To what extent did assumptions about local ethnic identities,
fostered amongst UN officials during the Bosnia mission, frame
their policies for the Kosovo mission?

By

Bojan Jankovic

A Thesis

Submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in Partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of
International Relations (MIR)

Supervisor: Dr Robbie Shilliam

INTP 595

01 March 2010

School of History, Philosophy, Political Science and International
Relations

Victoria University of Wellington

2010

Abstract:

This thesis focuses on the role of an international actor – United Nations (UN) - and its missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMBiH) during 1992-1995 and Kosovo (UNMIK) in the post war conflict period of peace building. It scrutinizes the tenor of UN peace building missions in these territories by analysing the scope of the policies introduced and the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of the international actors' activities during the times of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) before the conflict in Kosovo and Metohija (KiM); and the current situation in these two territories. The thesis will also argue that the ethnic identities played a critical role in relation building between the UN and ethnic groups, where the one ethnic group (Serbs) was recognised as a crucial factor for the conflict's escalation and development.

A further focus in this thesis is not only to provide constructive discussion of the ineffectiveness of policies and missions introduced by International Actors (IA) but also to challenge the UN and IA's decision for non-intervention in BiH and to address the consequence of subsequent humanitarian-military intervention in KiM.

This paper outlines an analysis of the lack of literature relating to the historical-sociological perspective of the ethnic groups' in BiH. The lack of understanding of the complex relationships among the ethnicities is an additional gap. This is exacerbated by the lack of understanding of the complex relationships among the ethnicities, within itself, as well as the differences among the groups within each ethnic group. It appears that the literature is unable to acknowledge the structural formation of societies in BiH, and to

make proper segmentation in understanding the particular group of people¹ (Rex, 2001) as a collection of peoples with different sociological characteristics² combined into something called ‘ethnicity’³. The handicap of such literature leads to the categorisation and generalisation of ethnicities; not at one particular area of an ethnic group’s presence but to the generalisation of the peoples’ ethnicities (all Serbs are barbarous, similar to the Germans after WWII). This paper argues that such generalisations developed the notion that the particular ethnic group (Serbs) has an ‘evil’ character, regardless of the territorial occupation (Bosnia as well as Serbia and Diaspora). In addition, the lack of recognising Serbs as a people composed of different individual (local) ethnic groups led to the global generalisation about Serbs. And yet, such generalisations, by the modern western actors, i.e. UN, EU (European Union) and USA (United States of America), led to the employment of negative assumptions about the Serbs which served as a tool for, and added impetus to, the implementation of a strategy to achieve the Western objectives of the devaluation of Serbian dominance in Bosnia and across the Balkan Peninsula.

Therefore the quality of literature, in addressing the questions about the conflict in BiH and later KiM, beside its attempts to offer some sustainable answers, remains inadequate and poor. This unsubstantiated position, offered by many involved in former-Yugoslavian conflict discussions, to offer an informed conclusion, persists as a never-ending debate.

Yet, the discourse about the guilty factor in BiH and KiM remains in the shape of the ‘evil’ Serbian nation.

¹ John Rex, ‘The Basic Elements of a Systematic Theory of Ethnic Relations’ *Sociological Research Online*, vol.6, no.1, 2001, Pp 1-24, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/1/rex.html>, “...the theory of nationalism has claimed to be a general theory of ethnicity, not recognising the difference between national groups and transnational systems of social relations and culture which bind together the members of migrating groups”.

² Phil Bartle, <http://www.scn.org/cmp/modules/per-per.htm> (accessed, 18 January 2010)

³ According to Rex’s article (Rex, 2001), ethnicity is a term used to describe additional characteristics of theoretically small enclosed community with definite boundaries. The ‘ethnic identity’ will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter 1 – State, Nation and Ethnic groups	11
Chapter 2 – The Interlocutors in the former-Yugoslavia	21
Chapter 3 – International Actors and Bosnia and Herzegovina	30
Chapter 4 – International Actors and Kosovo and Metohija	39
Conclusion	56
Bibliography	58

INTRODUCTION

“The successful demonization of the Serbs, making them largely responsible for the Yugoslav wars, and as unique and genocidal killers, was one of the great propaganda triumphs of our era. It was done so quickly, with such uniformity and uncritical zeal in the mainstream Western media, that disinformation had (and still has, after almost two decades) a field day”

*Edward S. Herman, Professor Emeritus of Finance*⁴

The thesis will argue that by claiming one ethnic group (Serbs) responsible for the destruction of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the UN and IA (European Union and United States of America), created an opportunity to start a new military mission towards the ‘Serbian nation’ in the Southern-Serbian province Kosovo and Metohija (KiM). The thesis also argues that the IA’s method of forcibly imposing solutions on Bosnian ethnicities without an adequate acknowledgement of cultural and religious differences resulted in failure, which was not recognised by IA’s themselves. Moreover, the coercive strategy towards the Serbs wouldn’t have been possible without international public blessing and media support. However; years after the conflict finished it is still unclear if the fabricated analogies and the biased reporting of mainstream journalists towards Serb ‘evil’ were simply in order to support International Actors’ activities in Bosnia and Kosovo or merely to a lack of insight.

There were two conflicts in Bosnia at the same time. One was the conflict between ethnic groups which were manipulated by political elites (Rex, 2001)⁵ in pursuing territorial and

⁴ Edward S. Herman is a Professor Emeritus of Finance, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. <http://www.southendpress.org/authors/39>

⁵ John Rex, ‘The Basic Elements of a Systematic Theory of Ethnic Relations’ *Sociological Research Online*, vol.6, no.1, 2001, Pp 1-24, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/1/rex.html>

political objectives in the form of ethnic-nationalism (Bellou, 1998)⁶. The other conflict related to the East and West interests⁷ (Hedges, 1997) over the leadership of this territory⁸.

“Bosnia alone among the former Yugoslav republics embraced the model of multi-ethnic, pluralist democracy, but despite its ostensible commitment to pluralism, the West found hard to comprehend self-determination for a people who did not define themselves as a mono-ethnic nation” (Calhoun 1997;64-5)⁹

My primary focus, in this thesis, will be on the issues caused by the lack of sufficient knowledge of the peoples by the International Actors. In the former Yugoslavia, accepting the assumptions as facts towards the one particular ethnic group (Serbs), created a chaotic situation in the field where the initial idea of the UN and the IA’s humanitarian mission resulted in failure. The early understanding by the International Actors that the mission’s objectives would lead to a stalemate position, ensconced their own insecurity into a coercive strategy towards one ethnic group, hence recognising this ethnic group (Serbs) as the key destructive force against peace and stability.

“As this tragedy has unfolded, the United States, European Community, Helsinki Commission, and United Nations have all concluded that Serbia bears the overwhelming responsibility for the war and its consequences.”¹⁰ (Cohen, 1994)

By using the various resources such as that of UN Resolution(s) for BiH and KiM, numerous documents from the missions’ representatives, and the analytical findings of academics and IA officials, this thesis is striving to find answers to the following simple questions:

- Do relationships exist between State, Nation and Ethnic groups, and if so, what would the effects be if any, if these relationships were ignored by the UN and IA?

This will be explored further in Chapter one.

⁶ Fotini Bellou, ‘Direct and Indirect Leadership: The Case of the US in Bosnia’, 1998

⁷ “The competition between Washington and Moscow attached importance to any conflict around the world. The threat that any one conflict, no matter how remote, could draw in the two superpowers and their nuclear arsenals evoked a national interest everywhere.”

⁸ Fotini Bellou, ‘Direct and Indirect Leadership: The case of the US and Bosnia’, 1998

⁹ Larry Ray, ‘Memory, Trauma and Genocidal Nationalism’, *Sociological Research Online*, Vol.4, no. 2, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/4/2/ray.html> (accessed 24 January, 2010)

¹⁰ Philip Cohen, ‘Ending the War and Securing Peace in Former Yugoslavia’, *Pace International Law Review*, Vol. 6:19, 1994, pp 19-40.

- Did the UN and IA officials have sufficient knowledge about the ethnic identities in BiH, and later in KiM? This will be addressed in Chapter two and three.
- Was that knowledge sufficient justification for the concrete actions taken at the field? This will be explored in Chapter three.
- Were the assumptions about the ethnic groups the only resource used to make the decision to blame and attack the Serbs in these two territories? This will be addressed in Chapter three.
- What effects did these actions bring to the ethnic groups? This will be addressed in Chapter four.

I conclude that the drive for any field activities in Bosnia and Kosovo had been done based purely on supposition, where local knowledge and familiarity didn't play any role and was completely ignored.

Although various documents¹¹ and material from academics, authors and missions' representatives will be used as a source in this thesis, there is one factor which is constantly missing; the adequate knowledge of the locals' ethnic identities. This critical omission of the intimate understanding of ethnic identities was, and still is, the main obstacle for any non-former-Yugoslav person to understand and comprehend the devastating effects on peoples and territory in BiH especially and later in KiM. The unfamiliarity with the core problems among the people has been successfully ignored, until today, despite the fact the current situation is on hold until the next ethnic activity towards 'the others'. However, the definition of 'the others' doesn't relate only towards the local others but towards the international actors as well.

¹¹ I will use here Security Council Resolution on Bosnia 819 (1993) and Security Council Resolution on Kosovo 1244 (1999), <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1999/sc99.htm> (accessed 21 January, 2010)

Yet, the neglect of these critical facts, by the UN and the IA, encouraged the destruction of homogenous societies and brought about the potential instability not only in Kosovo as current, or Bosnia as a reality, but to all of the Balkan states.

In Campbell's writing¹² we can find the complex array of historical, statistical and cartographic practices which were crucial for the UN and the IA to familiarise itself prior to, during, and in the aftermath of the conflict in BiH. Unfortunately, the complex problem in relation to the people of BiH was left untouched, probably because of external individual unfamiliarity of the peoples' characterisations in BiH. The deep issues which are present in the ethnic ambiguities left unexplored by Campbell are still an ongoing issue for the academics, politicians and anybody attempting to find a solution in relation to ethnic diversity. Nevertheless, Campbell's collection of various thoughts proved to be a valuable tool for a structured approach towards, not only the peoples in Bosnia, but also other peoples exposed to similar conditions.

An interesting observation in Stephen Kinzer's article¹³ about the potential threat towards all Balkan people at the territory of South-Serbian Province of Kosovo and Metohija is a starting point for international public preparation, not for potential, but planned conflict in the future. Kinzer's assumption that Kosovo will become a new conflict zone was an introduction for the new internal ethnic rift, so a repeat of the Bosnia situation was demonstrated in the programmed form of secessionism at the territory of Kosovo and Metohija recently. However, Kinzer's observation that the Serbs will provoke violence and start another conflict is an example of the use of a generic Serbian identity applied to policy prescription for Kosovo. Yet, Kinzer continues to develop the theory that Serbs should give away the land to the Kosovo Albanians since "most people in Kosovo strongly

¹² David Campbell, *National deconstruction: violence, identity, and justice in Bosnia*, (University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

¹³ Stephen Kinzer, 'Ethnic Conflict is Threatening in Yet Another Region of Yugoslavia: Kosovo', N.Y. Times, November 9, 1992

favour separation from Serbia”¹⁴. So, was Kinzer’s observation about the situation in Kosovo relevant to the international public? According to what happened at the end of the 20th Century, where the military intervention against the Sovereign state was taken in order to support one ethnic group secessionism, the answer is “yes”. In addition, when checking wheather Kinzer’s assumptions about the situation in Kosovo were relevant to the IAs as the starting point, in preparation for intervention against Serbs in Serbia, it appears that the answer is again positive. Therefore the fabricated reports, similar to the reports in Bosnia, played the major role in International Actors decision making for an intervention against the Serbian nation the only difference being that this time the geographic area is different.

Here we can see that Kinzer credits separatism as a normal form for the rearrangement of state sovereignty based on ethnic aspirations toward self-governing territories. Is this possible? According to international activities in Kosovo this was proved accurate. In *Minorities in a Decentralised Environment* (Eide, 1998)¹⁵ we can find that the principles of sovereignty have changed considerably in recent decades. Was Kinzer’s article therefore, an introduction to the international public of how the sovereignty principles will change in the future? Yes, of which Kosovo is an example; however there is the potential of many more to occur.

Moreover, the idea of having the UN and the IAs as guarantors for the prevention of conflict, i.e. protectors of people and peace builders in complex ethnic societies, is nothing but the *fata morgana* for the unfortunate, non-developed and ignored local peoples’ groups (minorities), whose living conditions still tend towards patriarchal orientation rather than

¹⁴ Ibid, p.1

¹⁵ Asbjorn Eide, ‘Minorities in a Decentralised Environment’ Norwegian Institute of Human Rights 2-4 September 1998, http://www.minelres.lv/publicat/Eide_Yalta98.htm “Maintenance of international peace requires respect for and protection of the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of states, but the principle of sovereignty has changed considerably in the last decades, and must now be understood within the framework of the obligation to adhere to international standards as set by the Charter, and by further standards set by the United Nations and relevant regional organizations”. (accessed 28 January 2010)

the unclear modernity empowered by modern standards and norms. So hypocrisy imposed on the non-developed ethnic societies by the international actors, is just a different approach in employing coercive methods on the weak in order to achieve full domination, the same as it was throughout the centuries or in recent history, especially in the post WWII era in Tito's Yugoslavia.

In the first chapter I will discuss the issues of the nation, nationality and nationalism together with the state, ethnicity and ethnic-nationalism issues in order to compare with the past and current situation in Bosnia and Kosovo.

