not right, because the “return to the roots” (fundament - basis, root) etc. may be a characteristic of any religion, including Orthodox, Catholicism, Buddhism, etc.
80 The role of JNA in the beginning was to remain “between warring parties”, but later, as soon as the possible defeat of the Serb forces would come to sight, they would obviously and openly side with them. Technically, JNA made it possible to the Serb rebel forces in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina to keep the territories won by force. After this “help” by the JNA, the Serb paramilitary forces would penetrate the “liberated” territory and finished the occupation by “ethnic cleansing” that has, most frequently, exhausted in executions or deportations of non-Serb civilians to prison camps.
into several smaller national corps that would, in the new circumstances, have the status of national minorities.  

Serbian politicians did not want that to happen because it would, in their opinion, divide them as the largest population in the Western Balkans that had lived in a single state, into some smaller groups that would not be in the same country. Such a development was directly opposed to the ideology of “Greater Serbia” and its main postulate “All Serbs in One Country”. However, one may conclude quite confidently that the Serbian national corps was the “biggest victim” of ethno-mobilization, both in terms of the intensity of its subjection to it, and in terms of the lethal consequences the Yugoslav conflict had on the national being and that are still felt today. As for the “victims” in the real meaning of the word, one may say that the Bosniaks (Bosnian Muslims) were the most vulnerable and mostly physically harmed national corps during the conflict: they suffered displacement within and outside of BiH, and physical destruction by means of genocide, which was confirmed in the verdict of the Hague Tribunal of the Republika Srpska Army General Radislav Krstić.  

One major document that had encouraged pan-Serbian ethno-mobilization was the Memorandum of the Serbian Academy of Science and Arts from 1986 that presented Serbs as a “threatened nation” deprived of their civil and political rights and called for a reaffirmation of Serb interests in the former Yugoslavia. This Memorandum was presented as a “broad and radical analysis of the position of Serbs in Yugoslavia” and it described the “anti-Serbian coalition” made by Slovenia, Croatia and the leadership of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. In addition to being the starting paradigm for the ethno-mobilization of “all Serbs’ for the creation of the “Great Serbia”, the Memorandum [...] prepared the ground for violence, as its implementation entailed territorial expansion and ethnic exclusivity. This must have threatened the basic security or even existence of other Yugoslav Peoples. [...] Thanks to Slobodan Milošević, a strong Serbian communist on the rise, the ruling communists forged an alliance with the Serbian non-communist nationalists and with the Serbian Orthodox Church, the Red-Brown-Black symbiosis that ensured the initial momentum and structure of the Serbian nationalism.  

As an introduction to the analysis of the role of religious communities in conflict generation and ethno-mobilization in BiH, one should mention that the process of ethno-mobilization of Serbs had for its ideological weft liturgical (ethno-confessional) nationalism, mixed with the blunt falsification of history and mythologized presentations and projections of a heavenly or chosen people, while
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in Croatian politics, this was instead an image of Croatia as the frontline of Christianity and civilization in the Balkans. Both concepts have lead to horrible consequences and suffering from which not even national corps of ideologists and creators of war in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina were spared.

All these processes and developments should have resulted in a “Great Serbia” and “Large Croatia”, but what it practically meant was the bloody division of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the obliteration of its statehood and national legal continuity. In addition, the disappearance of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country would mean the disappearance of its Muslim (Bosniak) national component as a constituent component of BiH statehood. Unfortunately for Bosnia and Herzegovina, the defensive attitude of the Bosniak religious-ethnic ideology joined the other two secularized religious narratives, and the Islamic Community was used as a spiritual logistic for transforming an aggressive war against Bosnia and Herzegovina into an inter-religious and inter-ethnic conflict. However, one should always emphasize that the internal conflicts in BiH are a consequence of aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina, not a natural content of the BiH ethnic misunderstanding based on centuries-long hatred, as seen by former rector of the Sarajevo University, politologist Mr. Nenad Kecmanovic in his political analysis for the *Nova srpska politička misao* and the *NIN*.
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3. Religious Communities and Conflict Generation

3.1. Serbian Orthodox Church (Srpska pravoslavna crkva - SPC)

The previous chapters show that the religious communities intervened in the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina in different ways. This research paper will confine itself to the role of religious communities in conflict generation. It will predominantly deal with the SPC, which occupied the public space the most intensely of all churches during pre-conflict ethno-mobilization. The famous action of carrying the remnants of the Emperor Lazarus through Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1988 and 1989 to mark the 600th anniversary of the Kosovo Battle was reported by media as the \textit{event of the day} and it was used for purpose of homogenizing the Serb people in Yugoslavia.

Croatian historian Dušan Bilandžić thinks that in this “ritual/religious way, the SPC... took part in developing movement for “Great Serbia”. It has, in a way that was little known in other peoples, renewed the syntagm of “Heavenly Serbia”, what fit and combined well with other paroles, yelling and battle cries in mass media, rallies and religious rites...”\textsuperscript{87} He also emphasizes that the transportation of the remnants of Emperor Lazarus through Bosnia and Herzegovina helped create the war psychosis. When bringing the remnants of the Emperor Lazarus through towns and villages, the episcopes read their epistles focusing on the term “heavenly people” and “heavenly Serbia”. So for instance, episcope of Sabac and Valjevo Jovan included in his epistle a part on “heavenly Serbia”. He states: “From Prince Lazarus and Kosovo, Serbs had been, first of all, creating the “heavenly Serbia” which has until now certainly grown into the largest heavenly state. If we only take the innocent victims of this last war (1941-45), millions and millions of Serbian men and women, children and the weak, were killed or tortured most terribly, or thrown into pits or caves by Ustasha villains, then we can see how large must be the empire in heaven”.\textsuperscript{88} He continues: “Saint prince Lazarus was designated as a symbol of Serb martyrdom and ruler of the “Heavenly Serbia”, the heavenly kingdom reserved for the righteous Serbs who had lived and died for cross and homeland”.\textsuperscript{89}

Bayford connects the rehabilitation of vladika Nikolaj Velimirović, renown for his anti-western and anti-modernistic views that incorporates the “anti-Jewish insults”\textsuperscript{90} with the revitalization of the myth of the Serbian people as martyrs.

