Description of document:	**US Department of State Self Study Guide for Bosnia, July 2002**
Requested date:	11-March-2007
Released date:	25-Mar-2010
Posted date:	19-April-2010
Source of document:	Freedom of Information Act Office of Information Programs and Services A/GIS/IPS/RL U. S. Department of State Washington, D. C. 20522-8100 Fax: 202-261-8579
Note:	This is one of a series of self-study guides for a country or area, prepared for the use of USAID staff assigned to temporary duty in those countries. The guides are designed to allow individuals to familiarize themselves with the country or area in which they will be posted.

United States Department of State

Washington, D.C. 20520

Case No.: 200701753

MAR 25 2010

I refer to your letter dated March 11, 2007 regarding the release of certain Department of State material under the Freedom of Information Act (Title 5 USC Section 552).

We searched for and reviewed the self study guides that you requested and have determined that all except one of them may be released. They are on the enclosed disc. One of the guides is being released with excisions.

An enclosure provides information on Freedom of Information Act exemptions and other grounds for withholding material. Where we have made excisions, the applicable exemptions are marked on each document. With respect to material withheld by the Department of State, you have the right to appeal our determination within 60 days. A copy of the appeals procedures is enclosed.

We have now completed the processing of your case. If you have any questions, you may write to the Office of Information Programs and Services, SA-2, Department of State, Washington, DC 20522-8100, or telephone us at (202) 261-8484. Please be sure to refer to the case number shown above in all correspondence about this case.

We hope that the Department has been of service to you in this matter.

Sincerely,

for Margaret P. Grafeld, Director
Office of Information Programs and Services

Enclosures:
As stated.

63934 Federal Register/Vol. 69, No. 212
Rules and Regulations

Subpart F – Appeal Procedures

§171.52 Appeal of denial of access to, declassification of, amendment of, accounting of disclosures of, or challenge to classification of records.

(a) *Right of administrative appeal.* Except for records that have been reviewed and withheld within the past two years or are the subject of litigation, any requester whose request for access to records, declassification of records, amendment of records, accounting of disclosure of records, or any authorized holder of classified information whose classification challenge has been denied, has a right to appeal the denial to the Department's Appeals Review Panel. This appeal right includes the right to appeal the determination by the Department that no records responsive to an access request exist in Department files. Privacy Act appeals may be made only by the individual to whom the records pertain.

(b) *Form of appeal.* There is no required form for an appeal. However, it is essential that the appeal contain a clear statement of the decision or determination by the Department being appealed. When possible, the appeal should include argumentation and documentation to support the appeal and to contest the bases for denial cited by the Department. The appeal should be sent to: Chairman, Appeals Review Panel, c/o Appeals Officer, A/GIS/IPS/PP/LC, U.S. Department of State, SA-2, Room 8100, Washington, DC 20522-8100.

(c) *Time limits.* The appeal should be received within 60 days of the date of receipt by the requester of the Department's denial. The time limit for response to an appeal begins to run on the day that the appeal is received. The time limit (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays) for agency decision on an administrative appeal is 20 days under the FOIA (which may be extended for up to an additional 10 days in unusual circumstances) and 30 days under the Privacy Act (which the Panel may extend an additional 30 days for good cause shown). The Panel shall decide mandatory declassification review appeals as promptly as possible.

(d) *Notification to appellant.* The Chairman of the Appeals Review Panel shall notify the appellant in writing of the Panel's decision on the appeal. When the decision is to uphold the denial, the Chairman shall include in his notification the reasons therefore. The appellant shall be advised that the decision of the Panel represents the final decision of the Department and of the right to seek judicial review of the Panel's decision, when applicable. In mandatory declassification review appeals, the Panel shall advise the requester of the right to appeal the decision to the Interagency Security Classification Appeals Panel under §3.5(d) of E.O. 12958.

The Freedom of Information Act (5 USC 552)

FOIA Exemptions

(b)(1) Withholding specifically authorized under an Executive Order in the interest of national defense or foreign policy, and properly classified. E.O. 12958, as amended, includes the following classification categories:

- 1.4(a) Military plans, systems, or operations
- 1.4(b) Foreign government information
- 1.4(c) Intelligence activities, sources or methods, or cryptology
- 1.4(d) Foreign relations or foreign activities of the US, including confidential sources
- 1.4(e) Scientific, technological, or economic matters relating to national security, including defense against transnational terrorism
- 1.4(f) U.S. Government programs for safeguarding nuclear materials or facilities
- 1.4(g) Vulnerabilities or capabilities of systems, installations, infrastructures, projects, plans, or protection services relating to US national security, including defense against transnational terrorism
- 1.4(h) Information on weapons of mass destruction

(b)(2) Related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency

(b)(3) Specifically exempted from disclosure by statute (other than 5 USC 552), for example:

ARMEX	Arms Export Control Act, 22 USC 2778(e)
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, 50 USC 403(g)
EXPORT	Export Administration Act of 1979, 50 App. USC 2411(c)(1)
FSA	Foreign Service Act of 1980, 22 USC 4003 & 4004
INA	Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 USC 1202(f)
IRAN	Iran Claims Settlement Act, Sec 505, 50 USC 1701, note

(b)(4) Privileged/confidential trade secrets, commercial or financial information from a person

(b)(5) Interagency or intra-agency communications forming part of the deliberative process, attorney-client privilege, or attorney work product

(b)(6) Information that would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

(b)(7) Information compiled for law enforcement purposes that would:

- (A) interfere with enforcement proceedings
- (B) deprive a person of a fair trial
- (C) constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy
- (D) disclose confidential sources
- (E) disclose investigation techniques
- (F) endanger life or physical safety of an individual

(b)(8) Prepared by or for a government agency regulating or supervising financial institutions

(b)(9) Geological and geophysical information and data, including maps, concerning wells

Other Grounds for Withholding

NR Material not responsive to a FOIA request, excised with the agreement of the requester

BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA SELF STUDY GUIDE

GEORGE P. SHULTZ
NATIONAL FOREIGN AFFAIRS TRAINING CENTER
School of Professional and Area Studies
Foreign Service Institute
U.S. Department of State

Bosnia-Hercegovina has often been described as a miniature Yugoslavia, in which throughout history no ethnic group has predominated and in which all three major nationalities have vied for power and resources. The country has also proved an enigma, in that centuries of multi-ethnic coexistence were violently shattered when Yugoslavia itself disintegrated at the beginning of the 1990s. In seeking to understand the complexity of relations between Muslims (Bosniaks), Serbs, and Croats, it is important not only to examine their history, social structure, religion and culture, but also the impact of competing political ambitions once the communist superstructure began to unravel. How did ultra-nationalism become such a powerful tool for promoting social mobilization, ethnic conflict, and territorial division?

Bosnia-Hercegovina also provides us with a valuable case study of international involvement to resolve an escalating war in the middle of the Balkans. The various forms of military, political, and economic intervention have been riddled with criticisms and shortcomings. Ultimately, however, one must ask the question whether in the absence of an international protectorate and foreign economic assistance Bosnia-Hercegovina can survive as a single state. This Self-Study Guide is intended to elicit thought and debate on these perplexing issues and to engender a more intensive focus on a country that has preoccupied the international community for over a decade.

The first edition of this Self-Study Guide to Bosnia-Hercegovina was prepared by Janusz Bugajski, Director of East European Studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington

D.C. The views expressed in this Guide are those of the author and of sources attributed in the text and do not necessarily reflect official policy or the position of the Department of State or the National Foreign Affairs Training Center. This publication is for official educational and non-profit use only.

First Edition
July 2002

Table of Contents

BOSNIA-HERCEGOVINA TIMELINE

- 1800 BC: Settlements of Illyrians, first inhabitants of what is now Bosnia-Hercegovina, traceable to the Neolithic period.
- 9 AD: Illyrians conquered by the Roman Empire.
- 6th century AD: Settlement of Slavic tribes.
- 7th century AD: Second wave of Slavs, particularly Serbs and Croats.
- 958 AD: Bosnia first mentioned by that name in a surviving document.

- 1180: Ban (governor) Kulin establishes an independent Bosnian state.
- 1326: Ban Stephen Kotromanic's conquest of Hum (later Hercegovina) unites Bosnia and Hercegovina for the first time.
- 1377: Stefan Tvrtko, crowned Tvrtko I, King of Serbia and Bosnia. Medieval Bosnia reaches its zenith under his rule.
- 1448: Stefan Vukcic, lord of Hum, declares his independence and gives himself the title *herceg* of Hum, thus the land becomes known as Hercegovina.
- 1463: Ottomans conquer Bosnia.
- 1483: Ottomans conquer Hercegovina.
- 1875: Peasant uprising against Ottoman rule.
- 1877: Russia declares war on the Ottoman Empire
- 1878: Congress of Berlin. Ottoman authority abolished. Austro-Hungarian Empire occupies and administers Bosnia-Hercegovina.
- 1908: Austro-Hungarian Empire formally annexes Bosnia-Hercegovina.
- 28 June 1914: In Sarajevo, the Bosnian capital, Gavrilo Princip, a young Bosnian Serb nationalist assassinates Austrian Archduke Francis Ferdinand.
- July 1914: Austro-Hungarian Empire declares war on Serbia. During the war most Bosnian Serbs, Croats, and Muslims remain loyal to Austria-Hungary.
- 1918: End of World War I, Austro-Hungarian Empire disintegrates. Bosnia becomes part of the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.
- 1929: The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes is renamed as Yugoslavia.
- April 1941: Following the German invasion, Bosnia-Hercegovina is divided into German and Italian occupation zones. Most of the country is incorporated in the Independent State of Croatia, a puppet state of Nazi Germany controlled by the Croatian fascist *Ustase* movement.
- November 1943: A Congress of the Yugoslav Communist party proclaims a new federal

Yugoslavia.

- May 1945: End of World War II.
- November 1945: Communist government installed in Yugoslavia headed by Josip Broz Tito. Yugoslavia becomes a federal state of six republics, including Bosnia-Hercegovina.
- 1948: Yugoslav Communist Party breaks away from Stalin's Soviet Union and is renamed as the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY).
- 1968: Muslims are officially recognized as Yugoslavia's sixth national group.
- 1980: Tito's death. Onset of political and economic crisis.
- 1990: Disintegration of the LCY and multiparty elections held in all six Yugoslav republics.
- March 1992: Referendum on independence in Bosnia-Hercegovina demanded by EU. Bosnian Serbs boycott the referendum, but 97% of the Croats and Muslims vote for independence.
- 6 April 1992: Bosnia's independence is formally recognized by the international community.
- April 1992: Full-scale anti-civil war erupts as Serbian forces target Muslim civilians to gain territorial conquest.
- June 1992: The United Nations mounts a humanitarian operation in Bosnia and approximately 7,000 UN troops are dispatched to the republic.
- May 1993: A United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTFY) is established in the Hague, Netherlands.
- November 1995: The Dayton peace accords are signed by the three protagonists.
- December 1995: The first United Nations High Representative to Bosnia-Herzegovina, Carl Bildt, the former Prime Minister of Sweden, is appointed.
- 16 December 1995: NATO launches the largest military operation undertaken by the Alliance, Operation Joint Endeavor, with the deployment of 60,000 IFOR (Implementation Force) troops in Bosnia-Hercegovina.
- 14 September 1996: The first post-war general elections held under the supervision of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

- 20 December 1996: A NATO Stabilization Force (SFOR), consisting of 31,000 troops, is activated on the date the IFOR mandate expires.
- June 1997: UN High Representative Carl Bildt is succeeded by Carlos Westendorp the former Spanish Secretary of State for European Affairs.
- 12-13 September 1998: Bosnia's second general elections overseen by the OSCE.
- August 1999: Wolfgang Petritsch, the former Austrian Ambassador to Yugoslavia is appointed UN High Representative.
- November 2000: A new round of general elections in which centrist and civic parties increase their parliamentary seats.
- May 2002: Britain's Paddy Ashdown is appointed UN High Representative.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this self-study guide to Bosnia-Hercegovina is to provide some basic background information and analysis for persons being assigned there. The information is presented in such a way as to enable easier digestion. Each section concludes with several questions for further exploration and a brief list of pertinent resource and research materials. Several websites containing information on Bosnia-Hercegovina are located at the end of the guide.

GEOGRAPHY AND CLIMATE

The Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina lies at the center of the Balkans or South East Europe. It is bordered on the north, west, and southwest by Croatia, on the east by Serbia, and on the southeast by Montenegro. It also has a narrow outlet to the Adriatic Sea of 12 miles around the town of Ploce. The republic occupies an area of 19,741 square miles and is historically divided between the larger and more northern Bosnian territory and the smaller southern area known as Hercegovina.

The country is predominantly mountainous. Its main ranges, forming part of the Dinaric Alps, run in a northwest-southeast direction and include Pljesivica, Grmec, Vitorog, Klekovaca, Cincar, and Radusa. The highest peak is Maglic (7,828 feet) near the border with Montenegro. The southwest

part of the country contains arid limestone plateaus with caves and underground drainage. The uplands are commonly denuded of forests because of thin soil and deliberate deforestation. Cultivable land is found between ridges containing alluvial soil. Central Bosnia contains forested terrain and fertile soils are found in the northern lowlands bordering Croatia.

Bosnia-Hercegovina's major rivers include the Sava, a tributary of the Danube, which forms the northern frontier with Croatia; the Bosna, Vrbas, and Una, which flow north into the Sava; the Drina, which forms the eastern border with Serbia; and the Neretva, which flows from Hercegovina into the Adriatic. Bosnia also has an abundance of underground rivers, glacial lakes, and natural springs.