My approach, in the second chapter, is to analyse, challenge and compare the interlocutors' debates and arguments with the real situation in the field in both BiH and KiM, together with the mistakes and omissions of the UN before and during the conflicts in these territories; in order to prove that the interlocutors are unable to explain or offer any pragmatic conclusion or solution.

Chapter three will explore 'ethnic identity' further, and how the definitions of ethnicity influence in the BiH case. It will analyse the basic elements of a systematic theory of ethnic relations (Rex, 2001). This chapter brings the issues of ethnic-nationalism, the IA's role and their interests in the conflict zones, and their assumptions about one ethnic nation (Serbs) and the consequences of that, into focus. History will also be explored in order to clarify to the reader the basis for the conflict. The work of Campbell¹⁶; Smith¹⁷; Ray¹⁸; and Rex¹⁹ and my understanding of "the ethnic identity" will be analysed and expanded

¹⁶ David Campbell, 'National Deconstruction, violence, identity and justice in Bosnia', University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

¹⁷ Anthony Smith, 'Nationalism', *Polity Press*, UK, 2001.

¹⁸ Larry Ray, 'Memory, Trauma and Genocidal Nationalism', *Sociological Research Online*, vol.4, no.2

¹⁹ John Rex, 'The Basic Elements of a Systematic Theory of Ethnic Relations' *Sociological Research Online*, vol.6, no.1, 2001, Pp 1-24, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/1/rex.html>

here. In addition the Chapter will analyse this biased selection as a core issue in supporting the conflict rather than preventing it.

The fourth chapter will explore the policies of the UN and IAs policies in Kosovo, together with their perception of the local ethnic groups. The desired outcome is to explain the implications and consequences of the policies set in the preceding engagement in Bosnia.

Chapter 1 – State, Nation and Ethnic groups

Which significant characteristics identify individuals and distinguish them from others within a single state's territory?

In this question, we can recognise the issues about ethnicity and the state, but also recognise the issue of nationality. So what links people and their territory? Is the relation between individuals and the state destined (Gellner, 1983), or a product of individuals' willingness to accept the political structure (state) as an inseparable connection and a guarantee for survival and existence? If yes, can we then draw a line between ethnicity and nationality?

The Bosnia case is a good example. The ethnic groups' development in the history was influenced by the foreign rule throughout the centuries. Some of the ethnic groups have accepted imperialistic power standards and became part of it. On the other side, the ethnic groups reluctant to accept foreign norms remained as a potential threat and had been recognised as 'attachment', which didn't serve the interest of the Empire.

The 'attachment' ethnic group, unable to establish any effective position within the boundaries of 'the dominant rule', had been prone for political manipulation by the elite, and hence serve as a tool for political gains only. This is typical for the Serbian ethnic group as well, where the political manipulation of the ethnic groups was used throughout the last century, especially at the end of it. Hence it developed the position of constant potential for the conflicts against the other ethnic groups orientated towards the foreign standards and norms. The Serbian ethnicity in Bosnia is a good example, where the motto of 'no acceptance of anything foreign' was present, hence establishing negative relations towards 'the others' as well as towards the foreign – UN and IA. In order to explain the

position of ethnic groups in Bosnia in relation to state, nation and ethnicity, I am utilising the following approach:

THE NATION, NATIONALITY AND NATIONALISM

What is the general approach about the definition of the nation today? In the works of Anthony D. Smith²⁰ we can find that a nation is not a state and it is not an ethnic community (Smith, 2001, p. 12), this is the generally accepted understanding about a nation. A nation is not a state 'because the concept of the state relates to an institutional activity, while that of the nation denotes a type of community'. A nation is a group of people who feel themselves to be a community bound together with a common history, culture and ancestry. A nation is a community whose members share a homeland. For Walker Connor, a nation is a 'group of people who believe they are ancestrally related. It is the largest grouping that shares such a belief' (Connor, 1994).

Are the Bosnian 'ethnic groups' a nation? According to Connor and Smith, these ethnic groups *are* the nations when referring to common history and culture, but these ethnic groups only have temporary physical occupation of the territory, hence can't be recognised as nations according to the current accepted norms.

A nation is not an ethnic community either, because an ethnic community 'has no political reference and in many cases lacks a territorial dimension, since it is not necessary for an ethnic community to be in physical possession of historic territory'. However this doesn't apply to a nation, where physical occupation of a territory is compulsory in order to constitute itself as a nation, to aspire to nationhood and be recognised as a nation (Smith,

²⁰ Anthony Smith, 'Nationalism', Polity Press, UK, 2001, ISBN: 0-7456-2659-9

2001, p.12). Yet, according to Smith we have to remember that a nation is derived from an ethnic group, meaning that a nation's origin is based on ethnicity (The Ethnic Origins of Nations, 1986).

What is the difference between nationality and nationalism?

Nationality represents a person's belonging to a certain nation. According to Kellas, the ideology built upon the concept of the nation and a form of behaviour is called nationalism.

"As a nationalist, I believe that my membership in a nation (in whatever way defined) is essential to my personal identity" (Lagerspetz, 1992)

By this definition we understand that a person must be tied to a nation to exist and to survive, to have a national identity which will define him/her as a member of particular group of people. Does this definition represent only members of the dominant group of people? Usually, it does. How this dominant position does reflects on the other group(s) of people within the same territory? In most cases, this is through the form of deprivation.

In his writing *The politics of nationalism and ethnicity* Kellas observes that minority nations may feel that their culture is under attack from the state's dominant nation in the form of political, economic and cultural deprivation, '...in the context of nationalism is experienced when discrimination or insult takes place on account of a person's national identity, language (including accent) religion, habits, tastes, and so on' (Kellas, 1991, p. 86)²¹. We can also find that such deprivation can occur in any society, modern as well as non/semi developed (Wolfe, 1973, p. 8). The form of deprivation occurs '...when face-to-face contact takes place between dominant and dominated nationals', also it can be experienced collectively at a distance, '...when linguistic or educational usages are imposed officially on all citizens by the state'.

²¹ James Kellas, 'The politics of nationalism and ethnicity', MacMillan Press Ltd, London, 1991, ISBN 0-312-21553-3

Kellas and Wolfe are correct. The form of deprivation was, and is, present in Bosnia, hence starting the discussion about the possibility for the Bosnian ethnic groups to become a nation in the future. Therefore we should ask: how is it possible to form a nation in the temporary territory where all ethnic groups recognise 'the others' as the "attachments" and threat. Moreover, is it possible to find the solution for conflict 'prevention in this situation'?

THE STATE, ETHNICITY AND ETHNIC-NATIONALISM

Based on the above, where we recognise the difficulty for the ethnic groups to form the nation (lack of definite territorial occupation); we face the issue of nationalism as the ideology, which can help one ethnic group to dominate the territory in the form of control over the others.

How is the state linked to nationalism?

Nationalism – the ideology, movement and symbolism is relatively recent, it is a modern innovation and it is not simply updated version of past happenings. It is a phenomenon brought into being by a wholly new set of conditions.

The ethnic groups have to be led by the elite in order to implement control over "the others", usually the weakest ethnic groups. Therefore the individuals have to accept 'the will' of the elite and their political orientation as a norm and vision for protection of their ethnic identity. Bosnia is a perfect example where we can see the political manipulation over the ethnic groups by the elite in the form of ethnic-nationalism.

Chronologically, ethnic nationalism appears to be the product of modernity. Smith (2001: p. 46) points out that nationalism – the ideology, movement and symbolism – is relatively

recent and that sociologically, nationalism is an innovation. Smith claims that ‘nothing similar to nationalism existed before’. However, Smith suggests that not only that nationalism is part of modernity but that the nations, national identities and the whole inter-national community are part of these national phenomena. Similarly to Smith, Lagerspetz (2004)²², in his writing recognised that a nation is a community defined by culture and political life rather than by law, therefore the nation is not a “legal person”, thus the legitimacy of a modern state is an embodiment of particular nations. Hence the links between nation(s) and state form the community united by cultural and political ties where the idea of sovereignty is the ultimate goal and the right towards its own state.

Gellner points out that the new ‘own’ state’s culture is necessary and that the state must incorporate all of its members and it must displace any pre-existing ethnic cultures. The state needs its own culture as a means of winning the loyalty of its citizens. They have to feel identified with it. So does the state’s ‘new culture’ enforce nationalism as a tool for control over the other national groups within its own territory? For, Kedourie, nationalist ideals are powerful in their own right; indeed, they have the power to lead people astray, to disorient them and ultimately to destroy them. (Kedourie, 1971)

According to Smith the concept of the state can be defined as a set of autonomous institutions which possess a legitimate monopoly of coercion and exploitation of a given territory (Smith, 2001, p.12). Which institution plays a lead role and which individuals exercise authority may be very dependent on the purpose in hand (Rex, 2001, p.8).

Similarly to Smith, Weber defines the state as ‘a compulsory political association’ whose administrative staff ‘successfully upholds the claim to the monopoly of the legitimate use of political force in the enforcement of its order’.

²² Olli Lagerspetz, ‘Diversity or Cacophony? New Sources of Norms in International Law Symposium; Article: National Self-Determination and ethnic Minorities’, University of Michigan Law School, Michigan Journal of International Law, Summer 2004

The centralising state's purpose is to be in the control of the territory, hence nationalism can occur in two directions, as a tool for a central government imposed on the person belonging to the nation against 'the other national groups' or as a reaction by a peripheral nationalist in seeking independence according to Hechter (Hechter, 2000, esp. chs 2-3).

Here, Hechter directly addresses the change in types of authority; it makes sense to appeal specifically to 'nationalism' as a means of blinding the peripheral population to the peripheral elite against the centralising state through a common 'nation'. This will be further developed when we address the Kosovo question.

Another prime motivator of nationalism is the unevenness of development. In *The Break-up of Britain* (1977), Tom Nairn argued that the unevenness of development was the prime mover of nationalism, the uneven wave of capitalism rather than industrialisation (Bosnia and Kosovo are good examples for such notion).

"The idea of political legitimacy implies that the individual, in some sense, sees the decisions made by the State (or another relevant political body) as expressions of her own will. That is, in some sense they express concerns shared by her even in the cases where specific decisions go against her personal views." (Rousseau 1987, Bk IV, Ch II, p. 206).

Gellner²³ notes that we live in a world of 'nationalism', in a world where the 'nation' and 'state' (political structure) are ingrained, however the 'nation' and 'state' can develop separately, where the state can emerge without the help of the nation and some nations emerged without the help of the state, but they are destined to each other and without each other they are incomplete, and constitute a tragedy.

²³Ernest Gellner, 'Nations and Nationalism' *Ithaca: Cornell University Press*, 1983, http://www.nationalismproject.org/books/g_h.htm#Anchor-Gellner-39029

THE ETHNIC APPROACH

“Ethno-nationalism’, which is the only nationalism, can never be rationally explained. It can only be analysed – and invoked. And that is exactly what nationalist leaders have done, and they have been more successful than the scholars, because they intuitively understood that ‘at the core of ethno psychology is the sense of shared blood, and they have not hesitated to appeal to it”

(Connor 1994: 197)

Does Connor advocate that human knowledge plays only marginal role once humans start the art of self-problematisation; in the situation where the self-concern of ‘some people’ is based on misanthropy and where philanthropic accords are impossible to be seen? Can we use Connor’s notion that the ‘awkward’ characters rule over knowledge and laugh in the face of it. If not, then what should be the answer once we face people who tend to negate normality for their own gains? What answer does modernity offer when humans start to ‘problematised’ what they are, what they do, and the world in which they live (Foucault, 1994).²⁴

Finally, what the ‘knowledge’ can do if the ‘undesirables’ follow their own rules entrenched into self-belief that their ‘primitive’ world is the only one in which they can exist. The world where one must be dominant and the other (Geertz, 1963)²⁵ must be dominated. The world where the marginalisation and exclusion of others (Weber, 1948, Kellas, 1991)²⁶, through the practices of violence, is the norm established in the history (Sells in Davis, 1996, p. 23)²⁷ and a world where the individual serves as a pawn (Kedourie, 1971) and is politically mobilised (Cornel and Hartmann, 1998, p: 149)²⁸ for

²⁴ Michael Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books, 1979, 141-43, 170-94.

²⁵ See in Geertz’s’ notion of attachments

²⁶ Estivill Jordi, ‘Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion’, *International Labour Organization*, 2003, p.37, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/socsec/step/download/96p1.pdf>

²⁷ See in Sotiropoulou

²⁸ Ibid, p.1

the exploitation of nationalism and a tool for pursuing territorial and political objectives for the gains of the dominant elite.

So what is ethnicity? Ethnicity denotes a group of individuals who share common characteristics which differentiate them from the other groups within society. Common characteristics can be identified in terms of language, religion, tradition and politics but also symbols and a shared history.

So what should be recognised as ‘the first in charge’ in the relationship between state and ethnicity? Moreover, are ethnicity and nationality linked into modern-community within state borders? Is it plausible that within this ‘modern community/state’ the individual follows the political legitimacy? The answer is positive, the individual accepts the State’s decision and will, but the individuals must see themselves as rooted in the common characteristics (Rousseau 1987, Bk II, Ch X, p. 169).

Yet, the question remains, what should the general theory of ethnicity be?

