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Abstract

This dissertation explores the ‘socio-cultural dilemma’ facing international peacebuilders in war-torn societies through a case study of the post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This is done with the help of a typological approach of the grid-group Cultural Theory framework, which defines four social solidarities – or ideal type cultures – of individualism, egalitarianism, fatalism and hierarchy. A central argument in the thesis is that international intervention is culturally individualistic and/or egalitarian, thus socio-culturally unviable in war-torn societies, which are usually dominated by hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities.

This underlying socio-cultural conflict is used to trace the Bosnian post-war process, where the relationship between the managing international institution – the Office of the High Representative of the International Community – and the local nationalist elites repeatedly changed in response to the failure of international policies to produce the desired result, namely broad socio-cultural change in the local politics and society. Four different periods in the process are identified: 1) 'economic conditionality’, 2) ‘Bonn Powers’, 3) ‘the concept of ownership’ and 4) ‘Euro-Atlantic integration’. Each period is defined by different culturally biased policies, supported by corresponding social relations and strategic behaviours.

The individualistic and egalitarian biased approaches usually resulted in failures, as they were not viable in the local socio-cultural context. After adapting to the local context, new viable approaches produced results in specific policy areas, but at the cost of unwanted side-effects in the form of reinforcement of dominant social solidarities. The result was therefore contrary to the broad goal of the process, which was to transform the local political culture.

In other words, the defining and re-defining of the OHR’s role in the Bosnian process was a consequence of the dilemma of having to make an unsatisfactory choice: either to adapt to the way the political game is played in the Bosnian socio-cultural context in order to achieve effectiveness in the policy process, or to stay true to the peacebuilders’ own cultural biases and attempt to change the local socio-cultural accordingly. In essence, it is argued, this is the socio-cultural viability dilemma that is inherent in international peacebuilding.

In unveiling of the socio-cultural viability dilemma, the dissertation explores central problems in the Bosnian post-conflict process. It provides a credible explanation to a number of hitherto unexplained difficulties and paradoxes experienced in Bosnia. It concludes that the international intervention in this particular case was neither a success story nor a failure per se, but one which failed to properly address the dilemma of socio-cultural viability. The key conclusions regarding peacebuilding in general are that there should be a greater understanding of socio-cultural issues in peacebuilding in order to better manage the socio-cultural viability dilemma. Practically, this means that international peacebuilders need to adapt to local context and strive towards the goal of local ownership of the process. The aim should be to make the intervention as viable as possible, as quickly as possible, to boldly implement policies that promote changes in the local socio-cultural context, and to withdraw only after the necessary conditions for local ownership are in place.
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Chapter One: Introduction

The focus of this thesis is socio-cultural viability of international post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies. I explore this subject through a case study of the post-Dayton process in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the changing role of the managing international institution in that particular process, the Office of the High Representative of the International Community (OHR). I will in this thesis argue that socio-cultural viability of international presence in deeply divided societies is of central importance for explaining the dynamics in post-conflict transition processes. Moreover, I will use the concept of socio-cultural viability to capture a basic dilemma facing policy makers and peacebuilding practitioners; namely, to attempt to force through changes in the local socio-cultural setting (the local political culture) or to try to change their own approach (in order to become effective), i.e., dilemma of staying the course or being adaptive. Indeed, this dilemma is, in a sense, the crux of a vast number of problems experienced in contemporary practice of international involvement in war-torn societies. Thus, the starting point of this study is an argument for the inclusion of concepts of political culture and socio-cultural viability in the studies of post-conflict intervention, given that contemporary peacebuilding practices differ from traditional peacekeeping practices, mainly due to emergence of ‘new wars’ and the consequent ‘new interventionism’ paradigm in international politics.