Bosnia-Hercegovina is cut off from the Adriatic climate zone by the Dinaric Mountains. Bosnia's climate is generally mild but with some sharp cold spells during the winter months. The heaviest rains in Bosnia fall in late spring. Hercegovina experiences hotter weather in the summer, with the major rainy season during the fall. The higher elevations have short and cool summers and longer and colder winters.

Approximately 40% of the country is forested with pine, beech, and oak predominating. About 14% of the land is arable and 20% is permanent pasture. Among the most common fruits are grapes, apples, plums, and pears. The diverse wildlife includes bears, wolves, wild boars, wildcats, chamois, otters, foxes, badgers, and falcons. The country's major natural resources include coal, iron, bauxite, manganese, timber, copper, chromium, lead, zinc, and hydropower. Much of Bosnia's infrastructure was destroyed during the 1992-1995 war and the country suffers from air and water pollution and inadequate sanitation facilities.

HISTORY

Early History

The territory of Bosnia-Hercegovina formed part of the Illyrian kingdom that stretched across the northwest Balkans; the Illyrians had settled in the area in about 1800 BC. The region became part of the Roman province of Illyricum at the beginning of the 1st century AD. Following the collapse of the Roman Empire during the 4th and 5th centuries AD, Gothic tribes conquered the northwestern and central Balkan territories. They were followed by Turkic Avars and by Slavic tribes. The Avars were defeated by the Frankish king Charlemagne in 796 AD and the Slavic populations accepted overall Frankish suzerainty.

For the next four centuries, various Slavic princes ruled the mountainous Bosnian area, including the Croatian Kingdom from the 9th century until the 11th century. At the end of the 12th century, a

powerful Serbian kingdom was founded under the rule of Stjepan Nemanja. By the middle of the 14th century, his descendant King Stjepan Dusan controlled a region stretching from the Adriatic to the Aegean seas that included parts of eastern Bosnia.

During the 12th century, Hungary conquered large parts of Bosnia and turned the region into one of its *banats* (provinces) under the control of *bans* (governors). Bosnia's rulers gained increasing independence from their Hungarian overlords with the rule of Ban Kulin at the beginning of the 13th century. During the 14th century, Ban Stjepan Kotromanic extended Bosnia's territory to include the Orthodox province of Hum, later known as Hercegovina, and much of the Adriatic coast. Krotomanic's nephew and successor Stephen Tvrtko further extended the boundaries of these territories, and in 1376 proclaimed himself King of Serbia and Bosnia. The Bosnian kingdom disintegrated after the death of Tvrtko. A rebellious Bosnian chieftain seized the Hum region early in the 15th century and established it as Hercegovina ("independent duchy").

Ottoman Control

The Ottoman Turks invaded Bosnia in 1386 and by 1463 most of the region became an Ottoman province and remained under Istanbul's control for more than 400 years. The population of the area included Roman Catholic Croats, Orthodox Serbs, and Bosnian Slavs who converted to Islam during Ottoman rule. The conversion process was the result of several factors: a lack of allegiance to either Catholicism or Orthodoxy, an absence of well organized Christian Churches, and the promise of improved political, social, and economic positions under Turkish rule. A local Muslim hereditary nobility developed together with a class of landowners. These Muslims developed a sense of ethnic and regional identity which produced tensions with their Catholic and Orthodox neighbors. The relative independence of the Orthodox Church under the Ottoman's "millet" system of self-governing religious communities, stimulated Serbian nationalism in areas of eastern Hercegovina and north west Bosnia.

Austrian Rule

In 1875, a large Christian uprising against the Muslim elite was put down by the Turks but it provoked Great Power intervention and the Ottomans were forced to surrender control over Bosnia-Hercegovina. At the Congress of Berlin in 1878, following the Russo-Turkish war, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary negotiated with other European rulers for administrative rights over the area and in 1908 annexed the two Bosnian provinces.

Bosnia became a center of nationalist agitation for political independence and cultural autonomy. Europe began to take sides in the disputes: Austria-Hungary and Germany opposed growing Serbian nationalism, while Russia and Britain generally supported it. The weakness of Ottoman rule encouraged some Slavic activists within the Austro-Hungarian Empire to press for union with kindred peoples elsewhere in the Balkans. This "Yugoslav" movement for south Slav unification was opposed by nationalist pan-Serbian and pan-Croatian groupings.

The Bosnian Muslim political emergence became more pronounced during Austrian rule between 1878 and 1918. Vienna encouraged a Bosnian national identity as a counterpoint to Serbian and Croatian irredentism and Yugoslavism, and it tolerated Islamic cultural activism. Such policies stimulated religious differentiation at a time of rising nationalism throughout the Balkans. Croatian nationalists rejected a south Slav union and sought a Greater Croatia to include all of Bosnia-Hercegovina. They considered all Bosnian Muslims to be Croats who had converted to Islam during Ottoman rule. Serbian nationalists demanded a Greater Serbia to include Bosnia-Hercegovina and claimed the Muslims as converted Serbs. Both sides tried to absorb Bosnia's Muslims and to elicit their political and ethnic loyalty in order to gain a majority in the country.

Royalist Yugoslavia

In June 1914, the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, Archduke Francis Ferdinand was assassinated in the Bosnian capital Sarajevo, an act that precipitated World War One. Gavrilo Princip, the assassin, was a Serbian student from Bosnia whose Young Bosnia movement believed that Vienna's policies would deny Serbia's territorial ambitions. Most of the Bosnian Muslim and Croatian population rejected Serb nationalist claims and sought to develop Bosnia-Hercegovina into an autonomous entity within the Habsburg monarchy.

During World War One, some Croats and Serbs fought together, hoping to create a kingdom that would unite all the South Slavic peoples, while others pursued an exclusively nationalist agenda. The Muslim population remained divided as to their political allegiances. On 1 December 1918, following the defeat of Austria-Hungary, Bosnia-Hercegovina became part of the independent Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes under the Serbian monarchy of Aleksandar I from 1921 to 1934. When political conflicts between Croats and Serbs exacerbated national tensions, Aleksandar tightened control over the country and in 1929 he renamed the kingdom Yugoslavia ("land of the South Slavs").

Croat and Serb leaders clashed over the Yugoslav state structure, with the Croats favoring a looser federal state while the Serbs were intent on a more centralized system. Bosnia's Muslims were caught in the middle of this struggle and were pressured to support either Croatian or Serbian separatism. While Muslim leaders generally supported the centralist constitution, a growing number claimed that Bosnian Muslims should be recognized as a distinct national group. However, Serbia's royal dictatorship denied the existence of separate nations in Yugoslavia and established new administrative districts (*banovinas)* that cut across ethnic and historical boundaries. Bosnia-Hercegovina was partitioned between four *banovinas,* each with a Muslim minority, thus alienating the Muslim population from the monarchist state.

Communist Yugoslavia

On 6 April 1941, the Axis powers invaded and dismembered Yugoslavia. Germany and Italy supported the formation of a fascist puppet state encompassing much of Croatia and Bosnia-

Hercegovina, which was headed by ultra-nationalists in Croatia. The *Ustase* leadership of the Independent State of Croatia sought to annex Bosnia and engaged in a policy of full-scale genocide against the Serbian population, while Serbian monarchists (*Cetniks)* slaughtered thousands of Muslims because of their alleged collaboration with Zagreb and their supposed "Turkish" identity. Although some Muslims engaged in anti-Serbian massacres, a significant number of Bosnians in all three ethnic groups favored the multi-ethnic communist partisan forces led by Marshall Josip Broz Tito.

At the end of the war, Tito restitched the various parts of Yugoslavia and created a federation with Bosnia-Hercegovina as one of the constituent republics. This was accomplished despite insistence by Serb activists that the region be transformed into a province of Serbia and Croatian demands for closer links with the Croatian republic. The Bosnian republic was designated as a multi-ethnic unit, thus precluding domination by any of the three constituent national groups. Such a policy was supported by Muslim leaders as a means of preserving their national and religious identity. During the 1960s, Tito's regime granted Bosnia's Muslims a distinct ethnic status, in a policy designed to place them on an equal footing with Serbs and Croats. They received their own power base in an increasingly decentralized Yugoslav communist structure.

One of Tito's objectives was to prevent either Serbia or Croatia from dominating the federation and reviving claims to Bosnian territory; hence the political and economic infrastructure of the republic was substantially expanded. Tito sought to balance Yugoslavia's national units and promote the growth of an overarching "Yugoslav" identity as well as a multi-ethnic Bosniak consciousness. He also en-deavored to strengthen Muslim identity to counteract Serb and Croat ambitions and forged a distinct Muslim political base in the republic.

In the 1971 Yugoslav census, Slavic Muslims were elevated to the status of a distinct nation, equal to that of Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Mon-tenegrins, and Macedonians. During the 1970s, the government adopted a more tolerant approach toward organized religion, including Islam, and Bosnia's Muslims experienced a cultural and religious revival. Many Muslim leaders concluded that similarly to the other Yugoslav republics, Bosnia-Hercegovina should be defined as their national territory. This sparked opposition among Serbian and Croatian leaders who feared that they would become minorities in the republic.

Bosnia-Hercegovina became the only repub-lic without a predominant nation as all three groups (Muslims, Serbs, and Croats) were considered equal constitutional entities, even though Croats and Serbs had their own "home" republics. The 1974 Yugoslav constitution underscored the equality of Bosnia's "constituent nations," an arrangement de-signed not only to prevent the dominance of one ethnic group but to avoid any compacts between two nations that would "minoritize" the third. Muslims were formally defined as a nation; thousands of people who had previously declared themselves as Serbs, Croats, or Yugoslavs assumed this definition in the new censuses.

Yugoslavia's complex system of governmental succession did not allow for effective central rule

while the republican administrations sought an acceler-ating devolution of powers. During the 1980s, following Titos' death in 1980, the disintegration of the ruling League of Communists of Yugoslavia and growing national and ethnic polariza-tion aggravated the position of Bosnia-Hercegovina as a region contested between Serbia and Croatia.

Economic difficulties also fueled inter-republican competition for scarce resources and increased social and ethnic tensions throughout the federation. Political and economic liberalization in Yugoslavia was evident in the late 1980s under the government of federal Prime Minister Ante Markovic. But the unraveling of communist rule also sparked demands for republican autonomy. As political liberalization gathered pace in all six republics, in February 1990 the Bosnian Assembly passed a law allowing for political parties to be formed freely in preparation for the first post-war multi-party elections.

Disintegration of Yugoslavia

In July 1990, the Bosnian Assembly declared the republic a "democratic and sovereign state," signaling the first step toward a looser federal arrangement but avoiding any explicit moves toward separation from Yugoslavia. The result of the November 1990 elections read like a census of the republic's population, with nationalist parties of the three major groups taking 80% of the vote in proportions reflecting their percentages of the population. Residents elected deputies to the 240-seat bicameral legislature, divided between a Chamber of Citizens (130 seats) and a Chamber of Municipalities (110 seats) as well as members of the collective presidency. Ethnic parity was to be main-tained in all three institutions.

The elections were designed to balance the representation of the three constituent nations in the Bosnian presi-dency, government, and parliament. Each ethnic group formed its own party: the Muslim-based Party of Democratic Action (PDA), the Serbian Democratic Party (SDP), and the Croatian Democratic Union (CDU). Although non-nationalist parties won a quarter of the seats in the Chamber of Citizens they had no lasting impact on political developments and could find no coalition partners. In the final tally, the PDA gained 86 seats in the Assembly, the SDP 72, and the CDU 44; the 38 remaining mandates were shared among eight political groups.

The victory of the three ethnically based parties both reflected and encouraged national identification among citizens. The key government positions were awarded to the three ethnic groups. Alija Izetbegovic, head of the PDA, was chosen as President of the nine--member presidency, a post that was established on a rotational basis among the three ethnic components. Jure Pelivan of the CDU was chosen as Prime Minister to head the republic's government, and Mom-cilo Krajisnik of the SDP became speaker of the National Assembly. Although the results preserved a tri-eth-nic balance in the legislature and the presidency, they also further polarized the country.

Leaders of the three national parties formed a coalition government. While the three ethno-parties

agreed to share power at the national level, in various municipalities *(opštinas)* the victo-rious parties proceeded to assume absolute control in local governments. The Serbian *opštinas* increasingly refused to recognize Sarajevo's authority. Beneath the facade of cooperation at the republican level, an intense power struggle was evident when parliament attempted to enact new legislation in response to the accelerating disintegration of the Yugoslav federation. It proved impossible to pass a new constitution, as the agreement of all three major parties was required. The Serbian side refused to countenance any constitutional changes propelling Bosnia toward statehood, while Muslim and Croat leaders feared that the secession of Slovenia and Croatia would leave the republic in a precarious posi-tion by strengthening Serbia's position in the shrunken federation.

As Slovenia and Croatia pressed for independence, Bosnia-Hercegovina found itself caught in the middle. Leaders of the three ethnic groups were increasingly pressured to side with either Serbia or Croatia. Serbian leaders voiced concern about an emerging Muslim-Croat alliance that would exclude Serbs from key government posts. Serb activists also calculated that Croats and Muslims would seek closer political and military ties with Croatia. Meanwhile, Muslim and Croat leaders grew anxious that local Serbian activists in league with the Socialist regime in Bel-grade were planning to engineer a crisis in the republic in order to detach large areas of Bosnia from Sarajevo’s control.