The above quotes show that the “Serbian Orthodox Church took active part in mobilizing the Serbian people; it went among people with the remnants of prince Lazarus, going from one town to another, with in detail elaborated religious and nationalist behavior, because the Serbs are “heavenly sole” and God’s only chosen envoys. The church procession and the carrying of the remnants of Prince Lazarus Hrebljanović were part of the preparations for marking the 600th anniversary of the Kosovo Battle (1389). In parallel with the ceremony in Kosovo, there was also an event organized near church Lazarus in Dalmatian Kosovo (1989), which also served the purpose of rehabilitating Chetnik movement”.\textsuperscript{91}
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celebration was organized in Knežina near Sokolac by a memorial service for the heroes fallen in the Kosovo battle. The ceremony was dominated by “orthodox, communist and royalist symbols and messages such as: “Milošević, Serbian Obilić”, “Long live Yugoslavia - Municipality Serbian Orthodox Gacko.”

The SPC established a link with the Serbian political leaders and, in coordination with the leaders of Serbia and Serbian intellectual circles gathered around Dobrica Cosić, it began preaching the idea of all Serbs in Yugoslavia being threatened. This was also confirmed by the St. Vitus’ Day’s “Proposal of church/national program” published in 1989 that read:

[...] The fact remains that during the last two years, there has been some warming up in relations between the Serbian church and Serbian politics - changes like that have not happened in the half-century since the war. For the time, we could not expect more. But we must not stop here. One should not be afraid and avoid the Church that has over centuries remained the most stable pillar of the Serb people. Now as before, the Serb Church will not partner with the state or have a share in political power. That is foreign to its spiritual meaning. And even though it is not specifically in favor of any socio-political system in the world, it can not be completely apolitical... That is why we are proposing to political leaders of Serbia, who act under the program of creating a democratic European state, to return to the Church its role which it had been unjustly and by force deprived of and thus fill the gap that had occurred by its neglect in society. Because there is no strong country without a strong Church!

The SPC’s involvement in politics was seen by the distinguished theological publicist Mirko Đorđević as problematic because the “church went back to history, to the terrible misunderstandings, divisions and conflicts from the World War II...” Đorđević, also notices that the same route by which the remnants of the emperor Lazarus were carried was later followed by the JNA, and social psychologist Dr. Jovan Beyford thinks that this event had marked the “territories they considered Serbian” following the logic “where the Serbian bones are, that is Serbian land...”

In the newsletter of the SPC, Muslims were shown as uncivilized, retrograde and “genetically bad people who accepted Islam, and now, generation after generation, this gene is simply condensed. It is getting worse and worse, expresses itself very simply, dictates such method of thinking and behavior. This is already in the genes”. The SPC began to pay full attention to Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the homogenization of Serbs in that republic in May 1990, when at the session of the Assembly of the SPC they “make a decision and sends a request to the responsible agencies to recover from pits the remnants of the Serbs killed in the World War II and to have them properly buried”.

In the SPC media, the Muslims, particularly Bosnian Muslims, were depicted as Islamic fundamentalists and a threat to Serbs. The SPC Priest from BiH, Dragomir Ubiparipović, said that the Serbs had become known in the recent decades as a “target of sudden pressure of fundamentalist Islam. [...] The new, edited
“Načertanije“ must set clear and undisputable borders of the Serbian state and it must defend our people who live in other countries...”

A special role in developing the image of Muslims as Islamic fundamentalists was taken by Serb Orientalists, and above all by Miroslav Jefčić. Jefčić argued as follows: “... Yugoslav Muslims are Islamic Fundamentalists that are nothing but reflection of darkness from past [...] Islam is opposing any legal relation, tolerance, dialogue and coexistence [...] in Yugoslav conditions, each Muslim is Islamic Fundamentalist because, even if they were not religious, they certainly belong to the secular Islamic Fundamentalism or Communist Islam [...].”

SPC openly offers a projection of ideal Serbian state because “Serbship without orthodox faith, as it had been said before, is not possible, it is just an abstraction”, and then “therefore, for Serbs to live in a Serbian country some conditions have to be met. If the national government and the leaders of the country are not orthodox, i.e. if they do not have spiritual connections with the Serbian Orthodox Church, if they do not come to services, do not take communion, if they do not celebrate their baptismal celebration, do not receive the priest for the purpose to consecrate the water, or even refuse to cross, then they can not be legitimate representatives of the Serbs. And if such people rule Serbia, Serbs can not consider them their own, just like the Turks have ruled Serbia for long time, and that never meant they were Serbian statesmen... Fortunately, there are Serbian lands with all features of Serbian state. Those are Srpska Republika Krajina and Srpska Republika BiH. In those countries, the flag, coat of arms and anthem are Serbian and Orthodox. Their highest leaders come to religious services, celebrate their baptism, introduce religion in their service; write Cyrillic in administration, accept their priests as spiritual leaders, not as opponents. But he time will show whether Serbia and Montenegro would become Serbian countries would become one day.

3.2. Islamic Religious Community (Islamska vjerska zajednica-IVZ)

In 1990, the IVZ got its new Reis-l-ulema, Jakub ef. Selimoski - a Macedonian Muslim. This represented the first time that someone outside of Bosnia and Herzegovina became the religious leader of Muslims in Yugoslavia.