According to Rex, it appears that the nationalism is the general theory of ethnicity for scholars today; hence in answering the theory of ethnicity we deal with the notion of ethnic nationalism (Rex, 2001).²⁹

What happens when we challenge ethnicity by calling it an ‘attachment’ as Geertz does in his definition of ‘the givens’? Geertz discusses (Geertz 1963. P.109) that the primordial attachment as “the givens” – is a culture, assumed, given of social existence, being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices. Geertz’s notion that some attachments are ‘unaccountable’, confirms that at some places today this is the state’s practice towards ‘the others national groups’, mostly towards minority groups. Max Weber (1948) showed

²⁹ John Rex, ‘The Basic Elements of a Systematic Theory of Ethnic Relations’ *Sociological Research Online*, vol.6, no.1, 2001, Pp 1-24, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/1/rex.html>

that the criteria of a nation – language, religion, territory– always fail to include some nations. As a reflection of exclusion or recognition of ‘some people’ (Gilbert, 1998; 16), there is always risk of the nations tendencies towards an independent statehood for which these group have right to strive to. However the tendency or right towards independent statehood is not the only desire, goals such as national unification and identity are part of the vision as well (Great Serbia or Albania for example).

Sometimes what has happened is that there has been a simultaneous overthrow of imperial power and of modernising tendencies within these areas. In these circumstances one might well see a return to an ethnic nation. More commonly however, some form of the modern nation state survives and this may even be governed by those who had served the imperial power but now seek to represent themselves as the new nationalists. In recent decades we can see the state power overthrow (Yugoslavia) where the massive aspirations towards ethnicity and self-recognition occurred. Such cases form the test bed for a challenge by ethnic nationalism. In these circumstances the various groups who had constituted the imperial/colonial order find their situation fundamentally altered. One possibility is that the society will simply break up. A second is that one of the ethnic segments takes over the state and governs the others.

In conclusion of this chapter I should ask, if the Bosnian ethnicities have no unique national identity, how is it possible that those ethnic groups claim the state and territory as their own? Also, how can the modernity cope with this problem in the future, and yet be cognisant that these ethnic groups will not give up their aspiration towards the domination over the others?

The narratives mentioned in this chapter will be used in the further development of this thesis, where the issues of nation, nationalism, state and ethnicity will be further analysed and compared with past and current situations in the former-Yugoslavia Republic: Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbian South-Province of Kosovo and Metohija.

Chapter 2 – The Interlocutors in the former-Yugoslavia

In this thesis I claim that the UN missions in BiH and KiM created a long lasting instability, rather than a solution for the peoples in these two territories. By dividing the ethnic groups into perpetrators (Serbs) and victims (Muslims), the International Actor's separation of ethnicities initiated a deep resentment and ultimate boycott by Bosnian Serbs towards the foreign powers (UN and IA). In Dr Cohen's³⁰ article, *Ending the War and Securing Peace in Former Yugoslavia*, the full responsibility for the conflict in BiH³¹ alludes to the Serbian aggression towards its neighbours. However, Dr Cohen postulates there were no policies implemented by International Actors to prevent (Serbian) aggression towards the other ethnicities.

"...no policy has been crafted or implemented by any of these entities that would effectively restrain the aggressive behaviour of Serbia against her neighbours...Failure to contain Serbian aggression endangers regional stability and threatens a wider regional conflict".
³²

Dr Cohen is right. It is true that orthodoxies carry a huge responsibility for the destabilisation of Bosnian territory, and that is undeniable. What is not true is that the conflict in Bosnia started because of Serbian aggression, but that the conflict began because of aggression towards the other ethnicities by Bosnian Serbs within the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The generalisation of Serbs brought to light widespread anathematisation of the Serbs³³ regardless of the territory, hence a defensive position

³⁰ Philip Cohen, 'Ending the War and Securing Peace in Former Yugoslavia', *Pace International Law Review*, Vol. 6:19, 1994, pp 19-40.

³¹ Ibid, p.19; Blaine Harden, *EC Withdraws Ambassador From Belgrade: Serbia Rebuked Again on Bosnian War*, *Wash. Post*, May 12, 1992, at A14; Harden, *U.S. Joins EC in Recalling Envoy From Belgrade*, *Wash. Post*, May 13, 1992, at A25; Jeri Laber & Ivana Nizlic, *Milosevic's Land Grab*, *Wash. Post*, May 25, 1992, (editorial) at A25; Chuck Sudetic, *Observer's Blame Serb-Led Army for Escalating War in Croatia*, *N.Y.Times*, Dec 3, 1991, at A8.

³² Ibid, p.19

³³ Edward Herman, "Serb Demonization as Propaganda Coup", *Global Research*, April 9, 2009

towards any foreign influence and activity. So the questions remain: Where were these Serbs, responsible for the conflict in BiH and destabilisation of the Balkan region, coming from? Are they from Yugoslavia (territory of Serbia; Montenegro; Macedonia); Diaspora, or 'Serbia'? Dr Cohen never clarified this fact, which is crucial in allocating responsibility towards a particular group of people, hence the responsibility relates to Serbs in general terms. Therefore the demonization of all Serbian people makes sense, according to Dr Cohen.

This is especially obvious in the UN and IA's constant accusations towards Serbs³⁴ based on insufficient data to prove Serbian atrocities and to prevent further Serbian military activities towards the Muslims³⁵ (Chomsky, 2005). Here, I have to clarify that my research paper has no ambition to negate the atrocities carried out by Bosnian Serbs towards the Muslims, rather to discuss the source of the data (collected from the media and peoples) where the investigative processes from the UN and IA officials were either slow³⁶ (Sweeney, 1996), ignored, absent or destroyed by Western government forces

³⁴ Ibid, "By early 1993 a consensus developed - especially in the United States, but also in some Western European countries and prominently in parts of the international liberal media - that the Serbs were the only villains."

³⁵ Noam Chomsky, 'Imperial Presidency: Based on a talk delivered in Toronto on November 4, 2004', *Canadian Dimension*, Vol. 39, no.1. January /February, 2005. <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20041217.htm> , "or Srebrenica, almost universally described as "genocide" in the West. In that case, as we know in detail from the Dutch government report and other sources, the Muslim enclave in Serb territory, inadequately protected, was used as a base for attacks against Serb villages, and when the anticipated reaction took place, it was horrendous. The Serbs drove out all but military age men, and then moved in to kill them. There are differences with Falluja. Women and children were not bombed out of Srebrenica, but trucked out, and there will be no extensive efforts to exhume the last corpse of the packrats in their warrens in Falluja. There are other differences, arguably unfair to the Serbs."

³⁶ John Sweeney, 'And We Are All Guilty...', *The Observer*, 8 December, 1996. <http://www.barnsdle.demon.co.uk/bosnia/guilty.html> "Come the spring of 1995, Lt-General Sir Rupert Smith, the new top military UN man in Bosnia, faced a brick wall. He knew that the UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force) machine was not up to its job of protecting the Bosnians. He also knew that his masters - the Western governments - did not want to know that. He knew that each of his predecessors had come unstuck trying to resolve the inherent, self-defeating tensions of the mission."

themselves³⁷. The Srebrenica massacre happened and is documented in the UN (Resolution 1993)³⁸ by civilians and media; however Western governments do not believe this and fail to acknowledge this occurrence. Yet Serbs remain as the only villains in the Bosnia conflict, despite reports from various UN/IA officials and reporters (Herman, 2009)³⁹. Nevertheless this assumption applies to all Serbs, not only to Bosnian Serbs. Since Yugoslavia was directly involved in the BiH conflict, according to UN data, only Serbs' atrocities remain relevant to the International Actor's officials, whereas the atrocities against Bosnian Serbs were mostly overlooked⁴⁰. Therefore the boycott by Bosnian Serbs, and also Serbs in Serbia (Yugoslavia), towards the solutions offered by Foreign Powers appeared as a logical development.

³⁷ Ibid, "The massacre is well documented by Honig and Both, but not so the cover-up by the Western powers. The Dutch government destroyed evidence of massacre; the American government sat on evidence of massacre, delaying the release of spy satellite or drone photos of the killing until three weeks later; the British government gave prominence to reports that no one had been massacred."

³⁸ United Nations Resolution 819 (1993), <http://www.nato.int/IFOR/un/u930416a.htm> "Deeply alarmed at the information provided by the Secretary-General to the Security Council on 16 April 1993 on the rapid deterioration of the situation in Srebrenica and its surrounding areas, as a result of the continued deliberate armed attacks and shelling of the innocent civilian population by Bosnian Serb paramilitary units... Aware that a tragic humanitarian emergency has already developed in Srebrenica and its surrounding areas as a direct consequence of the brutal actions of Bosnian Serb paramilitary units, forcing the large-scale displacement of civilians, in particular women, children and the elderly."

³⁹ Edward Herman, 'Serb Demonization as Propaganda Coup', April 9, 2009, "The same point was made by Canadian General Lewis Mackenzie, who insisted that "it was not a black-and-white picture and that 'bad' guys had not killed 'good' guys. The situation was far more complex" (Globe & Mail, July 15, 2005). The same was said by former NATO Deputy Commander Charles Boyd, former UNPROFOR Commander Satish Nambiar, UN officials Philip Corwin and Carlos Martins Branco, and former U.S. State Department official George Kenney. But anybody who parted from the party line was ignored or marginalized. When George Kenney changed his mind from anti-Serb interventionist to critic, he was quickly dropped by the mainstream media. Journalist Peter Brock, who wrote "Dateline Yugoslavia: The Partisan Press," in Foreign Policy's Winter 1993-1994 issue, which documented systematic bias and errors, was viciously attacked and driven into multi-year silence. A reporter like David Binder of The New York Times who refused to adhere to the party-demonization line was soon taken off the beat. "

⁴⁰ Ibid, "An important part of the fix was dishonest demonization, as with the famous August 1992 picture of Fikret Alic, an emaciated prisoner behind barbed wire in a Serb "concentration camp." But the UK journalists had pushed forward a man who was sick and quite unrepresentative: the barbed wire was around the journalists, not the camp, and it was a transit camp, not a concentration camp. Western journalists went berserk over these alleged camps, but failed to report the Red Cross finding that "Serbs, Croats, and Muslims all run detention camps and must share equal blame." John Burns' Pulitzer for 1993 was based heavily on his interview with an alleged Serb killer-rapist, Borislav Herak, who later confessed that after torture he had recited lines forced on him by his Bosnian Muslim captors.

According to the UN reports, the Serbs were the only obstacle to the conflict resolution, but where was the evidence for such assumptions? For anybody involved in discussion about the conflict in Bosnia, the only source of information was based on reports from media and people. The official UN reports were based on unclear methodology since the UN was not present everywhere in Bosnia.

The International Actors' approach based on insufficient or instructed assumptions towards one particular local ethnic group - Serbs, formed a strategy of blame rather than a strategy for betterment, to address and resolve the conflict in BiH. The strategy of constant accusation by the International Actors, supplemented by the competitive media (international as well as domestic), only served to manipulate the international public observers.

Patrick Chauvel, an international independent reporter, in his report on the situation in Bosnia⁴¹, commented that we can't see any rationale, as the accusations were based on assumptions towards Serbs only. Similar reports can be found in the latter Kosovo case, as well. The most disturbing part in Chauvel's report is the extreme lack of interpretation of the historical problem between the two ethnic groups⁴². However, his report reached the public and served as propaganda, primarily against the Serbs. Yet, the strategy of choosing only one responsible group, beside the ineffective strategy or policies introduced by the United Nations⁴³ (Hillen, 1998) in the field⁴⁴ and in front of the international public,

⁴¹ Patrick Chauvel, 'A War Torn Region', 1995. <http://www.earlham.edu/~pols/ps17971/terneel/rape.html> An example of shocking unfamiliarity about the locals and bizarre assumptions introduced by French independent photographer Patrick Chauvel in his summary of the situation in Bosnia in 1995. "Rape and other atrocities were committed by all sides including United Nations forces; however, only the Serbian factions seem to have had an organized war strategy including genocidal rape. Women were not the only victims of rape; survivors include male adults and children of either sex... I also will be focusing on the issue of rape although many other atrocities occurred on all sides of the war which I will not address in detail".

⁴² Ibid, "...Therefore, when the new Croatian nation-state started flying a flag which was an early symbol of anti-Serb, anti-Jew, anti-Romanian, and anti-fascism, the Serb nationality became extremely alarmed. Croatian-Serbs began protesting; these protests over time escalated into full scale war."

⁴³ John Hillen, *Blue Helmets: The Strategy of UN Military Operations*, Washington: Brassey's, 1998. P.504, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/120709> , "...the ability of the UN to carry out military tasks and the reasons why it was, or was not, able to succeed in different situations...especially in recent years, missions like Bosnia for

converted into a submissive position which most benefited the party blamed initially as this severely influenced further negotiation with the Serbs mostly.

In Chauvel's reporting we can see an example of how the journalistic reports had produced a misleading source of information. In retrospect his reports can be recognised as propaganda, encouraging all parties involved to continue with the conflict. It appears that the reporters were competing for whom could report more, based on localised events, in order to stimulate the international public interest. A common thread in the majority of the reports was the fact that only one perpetrator was identified, i.e. the Serbs.

The ethnicities, International Actors and the Breakup of former-Yugoslavia

The development of democracy was a vision for some, but a sign of destruction to the others. The weak government suddenly became associated with an orthodox government (Serbia) where democratic strengthening had been seen as a potential threat; therefore the democratic procedures and practices had been almost completely absent. In Haskin's article (Haskin, 2006) we can find the following:

*"...the West destroyed a country through the imposition of economic and political reform...reforms demanded by the West and asks where responsibilities lies when external pressures destroy a nation and lead to national meltdown...showing how Western plans for the liberization of the country resulted in ethnic polarization and the election of ethno-nationalist leaders".*⁴⁵

However, the democratically orientated ethnicities were greatly supported among themselves (Slovenia and Croatia), as well as externally by European states in particular.

which it was uniquely unsuited, instead of working out effective alternative policies and military strategies. In Bosnia, "ineffective half measures taken through the UN gave everybody an excuse for inaction and set up a whipping-boy to boot."