Serbian leaders sought to preserve a unified Yugoslav state with some measure of republi-can autonomy. Croatian leaders veered toward Bosnian sovereignty and independence. Caught between demands for Bosnian separatism and Yugo-slav federalism, Bosnia's Muslim leaders could not afford to take a neutral position: either option would have led to confrontation with Serbs or Croats. As war raged in neighboring Croatia and the prospect of international recognition appeared as a distinct possibility, the Muslim leadership leaned toward secession from Yugoslavia and the preserva-tion of a unitary Bosnian state. While this move largely satisfied Croatian aspira-tions, the Serbian leadership warned that they would not accept Bosnian independence. The slide into all-out war had begun in earnest.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- What were the origins of the Slavic populations that settled in the lands that later became Bosnia-Hercegovina?
- What role did the three major religions (Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Islam) play in Bosnian history?
- Have there always been conflicts between Serbs and Croats?
- Was the long era of Ottoman occupation of Bosnia-Hercegovina a period of consistent and severe repression?

- How much support was there for the creation of the first Yugoslavia among Bosnia's three ethnic groups?

- What was the extent of genocide and inter-ethnic violence in Bosnia-Hercegovina during World War Two?

- How did Marshall Tito manage to bring the warring factions together at the close of World War Two to create a single Yugoslavia and a single Bosnian republic?

- Trace the creation of a Muslim Bosniak identity during the pre-communist period and under communist rule?

- What was the impact of the 1990 multi-party elections on ethnic relations in Bosnia-Hercegovina?

Resource Materials for Further Study

Ivo Banac, *The National Question in Yugoslavia: Origins, History, Politics,* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984

Robert J. Donia, *Islam Under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Hercegovina, 1878-1914,* Boulder, East European Monographs, 1981

Robert J. Donia and John V. A. Fine, *Bosnia and Hercegovina: A Tradition Betrayed,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1994

Francine Friedman, *The Bosnian Muslims: Denial of a Nation,* Boulder: Westview Press, 1996

Charles Jelavich and Barbara Jelavich, *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920,* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977

Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History,* New York: New York University Press, 1994

Mark Pinson (Ed.), *The Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia,* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994

Sabrina P. Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1963-1983,* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992

Joseph Rothschild, *East Central Europe Between the Two World Wars,* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974

Peter F. Sugar, *Southeastern Europe Under Ottoman Rule, 1345-1804,* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977

"Bosnia and Herzegovina," Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2002, http://encarta.msn.com.

INDEPENDENCE, WAR, AND DIVISION

Serbian Separatism

By early 1992, Serbian leaders had carved out their own jurisdictions in Bosnian municipalities where Serbs formed absolute or relative majorities and threatened civil war if Sarajevo moved toward statehood. Croatian leaders in Herzegovina also began to make preparations for territorial autonomy in the event that Bosnia-Hercegovina remained in a truncated Yugoslavia. Meanwhile, the Belgrade government accused the Bosnian Muslim leadership of planning to transform the republic into an Islamic state and with pretensions to other Muslim-inhabited areas of Serbia. The charge was vehemently denied by President Izetbe-govic, who considered it a propaganda ploy designed to mobilize both Serbs and Croats against Bosnian independence.

As tensions mounted, in October 1991 Muslim and Croat deputies in Bosnia's parliament declared the republic's sovereignty and neutrality stopping just short of independence. Serbian leaders boycotted the session, declared the vote unconstitutional, and announced that they would not recognize Bosnian laws. Fearing an assault by the Yugoslav army, Muslim and Croat leaders de-cided to hold a referendum on independence. The ballot in February 1992 was boycotted by the majority of Serbian residents, but over 64% of the elec-torate turned out and voted overwhelmingly for Bosnian independence. Sarajevo promptly declared an independent state and gained international recognition. The move proved unacceptable to local Serb leaders, who launched an armed offensive within the republic with the active support of the Yugoslav army, charging that Sarajevo's policies threatened their national rights.

A series of steps were undertaken to solidify exclusive Serb control over the bulk of Bosnian territory, in an evident prelude to secession. In October 1990, the SDP set up a Serbian national council in the town of Banja Luka; a move that was condemned by the government for violating Bosnia's sov-ereignty by setting up parallel authorities. In April 1991, a Serb Community of Municipalities of Bosnian Kra-jina was declared, consisting of 14 Serb majority municipalities in western Bosnia that bordered the Serb-held territories in Croatian Krajina. Municipal governments in heavily Serb-populated areas of eastern, northern, and southeast-ern Bosnia also prepared to form autonomous communities avowedly to protect Serb interests against Muslim-Croatian separatism.

Sarajevo charged that the self-proclaimed communities under-mined the Bosnian administration and were the first steps toward estab-lishing autonomous regions. In September 1991, Serb leaders announced the formation of a Serbian Autonomous Region of Eastern and Old Hercegovina; it covered eight munici-palities in southeastern Bosnia inhabited primarily by Serbs. Meanwhile, the Bosnian Krajina region was declared the Serbian Autonomous Region of Krajina. Even more ominously, local Serb police forces and party radicals proceeded to establish armed "volunteer units" and steadily eliminated Sarajevo's jurisdic-tion in these areas.

During the fall of 1991, three more autonomous Serbian regions were proclaimed in northeastern Bosnia, northern Bosnia, and the Mount Romanija region east of Sarajevo. Leaders of the new territorial units threatened to establish a unified Serbian republic, secede from Bosnia, and remain in a federal Yugosla-via. They asserted that a declaration of Bosnian independence and the non-recog-nition of Serbian territorial autonomy would precipitate bloodshed. Muslim and Croat leaders declared that no autonomous regions could be formed on the republic's territory and dismissed any planned referendums on autonomy. Serbian representatives responded in February 1992 by adopting a constitution of the Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Hercegovina.

Croatian Separatism

Although CDU leaders criticized Serbian steps toward secession, activists in Croatian-majority municipalities, in close liaison with the authorities in Zagreb, proceeded to form their own quasi-autonomous regions. They claimed that they did not want to live outside of Croatia if a large wedge of Serbian-controlled territory separated them from other republics. In November 1991, a Croatian Community of Herceg-Bosnia was established to in-clude 30 municipalities containing a large Croatian population in western Hercegovina and central Bosnia. The community was declared a distinct political entity that would recognize the government in Sarajevo only as long as the republic upheld its sovereignty. A Croatian Community of the Bosnian Sava Valley was also established to incorporate eight municipalities in northern Bosnia. In January 1992, a third Croatian Community of Central Bosnia was formed, comprised of four municipalities. Croat leaders declared themselves in favor of union with Croatia.

Serbian and Croatian moves toward secession were accompanied by a propaganda barrage emanating from Belgrade as well as Zagreb alleging that Muslim extremists led by President Izet-begovic were intent on transforming Bosnia-Hercegovina into a militant Islamic state in which Serbs and Croats would be subject to persecution and genocide. They cited passages from Izet-begovic's previously banned *Islamic Declaration* as proof of his allegedly fundamentalist aims; the passages were taken out of context and presented as a manifesto for restructuring Bosnia into a Muslim state. Such charges were strenuously denied by the PDA, which asserted that it supported a tolerant, secular and multi-ethnic state.

Bosnia’s Independence

In December 1991, EC (European Council) for-eign ministers decided to recognize the

independence of all Yugoslav republics fulfilling four fundamental conditions, including commitments to various human rights accords, guaranteeing rights to national groups and minorities, respect for the inviolability of frontiers, and agreement to settle state succession and re-gional disputes. In January 1992, Slovenia and Croatia were recog-nized as independent, while Macedonian recognition was blocked by Greece. Bosnia-Hercegovina met most of the EC requirements, but it was not granted recognition because no referendum had taken place to ascertain “the will of the inhabitants" for constituting an independent state.

In response to the EC decision, the Bosnian presidency authorized a referendum. The SDP, led by its chairman Radovan Karadzi-c, declared the referendum illegal because it was not approved by the full Assembly and did not have the support of all three constituent nations. Although Serbian leaders did not comprehensively disrupt the plebiscite, local officials in Serbian-dominated areas refused to cooperate. 63.4% of eligible voters participated in the referendum, and 99.7% cast their ballots for independence. The consti-tutionally required two-thirds majority was thereby attained as the majority of Muslims, Croats, Yugoslavs, and other minorities favored Bosnian statehood. Immediately after the balloting, a shooting incident in Sarajevo suddenly raised tensions and Serb militias established barricades around various cities in preparation for armed confrontation.

Bosnia-Hercegovina was recognized as an independent state in early April 1992. The day after recognition, the Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina was formally proclaimed and SDP representatives withdrew from all Bosnian govern-mental institutions and openly recognized the authority of their own separate administrative organs. Momcilo Krajisnik, assumed the presidency of the Serbian Assembly and Radovan Karadzic the presidency of the Serbian Republic.

Anti-Civil War

In April 1992, the political impasse in Bosnia was transformed into an outright armed conflict launched by Bosnia's Serb leaders. The Sarajevo government had already lost administrative control in most Serbian majority regions. Militarily, Sarajevo was incapable of either neutralizing the Serb forces or protecting Muslim residents. As the war in Croatia died down in early 1992, the Yugoslav army transferred much of its heavy equipment and troops into Bosnia-Hercegovina. Militia detachments had been formed in the five Serbian "autonomous regions" and a military command was already functioning parallel to the Serb Assembly.

In June 1991, the Serbian-dominated Yugoslav Army General Staff had ordered that all weapons belonging to Bosnia's Territorial Defense Forces be placed under the federal army's control. Much of this weap-onry was apportioned to Bosnian Serb commanders and additional war materiel began to flow in from Serbia and Montenegro. Between March and May 1992, the bulk of the Yugoslav army stationed in Bosnia was transformed into a new Serbian army commanded by a former Yugoslav army gen-eral, Ratko Mladic.

With overwhelming firepower and material support from Belgrade, Serbian forces overran nearly

two-thirds of Bosnian territory by the close of 1992. Bosnia's Muslim forces were caught unprepared and suffered severe casualties across the republic. Serbian "ethnic cleansing" opera-tions were comprehensively applied to terrorize Muslim communi-ties and create “purified” and contiguous Serbian territories across western, northern, and eastern Bosnia. Over a million people were displaced from their homes.

As the conflict escalated, Croatian leaders in western Hercegovina formed their own army and government structures while nominally pledging allegiance to the govern-ment in Sarajevo. Suspicions persisted that if Bosnia were allowed to fracture, then Croatia would claim its share of about one-fifth of the republic. As Serb forces consolidated their hold over captured territories, a separate Serbian Republic was declared with the avowed aim of linking up with Serb-captured territories in Croatia and eventually joining the rump Yugoslavia. But although Serb forces controlled the major towns in about 70% of Bosnia's territory, Sarajevo remained under siege and much of the countryside became a battleground between competing guerrilla forces.

About 150,000 people were presumed dead or missing during the war and nearly two million became refugees. What began as a rebellion against Bosnian statehood by radical elements of one of the major nationalities had turned into an ethnic war purposively targeting civilians between leaders of the three communities seeking outright territo-rial control. Bosnia's Muslim and Serbian leaders continued to uphold diametrically opposed positions on the republic's future. While Serb spokesmen sought a far-ranging "cantonization" tantamount to partition, the Muslim leadership wanted to maintain a unitary state with extensive territorial and political decen-tralization but not based on ethnic criteria. The Croats increasingly veered toward partition as the Bosnian government proved unable to fully control the republic.

Serbian military objectives were twofold: to link up and expand the territories they controlled in northern and eastern Bosnia, thus creating a contiguous Serb republic between Croatia and Serbia; and to eliminate the non--Serb populations in this new political entity. A campaign of terror was unleashed against non-Serb civilians; atrocities committed by irregular forces were loudly publicized to intimidate remaining residents and escalate the war psychosis.

The systematic nature of the "ethnic cleansing" campaign indicated that the policy had been planned and approved at the highest political levels. It served several purposes: to eliminate the non-Serb population as a potential source of resistance; to provide war booty for local guerrillas and gunmen recruited in Serbia; to gain the loyalty of Serbs evacuated from other locations by allowing them to occupy captured houses and land; and to entrap non-combatant Serbs in a permanent conflict with Muslims in which the militias could pose as defenders protect-ing Serbs from Muslim revenge attacks.

The rapid success of Serb forces galvanized Bosnia's Croat leadership and strengthened the position of those favoring partition. The moderate CDU leader, Stjepan Kljujic, who had strongly favored an integral Bosnia, was re-placed, and the more radical Hercegovinian Mate Boban, took charge of political and military operations in Croatian-majority regions. Boban criti-cized the

Bosnian leadership for its lack of preparedness and military incompe-tence while establishing a separate military structure in western Hercegovina, central Bosnia, and the Posavina region, styled as the Croatian Defense Council (CDC). Under the chairman-ship of Jadranko Prlic, it made preparations to establish a separate Croatian republic with the option of joining Croatia at some future date.

Suspicions surfaced that Boban and Karadzic had fashioned a secret deal to partition Bosnia. In July 1992, Boban declared the autonomy of Herceg--Bosnia with its capital in Mostar and proceeded to consolidate a separate ad-ministrative structure. Nevertheless, the Croat side retained its membership in the Bosnian presidency and contin-ued to provide military assistance to the beleaguered Muslim forces. In Sarajevo, Tuzla, and other large towns, a marked degree of political and military cooperation remained visible. Many urban Serbs and Croats in Bosnian-controlled territory refused to recognize either the Karadzic or the Boban leadership and upheld their allegiance to the principles of a single multi-ethnic state. By the close of 1992, a separate Serbian state was already functioning and in August 1992, a Serb Assembly meeting in Banja Luka renamed the new entity the Serb Republic *(Republika Srpska)*.