Selimoski had presented opinions based on which one could conclude that the Muslims were for a unified Yugoslavia. In his interview for the weekly Danas from Zagreb, immediately after being elected Reisu-l-ulema, he said: “Concerning Muslims and Islamic Community, we can only be in favor of Yugoslavia, the AVNOJ Yugoslavia where all of us are equal, regardless of nationality or faith. Today, Muslims live and work in all Republic and all Provinces throughout Yugoslavia, and that is why we consider Yugoslavia our only homeland.”

Selimoski repeated similar statements during the first Congress of the SDA, although stressing that the “SDA is a legitimate representative of Muslim people” because it confirms that the “Muslim people should live on equal footing alongside
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the two other constitutive people in BiH, and at the same time peacefully look for a
certain form of Yugoslav community where all will be equal.”

He also criticized positions of Franjo Tudman and Vuk Drašković, who
offered them the “return to the grandfathers’ faith”, to the “mother nation”,
seeking “historical rights” because “that would result in national cataclysm and
fratricide”.

At the dawn of the war that was to start against Bosnia and
Herzegovina, Reisu-l-ulema Selimoski recognised that religious leaders “have
surrendered the initiative to the nationalistic passions of certain leaders and they
have, in turn, not only usurped democracy, but completely disabled it.”

Selimoski was in favor of multi-party system because, in his opinion, it was
obvious that “the single partisan system was not an expression of human strivings,
because a single-face and uniformity are foreign to human nature. Therefore, I am
in favor of establishing new forms of expressing various interests and joining the
European and world processes of cooperation and bringing the peoples
together.”

Just before the war in the former Yugoslavia, the Muslim political elite
gathered around Alija Izzetbegovic replaced Jakub Selimoski through an unpleasant
procedure. Izzetbegovic brought Mustafa ef. Ceric to the leading position in the
Islamic Community in BiH, a postiong which, both then and today, regularly
performed the function of a reis.

Much like other religious communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the
Islamic religious community drew near “its own national party,” the SDA, according
to reis Selimoski, and the president of Mešihat of IVZ in BiH Salih ef. Colaković.
At the first Congress of the SDA, ef. Colaković said that the “Islamic community
should support every cultural, economic and political programme in the interest of
the Muslim people, on condition that this programme is in line with Islamic
tradition.”

He also stressed that the SDA programme Declaration “contains elements
close to islamic teachings,” but stated that “certain individuals found it
necessary to improvise things I never advocated,” concluding that he was only
speaking of individuals from the party, whom I have told a long time ago that I
will not allow the IVZ to become a subsidiary of a political party“.

The Islamic publication Preporod included topics about the possibility of
genocide on Muslim and others. A good example of this is a text titled “Possibility
genocide on Muslim and our other people, during the Yugoslav crisis and war”
which calls for a trial of Draža Mihajlović for his crimes on the Muslim people
during WWII. The article also warned of the possibility of the worst kind of civil war
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if the crisis in Bosnia and Herzegovina escalated.\textsuperscript{113} Preporod called the JNA “Serb, hegemonisitic and partly nazi-fascist pro-cetnik army,”\textsuperscript{114} and warned that the Army was causing international conflicts.\textsuperscript{115}

The IVZ worked hard to mobilize Muslims just before the referendum, calling on other people as well to take part because “Bosnia is the country with a thousand year old tradition finally ready to take its place in the international arena of free countries.”\textsuperscript{116}

Mešihat of the IVZ headed by ef. Čolaković dismissed accusations that it was planning to create an Islamic Bosnian Republic. They stressed that a civil state was the best solution for Bosnia and Herzegovina but warned that it was not fair

\[\ldots\] to deny Bosnia something that both Serbia and Croatia have claimed a long time ago. The right to a country and freedom does not only apply to those greater in numbers. This is especially unfair towards the Muslim people to whom Bosnia is the only homeland and country. Only our people will be endangered if a free and independent Bosnia is not created or if Bosnia becomes a colony of Serbia and Croatia”.\textsuperscript{117}

Following attempts to reformulate the referendum question by HDZ BiH Preporod warned that (see Catholic Church in BiH op. S.T.) the “Serb-Croat coalition is possible and says that national threads of independent Bosnia are being pulled from Belgrade and Zagreb thanks to puppets from national parties in Croatia and Serbia.”\textsuperscript{118}

3.3. \textit{Roman-Catholic Church (Rimokatolička crkva - RKC)}

It is important to note that the Catholic Church in Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot be separated from the Catholic Church in Croatia, as actions of Catholic clerics in this neighboring country had immediate impact and influence on clerics in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is also very important to note that contrary to the SPC, the RKC was extremely poorly represented in the state media in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Yugoslavia. Due to this fact, it mostly communicated through its own religious publications.

Croatian bishops sent the first messages pointing to nationalistic tensions in Yugoslavia and threats to the Croatian people in October 1989, warning about “[…] programmed psychological terrorism, placing collective blame on the Croatian people, accusing them of genocide, and the Catholic Church as the main perpetrator and cause of gernocide.”\textsuperscript{119}

\textit{Glas koncila}, a popular religious paper published by the Catholic Church in Croatia and available in other parts of Yugoslavia, attempted to separate the
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Church from the Ustasha’s crimes during WWII. “The attempts to separate the Church from the Ustashas are obvious. However, although the crimes committed are scrutinised, what Glas koncila is missing is a conscience about the historical responsibility for the crimes.”

In the early 1990s Glas koncila began its campaign against the former state portraying it as a negative experience, and stressing the dominance of the Serb people in Yugoslavia, and accusing them of attempts to destroy Catholicism.

From the very beginning, the strongest in Yugoslavia considered the state their chance to destroy Islam and Catholicism and establish an Orthodox creed, or that during the past seventy years as hatred among peoples has grown, western catholic part only weakened and what was stared by the Turks it is now continuing in Yugoslavia. (GK, 35/2.9.1990.) What is clear is “broadening of serb and orthodox borders because Serbs are behaving like conquerers and Serbian Orthodox Church is trying to turn all Yugoslav believers into Serbs. (GK, 35/2.9.1990.) It is stressed that Croatian Catholic Church has never acted in this manner.