⁴⁴John Sweeney, 'And We Are All Guilty...', *The Observer*, 8 December, 1996.
<http://www.barnsdle.demon.co.uk/bosnia/guilty.html> (accessed 28 January 2010)

⁴⁵ Jeanne Haskin, 'Bosnia and beyond: the "quiet" revolution that wouldn't go quietly', *Algora Publishing*, 2006

“...public opinion in Yugoslavia seemed to be in favor of maintaining the federation. The US at first took the same position. Under German initiative, the EU quickly recognized Croatia without taking into account the rights of the substantial Serb minority.”⁴⁶

The orthodox government, suddenly challenged by the separation of the former Yugoslavia on one side and citizens to control within the boundaries of its orthodox casemate on the other, immediately proclaimed that every orthodox person had to be protected in the territory of all the then Yugoslavia.

The most striking fact, in BiH, was not the conflict itself, but the impotent role of the International Actor(s). The confusing reluctance to challenge the status quo of the IAs' reaction towards conflict development, combined with the tactic of accusation towards only one particular ethnic group (Serbs), brought to light something never seen before; it challenged the UN Institution's role in conflict resolution.

The reluctance to intervene; the double standards imposed on peoples supported by unclear modern standards and norms; and the omissions in missions based on insufficient information about the peoples, as the most effective strategy in the conflict resolution in the conflict zones, developed the notion that the United Nation Institution's role and its missions should be re-assessed and discussed further by international public and their governments in the future.

I will argue that this was compounded by the International Actors' poor knowledge of the peoples (ethnicities) in BiH, which was a critical gap in finding the most effective and beneficial tactic before and during the conflict. Issues about ethnicities had a different character in the Kosovo question, since the IA(s) had an already agreed understanding of the peoples in the South-Serbian province which was biased and based mostly on instructed assumptions, previously developed in the BiH case.

⁴⁶ Noam Chomsky, 'US-EU Relations: interviewed by Matic Primc', *Spekter (Slovenia)*, September 10, 2008. <http://www.chomsky.info/interviews/20080910.htm>

The United Nations and the International Actors' inability to comprehend the complex ethnic relations; developed a strategy of protecting and acting for the chosen ethnic groups (Muslims and Croats). This method was particularly beneficial in negotiation with ethnic group military forces, and controlling or preventing conflict escalation. Although this strategy certainly helped lower the intensity of the conflict pace, and protected people affected by conflict risks on one side, the strategy introduced a method of segregation (Serbs) on the other side.

The shocking ignorance about the ethnic group characterisations; the importance for choosing people to protect; the anathematisation of one particular ethnic group based on insufficient and inaccurate data; and the complete absence of historical knowledge and its importance, brought international actors to a stalemate position without almost any pragmatic solution where assumptions played a crucial role, claims Haskin in her 2006 article.⁴⁷

The only strategy from the UN and IA perspectives, I believe, was to portray the ethnic identity of Serbs as evil to support their own impotency in finding the purpose for their role in Bosnia.

The strategy towards the anathematisation of one (Orthodox) ethnic group (Serbs), not only in the territory of BiH, but in general terms, certainly benefited the separatist minority group (Albanians) in Kosovo and Metohija (KiM), to encroach the land that belonged to the sovereign state of Republic of Serbia⁴⁸. The failure in preventing development of the

⁴⁷ Jeanne Haskin, 'Bosnia and beyond: the "quiet" revolution that wouldn't go quietly', *Algora Publishing*, 2006

⁴⁸ Carole Rogel, 'Kosovo: Where It All Began', *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, November, 03, 2004, Vol. 17, No. 1, September, 2003, pp.167-182. "Ironically, when Yugoslavia began to disintegrate in 1991, and as it fell into four years of warfare, Kosovo remained relatively calm. Only after the Dayton peace, in late 1995, did Kosovo's Albanians opt for a militant policy toward the Serbs."

conflict in BiH after the experiences gained in Croatia⁴⁹; the inability to control the massive exodus' and migrations which affected neighbouring states economically (Croatia and Yugoslavia-Serbia/Montenegro) and further intensified conflict (the forced return of refugees into conflict zones) between ethnic groups; declaring Yugoslavia⁵⁰ (Serbs) as the only responsible party; and also the failure to ignore the deeply entrenched hatred among ethnicities which culminated in Srebrenica and was reported as a situation under control by UN officials such as the Secretary General Kofi A. Annan. Srebrenica, was the clearest evidence that ethnic diversities have been mostly overlooked by the International Actors and confirms that the UN was mostly orientated towards negotiation with the military leaders and less towards the safety or wellbeing of the peoples⁵¹.

All these omissions in BiH led the UN and the IA to make a quick decision to intervene against the perceived disobedient sovereign nation – the Serbian orthodox people (later Serbia), opening another Pandora's Box in Kosovo. Due to the late intervention in BiH and the consequences emerging out of such reluctance, the UN and the IA couldn't afford another mistake. However, their early intervention in KiM created an unprecedented violation of international law by the international actors themselves. The current situation in this south-Serbian province, confirmed by the Chiefs of the mission commencing at the

⁴⁹ Department of Public Information, United Nation. http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unprof_b.htm September 1996 "In May, despite all diplomatic efforts by the European Community, the Secretary-General's representatives and UNPROFOR to negotiate a lasting cease-fire, the conflict - between the Bosnian Muslims and the Bosnian Croats on the one side and the Bosnian Serbs on the other - intensified."

⁵⁰ Department of Public Information, United Nation. http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unprof_b.htm, September 1996. "On 30 May, acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council, in its resolution 757 (1992), imposed wide-ranging sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (which by then consisted of Serbia and Montenegro), in order to help achieve a peaceful solution to the conflict". (accessed 18 January 2010)

⁵¹ Colum Lynch, 'UN Appeased and Unwittingly Aided Genocide', Washington Post <http://globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/190/34333.html>, "15 November, 1999. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who was in charge of U.N. peacekeeping through much of the 1992-1995 Bosnian war, also shared the blame. While his personal role in the events in Srebrenica is not clearly addressed in the report, it says he has accepted general responsibility for the U.N.'s failure in Bosnia. "We gave the Security Council the impression that the situation was under control, and many of us believed that to be the case," Annan is quoted as saying. "The day before Srebrenica fell, we reported that the Serbs were not attacking when they were. We reported that the Bosnians had fired on UNPROFOR [the U.N. Protection Force] blocking position when it was the Serbs. We failed to mention urgent requests for air power." (accessed 21 January 2010)

very beginning of the IA's presence in this territory, reports that the mission in Kosovo was a failure and that the mission should have had a different character if such humanitarian intervention occurred from the first instance.

Since there is no solution in Bosnia and Kosovo, where the re-escalation of conflict could easily repeat, the role of any external party involved should be challenged further. The fact is that even 15 years after the Dayton Agreement in Bosnia and ten years after conflict in Kosovo, no solution exists.⁵² In addition there is a need for the international actors to ask themselves what the purposes of their missions were. The original purpose of conflict prevention appears to most to have been unsuccessful, as their presence for years without a concrete solution suggests. Hence, this situation is certainly an opportunity for the locals' to reorganise their aspirations towards reclaiming lost territories by using any means possible.

However IA made a crucial omission in granting territories according to an unsanctioned methodology. The process of dividing the territory of former-Yugoslavia into even smaller ones (Bosnia and Herzegovina; Republika Srpska, and Kosovo) was challenged by the signatory of the same Charter (Sovereignty of the State) as they envisaged the same risk and resultant domino effect in their own sovereign states. Hence, regardless of having agreements (Dayton) and treaties (Kumanovo) of the recognition of states that had not existed previously, the sovereigns risk their own sovereignty, which will inevitably happen, despite the states' modernity, once the Bosnia and Kosovo question is 'completely' resolved, and this resolution does not entertain and resolve ethnic issues.

⁵² A Joint US/Russian Research Project, 'Lessons and Conclusions on the Execution of IFOR Operations and Prospects for a Future Combined Security System: The Peace and Stability of Europe after IFOR', *Foreign Military Studies office (FMSO), Center for Army Lessons Learned, U.S. Army Combined Arms Center Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas and the Center for Military-Strategic Studies (CMSS), General Staff of the Armed Forces Moscow*, November, 2000.p.54
<http://www.smallwars.quantico.usmc.mil/search/LessonsLearned/bosnia/IFOR.pdf> "IFOR and SFOR cannot by themselves solve the Bosnian problem, rather military forces can create the conditions for the implementation of political and economic solutions. The solution to the Balkans' problems rests with the commitment of the international community, the civilian organizations, and the peoples of the region itself."

Chapter 3 – International Actors and Bosnia and Herzegovina

“Throughout history, the forms taken by exclusion have evolved, both with regard to their characteristics and the attitudes adopted towards them.”

Jordi Estivill⁵³

According to the events in BiH in the last two decades, the idea of broaching ethnic identities played the crucial role for my undertaking of this research. Fatal omissions by the international actors in recognising ethnic groups' needs, influenced their desire towards implementing modern norms and standards that are unknown and in some cases contrary to the ethnic groups ways (Knoll, 2005)⁵⁴, played a critical role in the international actors' unsystematic; non strategic resolution during and following the aftermath of the conflicts.

Was that fatal omission, based on assumptions towards the understanding of the peoples in Bosnia, purposely done by the international actors? Were the conflict, nationalism and ethnic cleansing a secondary issue for United Nations and International Actors?

James Steinberg, director of policy planning at the State Department stated that "Without U.S. leadership in Bosnia, we would face the imminent danger of a widening war that could embroil our allies, undermine NATO's credibility, destabilize nearby democracies, and drive a wedge between the United States and Russia" (Steinberg in Carpenter, 1996)⁵⁵

⁵³ Estivill Jordi, 'Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion', *International Labour Organization*, 2003, p.37, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/socsec/step/download/96p1.pdf>

⁵⁴ Knoll Bernard, 'Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory', *HTML – Offprint from: German Law Journal*, Vol. 8 No.1, 2007, pp. 39-56.

⁵⁵ James Steinberg, "Foreign Policy Myopia," *Washington Times*, January 19, 1996, p. A19

Exploration of the superpower leadership tendencies in Bosnia will be explored further in order to support my notion that the assumptions made by UN officials and international actors have created the policies for intervention in Kosovo and Metohija in 1999.

UN and IA assumptions towards Serbs

This thesis claims that the UN and International Actors representatives' unfamiliarity with the situation in Bosnia created a challenging position in which the foreign powers were unable to decide what to do⁵⁶. The moral/ethical dilemma was one of the most important, where the international community expected answers from the international actor involved (Drakulic in Campbell, p: 10)⁵⁷. This question to UNSC, as well as the EU, as the international actors involved in the Bosnia war, however, remained unanswered. The question of why the UN force didn't intervene at the beginning of the conflict in Bosnia still remains. However, by being in a position to make the decision, which was later challenged by the international public, the focus of UN went towards the dominant party (Serbia), because it was in control of most of the territory and of the military force as well. The net result being that by default, or was it design, the Serbs were blamed for the atrocities as well as the biased focus refused to acknowledge other ethnic participants.

*“At a time when few Westerner European observers appeared to share the growing sense of urgency in Washington regarding the future of Yugoslavia and its implications for Europe, it was difficult, according to number of present and former US policymakers, to figure out what to do.”*⁵⁸

Bosnia-Herzegovina was recognized by the United States in April 1992. Secretary of State James Baker condemned Serb aggression but plainly stated that the administration did not

⁵⁶ Colum Murphy, Former Deputy Head of UN Political Affairs Inside Bosnia, 'Closing the 20th Century with some Important Lessons: Bosnia and the Need for Enforcement', http://rsq.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/pdf_extract/23/4/121

⁵⁷ See Campbell, p. 10: "After a year of violence, with the dead numbering approximately 200.000, with many more wounded and over two million refugees flooding Europe...At least people in the West began to grasp what was going on."

⁵⁸ National Intelligence Estimate on Yugoslavia, 'The Intelligence Community Case Method Program. 2006, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_GIF_declass_support/yugoslavia/Pub36_Appendix_B.pdf

support military intervention. In May, the UN approved economic sanctions against Yugoslavia hoping that European Union will contain the Yugoslavia situation⁵⁹.

By being completely preoccupied with the Gulf War, the administration was unable to answer the question: was the conflict in Yugoslavia an international conflict between new republics, or a civil war?' This discourse paralysed the US policy makers. However, in order to provide any understanding and get to some form of a conclusion, the Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney eventually described 'the Balkan War' as an 'internal civil war.'⁶⁰

The impotent role of the United Nations in Bosnia⁶¹ and Europe⁶² was replaced with United States and NATO forces⁶³ which inevitably started to develop the US position⁶⁴ towards a US leadership role in Bosnia and the Balkans⁶⁵. Although US supported unity of Yugoslavian people at first⁶⁶, the strategy was changed several months later, when Bosnia and Herzegovina was officially recognised as an independent state by United States government and the United Nations institution. After the recognition of Bosnia and

⁵⁹ Warren Zimmerman, 'Yugoslavia: 1989-1996' *U.S. and Russian Policymaking with Respect to Use of Force*, 1997. <http://www.rand.org/publications/CF/CF129/CF-129.chapter11.html>

⁶⁰ Ibid

⁶¹ Hedges Blair, 'Reluctant Leadership: America's Response to Bosnia, 1991-1995', 1997, <http://www.owl.net.rice.edu/~hist490/kashmir/>

⁶² See Woodward in Hedges, 1997, "...the US did not want responsibility for affairs in Bosnia and encouraged Western Europe to take the lead... The US gave the impression that Germany should take an active role in the northern Balkans while the US would take care of the southern Balkans"

⁶³ Although originally supportive of European leadership, the US did not like the way Europe handled the Yugoslavia situation."