International Intervention

In June 1992, the United Nations mounted a humanitarian operation in Bosnia; it was named as UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force). Approximately 7,000 troops were dispatched to the republic. Their mission was largely confined to providing relief supplies to Sarajevo and other besieged cities. Food and medical aid also became a weapon in the siege of Bosnian cities. Serbian and Croatian militias periodically blocked U.N. convoys and severed essential water, electricity, and gas supplies in order to demoralize and starve out Muslim defenders. In August 1992, under the direction of Cyrus Vance, the personal representative of the U.N. secretary general, and David Owen, an EC-appointed mediator, the London Conference on Yugoslavia made efforts to find a political solution and enforce an agreement.

Following several rounds of negotia-tions, in October 1992, the Vance-Owen plan was formulated. It advocated the creation of a decentralized state consisting of nine largely autonomous provinces, three for each nationality, and a central region around the capital Sarajevo. In each province one of the three ethno-na-tional groups would predominate, thus opening up the possibility of population transfers under international supervision. The central government would have only minimal responsibilities, including foreign affairs, international commerce, taxation, and national defense.

The Vance-Owen plan was only acceptable to the Croats, who stood to gain pockets of territory outside the regions they already controlled, particularly in northern and central Bosnia. The Muslims would lose land in the north and the center but would regain some territories in eastern Bosnia that had been captured by Serb forces. Serbs were outraged by the proposed maps: acceptance would have meant the surrender of nearly a quarter of the occupied territories, with extensive territorial fragmentation in eastern Bosnia and the loss of their northern corridor. The

Croatian side promptly accepted the plan while the Mus-lims held out until March 1993, realizing that further opposition would simply prolong the war and ensure further Serbian conquests. By accept-ing the plan, Sarajevo estimated that significant international pressure would be exerted on the Serbs, particularly as calls for a U.N. intervention esca-lated.

Fearful of international military involvement, Serb leaders adopted a dual--track approach. They continued to procrastinate in giving a final decision on the plan while launching new offensives in eastern Bosnia during March and April 1993 to eradicate the remaining Muslim pockets. Karadzic initialed the Vance-Owen plan under pressure from Serbian President Slobodan Miloševi-c who estimated that the combined effect of tightening U.N. sanctions against Yu-goslavia and the possibility of bombing assaults on Serb positions would have precipitated a major crisis inside Serbia itself. But the validation of Karadzic's signature was made contin-gent upon the acceptance of the plan by the self-styled Serbian parliament which in April 1993 further delayed a decision by calling for a referendum among the Serb population. The ballot took place in May 1993 and the Vance-Owen plan was overwhelmingly rejected by voters.

Western indecision was quickly exploited by Bosnia's Serb leaders who pressed on with their military offensives. By the end of May 1993, the republic descended into an all-out land-grabbing operation. Bosnian Croat forces launched offensives against their erstwhile Muslim allies in central Bosnia and proceeded to expel the remaining Muslim population from western Herce-govina. Bosnian Serbs intensified their assaults on the surviving Muslim enclaves in eastern Bosnia, reducing them to barely defensible pockets that the U.N. declared as "safe havens" but failed to protect.

On 1 March 1994, fighting between Bosnian Muslims and Croats ended when the two groups signed a comprehensive cease-fire agreement in Washington. They also created a joint federation and a new constitution was promulgated on 30 March 1994. The federation was based on territory amounting to 58% of Bosnia-Hercegovina, contingent upon the recovery of territory from the Serbs. The federation was based on eight cantons, four of which would be Muslim-dominated; two controlled by Croats; and the remaining two of mixed ethnicity. International actors calculated that a political solution first had to be found between Bosniak Muslims and Croats in order to apply greater pressure on Bosnian Serbs.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- What major factors led to the disintegration of Yugoslavia?
- What was the position of the international community with regard to the survival of Yugoslavia as a single state?
- Describe how the 1992-1995 war in Bosnia-Hercegovina was engineered by rival nationalist politicians.

- How extensive was the campaign of "ethnic cleansing" in Bosnia-Hercegovina and what was the ultimate purpose of this policy?

- What factors propelled the international community to intervene in Bosnia-Hercegovina through a humanitarian mission?

- How effective was the Muslim-Croat federation as a functioning state?

Resource Materials for Further Study

Leonard Cohen, *Broken Bonds: The Rise and Fall of Yugoslavia* (Westview Press, 1993);

John Lampe, *Yugoslavia as History: Twice There Was a Country* (Cambridge University Press, 1996);

Sabrina P. Ramet, *Beyond Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics, and Culture in a Shattered Community* (Westview Press, 1995);

Laura Silber and Allan Little, *Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation* (TV Books, 1996);

Susan Woodward, *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Disssolution after the Cold War* (U.S.: Brookings Institution Press, 1995);

Warren Zimmerman, *Origins of a Catastrophe: Yugoslavia and its Destroyers* (U.S., Random House Inc. 1996).

There are numerous books on the Bosnian war (1992-1995), some scholarly, some documentary, some journalistic, and some personal accounts. Among the more notable are the following:

Rabia Ali and Lawrence Lifschultz, *Why Bosnia? Writings on the Balkan War* (Pamphleteers Press, Connecticut, 1993);

Sonja Biserko (Ed), *Yugoslavia Collapse, War Crimes* (Center for Anti-War Action, Belgrade, 1993);

Janusz Bugajski, "Blood and Soil in Bosnia," *Orbis: A Journal of World Affairs*, Vol. 40, No. 4, Fall 1996

Steven L. Burg, "Bosnia-Herzegovina: A Case of Failed Democratization," in Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrott (Eds.) *Politics, Power, and the Struggle for Democracy in South-East Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997

Steven L. Burg and Paul S. Shoup, *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention* (M.E. Sharpe, New York, 1999);

Joel M. Halpern and David A. Kideckel, *Neighbors at War: Anthropological Perspectives on Yugoslav Ethnicity, Culture, and History* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000);

Quintin Hoare and Noel Malcolm, *Books on Bosnia,* London: The Bosnian Institute, 1999

Radha Kumar, *Divide and Fall? Bosnia in the Annals of Partition,* London: Verso, 1999

Paul Mojzes, *Yugoslavian Inferno: Ethnoreligious Warfare in the Balkans* (Continuum, New York, 1994);

Michael A. Sells, *The Bridge Betrayed: Religion and Genocide in Bosnia* (University of California Press, 1996);

Raju G.C. Thomas and H. Richard Friman, *The South Slav Conflict: History, Religion, Ethnicity, and Nationalism* (New York, Garland Publishing, 1996).

Helsinki Watch, *War Crimes in Bosnia-Hercegovina,* New York, August *1992; Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1992,* Department of State, Wash-ington, DC, February 1993;

"The Ethnic Cleansing of Bosnia-Hercegovina," Com-mittee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC, August 1992.

POST-WAR BOSNIAN POLITICS

The Dayton Accords Events moved quickly during the summer of 1995. Serbian forces overran the UN “safe havens” of Srebrenica and Zepa and massacred thousands of Muslim civilians. NATO forces mounted a major air-strike campaign against Serbian positions to prevent further attacks. In cooperation with Bosnian Croat units, Bosnian government forces captured large areas of western Bosnia and the Serbs suffered their first major defeat of the war.

By the late summer of 1995, the Muslim-Croat federation controlled more than 50% of the country’s territory. Following lengthy negotiations mediated by U.S. assistant secretary of state Richard Holbrooke, Presidents Izetbegovic, Tudjman, and Milosevic initialed a comprehensive agreement in November 1995 near Dayton, Ohio. Officially signed in Paris the following month, the Dayton accords were intended to guarantee a lasting peace in Bosnia and to reconstruct the country as a single state consisting of two entities: the Federation of Bosnia-Hercegovina (also known as the Muslim-Croat federation), which would receive 51% of the territory, and the Serb

Republic, which would receive 49%.

The accord established Sarajevo as a unified city under the control of the central government. It also called for free elections to posts in both the central government and entity administrations, to be held in September 1996 under the supervision of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). To ensure peace, a NATO Implementation Force (I-FOR) was placed in Bosnia in January 1996. The force consisted of 60,000 troops from more than 20 nations, including approximately 20,000 U.S. soldiers and large numbers of French and British troops. The troops were stationed primarily along the demarcation line between the Muslim-Croat federation and the Serb Republic.

The three parties complied with the main military provisions of the Dayton accords by withdrawing their weapons and troops from the zones of separation and releasing most of their prisoners of war. However, other provisions of the agreement proved more difficult as Serbian and Croatian nationalists resisted the integration of ethnically divided communities. They also delayed the return of refugees to their homes. It took several months of negotiations before the Bosnian government at the central level was finally formed. The first session of the two-chamber Bosnian parliament took place in early January 1997 after months of obstruction by Serb representatives.

Political Structure

According to the provisions of the Dayton agreement, Bosnia-Hercegovina obtained two major administrative divisions: the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina *(Federacija Bosna i Hercegovina)* and the Serbian Republic *(Republika Srpska).* Brcko in northeastern Bosnia became a self-governing administrative unit under the sovereignty of Bosnia-Hercegovina, but is not part of either entity. The Dayton Agreement included a new constitution that is now in force, while the country's legal system is based on civil law

Regarding the executive branch, the chief of state is the Chairman of the collective Presidency, which has three members and rotates every eight months. The head of government is the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. The Cabinet is the Council of Ministers nominated by the council chairman and approved by the National House of Representatives The three members of the presidency (one Bosniak, one Croat, one Serb) are elected by popular vote for a four year term; the member with the most votes becomes the chairman unless he or she was the incumbent chairman at the time of the election. The chairman of the Council of Ministers is appointed by the presidency and confirmed by the National House of Representatives

The legislative branch consists of a bicameral Parliamentary Assembly *(Skupstina).* It includes a National House of Representatives *(Predstavnicki Dom),* with 42 seats: 14 Serb, 14 Croat, and 14 Bosniak whose members are elected by popular vote to serve two-year terms. The House of Peoples *(Dom Naroda*) consists of 15 seats: 5 Bosniak, 5 Croat, and 5 Serb whose members are elected by the Federation's House of Representatives and the *Republika Srpska's* National

Assembly to serve two-year terms.

The Bosniak-Croat Federation has a bicameral legislature that consists of a House of Representatives (with 140 seats and members elected by popular vote to serve four-year terms); and a House of Peoples (with 74 seats: 30 Bosniak, 30 Croat, and 14 others). *Republika Srpska* has a National Assembly with 83 seats, where members are elected by popular vote to serve four-year terms. The power sharing arrangements at all political levels demonstrated that ethnic proportionality combined with the separatist objectives of Serbian and Croatian representatives contributing to frequently paralyzing the central government institutions.

In the judicial branch there is a Constitutional Court consisting of nine members. Four members are selected by the Federation's House of Representatives, two members by the National Assembly of the Serb Republic, and three non-Bosnian members by the president of the European Court of Human Rights. A new state court, established in November 1999, has jurisdiction over cases related to state-level law and appellate jurisdiction over cases initiated in the two entities. The entities each have a Supreme Court and a number of lower courts. There are ten cantonal courts in the Federation, plus a number of municipal courts. *Republika Srpska* has five municipal courts

War Crimes and Refugee Issues

In early 1996, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY) based in The Hague, Netherlands, stepped up its activities. More than 50 Bosnians, the majority of whom were Serbs, were indicted by the ICTY for massacring civilians during the war. Those indicted included Radovan Karadzic and Bosnian Serb General Ratko Mladic. Although several lower ranking war crimes suspects were apprehended, the more important leaders successfully evaded capture. In July 1996, the ICTY issued international arrest warrants for both men on charges of genocide and crimes against humanity. Later that month, U.S. officials secured Karadzic’s resignation. Mladic was dismissed from power in November 1996 by Biljana Plavsic who had replaced Karadzic as President of the Serb Republic.

A number of trials before the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia have been concluded. In January 2000, five Bosnian Croats were convicted of crimes against humanity in connection with the killing of over 100 Bosniak civilians in the village of Ahmici in Central Bosnia in the spring of 1993. They received sentences ranging from six to 25 years' imprisonment. In March 2000, another Bosnian Croat, General Tihomir Blaskic, the highest-ranking army commander tried by the Tribunal, was found guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed in the Lasva River valley in central Bosnia. He was sentenced to 45 years' imprisonment, the longest sentence handed down so far.

Among other trials conducted before the Tribunal were those of Bosnian Serb General Radislav Krstic, accused of planning and ordering the killing of thousands of Bosniak men and boys after the fall of the former UN protected enclave of Srebrenica. Krstic became the first person to go on

trial before the Tribunal on charges of genocide. The trial of three Bosnian Serb paramilitary commanders accused of crimes against humanity in Foca was also underway. This trial was expected to set legal precedents in prosecutions for sexual crimes against women. In October 2000, Bosnian Serb Milorad Krnojelac went on trial on charges of war crimes committed in Foca prison. The trial of Bosnian Croats Dario Kordic and Mario Cerkez also continued. Both stood accused of war crimes against the Bosniak population in the Lasva River valley in Central Bosnia.

NATO's Stabilization Forces (SFOR) apprehended and dispatched to The Hague several other war crimes suspects, including the former Serb Republic presidency member Momcilo Krajisnik, who had been secretly indicted for genocide and crimes against humanity. Some suspects died during attempted arrests by NATO troops. In 2000, the new democratic government in Croatia transferred Mladen Naletilic, a Bosnian Croat indicted for war crimes in Mostar, to the Tribunal's custody. During 2001 and 2002, NATO forces failed to capture the former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic, despite several attempts, while General Ratko Mladic was believed to be in hiding inside Serbia protected by elements of the Yugoslav military establishment.