Catholic Church was making efforts to mobilize Catholics and Croats to participate in the first multy-party elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bishops stated that “the Church does not command which party to vote for” but it recommends “voting maturely with a Christian conscience and individual beliefs for that party that guarantees the best political, social and economic programme. No one should be worried about losing a job or pension if they vote according to their Croatian conscience and beliefs.”

Similar messages were sent to all Croats in Yugoslavia. Although clerics could not be members of political parties, they were responsible to “teach people how to actively take part in elections and freely vote for the party whose programmes are in line with Christian principles.” During this time “Catholic Church [became] closer to HDZ BiH.”

The Catholic Church urged Catholic Croats to take part in the referendum in 1992 and to cast their votes for an independent Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bosnian Franciscans were very active in doing so. However, during this period two opposite currents become apparent within the Catholic clergy in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the Bosna Srebrena Catholics scrutinized everyone who wished to join the Bosnian territory to one of the neighbouring countries, but in Herzegovina they “openly support[ed] nationalist politicians in BiH.”

[...] Tomilsav Pervan, a leading clergyman from Mostar region, repeats Tudjman's propaganda about Muslims intending to create an Islamic state. He states that “there is no freedom of speech, democracy or freedom of religion in Islamic countries” and in Bobanovo in Herzegovina another clerk Vinko Mikolic adds that Bosnian government is “just like the Turkish aggressors”.
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4. Ethno-Intellectuals: Friends of the Nations are Preparing for Violence

What was happening in the political and social arena during 1987 in the former Yugoslavia offers contradicting meanings of the word elite. Although contemporary political literature considers this to describe a certain caste of people - the highly intelligent, the best, the chosen, the most capable and at the same time those chosen by the people, by the voters based on their talents - in this region it has proven to mean also the self-chosen elites. It was through visions, god’s will, roots, a historical mission or party will that they came to believe that they possessed the necessary talents to rule. In the socialist system entering elites was conditioned by the Communist party membership. The old regime tried to control many social organizations. Of special interest were humanist unions: writers’ unions, philosophers’ unions, sociologists’ unions, artists’ unions, Academies of Science and Arts. During difficult times and the crisis of the communist regime they gave support to the communist regime and at times they were the catalyst for the dissatisfaction of the public at large. Charismatic power and a charismatic leader was the basic core of the political system in the former Yugoslavia. As Max Weber demonstrated, this kind of system is more capable of self-destruction than political systems based on traditional or rational principles. This sort of system, in which a charismatic leader is a basic source of stability like Tito was in the former Yugoslavia, hides the lack of basic consensus. After Tito's death this absence became obvious.

The revolutions in Europe in 1989 and the global fall of communism marked the foundation of pluralistic societies. Intellectual elites had a prominent influence on these events as “they were traditionally considered leaders in Eastern Europe”. This acceptance of intellectuals as leaders often enabled them to take over the positions of communists, and in this way to assume political responsibility. A number of intellectuals offered various visions of how the new social structure would function. However, what started as a battle for democracy ended up being a battle for ethno-mobilization. Writers’ unions in all republics of the former Yugoslavia began fighting for the democratisation of society through their own social engagements. According to Radosavljevic, the Writers' Union of Serbia was, in a way, an ideological organization founded and controlled by the official policy as much as was required by the government. Problems caused by some members of UKS that immediately affected the government were not problems of the UKS. Changes started taking place after Tito's death. A number of events including the trial of poet Gojko Djogo, the banning of the show “Golubnjaca” in theatres in Novi Sad, the banning of Nebojša Popov’s book “Social conflicts - a challenge to sociology”, and the political pursuits of Alija Izetbegović in BiH, Vladimir Šeks in Croatia, Vojislav Šešelj in BiH Adem Demaci in Kosovo, Dobroslav Paraga in Croatia would facilitate the mobilization of intellectuals in the fight for a free spirit, which was one of conditions for the establishment of a democratic society. However, the denial of the Yugoslav communist government became the denial of the idea of a Yugoslav political and state community.

The UKS organised public protests in support to poet Djogo. The UKS Assembly asked the government to renounce the judgment of April 1983 as, in their opinion, it violated artistic freedom. While the trial to Djoga was in process, a Committee for Artists’ Freedoms was formed. They were very active, especially in

---

129 Duško Radosavljević, Elite i transformacija: slučajevi Poljske, Mađarske i Srbije (Novi Sad, Ilida, 2001), 54.
their reactions to political pursuits. According to Radosavljević these activities were more a reaction to events than an expression of the UKS’s political affiliation. However, in May 1987 the UKS organised protests against the status of Serbs and Montenegrins in Kosovo, aligning in support of the public state policy. “We are moving away from the situation where the writers were defending their profession to the general standpoint on the defence of our own, Serb people.” Although it looked as though this political involvement of the writers had democracy for its aim, things suddenly took a more dangerous route.

The UKS started a number of public activities, usually covering topics related to Kosovo and the status of Serbs living there. A text by Dobrica Cosic was published in “Knjizevne novine” on 1 June 1987, in an attempt to define the Serb question by stressing that along with the question of Yugoslavia it could only be solved through changes to the 1974 Constitution. It also stated that the Serbs were in the most difficult position among the people in Yugoslavia. In 1985, the SANU Assembly made the decision to formulate a memorandum stressing all economic, social, political, scientific and cultural programmes that would lead to overcoming the general crisis in Yugoslavia. This controversial and contradictory text is based on the Serb political programme - “All Serbs in one state”. During one of the SANU meetings Radovan Samardzic said, “Our science and SANU are responsible for this opportunity for change. Today, this intellectual engagement is classified through the strategy of wars in former Yugoslavia and strategy that stopped establishment of democracy in Serbia.”