The end of the Cold War changed the nature of major armed conflicts.¹ This was evident at the beginning of the 1990s by the increased number of internal and civil wars and by the accompanying decreased number of traditional state-to-state wars.² Furthermore, the primary causes of major conflicts shifted from ideological differences to ethnic and religious differences.³ This resulted in major humanitarian disasters as civilian populations increasingly became the primary targets in ethnic/identity wars and, for example, in Bosnia, Rwanda and Sudan, genocide and ethnic cleansing emerged as primary goals of at least one

¹ For more on patterns of major armed conflict, see Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) and the Uppsala Conflict Database (UCDP) available at www.sipri.org, last accessed on 2 July 2006. A number of other data collections exist on the same issue, notably The Correlates of War (COW), available at www.correlatesofwar.org, last accessed on 2 July 2006. For an overview, see Kristine Eck, "A Beginners Guide to Conflict Data: Finding and using the right dataset" in UCDP Papers (Uppsala: Uppsala University, December 2005).
of the warring parties. Other post-Cold War changes include differences in methods of financing warfare, characteristics of the main actors involved, types of military technologies used and the role of the media in conflicts. Given these and other changes observed in the 1990s, some new terms describing the modern inter-communal conflicts have been created – terms such as ‘fourth generation warfare’, ‘uncivil wars’, ‘asymmetric warfare’ and ‘wars of the third kind’. The most commonly employed term is ‘new wars’, used by scholars such as Mary Kaldor, Mark Duffield and Robert Kaplan. According to those authors, the new wars are quite different from the traditional, post-Westphalian state-to-state wars of the last 350 years. The modern post-Cold War conflicts are inter-communal civil wars that are indirectly caused by globalization and the end of the bi-polar global system, and more directly by the phenomenon of ‘state failure’. These conflicts are characterized by identity politics and the participation of non-state actors and warlords who target the civilian population and engage in illegal economic activities such as smuggling, drug-trade, looting and plundering. Examples of the new wars are the conflicts in Bosnia, Kosovo, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Somalia, although there are elements typical of such wars in most post-Cold War conflicts, including Afghanistan and, more recently, the developing conflict in Iraq.

Given the character of the new wars and the resulting humanitarian catastrophes, the response of the international community to internal conflicts

---

7 Used in Donald M. Snow, Uncivil Wars: International security and the new internal conflicts (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1996).
8 Used in Vincent J. Goulding, "Back to the Future with Asymmetric Warfare", in Parameters (2000).
changed as well. Commonly referred to as a paradigm shift to ‘new interventionism’ in international politics, this change consisted of a newfound willingness by the international community to intervene in civil wars, stop the fighting and assist in the post-conflict recovery of war-torn societies. As new wars emerged, the large international organizations and western states began to view international intervention in war-torn societies to be the primary solution leading to peace, democracy and stability. This paradigm shift occurred in several stages, the main being a broadening of the relevance of the United Nations (UN) Charter Chapter VII. This broadening meant that the narrow term ‘threats to international peace and security’ was expanded to include ‘internal armed conflicts, humanitarian crisis and disruption to democracy’. This altered the sovereignty principle adhered to since the Westphalian peace treaty of 1648. Furthermore, the end of the Cold War brought new hope for the possibilities of successful collective international action as the UN Security Council became operational after decades of obstruction by one or the other permanent member exercising its veto rights. Accordingly, there was a new faith and increased optimism within the UN that the Security Council finally would have the chance to fulfil its purpose, as propounded by the architects of the UN. Moreover, the new media technologies brought the far-away wars directly into the living rooms of people in western states (the so-called ‘CNN-effect’) and thus created an increased internal pressure on the western governments to interfere in conflicts for humanitarian reasons. Finally, there was an ideological change – a strengthening of ‘humanitarianism’ in relation to the principle of state sovereignty – as human rights’ violations and human security increasingly became recognized as legitimate reasons for overriding the basic, centuries-old non-intervention principles in international relations. All these factors combined and created a fertile ground for a new way of thinking about the role of the international community in conflict management. Its new role, based on the ideas of humanitarianism, was to take a proactive role rather than the traditional role of observer. Traditional peacekeeping was limited by the practice of non-intervention, based on the principle of the sovereignty of states and the inability of the UN Security Council to agree on a common policy regarding