The Bosnian conflict left some 200,000 people dead while 2.2 million, over a half of the country's population, were forced to flee. Most of the remaining refugees have decided to stay abroad, while only 300,000 of them expressed a wish to return. Under pressure from international agencies, local authorities have pressed on with the eviction of illegal occupants, thus enabling pre-war owners to repossess their property.

The return of refugees was mandated in the Dayton agreement, but had not transpired in any significant numbers by the close of the 1990s. This was especially true regarding the return of people into areas where their ethnic group was in the minority after the war. During 1998, up to 830,000 people within Bosnia remained displaced from their previous homes. In general, the major nationalist political leaders among all three groups have sought to ensure that ethnic divisions are consolidated. Despite the assurance of security and the termination of armed hostilities, NATO had failed to guarantee the return of all refugees and the freedom of movement for all Bosnian residents.

According to figures published by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), more than 60,000 registered minority returns took place during 2000 and approximately 92,000 in 2001. About 90,000 refugees were expected to reclaim their homes or move back to their villages and neighborhoods during 2002. The number of internally displaced people and refugees at the beginning of 2001 amounted to approximately 500,000 and 700,000 respectively.

The acceleration in the process of refugee returns after 2000 was primarily stimulated by the spontaneous return of displaced people to destroyed housing, mostly outside urban areas. Meanwhile, returns to town and city centres were proceeding slowly, primarily as a result of the failure to implement property legislation enabling owners to repossess their houses. In September 2000, the UN High Representative removed 15 government officials in the Serb entity from office for their obstruction of the return process. In addition, many of the spontaneous returns were

unsustainable because of a lack of funding for the reconstruction of housing and infrastructure. Refugees also faced violence from local gangs intended to discourage their return in many parts of the country. The voluntary return of most refugees would be an important indicator of the establishment of the rule of law and governmental accountability throughout the country.

Struggle for Power

National elections were held in Bosnia-Hercegovina in September 1996. Six other ballots also took place for: cantonal assemblies (in the Federation), the House of Representatives in the Federation, the National Assembly of the Serb Republic, the Presidency of the Serb Republic, the House of Representatives of Bosnia-Hercegovina, and the Presidency of Bosnia-Hercegovina. The election campaign was riddled with violations that would have disqualified the ballot under normal conditions. No free movement of people existed between Muslim-Croat and Serb territories, many war criminals were on the ballot, freedom of assembly remained tenuous, and the major media outlets were dominated by nationalists who wanted to seal Bosnia's division not reunification.

The ruling Muslim, Serbian, and Croatian nationalist parties scored major victories, each capturing about 80% of the vote of their ethnic constituencies. The Party of Democratic Action (PDA) won the largest number of seats in Bosnia's central legislature. Seats on the three-member collective presidency went to Bosnia's Muslim president Alija Izetbegovic, Serb leader Momcilo Krajisnik, and Croat leader Krezimir Zubak. Izetbegovic received the most votes and thus chaired the presidency. Disputes surfaced between Muslim and Serbian leaders over the role and power of the collective presidency. The Serb side often raised questions to sow confusion and paralyze the newly constituted governing bodies.

The Serbian Democratic Party (SDP) won the majority of seats to the assembly of the Serb Republic, and Biljana Plavsic, a member of the SDP, continued as president of the entity. The PDA won the largest number of seats in the Muslim-Croat federation's House of Representatives, followed by the Croatian Democratic Union (CDU). The presidency of the Muslim-Croat federation was chosen by the federation's parliament and thus was not contested. The overwhelming victory of the country's ruling parties reflected the suppression or media neglect of opposition parties in the weeks leading up to the elections. Many observers feared that the success of nationalists would serve to ratify Bosnia's partition along ethnic lines. Instead of cementing together the two halves of Bosnia, the general elections seemed to consolidate the power of the three ethno-nationalist political forces.

The Karadzic faction withdrew its representatives from the joint Council of Ministers and blocked meetings of the Bosnian collective presidency. Their battles with Plavsic revolved around control over the army, police forces, political and economic networks, and the mass media. Police units divided into two: about half of the 20,000 officers backed Plavsic's attempt to take over Serbian institutions. The remainder, together with an estimated 3,000 "special police" troops, remained loyal to the old SDP leadership. Two rival power centers emerged in the Serb Republic. Plavsic

created her own party in Banja Luka and attracted some former Karadzic loyalists. The Serbian media also split and became the propaganda mouthpiece of two factions: Karadzic hard liners in Pale and Trebinje and Plavsic rebels controlling Banja Luka television.

In December 1996, NATO launched a new, 31,000-strong stabilization force (S-FOR) in Bosnia to replace the 60,000-member I-FOR, whose one-year mandate had expired. The S-FOR mission was to deter new hostilities and provide a secure environment for civilian peace efforts. Washington contributed 8,500 troops to the new force. In February 1998, NATO leaders decided to extend the S-FOR's mission past June 1998 while the ICTY delivered a historic verdict when it convicted Dusan Tadic, a Bosnian Serb, of crimes against humanity for participating in an ethnic cleansing campaign against Muslims. This trial marked the first time an international court had tried and convicted someone for war crimes since the close of World War Two.

A Dysfunctional State?

During 1997, Serb Republic President Plavsic clashed with a Serb Assembly dominated by hard-liners. With Western backing, Plavsic formed a new party, the Serb People's Alliance (SPA), in August 1997. On 3 July 1997, the Serb Assembly called for Plavsic's dismissal, accusing her of betraying the Serbian cause. She responded by dissolving the Assembly and legislative elections were called for 22-23 November 1997. Following the vote, a new National Assembly was formed and nationalist predominance was gradually undermined.

18 members of the Bosnian Serb assembly were Muslims, elected by Muslim refugees voting in their home areas. These new legislators combined with Plavsic supporters in January 1998 to elect as Prime Minister the businessmen Milorad Dodik, who had only limited ties with the Bosnian Serb wartime leadership. For the first time since the war began the Bosnian Serb government was not controlled by the SDP. Dodik led a minority government dependent on the support of the PDA and the CDU; but the latter two were formally excluded from the government for fear of losing Serb support for Dodik. Dodik sought to minimize SDP influence in the Serb entity, especially by breaking that party's hold over the media. He also moved the government of the Serb Republic from Pale to Banja Luka, where Plavsic had more influence.

Nationalists on all three sides hampered the free movement of people and the process of ethnic homogenization continued. Moreover, Serbian leaders hampered the functioning of the central government in Sarajevo. Although the three-person Bosnian presidency was formed together with an executive cabinet in which all three ethnic groups were represented, the powers of the central government remained limited while the entity authorities retained substantial control.

In the Bosnian Federation, Muslim leaders complained that Croatian leaders were sabotaging the agreements and constructing their own state structure. Croat representatives claimed that their counterparts in Sarajevo were refusing to approve true power sharing institutions for the Federation. Moreover, they voiced fears that a "unitary federation" would give the Muslims a

dominant role in the midst of growing Islamic nationalism. In effect, federal institutions remained largely paralyzed and cantonal and local authorities exercised more effective control.

Croatian nationalists retained strong vested interests in a permanent division of the country. Millions of black-market dollars were earned from the war and from the subsequent peace. Politically connected criminal gangs in the Croatian territories were manipulating nationalist sentiments, instilling fear in the local population, preventing the normalization of life throughout western Hercegovina and siphoning off vital funds from the government in Sarajevo. The CDU retained a monopolistic organization that eliminated all space for a free mass media and political pluralism. As a result, ethnically separate political and military structures continued to operate within the Federation.

In the Serb Republic, President Plavsic realized that without Western economic assistance the entity faced catastrophe. In order to retain power she challenged Karadzic, Krajisnik, and other war profiteers. Her campaign against corruption struck a chord among many ordinary Serbs. Plavsic in effect challenged the monopoly of the SDP. Some observers feared that the Serb entity could dissolve into an all-out civil war and a split into two antagonistic parts: the western section based around the Plavsic and Dodik leadership in Banja Luka and the eastern Karadzic group in Pale.

Fresh elections to the Bosnian Serb Presidency and for the Serb member of the collective Bosnian presidency took place on 12-13 September 1998. The latter ballot was won by Zivko Radisic from the Socialist Party of the Serb Republic (SPSR). Nikola Poplasen, a leader of the Serbian Radical Party, won the vote to the Serbian presidency but was barred from taking office by the UN High Representative Carlos Westendorp because of his staunch opposition to Bosnian integration. A new series of municipal elections took place in April 2000, but showed mixed success in integrating Bosnia and curtailing the powers of nationalist forces. Serb nationalists won in 49 municipalities, while Croatian nationalists captured 25. The Muslim Party of Democratic Action won in 23 by itself and in 11 more in coalition with the more moderate Party for Bosnia-Hercegovina. There were some encouraging signs in that the multi-ethnic Social Democrats won in 15 municipalities and made important electoral advances.

After general elections in November 2000, a new central government took power in February 2001, consisting of a post-election coalition that excluded the nationalist parties from power. This coalition, the Alliance for Change, was centred on the multi-ethnic Social Democratic Party (SDP) and the Party for Bosnia and Herzegovina (SBiH). The Alliance also came to power in the Federation. However, the Bosnian Party for Democratic Action and the Croatian Democratic Union remained powerful. The Serbian Democratic Party won a significant plurality in the Serb Republic in the November 2000 ballot, while its coalition partner in the government, the moderate Party for Democratic Progress of Prime Minister Mladen Ivanic, remained dependent on the SDP in order to remain in office.

International agencies remained hopeful that the general elections scheduled for October 2002

would further strengthen the multi-ethnic parties and undermine the three nationalist formations. To achieve such an objective, a comprehensive package of election law reforms would be necessary and the powers of the two entity governments would need to be whittled down.

Parallel political structures in the Serbian entity and the Croatian dominated cantons in the Bosnian Federation maintained their own intelligence services, economic networks, and financial sources. Many of these sources were either illicit or deprived the central government in Sarajevo of necessary revenues from taxation or customs duties. Their activities were enhanced by the shortcomings evident in the judicial system and in law enforcement. Much needed was the merger of disparate intelligence services linked with particularistic interests into a professional organisation under central government control. In June 2002, it was announced that a common intelligence service was to be established for the all-Bosnian state institutions.

According to the U.S. State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for the year 2000, Bosnia's dominant political parties continued to exert influence over the media, while freedom of the press was restricted in both entities. Government pressures against journalists remained high although threats of physical violence were decreasing. Academic freedom was restricted and the authorities continued to impose some limits on freedom of assembly and association. Both governments and private groups continued to restrict religious practice by minorities in majority areas. Although freedom of movement continued to improve, some restrictions remained in practice. The police failed to ensure security for all refugees returning to areas in which they were an ethnic minority.

Endemic corruption, an obstructionist bureaucracy, too many layers of government, and insufficient clarity in property ownership have greatly inhibited foreign investment and stifled local entrepreneurship. Limited economic opportunities have exacerbated the emigration of many of Bosnia's best-educated and most ambitious young people. The country was clearly in need of a unified legal system to deal with business, tax, privatization, and property ownership, as well as the functioning of a single state customs service responsible to the central government in Sarajevo for gathering revenues.

Military reform was long overdue in the country, as Bosnia-Hercegovina needed a single army in order to participate in NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) program. The existence of three military structures (Serbian, Bosniak, and Croatian) has proved financially and politically costly while impeding the modernization, standardization, streamlining, and professionalization of Bosnia's armed forces.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- Provide an assessment of the Dayton accords and to what degree have its principles been implemented in practice.

- What are the major differences between the United Nations UNPROFOR mission and NATO's IFOR and SFOR operations?

- What are the major post-war impediments to creating a single Bosnian state?

- Has the international presence consolidated unity or division in the country, and how dependent is Bosnia-Hercegovina on international actors for its political survival?

- What impact has the war crimes issue had on the process of post-war reconciliation in Bosnia-Hercegovina?

- How important is the return to their homes of refugees and displaced persons in rebuilding a multi-ethnic Bosnian state?

- Assess the nature and consequence of political conflicts between nationalists and multi-ethnic liberals in the two Bosnian entities.