Norman Cigar has analyzed tens of publications, books and articles written by Serb orientalists and concludes that they are “closely connected to political context and political aims.” “Instead of promoting peaceful coexistence and solutions Serb orientalists added oil to the fire and increased fear and hatred among Serbs. Long before the real break up of Yugoslavia these scientists formulated stereotypes about Muslims as foreign, inferior and threatening factor.” Cigar has also analyzed many texts by Aleksandar Popović, Darko Tanasković, Miroljub Jevtić, Neda Todorov. In this context Muslims are portrayed as “contradictory to the pragmatic west”, a “delusioned”, people “who have nothing in common with European civilization”, and thus are “a threat to modern civilization”. “Islam is against equal communication, tolerance and community”, they state, “Islam is an agressive religion”.

Territorial appetites and the production of fear were ever present. Ethno-intellectuals participated in the assemblies of national parties. On one occasion, Milorad Ekmeć explained the crisis in Slovenia by adding that “it is only a matter of days and special circumstances when the conflict in Sarajevo will begin.” At a Congress of Serb intellectuals Gojko Đogo stated, “Serbs cannot give up their centuries long dream: to live in one country. That idea has no price.” Intellectuals’ worries for their nation, her subservient status, development and future were a basic justification for the beginning of the war.

The role of ethnic intellectuals and media in ethno-mobilization processes in BiH was extremely negative because the citizens of BiH were exposed to media and intellectual terror from neighbouring countries, as well as from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Clubs and fora of Muslim, Croat, and Serb intellectuals flourished. Members of the civil community warned that the attribute of ethnicity was not appropriate for an intellectual, but it was in vain. Perhaps the best illustration of this was given by Miodrag Živanović in his comment in the Oslobodenje:
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The very term ‘Muslim, Serb or Croat intellectual’ is *contradictio in adjecto* as far as logic is concerned, and in a political sense, this means nothing but reducing the intellectuals to serve only one nation, only narrow nationalist interest, or even worse, the daily interests of political party that in that way represents the so-called national interest: it is not a nation that is in jeopardy, - it is everything that is intellectual and spiritual. As a consequence, there was threat to constitutional establishment - whatever that establishment was. Institutions of para-government were established (the leading position in this process was assumed by the SDS, but it is not beyond imagination that the SDA and the HDZ would follow) basing such actions on the thesis that the nation is the only and exclusive constituent of social relations and the only area of human confirmation. True, the nation has its undisputed moral, cultural and other values, but it is certainly too narrow a space for the breadth of human thinking and working. This is, in fact, an overall reduction. This means the narrowing of mine, and the lives of other people... the SDS organizes a referendum of Serb people, whether they are for or against Yugoslavia. Formally and legally, this national referendum is contrary to Constitution, but a bigger problem lies in the fact that this referendum does not provide for anything common (as declared by the SDS leaders), but quite the contrary: we are divided along ethnic lines. What if similar referenda were organized by political parties of Muslim and Croat peoples in BiH, and if their decision were contrary to the decision made by Serbs? Would that not separate us […]”

Živanović’s concerns were realized. Many citizens of BiH were ideologically divided. This was at the same time a message to international community that these territories “by their nature are incapable of democratic development of the Western-European type.” (Bibo)

---

5. Media Hate-Speech

Media from neighboring countries (Serbia and Croatia) used “speech of hatred” thereby becoming accomplices and pure executors of nationalistic politics in these areas, and contributing to the to inflammation of war against BiH. The research shows that the media were not only the classic means of propaganda for winning power, but also the strongest weapon of national mobilization of the popular masses in the Balkans. In the early 1980s in the Yugoslav capital Belgrade, the laws on freedom of information (that corresponded to international conventions on freedom of information), including the Law on Basics of the System of Public Information, Republic Law on Public Information and the Criminal Code, all prohibited inciting national, religious intolerance and undermining good international relations” (underlined by authors). Nevertheless, these became dead letter because the regime lead by Slobodan Milošević, had put the institutions and elements of the information system of Serbia into the service of nationalist oligarchies, with the purpose of extensive teaching of hatred and preparing the people for war. Similarly, but in a milder and less aggressive form, the same thing happened in the information system of Croatia.

5.1. Print Media

Regarding the media influence of the neighbors on BiH, it is little known that the enflaming of hatred was helped by the informative configuration of the system in the former SFRY and the level of exposure of Bosnia and Herzegovina’s people to the media from neighboring Serbia and Croatia. Milošević’s, but also Tuđman’s broadcasting, spilled over the borders of Serbia and Montenegro. Politika from Belgrade found its place in Bosnia and Herzegovina, mostly in those parts inhabited by Serbs, and the Croatian Vjesnik had a grateful market, particularly in western Herzegovina. The Oslobodenje from Bosnia and Herzegovina had circulation of 70,000, and it sold well in Sarajevo, Zenica, Travnik; but there were parts of BiH where it was almost not sold at all.