---

collective security interventions. Indeed, as intervention became the preferred option of policymakers in the UN, Washington and Brussels, the number of international interventions increased in the 1990s. For example, the United States (US) attempted a humanitarian intervention in Somalia, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) used air-strikes in both Bosnia and Kosovo in order to stop the fighting. In addition, the events of 9/11 and the emergence of global terrorism pushed the envelope even further, as the United States changed its foreign policy and started arguing for even more international intervention – this time not only for humanitarian reasons but also to oppose states that sponsor terrorism and states that develop weapons of mass destruction. Regardless of the legal merits on which they are based and regardless of the moral and ethical debates they have caused, these interventions illustrate the ‘new interventionism’ – a newfound willingness and ability of the international community to intervene in conflicts and to justify the intervention based on the expanded meaning of the Charter VII of the UN Charter.

The new wars and the consequent new interventionism resulted in increased international military interventions, requiring increased depth and scope in the international post-conflict operations. Traditional military peacekeeping was faced with war-torn societies and failed states and, given its mandate, found itself incapable of tackling these challenges. Usually, peacekeeping forces were deployed only after there was a peace settlement and their role was to separate the warring parties and thus create the conditions for conflict resolution. Their activities were governed by principles of non-coercion, neutrality, permission of the host countries, limited military capability and clear and narrow mandates. However, in the post-Cold War conflicts, intervention happened before peace settlements were reached and consequently, the war-torn societies and failed states required different kinds of help from the outside, including military intervention, but also logistical help in distribution of humanitarian aid, as well as reconstruction aid, judicial and security assistance and, in some cases,
even assistance in state-building and/or nation-building. As the number of interventions multiplied and the type of intervention changed, the diversity and complexity of what was being done under the umbrella of international peacekeeping increased as well. International involvement in post-conflict societies now ranges from simple peacekeeping operations in which an international military force is positioned between the warring parties, to full-blown international protectorates in which the international officials effectively run the state apparatus in a failed state, i.e., ranging from Cyprus-like to Kosovo-like operations.

While different in scope and depth, contemporary international post-conflict intervention is an outgrowth of the tradition of peacekeeping. It is sometimes described as a further stage of peacekeeping, and sometimes termed ‘second-generation peacekeeping’ or ‘wider peacekeeping’. Though complex operations such as those in Kosovo, Bosnia, East Timor, Cambodia and Afghanistan are better described by the terms ‘post-conflict peacebuilding’, ‘post-conflict state-building’, ‘peace-support’ or ‘peace-maintenance’ operations, and sometimes, they are even referred to as ‘international administration’ or ‘international governance’ of war-torn societies.