Resource Materials for Further Study

Thomas Ambrosio, "The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Failure of Implementation," in John S. Micgiel (Ed.) *State and Nation Building in East Central Europe: Contemporary Perspectives,* New York: Columbia University, Institute on East Central Europe, 1996

Bosnian Institute, "The Three Milosevic Indictments at The Hague", *Bosnia Report*, London, No. 26, November-December 2001

Janusz Bugajski, "Stabilizing Partition with SFOR," *Transitions: Changes in Post-Communist Societies*, Vol. 3, No. 3, 21 February 1997

David Chandler, *Bosnia: Faking Democracy After Dayton,* London, Pluto Press, 1999

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "Brcko: A Comprehensive Solution," *Balkans Report #55, 8 February 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "Breaking the Mould: Electoral Reform in Bosnia & Herzegovina," *Balkans Report #56, 4 March 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "Rule Over Law: Obstacles to the Development of an Independent Judiciary in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Balkans Report #72, 5 July 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Preventing Minority Return in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Anatomy of Hate and Fear,” *Balkans Report #73, 2 August 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Is Dayton Falling? Policy Options and Perspectives Four Years After,” *Balkans Report #80, 28 October 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Rule of Law in Public Administration: Confusion and Discrimination in Post-Communist Bureaucracy,” *Balkans Report #84, 15 December 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Bosnia’s Municipal Elections 2000: Winners and Losers,” *Balkans Report #91, 28 April 2000*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Bosnia’s Refugee Logjam Breaks: Is the International Community Ready?” *Balkans Report #95, 31 May 2000*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “War Criminals in Bosnia’s Republika Srpska,” *Balkans Report #103, 2 November 2000*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, “Bosnia’s November Elections: Dayton Stumbles,” *Balkans Report #104, 18 December 2000*

U.S. Department of State, Bosnia and Herzegovina: Country Profile, September 2001, www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2868.htm

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

International Protectorate

The Bonn Conference in December 1997 empowered Carlos Westendorp, the UN High Representative, to impose solutions on the three Bosnian protagonists. The High Representative was authorized to make binding decisions on how to run the central government, impose interim solutions during disputes, and fire Bosnian officials who blocked progress toward integration. Some observers considered Westendorp’s new mandate to be a major step toward transforming Bosnia into an international protectorate. Westendorp complained that the country lacked human and minority rights protection, laws on foreign investment, customs rules, national political parties, and public corporations. The Bonn Document called for a sustained campaign against official corruption and efforts to break the links between nationalist politicians and criminal rackets.

The international community provided several billion dollars in aid to Bosnia after the signing of

the Dayton accords. But there were persistent complaints that funds had been misused and primarily benefited the ruling nationalists. No major boost in production was registered and the Serbian entity in particular remained pauperized and devoid of any significant reconstruction assistance because of the obstruction of nationalist politicians. The reconstruction of Bosnia-Hercegovina as a single state and the promotion of a central political authority frustrated the international community. Nationalist politicians, especially from the major Serbian and Croatian parties, persistently blocked the process of state integration. The country remained polarized along ethnic lines as nationalist parties controlled decision-making in the two entities. Exclusivist nationalist parties continued to pose as the defenders of allegedly endangered "national interests."

International agencies favored the marginalization of nationalist hard-liners among all three ethnic groups. For example, during his term in office, Westendorp dismissed the President of the Serb Republic, Nikola Poplasen, for interfering in the country's democratic process and for supporting partition. Westendorp also tried to intensify the state-building process by various unilateral measures such as deciding on the country's new flag, national anthem, a joint currency, a common passport, and common national license plates.

Nationalist politicians in several cantons who openly violated the Dayton provisions were either removed from office or barred from standing in future elections. Westendorp also began to restructure the Bosnian media by wresting control of several television stations from the ruling nationalist parties. Although the High Representative did not technically command any military force, his control of major aid and reconstruction resources enabled him to enforce most of his decisions.

The degree of Westendorp's intervention led to complaints about externally imposed solutions among various Bosnian activists. Others believed that the High Representative had not sufficiently exercised his authority or unnecessarily delayed the full implementation of the Dayton accords. Westendorp's successor, Wolfgang Petrisch, concentrated his efforts on reforming Bosnia's corrupt judicial system, buttressing its precarious independent mass media, and improving its educational system. International representatives also condemned the activities of the Croatian Hercegovinian ultra-nationalist networks, which thwarted the development of a functioning democracy and prevented the emergence of a competitive market economy. They criticized the Franjo Tudjman government in Croatia for supporting illicit structures inside Bosnia and for harboring designs on Bosnian territory.

Without international pressures and financial incentives, the position of Bosnia's refugees and local minorities would be have been even more precarious. International dependence was also evident in the Bosnian economy. Real growth continued to stagnate as a consequence of numerous factors, including corruption and mismanagement, over-dependence on international agencies, and limited indigenous economic development. Since 1995, Bosnia benefited from substantial foreign economic aid particularly from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Reports also surfaced that government leaders had misappropriated large amounts of cash from

public funds or from international aid projects. The embezzled funds were believed to amount to a substantial portion of all state finances. The allegations were vehemently denied in both entities but they soured the climate for further foreign assistance and investment. International agencies also bemoaned the lack of a proper banking system and an effective tax and tariff collection agency in the country. Both factors encouraged illegitimate business activities and undermined the authority of the central government.

The survival of Bosnia-Hercegovina as a single state remained dependent primarily on the presence of NATO and other international institutions to provide physical security, state resources, economic reconstruction, institutional continuity, and territorial integrity. Hard-line nationalists calculated that international resolve would weaken over time and that their resistance to ethnic reintegration and civic democracy would eventually pay off as international organizations disengaged from Bosnia and *de facto* recognized the existence of two sovereign states.

Meanwhile, Bosnia's democrats were frustrated by the initial weak pressures exerted by international organizations on nationalist "warlords" and the slow development of civic institutions. But the civic activists and integralists were also cognizant that over-dependence on international actors could undermine the authenticity and indigenous development of Bosnia's multi-ethnic and civic-democratic institutions.

Although centrist and civic forces proved more successful in the general elections on 11 November 2000, the three nationalist parties gained sufficient representation to obstruct multi-ethnic integration. In particular, the SDP and the CDU continued to block democratic reform and governmental authority at the central level. The issue of systemic corruption and organized criminality grew in significance during the 1990s and increasingly preoccupied international actors.

In June 2002, the newly appointed UN High Representative Paddy Ashdown pledged a prolonged campaign against crime and corruption in Bosnia-Hercegovina. The country would acquire special anti-corruption bodies within the judiciary by the end of the year, and Ashdown called for the "creation of special organized crime, economic crime, and corruption panels in the criminal division and appeals division of the new State Court of Bosnia-Herzegovina."

International Relations

In the early part of the 1990s, the Serbian and Croatian governments harbored clear designs on Bosnian territory and sponsored proxy forces in the republic to promote partition and potential annexation. Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic was closely involved in promoting the Bosnian war through military, financial, economic, political, and intelligence support to the Bosnian Serb leadership. Croatian President Franjo Tudjman likewise maintained a close relationship with the CDU political and military leaders in Hercegovina.

Following the signing of the peace treaty at Dayton in 1995, Bosnia's foreign policy has developed parallel to various international efforts in Southeast Europe. The principle pillars of Bosnian foreign policy revolve around building lasting regional security structures, and ensuring closer regional economic cooperation.

In March 1998, an agreement was signed to institutionalize regular high-level consultations between Sarajevo and Zagreb, while an agreement was reached during the summer of 1998 providing Bosnia with easier access to the Adriatic Sea through Croatian territory. Nonetheless, Bosniak Muslim leaders remained suspicious that the Croatian government still held aspirations to divide the country. A provocative speech by Croatian President Franjo Tudjman in February 1998, which called for a partition of Bosnia along ethnic lines, was vehemently condemned by Muslim leaders and by the international community.

Bosnia's relations with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) remained stalled. The government in Belgrade proved hesitant in unequivocally recognizing the integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina. In addition, Yugoslav President Milosevic played off rival factions in the Serbian entity in order to maintain his influence in the country. Fears were also generated during the summer of 1998 that the brewing conflict in the Serbian province of Kosovo could have negative consequences in Bosnia by encouraging the secession of the Serb republic and the Croatian regions.

In 1999, some members of President Tudjman's ruling party in Croatia called for the creation of separate Croatian and Muslim entities in Bosnia to replace the existing Bosnian Federation. Muslim leaders considered this a move toward Croatian separatism, and Bosnia's deputy Prime Minister Haris Silajdzic declared that Tudjman should be sent to The Hague tribunal for his role in war crimes committed during the 1993-1994 Muslim-Croat war. By contrast, Croatia's democratic opposition called for the decentralization of political power rather than the creation of three entities. They believed that Bosnia's cantons (or districts) should become the main locus of political authority in which the three ethnic groups could gain greater representation.

After Tudjman's death at the end of 1999 and the election of a democratic coalition government in Croatia in January 2000, substantial progress was achieved in relations between Sarajevo and Zagreb. Croatia displayed its commitment to an integral Bosnia and thus improved prospects for eliminating separatist trends in Croatian Hercegovina. In March 2000, the new Croatian President Stipe Mesic visited Sarajevo and announced that Zagreb would no longer interfere in Bosnia's internal affairs or finance the Croatian separatists as had been the case under Tudjman's tenure.

The new Croatian government recognized the territorial integrity of Bosnia and adopted a "one-Bosnia" approach. A number of important bilateral agreements have been signed between the two countries, including cooperation on refugee repatriation, cooperation between the two Defense Ministries on regional security, and cooperation on border controls. The two sides have also signed an agreement finalizing the Bosnian-Croatian border. In sum, 76 bilateral agreements have been signed between the two states.

The ouster of Slobodan Milosevic in October 2000 generated hope that Sarajevo's contacts with Belgrade would be placed on a more constructive footing. The Yugoslav government formally recognized the territorial integrity of Bosnia-Hercegovina This opened bilateral channels and the two states have begun to cooperate on an array of issues, including refugee repatriation, movement of people and capital, and the UN war crimes tribunal at The Hague. The two countries have forged a favorable economic relationship, particularly in the field of energy, signing a free trade agreement in February 2002. Normalization of all types of traffic remains an important precondition for unimpeded communication between the two countries. In this context, activities have been intensified with a view to the conclusion of necessary agreements.

International pressures have been exerted on the FRY (Federal Republic of Yugoslavia) government to sever military assistance to the Bosnian Serb military and to establish more cooperative relations with the central government in Sarajevo. Close personal and institutional links between the Serb Republic and the Yugoslav government in Belgrade remained a cause of international criticism as they undermined the forging of a unified Bosnian state.

Bosnia has pursued cooperative relations with the majority of EU countries, the US, and member states of the OIC (Organization of Islamic Countries), particularly Iran and Turkey. Sarajevo established cordial ties with all countries making significant contributions to its reconstruction and development as well as other member countries of the Peace Implementation Council (PIC). The priority of the government is to take steps toward European and trans-Atlantic integration, including admission to the Council of Europe, NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP), and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Bosnia's participation in three multilateral initiatives is of particular relevance: the EU Stabilization and Association process, the Stability Pact, and the OSCE Agreement on Regional Stabilization. In May 1999, the European Commission outlined the EU's Stabilization and Association Agreement (SAA), anchored to a common set of political and economic conditions that needed to be met for a country to move toward EU assimilation. That same year, Bosnia began actively participating in the EU Stabilization and Association Process (SAP). A road map was adopted, which Bosnia pledged to implement in full by end of 2002. SAP emphasizes the need for regional cooperation.

The Stability Pact was an attempt by the EU to implement a political and economic strategy in Southeast Europe to ensure security and growth. Under the provisions of the Stability Pact, Bosnia pledged to work towards the creation of a Free Trade Area, the establishment of a Migration and Asylum Initiative, and the resolution of refugee matters. Sarajevo agreed to participate in all negotiations on regional arms control and for achieving a regional military balance based on the lowest level of armaments. It also consented to negotiate for voluntary limits on military manpower, restrictions on military deployments and exercises, and restraints on the location of heavy weapons.

After the fall of communism and the outbreak of war, and the imposition of international economic sanctions, criminal activities turned much of the Balkan region into a hotbed for drugs and arms trafficking, people smuggling, and prostitution. Accordingly, the Bosnian authorities have promised to work actively in limiting and eliminating regional organized crime and corruption. Sarajevo is cooperating with other Balkan states in collecting and sharing intelligence data on trafficking networks. It is committed to a regional approach, through the adoption of similar standards, in the fight against organized crime. It is also a strong supporter of the Task Force on Trafficking in Women and Children of the Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- What is the legal basis for the international presence in Bosnia-Hercegovina and is the country in effect a United Nations protectorate?
- What role has NATO played in Bosnia-Hercegovina in its first out of area post-Cold War mission?
- Consider some of the positive and the negative consequences of Bosnia's dependence on international institutions?
- What would be your suggestion for creating a stronger, self-sustaining, and integrated Bosnian state?
- What role have both Serbia and Croatia played in Bosnian politics and in the country's economic development, and how has this changed since the demise of Presidents Franjo Tudjman and Slobodan Milosevic?
- How does Bosnia-Hercegovina fit into the evolution of the wider Balkan region since the disintegration of Yugoslavia?

Resource Materials for Further Study

Janusz Bugajski, "Balkan In Dependence," *The Washington Quarterly,* Vol. 23, No. 4, Autumn 2000.

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "No Early Exit: NATO's Continuing Challenge in Bosnia," *Balkans Report #110, 22 May 2001*

CULTURE, SOCIETY, AND GENDER

Ethnic Groups

Bosnia-Hercegovina's three major ethnic groups are Muslims, Serbs, and Croats. According to the last official republican census, completed in 1991, Muslims formed 43%, Serbs 31%, and Croats 17% of a total population of 4,364,574. By mid-2001, the population estimate stood at 3,922,205 although a precise figure was difficult to establish because of the dislocations caused by military action and "ethnic cleansing" in the 1990s.

The population ratios remained roughly similar in the wake of the 1992-1995 war, although the Croatian share reportedly dipped below 15%. Also in 1991, over 5% of the population declared themselves as Yugoslavs, but this category largely evaporated as a consequence of the armed conflicts and the disintegration of Yugoslavia. During the war, the term Bosniak generally replaced Muslim as an ethnic term partly to avoid confusion with the religious term Muslim. Other smaller minorities resident in Bosnia included Romas, Albanians, Montenegrins, Jews, and Slovenes. A Jewish community had found safe haven in Sarajevo in 1492 after their expulsion from Spain. There were no religious or ethnic ghettos in the larger cities and the republic's churches, mosques, and synagogues were often located close together, indicative of the tolerant character of Bosnian society.