5.2. Electronic Media

A similar picture can be seen in case of radio and TV systems. Signals of the radio systems of SR Serbia and SR Croatia covered large parts of BiH. The first program of Radio Sarajevo had “unclear” frequency, so it could only be heard with difficulty. TV signals from Serbia covered eastern Bosnia, while the TV signals from Croatia covered northern and western Bosnia and western Herzegovina. The area in BiH around the river Drina was poorly covered by signals of TV SA. This configuration of information system in SFRY already suggested the large possibilities of informative, i.e. propaganda action of information systems of Serbia and Montenegro on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time, these data show that the “defensive power” of the information system of BiH was very poor. Furthermore, this shows the domination of mass media policies from neighboring countries over BiH media.135 Compared to TV Belgrade and TV Zagreb, TV SA was in an inferior position. While the other two had a “clear” program concept: nation, national state on the principles of natural and historical rights,

emphasizing historical injustices or current threats, TV SA did not have such a concept and it could not have it. Only the peoples in BiH: Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats had their common, national information system. Still, the experience showed that the Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats were more exposed to “their own” national information systems, the centers of which were in Belgrade and Zagreb respectively. All those were the keys for the change of opinion that opened the door of ethno-mobilization and violence.
6. Referenda for Independence and Mutual Recognition of Yugoslav Republics

In the midst of ethno-mobilization and threats to wipe BiH off the geo-political map of the world, the German Chancellor at the time Hans Dietrich Genscher said that the report of the Badinter Commission would not oblige Germany, and that it would unilaterally recognize Croatia. Not waiting for the results of the Badinter Commission, which was supposed to make a complete report on situation of human rights in the Republics of the former Yugoslavia, Genscher “announced the establishment of diplomatic relations with Zagreb and Ljubljana on 23 December.”136 Later, the American national secretary accused Germany that its “early” recognition of Croatia did not contribute to “good results”, but instead “added oil to the fire”.137 This position resulted from awareness of the fact that the demands for recognition of independence from the Yugoslav republic would at the same time serve as appropriate protection of national minorities and control of their own borders, and at that time, this was a problem for Croatia. In its report the Commission had mentioned conditions Croatia could not meet. Of four republics that wanted international recognition (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia), the Commission recommended only the recognition of Slovenia and Macedonia. One of the recognition conditions for Bosnia and Herzegovina was organization of a referendum.138 The referendum was held on 29 February and 1 March, and 2,061,932 of a total of 2,073,568 voting citizens, or 99.44% voted for a sovereign and independent BiH, a state of equal citizens between the peoples of BiH - Muslims, Serbs, Croats and other nations living in it.

Ethno-mobilization was already in progress, and it had some direct reflection on participation in the referendum and its result: most Bosnian Serbs abstained from voting, while the majority of Muslims and Croats voted for independence. The Bosnian Serbs saw this fact as an “unprincipled coalition” and it signified the end of illusion that they would ever want to live in a country where they would constitute, as they felt, national minority. BiH leaving Yugoslavia appeared to the political leadership of Bosnian Serbs to give them a legitimate demand for the part of the territory of BiH inhabited mostly by Serbs to be separated from BiH. The only fact they had forgotten was that the Srpska Republika Bosna i Hercegovina (and later Republika Srpska) had never been a state in its full capacity. Although, stricto sensu, during the warring conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina only the Government of (Republic) Bosnia and Herzegovina was an internationally recognized government, the Republika Srpska (which had from the aspect of international law a status of para-state creation, and its army a status of rebelling forces), as well as the leadership of Bosnian Croats of the self-proclaimed Croat Republic Herzeg Bosna (with the same status of “state” and “army”) had de facto exclusive control over large territories of BiH through their single-national armed forces and civilian administration.

International recognition of BiH followed on 6 April 1992 and after that, the Presidency of BiH passed a Decision to proclaim imminent war danger, and on 20 June 1992, the Decision on Proclaiming a State of War.

In a referendum held in December 1990, Slovenia “decided to disassociate” from Yugoslavia within six months. Croatia did the same in a referendum held in

---


137 Ibid, 40.

138 Opinion of the Badinter’s Commission 3 and 11.
May 1991, while Macedonia organized a referendum in September 1991, and then passed a new constitution in November 1991, under which this republic too had ‘disassociated’ from Yugoslavia. Bosnia and Herzegovina, in its Memorandum of 14 October 1991 (the so-called Letter of Intention, “Official Gazette of SR BiH” No. 32/91) conditioned its stay in Yugoslavia on Croatia and Serbia staying too.”\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{139} Omer Ibrahimagić, \textit{Državno-pravni razvitak Bosne i Hercegovine} (Vijeće Kongresa bošnjačkih intelektualaca, Sarajevo 1998), 133.
The Serb Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Srpska Republika Bosna i Hercegovina) was proclaimed on 9 January 1992, and its constitution was proclaimed on 28 February of the same year. The Constitution clearly said that the new creation had the strong intention of becoming a sovereign and independent state of the Serb people who lived in Bosnia and Herzegovina, regardless of what other parts of BiH and other peoples living in the self-proclaimed republic of Serbian peoples, or for that matter, thought about it.

In Article 1, the Constitution said it was a “state of the Serbian people and all other citizens” and that the “territory of the Republic is unified, inseparable and inalienable”. This fact represented a new split of the country (following example of the SFRY), where, within one creation that did not really have its real name until the Dayton Constitution, one “Federation” and one “Republic” emerged whose capacity was recognized later in the layman form of an “entity”, but also a limited international-legal subjectivity. “Atypical solution that can hardly be recognized by theory of law (and practice) is seen in the following (i) normally, it is not usual that a “federation” is a part of a country. “Federation” is a union of states, or rather a form of administrative-territorial-political organization of a complex state that “covers” two or more “states”.140

Hrvatska zajednica Herceg-Bosna (HZHB) - later, ever since 28 August 1993, a self proclaimed Hrvatska Republika Herceg-Bosna (HRHB) - which was established on 18 November, was a Croatian counterpart of the para-state organization within the up to then unified BiH within its AVNOJ borders. The ultra-right element of the HDZ proclaimed HZHB as a separate economic and political, cultural and ethno-territorial unit on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. After establishing this creation, they wanted to achieve an ethnically clean area by expelling the non-Croat population. The HVO took control over the municipal government, removing local non-Croat political leaders and maximally marginalizing their influence on political circumstances in this part of BiH. Media imposed ideas of Large Croatia, and Croatian heraldic symbols became a usual sight in all municipalities under HVO control. The Community had a very well organized and developed para-state structure that has, informally, continued to exist within the established Federation of BiH. The Community was at the same time a reaction and a copy of the politics of the Bosnian Serbs who wanted to create their ethnically clean territory. The animosity of both groups towards the Bosniaks contributed to the gradual, but very visible ethno-mobilization of Bosniaks and to ethno-religious radicalization of a part of the intellectual and military and political circles.