⁶⁴ Fotini Bellou, 'Direct and Indirect Leadership: The Case of the US in Bosnia', 1998, "... Washington aimed to project its self-conceived role were not readily accepted by the United States' most significant allies, thus causing US inertia which in turn raised questions about the substance of US leadership".

⁶⁵ Fotini Bellou, 'Direct and Indirect Leadership: The Case of the US in Bosnia', 1998

⁶⁶ During the 12 February 1991 Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearings, James Dobbins, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs, testified that the U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia supported democracy, dialogue, human rights, market reforms, and unity

Herzegovina⁶⁷, the International Actors promptly commenced with a campaign against one ethnic group, the Serbs⁶⁸.

According to Clinton, Serbia was an expansionist country, the same as was Nazi Germany; hence it presented a threat towards the security of Europe. The concern that Serbia might ignite a continental conflagration in the form of a widespread war was enough for the superpower to take action in Bosnia⁶⁹.

*'President Clinton repeatedly defended his decision to send American troops to Bosnia by insisting that if the United States and its NATO allies did not take steps to solidify the fragile peace in that country, they would risk the outbreak of a "wider war." Such a conflict would threaten overall European stability, which is deemed important to America's own security and well-being.'*⁷⁰

However, by calling Serbs as a “plague against which NATO have to fight” the Clinton Administration added impetus to the widespread negativity towards anything in relation to the Serbs, globally.

The Serbian people and their military force were ideal for accusation as the major party involved and therefore had to take the heaviest responsibility (James Gow and James D. D. Smith. in Mats, Economides 2007)⁷¹. Was that the strategy for a US leadership role in Europe? The answer appears to be yes and this will be expanded further in the Kosovo case.

⁶⁷ After the United States recognized the new republics of Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina in April 1992, Baker condemned Serb aggression but plainly stated that the administration did not support military intervention.

⁶⁸ “Secretary of State Warren Christopher’s testimony before the House of Representatives that ‘the US had no moral obligation to intervene to protect Bosnia’s Muslims because all three sides shared responsibility’ at odds with testimony in February which had blamed Serbia alone.”

⁶⁹ James Steinberg, ‘Foreign Policy Myopia’, *Washington Times*, January 19, 1996, p.A19

⁷⁰ Ted Galen Carpenter, ‘First Moral Obligation Owed to Our Own Citizens’, *Boston Globe*, December 3, 1995

⁷¹ See James Gow and James D. D. Smith, *Peace-Making, Peace-Keeping, European Security and the Yugoslav War*, London Defence Studies No. 11 London: Brassey’s, for the Centre for Defence Studies, may 1992, p. 36.

The Strategy in Bosnia of focussing on a particular ethnic group (Serbs)⁷² was based on misguided assumptions, as well as misleading and manipulative data from the field⁷³ (Marshall Harris, 1993), therefore the UN mission and US involvement in Bosnia, had ultimately delivered a long lasting negative situation, where no ethnicity found satisfaction.

What influence did history have on the conflict in Bosnia?

Can we use History to substantiate the statement that it was an important part of the poor relationship among the ethnicities which brought about the conflict in Bosnia? In the following I will explain that UN and International Actors had difficulty in understanding the peoples, hence the mission strategy lacked quality⁷⁴. Bringing foreign actors in the situation to make a quick decision ultimately forced them to choose one particular ethnicity – Serbs, as the main ingredient in finding a resolution to the conflict.

History was a critical factor that should have been explored by the UN and the IA long before they landed in Bosnia; however it played no part in the IA strategy.

“The war...has added two melancholy reasons for examining its history more closely: the first is the need to understand the origins of the fighting and the second is the need to dispel some of the clouds of misunderstanding, deliberate myth-making and sheer ignorance in which all discussion of Bosnia and its history had become shrouded”. (Malcolm, p. xix)⁷⁵

⁷² See in Campbell, p.49: ...the Bosnians and the Serbs and the Croats – is almost unbelievable. It’s almost terrifying, and its centuries old. That is really problem from hell...the conflict was a “morass” with “atrocities on all sides”...A few hours before going to Capitol Hill, Christopher’s staff asked the relevant desk in the State Department to provide examples of atrocities committed by Muslims in Bosnia. Those who dealt with the request pointed out the difference between the isolated war crimes of individual Bosnians and the systematic policy of the Bosnian Serbs, but these objections did not deflect Christopher from assigning equal culpability to all”.

⁷³ See in Campbell, p.50: ‘Marshall Harris, introduction to Boyle, *The Bosnian People Charge Genocide*, xv-xvi. Harris worked in the office that was asked for these data, and later resigned from the State Department in protest against U.S. policy.

⁷⁴ See in Hedges, 1997: “From 1991-1995, the UN pursued a well-intentioned but ineffectual policy of peacekeeping in the Balkans which had neither peace to keep, nor a mandate to achieve peace. Only with the eventual exertion of American leadership and use of decisive force, in the form of NATO airstrikes, did the UN and the United States attempt to reclaim legitimacy by forcing negotiation, culminating in the Dayton Peace Accords in November 1995.”

⁷⁵ Noel Malcolm, ‘Bosnia: A short History’, New York: New York University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-8147-5520-8

Various writings by academics (Jenkins and Sofos, 1996, p: 254; Schöpflin, 2000, p: 330 in Sotiropoulou),⁷⁶ as well as politicians, mention that the history and settlement of the peoples in these territories plays a crucial role. So, whether the international actor(s) choose to ignore this or whether time restrictions precluded them from the necessity of in-depth analyses of the deeply entrenched ambivalences among the ethnicities, the fact remains they did not acknowledge endemic history of the peoples in the affected areas.

*‘Sir, I wish I had the answer to your question...but there is certainly a history going back, at least in my study of the problem, as far back as the thirteenth century, of constant ethnic and religious fighting among and between these groups’*⁷⁷

It appears that, for peoples from the developed world, the definition of the people in the Balkans had never been properly explored and established before 1880. As late as 1850, the Slavonic races were recognised as Greeks, hence linked to the Hellenic identity. Mazower observes in “The Balkans” that there was no distinction between orthodox populations before 1880.

*“Not before the 1880 were there many references to ‘Balkan’ peoples either...British historian E.A. Freeman in 1877, ‘all the Orthodox subjects of the Turk were in most European eyes looked alike as Greeks.’”*⁷⁸

According to Mazower’s writing, since there wasn’t a distinction between Slavs before 1850, and that Slavs were recognised as a Greek orthodox religion by many European historians and scholars, then where is the foundation for Serbs as well as Croats to have established a unique national identity, at least before the nineteenth century?

The Croatian historic development of national identity was greatly suppressed by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. What was forbidden, by Hungary, was the cultivation of a national consciousness and of a national political life among the minority races of

⁷⁶ See in Sotiropoulou, p.3

⁷⁷ Campbell, p.53

⁷⁸ Mark Mazower, *‘The Balkans: A short History’* (New York: Modern Library, 2001), p. 2,3

Hungary. For Croats, this was the main obstacle in developing their own identity and role within Austro-Hungarian domination. Crankshaw observes that, life under Magyar rule, where the minorities had almost no voice other than to exist and obey, the ethnic identity existed in the form of Magyar only.

“A Croat could be a good Magyar; but if he wanted to be a good Croat he was prescribed.”⁷⁹

An interesting observation about the ethnicity in Bosnia came from UN negotiator Thorvald Stoltenberg in Norway on 31 May 1995 in which he ‘endorsed a civil war by saying that most if not all of the people in Bosnia were Serbs: Serbs who converted to Islam or dress like Croats’ (Stoltenberg in Campbell, 1998).⁸⁰

How is it possible to recognise a Muslim, a Serb or a Croat in Bosnia? What are the characteristics that define one person and distinguish them from others?

The purpose of the missions, as stated in the UN Resolutions, was to prevent conflict and to establish long lasting peace and stability. However, the unclear strategy had been present since the UN was deployed in these territories, where the purpose of the mission was challenged by inability of the international actor to cope with the definition of locals’ cultures and their needs. The assumptions⁸¹ implemented from the very start in Bosnia by UN officials and US decided the direction of the development of future relationships among the ethnicities.

The complexity of ethnic identity issues in BiH is unique, since it represents the network of families distinguished by surnames which is the key indicator for religion. The difference

⁷⁹ Edward Crankshaw, *‘The Fall of the House of Habsburg’* (London: Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd, Aylesbury, Bucks, 1974), p.310

⁸⁰ See in Campbell, p. 49.

⁸¹ Quoted in Ann Devroy, “Clinton Lobbies for Troops, *Washington Post*, November 26, 1995, p. A33.

between people can be only recognised by individual surnames since stamina, shape and body characteristics are very similar between the all ethnicities in Bosnia.

Surnames played a crucial role in history, especially during WWII (ethnic cleansing); however, in the case of Bosnia the same surname played the deciding role in granting special status, mobilisation, migration, or arrests, collection into concentration / investigative camps and elimination.

The above mentioned surname differences, were an irresolvable obstacle for the UN and the IA, where the utter confusion of who belonged to whom created an untenable situation for officials unable to comprehend and to establish proper strategies to address these. However, none of the writings did academics or scholars mention these differences as crucial to the success of the missions.

Maybe the closest, most realistic approach in understanding the needs for ethnic diversities and the consequences of an inadequate understanding of the same was analysed and discussed in Campbell's "National Deconstruction". Although Campbell's writing, which covered various ethnic issues and complexities, deserves applause for its brave attempt, it proves that even Campbell's efforts to combine the various thoughts in relation to the ethnic identity definition was just another unsuccessful attempt to explain essence of ethnic diversities.

*" Some Western observers of events in Yugoslavia expressed occasional frustration with the chronic divisiveness of its people, particularly over matters of religious faith, The Serbs were Orthodox, the Croats and Slovenes shared a common Central European Catholic culture, and the Muslims – comprising about 10 percent of the total population in Bosnia"*⁸²

⁸² National Intelligence Estimate on Yugoslavia, 'The Intelligence Community Case Method Program', 2006, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_GIF_declass_support/yugoslavia/Pub36_Appendix_B.pdf

The IAs' unfamiliarity with domestic, historically established ethnic antipathies created a stalemate position, where the only critical factor in conflict resolution was time. However, the constant guessing by the IA of who to blame and with whom to negotiate caused complete distrust towards the IA's mission. According to Kofi A. Annan⁸³ 'the organisation has become embroiled in circumstances that scarred its credibility and moral stature...the organisation has come a long way in determining what it can and cannot do to save lives and promote peace'⁸⁴.

⁸³ Kofi Annan A. of Ghana, the seventh Secretary-General of the United Nations
http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2001/annan-bio.html

⁸⁴ See Kofi A Annan, p.56 Jonathan Moore: Jonathan Moore, '*Hard choices: moral dilemmas in humanitarian intervention*', Rowman & Littlefield, Oxford, 1998, ISBN 0-8476-9031-8

Chapter 4 – International Actors and Kosovo and Metohija

‘You gave us freedom, but not a future’

*Kosovo Albanian Student*⁸⁵

UNITED NATIONS – KOSOVO QUESTION

The idea of international leadership fully emerged at the end of 20th Century in the Serbian Southern Province of Kosovo and Metohija. The experience previously gained in Bosnia, and the insufficient results of its mission⁸⁶, brought about the strategy where the Bosnia case could not be repeated in Kosovo. The Clinton Administration had sufficient misleading data about the Serbs and their alleged atrocities⁸⁷, utilising powerful media (Dorich, 1999)⁸⁸ to sell the ‘new’ news to the international public which again created ‘enough information’ for another chapter towards the destruction of Serbs and their credibility, if any.

During the period from 1991-1995, the Kosovo Question was not active, at least not in the international community, which in fact did nothing to recognise and support the plight of Kosovo Albanians. Local Albanians hadn’t been involved in any process of asking for

⁸⁵ See in Knoll 2005, p.1

⁸⁶ Mats R. Berdal, Spyros Economides, ‘United Nations interventionism, 1991 – 2004’, University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2007, ISBN-13: 978-0-521-54767-3, p.7, “This was a process of *creeping escalation*, with a component of more activist peacekeeping, accompanied by an increasingly clear realisation that the regional agencies were incapable of retaining control.”

⁸⁷ Julius Strauss, ‘Massacre that started long haul to justice’, 30 Jun 2001, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1312900/Massacre-that-started-long-haul-to-justice.html>, accessed 11 February 2010.

⁸⁸ “In the past 7 years some 8,000 articles have been published on Bosnia and Kosovo in the Los Angeles Times. Not a single article was published that was written by a Serbian journalist, author, scholar or political leader. This same ugly record has been achieved in almost every major newspaper in this nation, with few exceptions... Serbs have also been personas non grata at the Foreign Relations Committee, the Helsinki Commission and the Human Rights Caucus-where Serbian views have been barred since 1992. The hallmark of a great society is the guarantees and protections it offers dissenting views. <http://www.srpska-mreza.com/Yugoslavia/views/Dorich-silence.html>, accessed 02 February 2010.

independence during this period. The threat of punishment from the strong Yugoslavian Federal army was very present. The theory of “attachment” (Geertz, 1963) and the risk of the state’s (Serbian Government) exercise of authority (Smith, 2001, p.12; Rex, 2001, p.8) put the Albanian’s aspiration in seeking independence (Hechter 2000, esp. Chs 2-3) on hold.