Bosnia-Hercegovina was in a unique position among the former Yugoslav repub-lics, in that no single nation or nationality formed an absolute majority. By the late 1980s, Bosnia's ethnic balance was compounded by a complex territo-rial mix among the three major communities. In the 99 municipalities outside of the capital Sarajevo, Muslims formed absolute majorities in only 32, and few of these were territorially contiguous: the biggest concentrations were in northwest-ern, eastern, and central Bosnia. Serbs constituted absolute majorities in 30 mu-nicipalities, most of these in western, northeastern, and southeastern Bosnia. Croats formed absolute majorities in only 14 municipalities, the majority in the western Hercegovina region.

In 23 municipalities, no ethnic group possessed a clear majority and even in districts where one ethnic group predominated there were large minorities of one of the other two nationalities. Cities were ethnically very mixed; in the smaller towns specific groups tended to live in different quarters; while in villages one group tended to predominate.

The major language of all three ethno-religious communities was formerly known as Serbo-Croatian or *stokavian,* a dialect selected by the intellectual founders of Yugoslavia to be the chief language of the new state. There were some minor variations in pronunciation and vocabulary but these variants were more similar to each other than to the Serbo-Croatian spoken in Belgrade or Zagreb. Bosnia also had two alphabets, the Latin and Cyrillic scripts, and both were taught in schools and used in the press.

Since the breakup of Yugoslavia, leaders of the three ethnic groups have endeavored to forge their linguistic distinctiveness by adding new vocabulary and officially referring to their language as either Bosniak, Serbian, or Croatian. While Croats and Bosniak Muslims largely dispensed with the Cyrillic alphabet, Serbs discarded the Latin script.

Composition of Population, 1991 Census

Ethnic Group	Number	% of Population
Muslims	1,902,954	43.60
Serbs	1,370,476	31.40
Croats	755,071	17.30
Yugoslavs	240,052	5.50
Others	96,02	12.20
Total Minorities	4,364,574	100.00
Total Population	4,364,574	100.00

Major Religions

The major distinguishing feature in Bosnia is religious affiliation. While the predominant Bosniak population is Muslim, the Serbs are overwhelmingly Christian Orthodox, and the Croats are Roman Catholics. The Muslim name, as an ethnic category and one of Yugoslavia's constituent nations, was adopted by the Communist authorities to preserve a multi-ethnic balance in Bosnia and prevent Serbian and Croatian domination.

The dividing line stemming from the Christian schism in the 11th century passed through Bosnia-Hercegovina. Bosnian historians claim that most of the local population felt no particular allegiance to either Croatia or Serbia as control over the territory was changeable and often nominal and both the Catholic and Orthodox Churches were organizationally weak. Many of the local inhabitants either belonged to an autonomous and schismatic Bosnian Church or to a heretical dualist sect known as the Bogomils. Many Bosnians converted to Islam during Ottoman rule in the 15th and 16th centuries as a consequence of weak allegiance to Catholicism, Orthodoxy, or Bogomilism, as well as opportunities for improved political position, social status, and economic benefits under Ottoman rule. The form of Islam was generally Sunni and was moderate in its orientation.

Religion has a close association with national identity despite poor attendance at religious services and other rituals. Despite the prevalence of secularism, a religious revival was visible during the collapse of communism and as a consequence of the brutal 1992-1995 war. Indeed, Muslim-Bosniak consciousness and identity expanded and solidified during the course of the conflict. However, the form of Islam in Bosnia is moderate with few if any militant or fundamentalist elements despite attempt by states such as Iran to promote more extremist Islamicist sentiments. For example, the consumption of alcohol was commonplace among all groups, without any prohibitions. Since the war however, it has been discouraged in some Muslim areas as Islamic rituals and practices have intensified.

The Bosnian Constitution provides for freedom of religion, including private and public worship. Although in general, individuals enjoyed this right in areas that were ethnically mixed or where most people adhered to one majority religion, the ability of individuals to worship in areas where their religion was in the minority was restricted, sometimes violently, according to several human rights reports.

Administrative and financial obstacles to rebuilding religious structures impeded the ability of minorities to worship and contributed to impeding their return in many areas. The absence of a police force willing to protect religious minorities and a judicial system capable of prosecuting crimes against them constituted major obstacles to safeguarding the rights of religious minorities. According to U.S. State Department reports, the Bosnian Serb government, local governments, and police forces frequently allowed or encouraged an atmosphere in which abuses of religious freedom could take place.

Cultural Factors

Before the 1992-1995 war, about two thirds of the Bosnian population was rural although the dry plateaus in Hercegovina were more sparsely populated than the central and northern zones of Bosnia. The country had a traditional urban-rural divide with a good deal of mutual stereotyping between the two groups that often transcended ethnic and religious differentiation. During the 1960s and 1970s, the urban population almost doubled as many young people left the countryside for the industrial centers of Sarajevo, Zenica, Banja Luka, Tuzla, and Mostar, and were often accommodated in suburban apartment blocks.

Bosnia had an urban population that aspired to the living standard common in western Europe and was increasingly intermixed ethnically, residentially, and occupationally, with increasing cross-ethnic marriages. About one third of all urban marriages on the eve of the 1992-1995 war were between partners from different ethnic backgrounds. The rural population remained more divided ethnically and was generally poorer. As a result of the wars, ethno-religious identification has risen among all three major groups.

The largest cities had mixed populations in 1991, but the war and its aftermath made them almost homogenous. For example, Banja Luka, 55% Serbian in 1991, was almost 100% Serbian by 1993. In 1991, Mostar was 34% percent Croatian, 35% Muslim, 19% Serbian, and 10% “others” (people who registered no ethnic affiliation); but by 1995 it had been divided into an almost purely Croatian western part and a Muslim eastern part. Under the terms of the 1995 Dayton accords, Sarajevo, located in the Muslim-Croat federation, is a united city under federal Bosnian control. However, the city's population changed from 49% Muslim before the war to 90% Muslim by 1996, and the Bosniak-Muslim authorities permitted few non-Muslims to return in the immediate aftermath of the war.

Bosnia's pre-war ethnic diversity enriched its cultural life. Epic stories, a form of traditional oral literature, were still sung throughout the republic well into the 1950s. Bosnian urban love songs,

largely Muslim in origin, were popular throughout the former Yugoslavia. Ivo Andric, a Serb who was raised Catholic in Bosnia, won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1961. His novels include *Na Drini Cuprija* (1945; *The Bridge on the Drina*, 1959), in which a bridge from the Ottoman period symbolically united Bosnia's peoples. The film director Emir Kusturica, of Muslim origin, made internationally acclaimed films in Sarajevo. His film *When Father was Away on Business* was a finalist for the Academy Award in the United States for best foreign film in 1984. That film had a cast and crew that included Muslims, Serbs, and Croats. Through 1991, the Bosnian rock group *Bijelo Dugme* was extremely popular throughout Yugoslavia, playing music influenced by the various traditions of Bosnia.

The cultural mix has declined since the war. The Bosniak authorities regard Andric as having been anti-Muslim, and they closed the museum devoted to him in his home town of Travnik. Filmmaker Kusturica moved to Serbia in 1992 while his internationally acclaimed 1995 depiction of the war, *Underground*, was condemned in Sarajevo.

The most important library in Bosnia was the National and University Library in Sarajevo. It was deliberately destroyed by militant Serbian shelling in 1992. The world famous bridge in Mostar, built by Ottoman rulers in the 17th century, was intentionally destroyed by the shelling of militant Croats in 1994. Throughout Bosnia, Orthodox and Catholic churches and mosques were deliberately targeted and destroyed during the war. Among the most important losses were two mosques in Banja Luka that were on the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) register of world cultural monuments. They were leveled by Bosnian Serb authorities in 1992.

Social Structure

Bosnia's social structure has few traditional features remaining but mostly modern pan-European elements. The basic unit is the nuclear family, although in some areas the ancient Slavic *zadruga* or extended family remains a source of cooperation. The fairly recent trends toward urbanization, mostly since the end of World War Two, meant that many families retained relatives in both the city and the villages and could draw upon resources from both environments. Bosnian Moslems tended to maintain fewer connections between city and country, because since Ottoman times they have tended to be largely an urban population. Under the communist system, family and friendship networks were employed to gain various benefits.

Bosnia-Hercegovina had a high rate of population growth in comparison with the other Yugoslav republics. When the republic achieved independence, much of the population was young, with over a quarter under the age of 15. In addition, large numbers of Bosnians lived as guest workers in Germany, Austria, and other West European countries. Before the war, Sarajevo had a population of 526,000 inhabitants, while the other sizable cities included Banja Luka, Mostar, Tuzla, and Zenica. Since the war, according to estimates made in 2001, the population structure has altered, with 20% under 15 years old, 70% between 15 and 64 years of age, and 9% over 65

years old.

Before the 1992-1995 war, Bosnia-Hercegovina was a modern and industrialized European country with good educational, welfare, and health care standards. Education was compulsory and free for all children from ages 7 through 15. Secondary education was also free. Wartime destruction or damage to schools disrupted education for many children, although “war schools” were created in other buildings. There are officially four universities in the country, in Sarajevo, Banja Luka, Tuzla, and Mostar. The university in Mostar, however, has split into two unrelated institutions, a Croat university in western Mostar and an Islamic one in eastern Mostar.

Gender Issues

Although women were guaranteed full equality and entry into the work force under the communist system, this often resulted in women performing two jobs, one at the office or factory and one at home. Polygyny as a Moslem custom was practiced only in isolated regions of the country as most marriages followed modern customs. Arranged marriage between families also largely disappeared. The size of Bosnian families, especially in the urban areas, has also been decreasing as education and living standards increased.

During the 1992-1995 war women in general were the major victims of ethno-nationalist policies. They were the primary victims of rape and displacement. It is difficult to estimate the exact number of women and girls raped during the conflict. Human-rights observers, journalists, and witnesses reported on the organized and systematic rape of at least 20,000 women and girls by the Serbian military and the murder of many of the victims. Croatian and Bosnian militias also engaged in rape and abuse but on a smaller scale. Rape was employed as a deliberate military tactic in the process of “ethnic cleansing.” Rapes were committed in a sadistic fashion to humiliate the victims, their families, and the entire community. Women and girls aged anything between 6 and 70 were gang-raped in special camps in various parts of the country. Rape was used as a strategic weapon condoned by local political and military leaders.

Since the war many Muslim women have adopted Islamic dress styles that had not been common in the cities before the war. The destruction of the economy and the loss of employment has also thrust many previously working women into traditional female roles as housewives and mothers.

After the conflict, some women became ardent pacifists and supported the process of reconciliation. A minority of women began to create independent civil organizations in order to have a greater political input in policy making. New women’s civil groups developed out of the need to help the victims of war especially given the collapse of the former state welfare system. However, they have often lacked domestic visibility and recognition for their efforts. Women’s groups received support from international agencies not only for their work with war victims but also in their attempts to increase women’s political involvement.

According to human rights groups, violence against women, particularly domestic violence, was a persistent yet underreported problem. A report by the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights in 2000 estimated that approximately 30% of women in the country were victims of domestic violence; however, there was little reliable data available regarding the extent of the problem. Discrimination against women in employment also persisted in the country particularly in rural areas and few women occupied positions of real economic or political power. Women have been discriminated against in the workplace in favor of demobilized soldiers.

Trafficking in women from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union for purposes of sexual exploitation was a serious and growing problem in Bosnia-Hercegovina. There were no existing laws that specifically prohibited trafficking in persons. The country remained a major destination and transit point, and to a lesser extent a country of origin, for women and girls trafficked for sexual exploitation. Bosnia was extremely vulnerable to trafficking in persons, because of weak laws, porous border controls, and corrupt police who were easily bribed. Many of the women were smuggled through Bosnia to Italy, Germany, and other Western European countries for prostitution.

International organisations have attempted to address the problem of people smuggling and programs have been established to repatriate trafficked women who seek to return home. A number of shelters have been created to house trafficked women while they await return to their countries of origin. However, public awareness of the problem remains low and trafficking is tolerated at most levels of society.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- Describe the relationships between the three religious communities in Bosnia-Hercegovina before and during communist times.
- What impact did the 1992-1995 war have on traditional customs and group identities?
- What was the impact of the 1992-1995 war on Bosnia's smaller minorities (Romas, Jews, and so on)?
- How significant are religious beliefs and institutions in structuring the values and behavior of the three Bosnian nationalities?
- How has the position of women changed in the country during and after communist rule? How has it altered in the aftermath of the 1992-1995 war?

Resource Materials for Further Study

CIA World Factbook, Bosnia and Herzegovina

"Bosnia and Herzegovina," Microsoft® Encarta® Online Encyclopedia 2002 http://encarta.msn.com © 1997-2002 Microsoft Corporation. All Rights Reserved.

The Warburton Report, European Community 1993. Bosnia Herzegovina, *Rape & Sexual Abuse by Armed Forces*, Amnesty International Jan 1993.

Catherine MacKinnon, `Crimes of War, Crimes of Peace`, to appear in *Of Human Rights* (Basic Books 1993).

Sonja Lokar, "Gender Equality in International Peace Initiatives," Stability Pact for South East Europe Gender Task Force www.europeanforum.net

Sabrina Ramet (Ed.), *Gender Politics in the Western Balkans: Women and Society in Yugoslavia and the Yugoslav Successor States*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.