Bosniaks (Bosnian Muslims) had two political and legal solutions for this extremely unfavourable institutional, legal and political situation: the first one was to attempt with full strength to preserve the territorial integrity and independence of BiH as the only guarantor of their survival, and second, to accept the establishment of a mini-ethnic community with a majority Bosniak (Islamic) population. The latter would be the most intensive form of ethno-mobilization, but it would at the same time signify its end because gathering on the basis of religion/nation would lose is point because “the others” would probably not be

140 Zarije Seizović, „Bh entiteti: države u državi i/ili pravno-teorijska enigma: Daytonsko ad hoc priznanje limitiranih međunarodnoopravnih subjektiviteta bh entitetima“, Pravna misao, no. 9-12, Sarajevo, (1998), 62.
there any more. Bosniaks opted for the first solution, but, having found themselves “between a rock and a hard place” (politics of national exclusivities of Serbia and Croatia), with an incompetent, and essentially anti-Bosnian elite, which inevitably led to the reaffirmation of their own nation, and ultimately their own nationalism, but at the same time, they kept emphasizing their unconditional desire to preserve BiH as a state, its multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious social substrate, being fully aware of the fact that the sovereign and independent Bosnia and Herzegovina was the only possible state framework for full affirmation of their civil, national, national/confessional identity, and the only guarantor of their survival on the territory of the Balkans. Still, it was ketmen policy, hypocrisy and insincerity, because objectively viewed, by acceding to a mono-ethnic mobilization of Bosniak masses, by accepting the negotiations on the ethnic division of BiH, and finally, by forming a nationalist party (SDA), the political elite of Bosniak people sent a message of their own immaturity, and their undeveloped attitude towards Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is a horrifying handicap of Bosniak policy from which it never fully recovered.
8. Conclusion

From what has been said above, one may conclude that ethno-mobilization in BiH was “collateral damage” i.e. the by-product of already made nationalist homogenization in Serbia and Croatia, which means that the ethno-mobilization of Serbian and Croatian national corps in BiH was induced by identical processes in the eastern and western neighbours respectively, while the ethno-mobilization of Bosniaks, in turn, was caused by the ethno-homogenization of Bosnian Serbs and Croats. The missing link for creating proper political foundations for the disintegration of Bosnia and Herzegovina was Bosniak ethno-mobilization. This is the reason why the formation of national political parties is the primary cause of the war against Bosnia and Herzegovina. This materialized within the first multi-party Parliament of BiH, which was formed after the first multi-party elections (1990). Everyone hoped that these elections would mark the end of a single party system and the beginning of a multi-party democracy as a form of Parliamentary Assembly that would become an arena of interest driven political conflict.141

In Bosnia and Herzegovina the development of democracy based on an unrestricted right to form national political parties turned into a geopolitical request of two states. This is one of the main causes of war against BiH and the *volens-nolens* defeat of democracy. For this reason, the Parliament of BiH is the key factor and cause of the production of violence in the few years immediately before the war.

Ethnic issues dominated conflicts in the Bosnian Parliament regardless whether topics covered forest protection or vital national interests. This complete domination of ethnic issues of the Bosnian Assembly agenda is a result of the victory of the three national parties that formed the majority of the Parliament. Apart from the SDA, SDS and HDZ, Ante Markovic's reformist party - Reformists Union of Yugoslavia for BiH (SRSJ za BiH) and the communists lead by Durakovic Socialist Democratic Party (SDP), later Socialdemocrats also had a very significant role within the Parliament. Other parties were irrelevant when it came to making history.

Before the communists had time to recover from losing the elections, the three national parties formed a silent and non-transparent coalition that carried on ruling the Bosnian Parliament. Their aim was to destroy the left political idea, which the nationalistic elites portrayed as the biggest evil. Use of hate speech aimed at the leftist political parties within the BiH Parliament marked a new and dangerous rhetoric of negating the Other. Its aim was a new BiH Parliament based on a coalition between the three ethnic parties, which would urge representatives of other parties to enter the realm of ethnicity because this was a new era and people needed to know who was who.

---

141 Unfortunately, interest based political conflict founded on pluralistic principle that binds desicion making and power with the premise that „there is no unique elitist power, but each new decision is created through new coalitions between the powerful“ (Grdešić, 1995) was missing, and a new „decision making model“ was created (ibid) only interested in „fundamental decisions which allow research of the possibilty to realise an already established aim“. (ibid). This way of desicion making within the BiH Parliament lead straitag to war, because all things fundamental are by default in opposition to each other as each and every fundamental belief was based on some myth or another and not political in nature thus negating the very idea of a Parliament as an arena where political arguments can lead to a decision in the best interest of the citizens without prejudice.
The artificial creation of hatred and fear of the Other culminated in 1991, despite the fact that members of Parliament who produced it drank coffee together during Assembly sessions breaks while their nationalistic politics entered the homes of uninformed citizens through their TV screens. The main question that quietly but quickly came to the top of the agenda in Parliament was that of the further political and historical existence of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As the question of the legal status of the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina became a strategic parliamentary question, a constitution of two super party blocks took over from the constitution of party politics: on one side were the members of Parliament who voted for independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina upon realising that the dissolution of Yugoslavia was imminent, and on the other were representatives of SDS who voted against the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina even if it meant war. An interesting fact is that a great number of Marković’s reformists went to the Serb block either openly or by borrowing the status of an independent representative. This is how the ideological conflict within the Parliament of Bosnia and Herzegovina became uncontrollable and the open political conflict pro et contra Bosnia and Herzegovina entered a critical phase. In 1991 and 1992 Parliament meetings ended in between days, which added to the drama of the historical moment in both a realistic and symbolic political field.