28 As Tschirgi noted, the meaning of the term peacebuilding is not clear, despite more than a decade of practice in numerous post-conflict environments. There are no commonly defined and agreed peacebuilding policies and doctrines. Necla Tschirgi, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding Revisited: Achievements, limitations and challenges" in WSP International/IPA Peacebuilding Forum Conference (New York: International Peace Academy 2004). Thus, there is some confusion in terminology used to define the practice of peacebuilding. Caplan argues that complex peacebuilding operations where the representatives of the international community take on the traditional responsibilities of the state are better described by the term ‘international governance’. See Richard Caplan, International Governance of War-Torn Territories: Rule and reconstruction (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) pp. 1-5. Others include the state-building and nation-building agendas in the concept of peacebuilding. For example, see Alejandro Bendana, "From Peacebuilding to State building: One step forward and two steps back?", in Development 48, no. 3 (2005). Yet another definition is ‘peace-support’ missions preferred by the UN, meaning peace operations that include both a robust military force and a significant civilian component, see Alex J. Bellamy et al., Understanding Peacekeeping (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004) p. 165. Finally, there is a definition used, for example, by Chopra, ‘peace-maintenance’. Jarat Chopra, "Introducing Peace Maintenance", in Global Governance 4, no. 1 (1998). All these definitions are, in one way or the other, attempting to distinguish the complex post-conflict interventions from the traditional peacekeeping, as the former includes a significant civilian and/or political component.
Probably the most complex collective endeavours undertaken by the international community today are those in which the international community intervenes in war-torn societies and assumes some of the responsibilities of the state, while it also conducts a state-building project designed to restore the state authority, consequently creating conditions for a lasting peace. Despite extensive research, the effects of this type of highly complex intervention are not yet sufficiently well understood. This is because most studies focus on the legal, ethical and moral prescriptions that underlie the new interventionism paradigm in international relations or, alternatively, employ theoretical frameworks usually used to understand and study traditional peacekeeping. Such frameworks typically combine policy-relevant research with ‘lessons-learned’ type of conclusions: that is, scholars analyze successes and failures of specific peacebuilding policies and recommend specific improvements, typically focusing on increased resources, better planning and clearer mandates in connection to the policy areas they are studying. As argued by Bellamy, the research in the field has been guided by a ‘problem-solving approach’ and even though this starting point is useful and very important, it “provides partial explanations” and it “severely limits the scope of thinking about international intervention” as such. While lessons-learned reports and academic articles mount, the theoretical understanding of different aspects of complex post-conflict civilian international intervention is far from sufficient. There is a ‘knowledge gap’, caused by the narrowness of the usual theoretical approaches. Among other things, this lack of understanding results in regular underestimates of scope, size, depth and length of the post-conflict processes. The ambitious goal of a swift intervention and a speedy exit more often than not results in disappointments on the ground, as the international agencies become deeply involved in the politics of the intervention-receiving societies. While most are aware of the complexity of the problems in war-torn societies and failed states, especially in the light of recent experiences in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan, the understanding of how and why these problems are so difficult seems to be rather poor. Repeatedly, the international community has been surprised when the processes of democratization and peacebuilding failed to provide expected immediate results and more resources, time and credibility had to be invested in order to move the recovery process further.

29 Roland Paris defines this problem as an overemphasized focus on policy relevance, rather than the field being under-theorized, as other scholars have suggested. The problem is not lack of theories, but their limited scope and ambition. Roland Paris, "Broadening the Study of Peace Operations", in International Studies Review 2, no. 3 (2000).

30 Best examples are official reports such as the Brahimi Report, see Laktar Brahimi, "Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations" (New York: United Nations General Assembly 2000).

31 Alex J. Bellamy, "The 'Next Stage' in Peace Operations Theory?", in International Peacekeeping 11, no. 1 (2004).

In part, these problems originate from a commonly-held view that the role of the international community in post-conflict processes is essentially instrumental, and the representatives of the international community are merely providing ‘technical assistance’ in the transition from war to peace. What occurs within the process is conventionally understood through the ‘conflict cycle’ theories that define post-conflict peacebuilding as the last stage of a conflict cycle, one that follows an armed conflict and precedes a sustainable peace, or a relapse back into armed conflict. Consequently, the activities undertaken in post-conflict peacebuilding processes are connected to the theoretical understanding of what causes war in the first place and of how wars end. Peace processes are viewed as processes of implementation of different aspects of peace agreements, and peacebuilding is perceived as a process of elimination of the underlying causes of war. In other words, the post-conflict third-party intervention is understood primarily as an instrumental process where the international community can (and should) engage in the creation of practical solutions leading to sustainable peace. This is underscored by the words of former United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who defined international involvement in post-conflict peacebuilding as “actions to identify and support structures which will tend to support and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.”

The meaning of this phrase has been widely debated in the last ten years or so given that the scope, size and time span of contemporary peacebuilding operations have exceeded that envisioned by the Secretary-General in 1992. The overall goals of peacebuilding operations seem to be much broader than just to the objective of avoiding a relapse into conflict. In a number of cases, the international community has attempted to transform and modernize whole societies, introducing and demanding transition to market economy, democratization of the political process, high standards of human rights legislation, rule of law, and so on.