The first sign of movement by Kosovo Albanians occurred after the Dayton Agreement was signed. The international community raised the question of the Kosovo problem for the first time. However, the Yugoslavian president considered being a signatory of the Dayton Agreement a mark of respect by international community and recognition of his involvement in the final resolution of Bosnian conflict; hence recognition of the Kosovo problem was a debate of less significance. Moreover, a delegation of Kosovo Albanians attempted to be present at Dayton but was turned back as being a delegation with no credibility. By acting in that manner, the international community confirmed that the Kosovo question was not their concern, since it has local character within a sovereign state. However, for the Kosovo Albanians, that was the starting point of their fight for independency.

The Kosovo Albanian’s tactic of starting with non violent action, as instructed by their president Rugova, was ineffective, thus violent action was the next logical step.

The first military group, the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) was formed shortly after the war in Bosnia was over. On the other side the Clinton Administration set an American policy on a course for a U.S.-led NATO military intervention in Kosovo.⁸⁹ Nevertheless, the constant provocation from KLA towards the Yugoslavian police developed into an open conflict. For example: A bombardment, lasting for three months, without

⁸⁹ Larry E. Craig, *Bosnia II: The Clinton Administration Sets Course for NATO Intervention in Kosovo*, United States Senate Republican Policy Committee, August 12, 1998. <http://rpc.senate.gov/releases/1998/kosovo.htm> accessed 27 January 2010.

proclamation of war against Yugoslavia, took place, destroying all vital industrial sectors in the state, including massive collateral damage (this definition is used for the first time to explain poor military strategy).

The confusion of the Kosovo Question is still present; the state has been recognised by some of the governments around the Globe. This is mostly by the actors involved in the bombardment of Yugoslavia and the Muslim states which greatly supported Muslims in Bosnia, or states under ultimatum.

*"States that do not recognise Kosovo should be held responsible for impeding the progress of European Union enlargement...Ahtisaari said that he regretted that the EU was divided on the question of Kosovo...EU should not accept Serbia's accession unless Belgrade recognised Kosovo...Several EU leaders, including from countries that do recognise Kosovo, have insisted that recognition of Kosovo by Serbia is not a precondition for progress in Serbia's EU aspiration."*⁹⁰

However, the recognition of the Serbian autonomous territory of Kosovo and Metohija is difficult for many to accept⁹¹, primarily because of the ambiguity that by doing so their government will need to address the Kosovo question in their own sovereign states⁹².

What is really important in this Chapter relates only to the International actors – United Nations and NATO. The brash intervention by NATO in Kosovo was the most confusing moment in the relationship between these two institutions.

⁹⁰ The Sofia Echo, 'Refusal to recognise Kosovo hampering EU enlargement – Ahtisaari', 2009, http://sofiaecho.com/2009/09/08/780909_refusal-to-recognise-kosovo-hampering-eu-enlargement-ahtisaari

⁹¹ "The Brazilian government does not support the independence of Kosovo and would only recognize if such a political agreement was made with Serbia, under the conduct of the United Nations. The Brazilian government reaffirms its belief that a peaceful solution for the issue of Kosovo must continue to be sought through dialogue and negotiation, under the auspices of the United Nations and the legal framework of Resolution 1244 of the Council Security" was stated by Celso Amorim, Foreign Minister of Brazil, in statement regarding protests against Kosovo independence in Serbia. He also said that countries that have recognized the independence of Kosovo put the United Nations in "second place." In Portugal - "Assembly of the Republic discussed the issue twice and parties agreed that Portugal should not recognize Kosovo for now because the UN and the EU have not yet reached a consensus position."

⁹² Catalonia welcomes Kosovo's independence, February 17, 2008, <http://waytoownstate.blogspot.com/2008/02/catalonia-welcomes-kosovos-independence.html>

“As NATO forces entered Kosovo, tremendous efforts were undertaken to discover evidence of war crimes, a “model of speed and efficiency” to ensure that no evidence would be lost or overlooked. The efforts “build on lessons learned from past mistakes... Despite the intensive efforts, the results of “the mass-grave obsession,” as the WSJ analysts call it, were disappointingly thin.”⁹³

UN policies in Kosovo

To prevent mistakes made in Bosnia, where the UN’s credibility had been significantly challenged by their non-satisfactory role in bringing peace and stability in Bosnia; the UN this time have cooperatively engaged its troops with the troops of a U.S. Army-led NATO force. This was strongly opposed by permanent members of UN – Russia and China.

According to Resolution 1244, Annex 2: “The international security presence with substantial North Atlantic Treaty Organization participation must be deployed under unified command and control and authorized to establish a safe environment for all people in Kosovo and to facilitate the safe return to their homes of all displaced persons and refugees”.

I have to stop here to compare the policies of the UN and Clinton’s Administration.

“The Clinton Administration’s drift towards intervention in Kosovo bears striking similarities to the *biased* decision making that lead the Bosnia intervention beginning in 1995, on a broader scale, this has become the hallmark of the Clinton foreign policy.”⁹⁴

The similarities include⁹⁵:

- The framing of highly complex ethnic conflict in simplistic terms in order to justify military interventions in an unknown region;

⁹³ Noam Chomsky, ‘A Review of NATO’s War over Kosovo’, Z-Magazine, 2001, <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/200005--.htm>

⁹⁴ Larry E. Craig, “Bosnia II: The Clinton Administration Sets Course for NATO Intervention in Kosovo”, United States Senate Republican Policy Committee, August 12, 1998. <http://rpc.senate.gov/releases/1998/kosovo.htm> accessed 27 January 2010.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

- Lack of clarity and coherence as to the outcome which the Administration's policy will produce;
- Lack of evidence of how the Administration's policy serves the national interests of US;

The Clinton Administration's policies confirmed that these were serving the interests of Clinton Administration rather than to protect American interests. Nevertheless, the Clinton Administration used the given moment to establish a US leadership role⁹⁶ at Kosovo and other Balkan states, together with European allies.

On the other side what is the gain in the UN policies, can we divide them into failures and lessons learned? According to the UN Special Envoy at Kosovo, Martti Ahtisaari, his plan was developed against the will of the sovereign, democratic state; solutions were predetermined from the start of negotiations; there was limitation of discussion options amongst the parties involved; there was a time limit for the negotiation processes; the conclusion/results after the negotiation processes have never included/taken into consideration of the minorities in Kosovo; there was an obvious lack of interest and unwillingness to consider Serbian interests; there was no compromise in negotiation processes; there were prerogatives of a state: constitution, border, army without consideration of Kosovo Albanian view.

According to Ahtisaari's plan, we can see that there was obvious dominance in choosing the way how the negotiation processes between Serbs and Albanians would begin and would continue to be developed. However, can we learn something from Ahtisaari's plan

⁹⁶ See Bellou, p.2: "Precisely because the implementation of Dayton was structured upon a strategically inclusive and practically functional cooperation scheme around Washington's orbit, with implications beyond the Balkan region, it had invigorated US leadership and reinforced its image even further. Thus in this respect it tended to inhibit anything less than US continuing commitment to Bosnia. Effectively, Washington's military withdrawal from the post-Dayton Bosnia, that some American policy makers constantly demanded in the first years of peace implementation, would have been detrimental to Washington's most vital interest: namely, European confidence in US leadership in the European security setting which in turn defines Washington's global leadership role.

or we should ignore it, since there are no results to assure anybody involved in Kosovo Question, that this plan was the essence for stability and peace.

We would not expect that the UN and International Actors would ignore the UN Chapter, UN Resolution 1244, 1975 Helsinki Final Act on non-violability of borders and 1992 Badinter Commission (no new states within former Yugoslav republics). Also, diplomacy should not have predetermined solutions in negotiation processes since the favoured side has no incentive to negotiate. It appears that this not only happened, as well as hindered talks and deadlines, encouraging individuals to conclude before overall agreement was reached. Diplomacy should include both parties in the negotiation processes and force the sides involved until the solutions are explored in the interests of all parties involved.⁹⁷

So, was Ahtisaari's plan a solution in the Kosovo case? The reports from UN special envoys can confirm the engagement of the UN and IA in Kosovo⁹⁸ based on Ahtisaari's plan was a failure⁹⁹, from the beginning to the end, since the beginning of the conflict in Kosovo was constructed by the policies of the Clinton Administration as mentioned above.

The failure in finding a long-lasting solution and the lack of adequate strategy in achieving UN missions' goals opened the space for the new tensions. The current situations among the ethnicities in KiM are at a point where they are ready to re-emerge into open confrontations, regardless of the bilateral agreements signed by all the ethnicities involved, and the close presence of UN, NATO and USA forces in the field. In BiH, the conflict can re-occur between ethnicities, however in KiM, there is a potential for conflict involving the

⁹⁷ Kosovo Compromise, Chart 02. www.kosovocompromise.com

⁹⁸ Karl Eide, Special Envoy of the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, August 17, 2004: "Today a Kosovo is characterised by growing dissatisfaction and frustration...Our current policies are seen as static and unable to respond to the real problem facing Kosovo."

⁹⁹ Karl Eide, Special Envoy of the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, October 7, 2005: "Today the rule of law is hampered by a lack of ability and readiness to enforce legislation at all levels. Respect of the rule of law is inadequately entrenched and the mechanism to enforce it are not sufficiently developed."

locals (Albanians) and UN and IA military forces.¹⁰⁰ The notion exists, that place for long-lasting conflicts in the future is present, in South-Serbian provinces not only between ethnicities but between saviours and the saved as well. According to the results of the UN missions, confirmed by the various UN and IA representatives, the counter-productivity of UN activities was in direct contrast to the purpose of the UN missions, creating uncertainty for the future of the peoples and their life under a UN presence that was poorly defined.

Karl Eide, the special envoy of the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, confirms the IA frustration with the Kosovo development.

*“Our current policies are seen as static and unable to respond to the real problems facing Kosovo. Marginal adjustments will only add to the frustration, increase the danger of more violence, damage the reputation of Kosovo further and weaken the international community...The majority Kosovo Albanian leadership consider our current approach as a policy of status quo, which can only lead to a further worsening of difficult economic and social condition.”*¹⁰¹

The humanitarian military actions exercised by these institutions can be easily converted to a practice of domination, as shown in the cases of Bosnia and Kosovo, and hence such actions can be seen as a new form of colonialism, since there are no long-lasting solutions for the peoples. As Caron noted, “perception of an international institution’s illegitimacy will arise when the expectations generated by its promise diverge greatly from what the institutions can actually deliver...Simply put, when an international administration behaves as ordinary government.”¹⁰² Nevertheless, the UN and IA presence, together with an unidentified time frame for their own activities in the field, can be recognised as a threat to

¹⁰⁰ See Smith in Bernard Knoll (2005), ‘From Benchmarking to Final Status? Kosovo and The Problem of an International Administration’s Open-Ended Mandate’. p.639 ‘Angry Kosovars Call on “Colonial” UN Occupying Force to Leave’, Observer, 19 October. 2003”

¹⁰¹ Karl Eide, ‘The Situation in Kosovo: Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations’, ERP KiM Newsletter, 2004, http://www.kosovo.net/news/archive/2004/August_17/1.html (accessed 04 October 2009), p.1-2

¹⁰² See David S Caron, in Knoll Bernard’s (2007), “Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory”. HTML – Offprint from: German Law Journal Vol. 8 No.1 – 1 January 2007, p.12

the locals and hence the UN and the IA activities recognised as a strategy for absolute control over the locals and their expectations.

A stereotypical approach towards the locals' diplomatic ability to negotiate multilateral conditions successfully prevented the UN and the IA involving the locals more¹⁰³; hence the practice of domination follows. According to Bernard Knoll's article¹⁰⁴ we can find that the 'Kosovo actors are caught between international personality and legal *nihil*' where the international agent lacked a meaningful theory of how to build a viable state institution. The matrix of norms, rules and legal practices through which an international mission should navigate to govern Kosovo in fact didn't exist. (Knoll, 2007, p: 639). Since the policy *Standards before Status* is introduced in order for Kosovo to "earn sovereignty" the local political leaders had argued that the task of institution-building is more complex when it plays out in an environment of suspended sovereignty.¹⁰⁵

*"The international agent convinced that the political institutions are not yet ready to meet the standards they are charged to implement will tend to de-legitimise the latter in the eyes of the "people" who compose the electorate. By portraying the local agent as overly corrupt and incapable of conforming to the benchmark standard for self-government, an international authority communicates that the institutional resources for democratic authorisation are lacking."*¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ "UNMIK authorised itself to exercise external affairs powers by providing, in the Constitutional Framework, that the SRSG remains exclusively responsible for 'concluding agreements with states and international organizations'...UNMIK thus follows established rules of agency in international law."

¹⁰⁴ Bernard Knoll, 'Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory', HTML – Offprint from: German Law Journal Vol. 8 No.1 – 1 January 2007, p.639.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 641

¹⁰⁶ Bernard Knoll, 'Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory', p. 9

The initial mission objectives for humanitarian intervention and responsibility of protection morphed into an undefined coercive presence without clear definition of the missions' purpose. The hypocrisy of IA's purpose in these territories and the double standards imposed on different ethnic groups are visible in the form of constant tension among the locals on a daily basis, irrespective of the constant presence and the full control of the IA's.

'The structuring of opinion-making in this way by the two dominant local groups in Kosovo forces marginalized groups to align themselves clearly with either Kosovo-Albanians or the Serbs. The concept of tolerant multi-ethnicity has lost considerable ground as a result of these kinds of group reactions, whereas UNMIK has made mistake of focusing its policy on ethnic categories, instead of trying to overcome them.'¹⁰⁷

Even more difficult is the operational approach by the UN peace keeping forces, consisting of military personnel from various states. Their approach is mainly based on self-developed relations with the locals, and so the quality and level of protection and service vary significantly.