The national political parties, SDA, HDZ and SDS, became masters of the Parliament and their “friendly doctrine of unfriendliness” made it impossible to create conditions for any reasonable idea leading towards an independent Bosnia and Herzegovina to be discussed within the Parliament. However, since the parliamentary conflicts were orchestrated through nationalistic ideologies an independent Bosnia and Herzegovina did not suit the SDS, HDZ or SDA as without a war, primarily generated from Belgrade and secondarily by Tudjman, all three nationalistic parties would cease to exist.

The inability of SDA’s leader Izetbegović to create an independent BiH without a war materialized through the planned aggression from Belgrade with aim to destroy BiH as a state and the geopolitical entity and her socio-cultural identity, and later Tudjman’s attempt through his puppet pseudo government in BiH trying to re-create Croatian Banovina.

One has to stress that the attempts from Belgrade and Zagreb had a relative impact, and that the responsibility of the SDA and Izetbegović cannot be forgotten. This responsibility comes from SDA’s political and cultural ignorance towards BiH and the irrational, unskilful and unrealistic vision this party had about BiH.

Izetbegović announced that BiH would follow Slovenia and Croatia on the road to independence after Marković’s reformists and other, smaller parties were

---

142 These objective parameteres are historically generated as Serb nationalism did not enter BiH from a third dimension but from a historical source of territorial expansionism, which by it nature does not tolerate ethnic factor: “... when the ideology of historical rights does not apply because territorial intentions conflict with non Serb people, then the Serb ideology calls upon the ethnic principle, which does not mean anything else but panserbianism: non Serbs are pronounced ethnically Serb, and these are aparently their roots, and only through the unfortunate historical events they became either albanised, muslimised... ( Esad Zgodić, Ideologija nacionalnog mesijanstva, (VKBI, Sarajevo, 1999), 206.

143 “Tuđman will not forever mimic the expansionist motives of Croats ( as opposed to Milošević, op. N. Ć.). Quite the opposite, he will clearly present them. This he will do through two classics of imperial politics: historical rights and ethnic principle. From this he will deduce the politics of negating Bosniak national identity as well as the politics of negating BiH as an independent state.” (Zgodić, ibid: 196) Tuđman saw BiH as an essential part of Croatia and concluded that:“Croatia has a right to Bosnia and Herzegovina based on historical community and geopolitical whole.” ( Tuđman, Zgodić, op. cit, note 136, 197.).
destroyed, marking the height of the ideological conflict. This was obvious after the parliamentary vote for a referendum as one of the largest democratic frameworks confirming the wish of citizens of BiH for an independent state.

Karadzic's SDS, acting as a satellite from Belgrade, tried to stop even the slightest thought of a referendum. Karadzic sent a clear message to Muslims in BiH at the Parliament Assembly on 14 October 1991:

What you are doing is not good. This is what you want for Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is the same road to hell and suffering that Slovenia and Croatia took. Do not think for a moment that you will not go to hell and Muslim people most likely to oblivion because Muslim people cannot defend themselves if a war starts.

This message unified Serbs as well as Bosnians and Croats in BiH, and, in addition to the Serb expansionist politics as an outside influence, was a conscious preparation within for the war. Karadzic played the card of Otherness, bringing an apocalyptic tone into the Parliament. This was calculated as he only had personal interest at heart: "What interest? What prize for creating fear? What social or political advantage? Do they want to scare us? Do they want to please us? How? Do they want to blackmail us? Is it contradictory? What interests and what aim do they want to achieve by their proclamations of an oncoming or already started war?"

However, despite this apocalyptic tone based on the force of the Yugoslav People's Army, Bosnia and Herzegovina organized a referendum on 29 February and 1 March 1992 which was successful as 64% of citizens able to vote came out to do so and 99.44% of them voted for an independent state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Everything was legally correct, but politically a war over Bosnia and Herzegovina was created within the Parliament of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Representatives of the Serb political block left the Assembly of BiH in January 1992 after a referendum was voted for and created an illegal Serb para-Assembly. This puppet association made the decision to ignore the Assembly of BiH, calling it a "Muslim-Croat Assembly." After the Badinter Commission established that there was a real, non-doubtful possibility for Bosnia and Herzegovina to become an independent state, the road towards international recognition was open. After the European Community recognised Slovenia and Croatia it did so with Bosnia and Herzegovina on 6 April 1992, which was followed by the recognition of the USA on 7 April 1992, leaving the door open for Bosnia and Herzegovina to join the UN on 22 May 1992. Cheering in the General Assembly of the UN had not even stopped as war already began raging across Bosnia and Herzegovina. The parliamentary production of war against Bosnia and Herzegovina had stopped and the real war against Bosnia and Herzegovina had started.

The experience of nationalism indicates the fact that “national homogenization [...]” will remain the main obstacle to the political and economic
integration of BiH society and play an important part in continued processes of disintegration throughout the country, while the national identity will, as it appears, soon become the only mode of identification of citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina.¹⁴⁸ This is, first of all, a result of violence generated during the nineties, with the purpose of creating an image of BiH as a country without its own identity, as a false country. “Masters of darkness” have largely succeeded in this intention. In a heterogeneous country like BiH, after the introduction of multi-party system, the “inter-ethnic brotherhood”, although disputed by nationalist parties, was in practice supported by the very same parties, first through mutual congratulations on their founding assemblies, then by tying together the flags of nationalist parties through election campaigns, etc. How this co-ethnic brotherhood was in its core “false”, “hypocritical”, “existentially seductive”, treacherous towards the citizens in BiH was made evident in the war against Bosnia and Herzegovina, in which tens of thousands of innocent civilians, women and children, were killed. Was it worth it?
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