ECONOMICS

Economy and War

Even prior to the 1992-1995 war, Bosnia-Hercegovina was among the poorest republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). It ranked next to Macedonia in terms of the lowest per capita income. Its GDP was estimated at US$ 10.6 billion, or about US$ 2,429 per capita. The economy was industrially diversified with the majority of the population employed in the manufacturing, mining, technology, and service industries. Industries such as metallurgy, chemicals, and manufacturing constituted the most important economic sectors, accounting for about 65% of GDP. In the service arena, the most developed was the civil engineering sector.

Overall, the labor force was highly educated with a small but capable entrepreneurial class. In addition, due to its strategic geographic location and mountainous nature, Bosnia was home to

some of the largest and heavily overstaffed Yugoslav military industry. Yugoslav leader Marshall Tito had pursued the development of military industries in the republic with the result that Bosnia hosted a large share of Yugoslavia's defense plants.

The 1992-1995 war caused Bosnian's production to plummet by about 80%. In total, 70% of factories and 60% of all buildings were destroyed in the fighting. By the end of the war in 1995, Bosnia's GDP fell to less than US$500 per capita -- about 20% of the pre-war level. Total output collapsed to between 10% and 30% of pre-war production. Most of the existing physical capital, including factories, shops, mines, and electrical power plants, was destroyed.

The war also brought about a devastating loss to human capital. Half of the pre-war 4.5 million people were displaced, almost a quarter of a million people lost their lives, and the social fabric of the Bosnian people was profoundly disturbed and forever altered. In addition, the war caused a significant brain drain, which has seen only minimal reversal, as post-war income levels remain low. The material damage was estimated to be approximately six to ten times higher than the US$ 5.1 billion, which was earmarked for reconstruction and recovery by international donors in the "Three to Four Years Priority and Reconstruction and Recovery Program" launched at the end of 1995.

Post-War Economic Developments

The 1992-1995 war caused production to plummet by 80% between 1990 and 1995, while unemployment soared. After the NATO mission was deployed in Bosnia, output initially recovered between 1996 and 1998, but growth slowed down again in 1999 and 2000, and GDP remains far below the 1990 level. Economic data are of limited value, however, because although both Bosnian entities issue figures, reliable national-level statistics are not available. Official data also fails to include the large share of activity that occurs on the black market.

The *marka*, the national currency introduced in 1998, has gained wide acceptance, and the Central Bank of Bosnia-Hercegovina has dramatically increased its reserve holdings. However, the implementation of privatization has been slower than anticipated. The country has received substantial amounts of reconstruction assistance and humanitarian aid from the international community but does not seem to be prepared for an era of shrinking outside aid and declining dependence.

In the year 2000, the GDP real growth rate stood at 8%, while per capita GDP only reached $1,000 -- approximately half the pre-war level. The composition of GDP earnings by sector included: agriculture, 19%, industry, 23%, and services, 58%. Bosnia-Hercegovina continues to record one of the lowest GDPs in Eastern Europe. In 2000, the country registered the second lowest GDP in the region, placing itself just above Albania.

Bosnia's labor force approximated 1,026 million people while the unemployment rate reached

between 35% and 40% in 1999, and many individuals were forced to operate in the informal economy. Workers in the unofficial market typically receive no benefits, but those with formal employment are often paid only partial salaries, which are often distributed several months late. Pensions and other benefits are also paid only in part and are invariably delayed due to a lack of government revenues.

The major industries include steel, coal, iron ore, lead, zinc, manganese, bauxite, vehicle assembly, textiles, tobacco products, wooden furniture, tank and aircraft assembly, domestic appliances, and oil refining. Bosnian industry remained greatly overstaffed, as one reflection of the lingering socialist economic structure. Agricultural products consisted of wheat, corn, fruits, vegetables and livestock. Although agriculture is now almost entirely in private hands, farms are small and inefficient, and the republic traditionally is a net importer of food. Moreover, with the exception of Croatia, Bosnia runs a trade deficit with all of its major trading partners.

Almost seven years after the signing of the Dayton accords, Bosnia's economy is still far below the pre-war level. Many people have no regular jobs, while most young people are trying to leave the country. Most of the money entering Bosnia has come in the form of international aid -- over $5 billion in the past six years – while foreign direct investment has been low, and is currently in decline. Government spending is struggling to prevent investment capital from declining further as foreign investors pull out. Economic development has been largely confined to basic reconstruction requirements financed by international donors.

Higher government spending is crucial if Bosnia is to realize economic prosperity and return its war-torn economy to a pre-war level. Incoming foreign funds, in terms of credit lines to small and medium size enterprises, are far too small to boost or even sustain current development. Most of the limited economic growth has been spurred by small enterprises, while structural reforms in the large enterprises and banking sectors have so far been insignificant.

Bosnia's economy remains largely divided in a manner corresponding to it two political entities. An uneven development of the two economies, with that in the Serb Republic (SR) lagging far behind the Federation, is exerting significant pressure on social and political developments. In addition, effective monetary and fiscal policy-making is largely impossible as the Serb Republic runs its own economic programs. However, it does not have an independent monetary policy and no independent central bank, but is represented in the governance of the Central Bank of Bosnia-Hercegovina; the Main Bank in the SR is a unit of the Central Bank of B-H. Wide economic differences between the two entities have led to substantial variations in living conditions. Although efforts have been undertaken to unite the divided economy, the restricted movement of capital and labor has retarded progress.

Unemployment is a serious concern and will likely remain a major obstacle to Bosnian's economic recovery. The official unemployment rate is estimated around 35%, although, experts argue that it is in fact much higher. A large portion of those technically employed are on the employment waiting list, while others do insignificant part-time jobs. The average monthly wage remains low

in Bosnia, forcing many young educated people to leave the country in search of better opportunities elsewhere. With a growing gap between Bosnia and its neighbors (in Bosnia's disfavor) in terms of economic recovery, capital and labor flights are likely to intensify. Even though the market is well supplied, and prices are much lower than in other East European countries, the purchasing power of the population as a whole remains low.

A large portion of the labor force is engaged in material reconstruction, public administration, and international organizations, all of which offer only temporary employment or are poor stimulators for capital accumulation. For example, from June 1996 to December 1998, a total of 555 small projects, such as road and electric lines repair, and reforestation, were implemented, all of which temporarily eased unemployment as they were all labor intensive. However, these are only short-term solutions. High unemployment and low-income levels also provide a steady source of human capital to the growing Balkan illicit economy. As unemployment remains high, any efforts by the Bosnian government to combat organized crime, corruption, and reverse the illicit economic activity are significantly compromised.

Although privatization is amongst the central pillars of Bosnia's economic recovery, an effective transition to a free-market economy has been slow. Transparency and legal mechanisms accompanying privatization in other East European countries are largely missing. Oftentimes contradictory legislation has compromised transparency, providing a rich seam of corruption for some state officials. Corporate ownership and foreign private incentives are still strangled by Bosnia's socialist heritage. Investment protection laws, especially laws concerning foreign investment, are underdeveloped, and the maze of bureaucracy is a barrier to foreign investment.

Bosnia's power politics are also a major obstacle to privatization. The entity governments have made some progress on reforms in the banking and financial sectors, but privatization of the state-owned strategic enterprises remains slow. Too many layers of bureaucracy at state, entity, and local level discourage free enterprise and business development and are also proving expensive to maintain from state revenues.

While more than half of the population subsists below the poverty line, many war profiteers and political elites have dominated the privatization process. Hence, the risks associated with investment are often higher than the potential profit on investment. Significant efforts in developing a functioning capital market (such as creating institutions to monitor and support the privatization process) could help limit corruption and implant greater investor confidence. The successful development of a functioning capital market would also help to fill the legal vacuum, which currently shields corruption and other illicit activities.

The economy remains heavily dependent on international assistance. A major player in Bosnia's economic reconstruction has been the European Union's European Commission (EC). The EC has adopted a double transition strategy in rebuilding Bosnia-Hercegovina. On the one hand, it supports programs that stimulate economic growth and development; on the other hand, it runs programs that prepare Bosnian society for democratic development.

Following the signing of the Dayton accords, the EU Council of Ministers established political and economic conditionality for the development of bilateral relations with Bosnia and the country began to benefit from direct assistance. In 2000, this aid totaled some $104 million, with a grand sum of over $890 million since 1997. In 1999, the Stabilization and Association Process (SAP) was launched with a prospect of Bosnia's integration into EU structures. An EU Road Map set out a number of essential steps to be undertaken by the government in order to open negotiations on a Stabilization and Association Agreement. Duty-free access was also provided to the EU market for products from Bosnia-Hercegovina.

The objective of the SAP was to support Bosnia in fostering inter-entity cooperation, helping inter-ethnic reconciliation and the return of refugees, establishing functioning institutions and a viable democracy based on the rule of law, and laying the foundations for sustainable economic development. Over $2 billion in EU funds have been committed to Bosnia-Hercegovina since 1991. Between 1991 and 2000 humanitarian aid totaled $1,032 billion. In 2001, more than $105 million of assistance was committed under the new CARDS (Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilization) Program. In addition the EU member states contributed over $1.2 billion in aid between 1996 and 2002.

The World Bank has been the other major provider. On 28 March 2002, the World Bank approved US$30 million for the Road Management and Safety Project for Bosnia, which aims to improve traffic flows and reduce accidents. Since joining the World Bank in 1996, commitments to Bosnia-Hercegovina have totaled approximately US$770 million for 36 projects. There are currently 20 active projects in Bosnia sponsored by the World Bank. In sum, EU, World Bank, and IMF financing have played a major role in the reconstruction of the Bosnian economy, but the question remains open whether the country can successfully wean itself away from long-term international dependency and establish a competitive and self-sustaining market economy.

Self-Study Questions for Further Exploration

- Compare the economic position of Bosnia-Hercegovina with that of the other republics of communist Yugoslavia.
- What impact did the 1992-1995 war have on the country's economic development?
- What kind of economy has been constructed in Bosnia since the signing of the Dayton accords?
- How significant is organized crime and corruption in the Bosnian economy and what impact does it have on the country's economic development?

Resource Materials for Further Study

"Rebuilding Bosnia and Herzegovina: Achievements and Difficulties," Country Report, Center for Balanced Development, Sarajevo, 8 February 2000.

"Bosnia and Herzegovina: World Bank Approves Road Rehabilitation Project," The World Bank, 23 May 2002.

CIA Factbook, 2001, http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "Why Will No-one Invest in Bosnia and Herzegovina?" *Balkans Report #64, 21 April 1999*

International Crisis Group Reports and Briefing Papers, "Bosnia's Precarious Economy: Still not Open for Business," *Balkans Report #115, 7 August 2001*

CONCLUSION

This Self-Study Guide to Bosnia-Hercegovina provides an overview of the complex history of the country, its ethnic and religious mix, its culture, social structure, gender relations, and economic system. It focuses in some depth on the fragility of the reborn Bosnian state and its continuing dependence on international institutions for national security, political cohesiveness, and economic survival. A series of questions are posed after each chapter and a relevant bibliography is provided to enable the reader to explore salient issues in greater depth. In sum, Bosnia-Hercegovina remains a challenge for the student as well as for the policy maker.

USEFUL WEB SITES

Embassy of Bosnia in Washington, DC http://www.bhembassy.org

Ministry of Foreign Affairs - www.mvp.gov.ba

Chamber of Commerce if BiH: www.komorabih.com

Central Bank of BiH www.cbbh.gov.ba

Foreign Investment Promotion Agency www.fipa.gov.ba

Human Rights Ombudsperson for BiH www.bihfedomb.org

Elections Committee of BiH www.izbori.ba

Government (Federation) BiH www.fbihvlada.gov.ba

Government Republika Srpska www.vladars.net

Agency for privatization (Federation) BiH www.apf.com.ba

Agency for privatization (Republika Srpska) www.rsprivatizacija.com

OHR - Office of the High Representative www.ohr.int

UNMIBIH - UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina www.unmibh.org

OSCE Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina www.oscebih.org

SFOR - Stability Force www.nato.int/sfor

US Embassy in Sarajevo www.usis.com.ba

USAID in Bosnia and Herzegovina www.usaid.ba

BiH Tourism www.bhtourism.ba

BiH Press News Agency www.bihpress.ba

RTV BiH www.rtvbih.ba

Oslobodjenje www.oslobodjenje.com.ba

Janusz Bugajski

Director, East European Studies

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)

Washington, D.C.

- Recipient in 1998 of the Distinguished Public Service Award from the U.S. Department of State,

the U.S. Agency for International Development, the U.S. Information Agency, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

- Books include *Political Parties in Eastern Europe: A Guide to Politics in the Post-Communist Era,* New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2002, *Ethnic Politics in Eastern Europe: A Guide to Nationality Policies, Organizations, and Parties* (M.E. Sharpe, 1994); *Nations in Turmoil: Conflict and Cooperation in Eastern Europe* (Westview, 1993 -- selected by Choice as one of the outstanding academic books for 1993 -- Second Edition, 1995); *East European Fault Lines: Dissent, Opposition, and Social Activism* (Westview Press, 1989); and *Czechoslovakia: Charter 77's Decade of Dissent* (Praeger/CSIS, 1987).

- Chairs the South Central Europe Area Studies at the Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State.

- Conducted consultancy work for the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the International Republican Institute (IRI), the Free Trade Union Institute (AFL-CIO), the Rand Corporation, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), the 21st Century Foundation, and several other private organizations and foundations.

- Columnist for the political weekly *Nacional* in Zagreb, Croatia, for the daily *Albania* in Tirana, Albania, for the weekly *Koha Ditore* in Prishtina, Kosova, and for the Bulgarian weekly *Kapital* in Sofia.