The discriminatory approach towards all ethnic groups displays the critical role, of the international actor, on the non-cohesive ethnic societies. The missions' impacts, constructed under the constant and undefined presence of UN and IA created a negative role, bringing about the nostalgic idea, that the current situation could be overcome without the international peace keepers' influence and control. An additional negative impact of this discriminatory approach, from the IAs representatives, is the confusion forced by the

¹⁰⁷ Jens Narten, 'In Need of Self-Reflection: Peacebuilding in Post-War Kosovo from a Systems-Analytical Perspective', p. 129-130

all ethnic parties involved towards the governing and the control of the states in Bosnia as well in Kosovo. (Narten, 2007)¹⁰⁸

International Institution/Actors standards

The standards and norms imposed on the locals by exterior powers intentionally bring about the condition of social inequality, reinforcement of social injustice and enforcement of political exclusion of the locals in the final decision making for the state's future.

The uncertainty for the peoples in the territories controlled by these two UN missions remains, whereas the UN role has been completely disturbed by being present for too long without the introduction of a proper vision. Therefore, the possibility for the controlled ethnicities to gain their promised self-governing role in rhetorically given territories, remains in the hands of the UN mission; and conflicts directly with the purpose of the missions. Hence the people of Bosnia and Kosovo and their expectation of self-governing roles are still in a transition and there is little probability this will change in the foreseeable future. Finally, the locals' inability to understand and adapt to the modern democratic standards has disastrous future implications for a multilateral relationship between the non-civilised, the international actor and international investors.

The understanding of the modern norms and standards is an important point for the mission's success; however the locals' response towards the norms is critically insufficient.

¹⁰⁸ See in Narten, p.127: "The European Union is seen as the primary actor in future stability and peace building in Kosovo, not only for economic reconstruction, but also as a partial successor organization to UNMIK. The EU is likely to take over selected functions after UNMIK's withdrawal, particularly in the field of police and justice (rule of law)."

“All quarterly reports of the UN Secretary General have described local efforts towards the fulfilment of the required standards as improving, but, as yet, insufficient for completion.”¹⁰⁹

According to the drafters of the Kosovo Constitutional Framework the territory should be an undivided territorial unit under international administration, however, the drafters overlooked the peoples’ identity characterisations and history, as obstacles for such a statement, hence promising something without careful examination.

“In the case of Kosovo, the (international) drafters of the Constitutional Framework pursued such foundation promise by positing that Kosovo would be an undivided territorial unit under interim international administration – an entity...which, with its people, has unique historical, legal, cultural and linguistic attributes.”¹¹⁰

How can the patriarchal orientated local ethnic groups defend themselves against the modern standards? Do they engage collectively in the form of riots and conflicts in order to prevent the modern norms taking place? How is it possible that the modern norms can become effective and efficient if these are not the objectives or vision of the locals and if the modern norms conflict directly with traditional patriarchal norms and standards.

The political participation and the gains of political engagement also form part of the local vision once peace becomes normality. However, in the cases of BiH and KiM, the locals’ struggled to achieve these objectives because the locals’ vision of political participation and governance is not accounted for in the international actor’s agenda. If we address the micro social processes in community (Kosovo in particular), the questions of the position of marginalised people are at the level of non-existence, hence the question for human

¹⁰⁹ See in Jens Narten, ‘United Nations Report of the Secretary General of the United Nations on the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, United Nations Documents S/2004/348, S/2004/613, S/2004/907, S/2004/932, S/2005/88, S/2005/335, S/2005/635, S/2006/45, S/2006/361 and S/2006/707.

¹¹⁰ Bernard Knoll, ‘Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory’, p.5

rights protection becomes another instance for the international actor to explain but also for the marginalised to survive. Therefore the negative side effects of unclear, and obviously, coercive mission methodology challenges the IAs presence further. It also explores the violence enforced by dominant majority over 'the others' and the impact on the international actor's missions (UNMIK particularly). In this regard, the questions of social inequality, injustice and political exclusion in governmental systems develop a suspicion in the IAs activities in BiH and KiM.

The stalemate position of the IAs and their inability to cope with local demands, expectations, provocations and hatred potentially brings about a suitable situation for a new wave of conflict re-escalation. It appears that the mission, for the IAs, is not the protection of the peoples but a new conquest assuring the geo-strategic position for the future domination of the territories, and by exploiting the thin line between the imposed modern standards and the indefinite time to achieve the standards objectives, the IAs are successfully hiding the truth of its real mission.

So, despite the unclear methodology of the IA, mostly based on pure assumptions without any intellectual reasoning or approach, the mission had some beneficial impact on ethnicities, it bought them time to at least try to understand modernism and its norms. However the missions' actors failed to achieve the mission's vision and goals of long lasting stability but rather incurred more long lasting instability and potential for the conflict to re-occur at any given moment. Hence, the beneficial side of the modern standards never achieved any positive results and benefits for the peoples.

The enthusiasm, based on philanthropically driven ideas, is absent here, since a positive and concrete resolution for multilateral balance among the ethnicities in BiH and KiM was not and is not, the vision of IA. Moreover, the mission's visions are based more on a coercive strategy toward the locals, where the primitive, undeveloped, barbaric ethnicities

(in the eyes of modernity) should be confined to their 'dark ages' societies, and be carefully observed, in order not to spread into the hegemonic developed world but to be exploited for the modern world's financial gains.

The UN and the IA's ignorant approach towards the locals' attempts to resolve inbred prejudice, confirmed that the humanitarian intervention in KiM had a different purpose; hence this question regarding local involvement, will try to elaborate on this, still very present, issue in KiM, and in BiH as well.

UN long presence and its influence on the locals

So, where are the facts for this statement and notions for accusations of the modern and friendly occupiers and modern tyranny? The question for this thesis is the entry into a huge controversy of how the reassembling of societies starts, tendentiously or by insufficient knowledge doesn't matter; the consequences are immense and irresolvable. The consequences lead to increased destruction of peoples norms and values and more control by the friendly occupier, where the violation of human rights and double standards by the purported friend of the weakest (in the skin of IA) exist.

The complex relations between the locals, their identities and their vulnerable relations on one side and international actors' inadequate knowledge on the other side initiated instability among the international actors themselves, negating their own mission policies and affecting the international institution's Charter, human rights and responsibility for protection. The idea in this research is to prove that assumptions towards a particular ethnicity can become a core preventative issue in finding an adequate strategy for conflict resolution, not only during period of war but also during the peace building process. This is particularly true where the expectations of all involved are out of sync, and the assumptions still persist, as they do in Bosnia and Kosovo today. However, the question remains, were the assumptions necessary in order to prevent proper analysis of the ethnic

identities (hence deliberately provoking and empowering the further escalation of the conflicts) or were the assumptions made owing to a dearth of knowledge regarding the history of the peoples and their ethnicities?

The crucial points in this thesis relate to the local actors' understanding of the peace building process; the purpose of development of civil society and governance; and the negative consequences of the international actor's long presence within the peace building territory. Additional points refer to obstacles in the form of incivility within ethnicities on one side; and the international actor's defective knowledge of cultural identities, their stalemate position in the conflict aftermath, and their use of ultimatums to ensure compliance with the limited governance given to the locals on the other. Persistent and definite assumptions of the ethnicities permanently affect the present and future relations between the outsiders and the locals, affecting some positively, and providing short term benefits. Yet, this also creates long lasting obstacles towards the ethnicities where they are not included as equal participants in problem resolution on the other side.

Since the start of the conflict, the International Actors' stereotypic partitioning of the peoples into desirables and non desirables, contributed greatly towards the escalation of the conflict in Bosnia; and the empowerment of the minority group in Kosovo and Metohija in claiming the territory of sovereign Serbian State. The International Actors' perception still remains unchanged today; a constant factor in failing to recognise the complexity among the identity of the locals sets the scene for future conflicts, which can be recognised in the Balkan states. At least the International Institution representatives admit that the reoccurrence of conflicts is possible if not imminent.

A further question directly challenges the purpose of the International Institution's missions in Bosnia, and Kosovo and Metohija. This question relates mostly to the International Institution's inability to cope with the challenges exposed by the locals in the field, especially in KiM.

The culmination of the International Actors' mistakes was when the inadequate knowledge of the identities of the locals resulted in a trade deal with the local leaders in Bosnia (Dayton Agreement, 1995) and Kosovo (Serbian Government – Milosevic and Albanian representatives, 1999). Hence, the broad issue remains the importance of understanding the locals' identities in order to prevent future conflict whereas the International Standards should be introduced according to locals' ability to comprehend them, not vice versa. Today, we have a situation where the International Standards were introduced by the International Actors in order to support its missions, not in order to provide a solution for the future to the locals, which definitely began to look like new colonialism of the territories controlled by the International Actors.

“The Kosovars will need to adopt the necessary economic and political reforms, while the European Union should take the lead in guaranteeing the rule of law...it is crucial for Kosovo to implement its new laws to protect national minorities and facilitate local self-governance.”

According to Hoh¹¹¹, Kosovo as a territory has to implement the new laws, not the people. If the people have to implement the law than he probably thinks about the Albanians not 'the others'. If the Albanians have to facilitate local self-governance, is there any space for the other peoples (Serbs and minorities) to participate and contribute in governing of Kosovo territory?

Johnson observes that the government of Pristina (Albanians only) must ensure the full inclusion of Serbs as a constituent people of independent Kosovo and urges the international community to address certain issues concerning the Serb minority, including protecting property and heritage sites. He doesn't address 'the other' minorities as a constituent peoples which confront directly with EU rule of law and agrees with Hoh's idea of self-governance (Albanians) indirectly.¹¹²

¹¹¹ Christopher Hoh, 'Yugoslavia Then and Now', p.2

¹¹² Ross Johnson, 'Yugoslavia Then and Now', p.3

It appears that the international *Standards before Status*¹¹³ supports the notion of complete domination over the territory and the peoples of Kosovo, in which the local self-governing body is trapped in understanding and implementing international actors' standards and norms on one side and be unable to establish satisfactory element of security and public order on the other. Hence, it hasn't been recognised as capable in maintaining the grounds of legitimacy once been placed in the network-based standards, policies and procedures of modernity. Therefore, the practice of domination, by the international actors makes sense, despite the local Albanians expectations that the IA forces will withdraw in near future. On the other side, according to Narten, "All international organisations in Kosovo enjoy full legal immunity from prosecution for abuse or omission of their duties, thus violating the citizens' right to effective remedy and equal protection by law."¹¹⁴

It appears that for the IAs to be in full control over the territory supported by the rule of law and exercised by the strong military forces on one side, and enjoying full immunity from prosecution for abuse or omission of their duties on the other side is nothing else but the form of new imperialism. If Kosovo is an exemption in International Law, confirmed by the UN and the IAs, then the Kosovo's exemption, in international legislations, is an experiment in formulation for the missions in the future secessionisms around the globe. The logical conclusion here should be that the Kosovo declaration of independence, supported by international institutions, is nothing else but the new form of new colonialism. Kosovo Albanians, legal citizens of Yugoslavia/Serbia, were granted the territory on a temporary basis, until the modern forces established their undefined presence, hence occupying not only the territory, as a geo-strategic position, but the

¹¹³ United Nations, 'Implementing 'Standards Before Status' Policy Core Political Project for UN Kosovo Mission', 2004, Press Release SC7999, Security Council 4910th Meeting(AM), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc7999.doc.htm> (accessed 21 October 2009)

¹¹⁴ Jens Narten, 'In Need of Self-Reflection: Peacebuilding in Post-War Kosovo from Systems-Analytical Perspective'. *The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations*. Winter/Spring, 2007, pp.121-132

peoples as well. By keeping the Kosovo people in economic (foreign investments)¹¹⁵ and military dependency, and by enjoying the full immunity from persecution for abuse and omission, is nothing else but the form of the new colonialism and slavery, where the Kosovo presents only the beginning of the new imperialism, not an exemption in the international law. As Knoll observes, “Given the uncertain future status of Kosovo in international law – its reincorporation into Serbia’s jurisdiction or independence – the challenge for an interim administration has been to compel local institutions to work within uncertain parameters and to build a presumptive legitimacy. This challenge has been met only to a certain extent. The dismal economic situation in Kosovo after seven years of international institution administration documents the failure of a system of power that became chronically unable to meet the interests of the people under its tutelage.”¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ Bernard Knoll, ‘From Benchmarking to Final Status? Kosovo and The Problem of an International Administration’s Open-Ended Mandate’. *The European Journal of International Law* Vol.16 no.4 (2005), p. 637 “...the contribution highlights some of the problems encountered privatisation of public assets in Kosovo.”

¹¹⁶ Bernard Knoll, ‘Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory’. HTML – Offprint from: *German Law Journal* Vol. 8 No.1 – 1 January 2007, p. 10

Conclusion

The assumptions and characterisation of the former-Yugoslavian nations by the international actors, as mentioned in the previous chapters were based on the defective knowledge of the people's identities. This developed the negative standpoints towards particular ethnic groups. At first, the lack of knowledge formed a realistic base in conflict zones, i.e. ethnicities were forced to protect their own, however this problem has not been addressed subsequently and still persists. Inadequate knowledge of the locals in Bosnia continues to challenge UN missions even today, hence the initial transparency towards the inadequate understanding of ethnic identities became a nuisance. This unhealthy condition, for all parties involved in the discussion over the Bosnia question, brought about a stalemate position for the international actors (UN as well as European Union) bringing the tentative solution to the brink of the collapse. Moreover, and the most importantly, the unclear methodology of the peace keepers brings only uncertainty for the all ethnic groups involved. This is the case not only in Bosnia, but in Kosovo as well. An inability to comprehend those ethnic identities and their complex relations became the source for omissions and became the most critical obstacle for the missions' success.

The significance of this study is that it suggests a basis for concern over the International Actors involvement in present conflicts all around the globe, by hiding behind its own Charter of non-intervention into sovereign state -domestic issues, yet by violating the same Charter at the same time, the UN and the IA role challenges its own purpose completely. Therefore, the numerous chaotic situations which the IA introduced, by not treating all the parties involved equally, negatively affected all participants regarding their present and future living conditions. The best example of this is Bosnia, where the current situation is under severe tension and where the re-occurrence of conflict is only prevented by the IA presence. How long this can last is another question? However, the experiences from the Bosnia conflict were not acknowledged by the IA in the form of future strategies for the

prevention of conflicts but by encouraging domination and suppression with full support of Institution.

The uncertainty for the peoples in the territories controlled by these two UN missions remains, whereas the UN role has been completely usurped by being present for too long without the introduction of a proper vision or achieving mutually acceptable long term outcomes. Therefore, possible solutions for the controlled ethnicities to gain their promised self-governing role in rhetorically given territories, remains in the hands of the UN mission; and conflicts directly with the purpose of the missions. Hence the people of Bosnia and Kosovo and their expectation of self-governing roles are still in a transition and there is little probability this will change in the foreseeable future. Finally, the locals' inability to understand the democratic modern standards has disastrous future implications for a multilateral relationship between the uncivilised, the international actor and international investors.

The most disturbing fact is that the situation at present, although seemingly under control, in fact hasn't changed much. The tension among the peoples remains, despite the international actors' efforts.

However the UN international actor is still present in Kosovo, as well as in Bosnia, and completely unable to withdraw and leave the locals to deal with international norms and responsibilities towards the other ethnicities and minorities within the same territory.

On the other hand, KFOR – UN military force, the protector of Kosovo people, is challenged more than ever now, not only by the mistakes done in the last two decades in the former Yugoslavia, but also by Kosovo Albanians who are seeking to expel them, once and forever from their own state Kosova (Kosovo and Metohija).

Bibliography:

Articles and Books

Annan Kofi A. Annan of Ghana, the seventh Secretary-General of the United Nations

http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2001/annan-bio.html

Bellou, Fotini, '*Direct and Indirect Leadership: The Case of the US in Bosnia*', 1998,

<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UNTC/UNPAN019077.pdf> (accessed, 8 February 2010)

Berdal, Mats R., and Economides, Spyros, '*United Nations interventionism, 1991 – 2004*', UK: University Press, Cambridge, 2007

Boyd, Charles, '*Making Peace with the Guilty: The Truth About Bosnia*', Foreign Affairs, 1995.

<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/51400/charles-g-boyd/making-peace-with-the-guilty-the-truth-about-bosnia> (accessed 21 January 2010)

Campbell, David, '*National deconstruction: violence, identity, and justice in Bosnia*', University of Minnesota Press, 1998

Caron, David S. in Knoll Bernard's, '*Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory*' HTML – Offprint from: German Law Journal Vol. 8 No.1 – 1 January 2007

Carpenter, Tod Galen, '*The Domino Theory Reborn: Clinton's Bosnia Intervention and the "Wider War" Thesis*', Cato Foreign Policy Briefing, No. 42, 1996,

http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=1567&full=1 (accessed 5 February 2010)

- Chauvel, Patrick, *'A War Torn Region: Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Yugoslavia'*, 1995,
<http://www.earlham.edu/~pols/ps17971/terneel/rape.html> (accessed 5 February 2010)
- Chomsky, Noam, *'Imperial Presidency'*, Canadian Dimension, Vol. 39, No.1, 2005,
<http://www.chomsky.info/articles/20041217.htm> (accessed 8 February 2010)
- Chomsky, Noam, *'US-EU Relations'*, Spekter (Slovenia) – interview, 2008,
<http://www.chomsky.info/interview/20080210.htm> (accessed 8 February 2010)
- Chomsky, Noam, *'A Review of NATO's War over Kosovo'*, 2001, <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/200005--.htm> (accessed 11 February 2010)
- Cohen, Philip J., *'Ending the War and Securing Peace in Former Yugoslavia'*, School of Law, Pace International Law Review, Vol. 6:19, 1994, pp. 19-40.
- Cornell, Stephen, and Hartmann, Douglas, *'Ethnicity and race: Making Identities in a Changing World'*, London: Pine Forge Press, 2007
- Craig, Larry E. *'Bosnia II: The Clinton Administration Sets Course for NATO Intervention in Kosovo'*, 1998,
<http://rpc.senate.gov/releases/1998/kosovo.htm> (accessed 18 February 2010)
- Crankshaw, Edward, *'The Fall of the House of Habsburg'*, London: Hazell Watson & Viney Ltd, Aylesbury, Bucks, 1974
- Eagleburger, Lawrence S. *'Yugoslavia Then and Now'*, Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, East European Studies, 2007,
http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.item&news_id=218646 (accessed 16 November 2009)
- Eide, Asbjorn, *'Human Rights for Human Development'*, Norwegian Institute of Human Development, 1998,
http://www.minelres.lv/publicat/Eide_Yalta98.htm (accessed 8 February 2010)

Eide, Karl, '*The Situation in Kosovo: Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations*', 2004,

http://www.kosovo.net/news/archive/2004/August_17/1.html (accessed 04 October 2009), p.1-2

Faucault, Michael, '*Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*', trans. Alan Sheridan', New York: Vintage Books, 1979, 141-43, 170-94.

Gellner, Ernest, '*Nations and Nationalism*' Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983,

http://www.nationalismproject.org/books/g_h.htm#Anchor-Gellner-39029 (accessed 2 February 2010)

Gow, James, and Smith, James D. D. '*Peace-Making, Peace-Keeping, European Security and the Yugoslav War*', London Defence Studies No. 11, London: Brassey's, for the Centre for Defence Studies, 1992, p. 36.

Haskin, Jeanne M., '*Bosnia and beyond: the "the quiet" revolution that wouldn't go quietly*', Algora Publishing, 2006.

Hedges, Blair, '*Reluctant Leadership: America's Response to Bosnia, 1991-1995*', 1997,

<http://www.owl.net/~hist490/kashmir/>(accessed 7 February 2010)

Herman, Edward S., '*Serb Demonization as Propaganda Coup*', Global Research, 2009,

<http://www.southendpress.org/authors/39>,

Hillen, John, '*Blue Helmets: The Strategy of UN Military Operations*', Washington Brassey's, 1998, pp.

xxiv, 312, <http://www.jstor.org/pss/120709> (accessed 2 February 2010)

Hoh, Christopher, '*Yugoslavia Then and Now*', Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, East

European Studies, 2007, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.item&news_id=218646

(accessed 16 November 2009)

Johnson, Ross, '*Yugoslavia Then and Now*', Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, East

European Studies, 2007, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=news.item&news_id=218646

(accessed 16 November 2009)

- Jordi, Estivill, '*Concepts and Strategies for Combating Social Exclusion*', International Labour Organization, 2003, p.37, <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/socsec/step/download/96p1.pdf>
- Kellas, James, '*The politics of nationalism and ethnicity*', MacMillan Press Ltd, London, 1991
- Kinzer, Stephen, '*Ethnic Conflict Is Threatening in Yet Another Region of Yugoslavia: Kosovo*', N.Y. Times, 1992, at A8, <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/11/09/world/ethnic-conflict-is-threatening-in-yet-another-region-of-yugoslavia-kosovo.html?pagewanted=1> (accessed 21 January 2010)
- Knoll, Bernard, '*From Benchmarking to Final Status? Kosovo and The Problem of an International Administration's Open-Ended Mandate*', The European Journal of International Law, Vol.16 No.4, 2005, pp. 1-18
- Knoll, Bernard, '*Legitimacy and UN-Administration of Territory*', HTML – Offprint from: German Law Journal, Vol. 8 No.1, 2007, pp. 39-56.
- Lagerspetz, Olli, '*Diversity or Cacophony? New Sources of Norms in International Law Symposium; Article: National Self-Determination and ethnic Minorities*', University of Michigan Law School, Michigan Journal of International Law, 2004
- Libcom '*Conkers or Bonkers? Humanitarian War in Kosovo*', 2005, <http://libcom.org/library/kosovo-aufheben-8>
- Lynch, Colum, '*UN "Appeased" and Unwittingly Aided Genocide*', Washington Post, 1999
<http://globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/190/34333.html>
- Malcolm Noel, '*Bosnia: A short History*', New York: New York University Press, 1994
- Mazower, Mark, '*The Balkans: A Short History*', UK: Weidenfeld & Nicolson History, 2001
- Moore, Jonathan, '*Hard choices: moral dilemmas in humanitarian intervention*', (UK: Rowman & Littlefield, Oxford, 1998, pp 55-70.

Murphy, Alexander, '*Historical Justification for territorial Claims*', Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol.80, No.4, 1990, p.531

Narten, Jens, '*Need of Self-Reflection: Peacebuilding in Post-War Kosovo from Systems-Analytical Perspective*', The Whitehead Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations. Winter/Spring, 2007, pp. 121-132

National Intelligence Estimate on Yugoslavia, '*The Intelligence Community Case Method Program*', 2006, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_GIF_declass_support/yugoslavia/Pub36_Appendix_B.pdf

Ray, Larry, '*Memory, Trauma and Genocidal Nationalism*', Sociological Research Online, Vol.4, No.2,

Rex, John, '*The Basic Elements of a Systematic Theory of Ethnic Relations*' Sociological Research Online, vol.6, no.1, 2001, Pp 1-24, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/6/1/rex.html>

Rogel, Carol, '*Kosovo: Where It All Begin*', Springer Netherlands, 2004, pp. 167-182

Smith, Anthony, '*Nationalism*', UK: Polity Press, 2001

Sotiropoulou, Angeliki, '*The role of ethnicity in ethnic conflict: The case of Yugoslavia*', MA in Contemporary European Studies, Euromaster, University of Bath, http://74.125.155.132/scholar?q=cache:qGLeRSxKco0J:scholar.google.com/&hl=en&as_sdt=2000

Steinberg James, '*Foreign Policy Myopia*', *Washington Times*, 1996, p.A19

Sweeney, John, '*And We Are All Guilty...*' *The Observer*, 8 December, 1996. <http://www.barnsdle.demon.co.uk/bosnia/guilty.html>

Strauss, Julius, '*Massacre that started long haul to justice*', 2001, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/1312900/Massacre-that-started-long-haul-to-justice.html> (accessed 11 February 2010).

The Sofia Echo, '*Refusal to recognise Kosovo hampering EU enlargement – Ahtisaari*', 2009, http://sofiaecho.com/2009/09/08/780909_refusal-to-recognise-kosovo-hampering-eu-enlargement-ahtisaari

United Nations, 'Implementing '*Standards Before Status*' Policy Core Political Project for UN Kosovo Mission', 2004, Press Release SC7999, Security Council 4910th Meeting (AM), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc7999.doc.htm> (accessed 21 October 2009)

Wood, Brian, and Peleman, Johan, "*The Arms Fixers: Controlling the Brokers and Shipping Agents*", 1999, Chapter 6: Mysterious Ships www.nisat.org/publications/armsfixers/Chapter6.html (accessed 28 November 2009)

Woodward, Susan. '*Balkan tragedy chaos and dissolution after the Cold War*'. Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1995, p.161.

Zimmerman, Warren, '*Yugoslavia: 1989-1996*', 1997, <http://www.rand.org/publications/CF/CF129/CF-129.chapter11.html> (accessed 04 October 2009)

World Wide Web

Catalonia welcomes Kosovo's independence, February 17, 2008,

<http://waytoownstate.blogspot.com/2008/02/catalonia-welcomes-kosovos-independence.html>

Center for Army Lessons Learned, U .S. Army Combined Arms Center Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas and the Center for Military-Strategic Studies (CMSS), General Staff of the Armed Forces Moscow, November, 2000.p.54 <http://www.smallwars.quantico.usmc.mil/search/LessonsLearned/bosnia/IFOR.pdf>

Department of Public Information, United Nation. http://www.un.org/Depts/DPKO/Missions/unprof_b.htm

Former Yugoslavia – UNPROFOR (United Nations Protection Force), September 1996.

<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unprofor.htm> (accessed 22 January 2010)

Human Rights Library, ‘Summary of the Dayton Peace Agreement on Bosnia-Herzegovina’, University of Minnesota, 1995, <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/icty/dayton/daytonsum.html>

Kosovo Compromise, Chart 02. www.kosovocompromise.com

National Defence University, ‘III. Economic Sanctions Against Former Yugoslavia (1991-1996)’, 1997, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/Books/Books_1997/Imposing%20International%20Sanctions%20-%20March%2097/chapter3.html

National Intelligence Estimate on Yugoslavia, ‘The Intelligence Community Case Method Program. 2006, http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_GIF_declass_support/yugoslavia/Pub36_Appendix_B.pdf

Security Council Resolution on Bosnia 819 (1993) and Security Council Resolution on Kosovo 1244 (1999), <http://www.un.org/Docs/scres/1999/sc99.htm> (accessed 21 January, 2010)

United Nations, ‘Implementing ‘Standards Before Status’ Policy Core Political Project for UN Kosovo Mission’, 2004, Press Release SC7999, Security Council 4910th Meeting(AM), <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc7999.doc.htm> (accessed 21 October 2009)

United Nations Resolution 713 (1991), <http://www.nato.int/ifor/un/u910925a.htm>

United Nations Resolution 819 (1993), <http://www.nato.int/IFOR/un/u930416a.htm>