Apart from theoretical debate about the concept, the meaning of the term had been debated even within the UN system. Since the publishing of an agenda for peace, a number of UN reports have addressed the issue. See, for example, Ramesh Chandra Thakur and Albrecht Schnabel, *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Ad hoc missions, permanent engagement* (New York: United Nations University Press, 2001).
law, good administrative practices and so forth. At the same time, the actions undertaken by peacebuilders in the field go far beyond identifying and supporting structures designed to support and solidify peace. In a number of cases, the international community has interfered deeply in the political, economic, administrative and judicial systems of societies in a quite direct manner, through the exercise of executive and even legislative political power, sometimes even by completely taking over the responsibilities traditionally reserved for the state government. Such involvement is much more complex than mere providing of assistance to local actors. The international peacebuilders create and implement policies, unwanted by some or all local groups and local political actors. They do politics, so to speak. However, the traditional literature on post-conflict intervention, through its narrow definitions of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and the focus on policy evaluation and the technicalities of policy implementation problems, regularly misses this dimension. The broadening of the definition of peacebuilding and the inclusion of the political aspects of peacebuilding leads to a proposition that the international post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies is first and foremost an externally promoted transition process, including goals of broad political change, as well as an even broader, externally-promoted social change.

This way of defining post-conflict peacebuilding involvement, through concepts of political and societal change rather than technical assistance to local structures, is not a novelty. In 1975, Galtung defined post-conflict peacebuilding as “implementing peaceful social change … through socio-economic reconstruction and development” (emphasis added). Many other scholars have since then made the connection between peace and socio-economic development. Pugh has linked peacebuilding with reduction of poverty, whereas Lederach has argued that peacebuilding is a wide and all-encompassing societal process. Paris described peacebuilding processes as political projects guided by a ‘liberal market democracy’ paradigm, rather than processes where the international community impartially provides technical assistance to local actors. All of these peacebuilding theoreticians argue in one way or another that the international involvement in post-conflict peacebuilding is a political, rather than an

39 For an overview, see Monica Llamazares, "Post-war Peacebuilding Reviewed" in Working paper 14 (University of Bradford Department of Peace Studies, February 2005).
instrumental process, with a goal of transforming the society, rather than merely assisting the local actors in their search for solutions to post-war security problems. This thesis rests on a conceptualization of the civilian international intervention in post-conflict societies as a political process of socio-cultural change, introduced and promoted by a third party, i.e., the representatives of the international community who intervene in a war-torn society through politics, governance and policies.

Clearly, this is an aspect of post-conflict international intervention in war-torn societies that deserves greater academic attention. The interactions between the representatives of the international community and the local authorities are central for the understanding of the dynamics in the politics of a post-conflict recovery process.43 As those processes are processes where a third-party, i.e., the representatives of the international community, attempt to promote a transformation of the social and political practices, i.e., the political culture of a society44, there is a need for a socio-cultural analysis45 of the effect of the presence of the international community’s representatives and their policies on the host country, its politics and political culture.

Research Problem

As argued above, the international activities in war-torn societies and the problems international peacebuilders encounter in these operations are not sufficiently well understood nor well explained by the usual problem-solving and normative theoretical approaches used to study peacekeeping, peacebuilding and international intervention. While legitimacy of intervention certainly has bearing on the success of the post-conflict process, as well as available resources, planning and mandates, the missing aspect in the understanding of the role of international intervention in post-conflict recovery of war-torn societies is the aspect of culture, as in political culture (meaning shared values and beliefs

43 For more on the need to include the relations between representatives of the international community and the local authorities, see Necla Tschirgi, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding Revisited: Achievements, limitations and challenges" in WSP International/IPA Peacebuilding Forum Conference (New York: International Peace Academy 2004).
rather than national culture, i.e., ‘thick culture’ rather than ‘thin culture’). While the concept of culture has been included in the studies of international intervention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, it has almost exclusively been in ethnographies with the focus on national cultures, rather than on cultures understood as shared values and beliefs. A number of studies have pointed to the fact that cultural conflicts exist in peacekeeping operations, causing at times grave misunderstandings, difficulties and failures. Such studies generally conclude that there is a need for cultural sensitivity training of the personnel representing the international community. In his theory of peacebuilding, Lederach included a cultural aspect inasmuch as he argued that local cultural practices constitute an underlying resource in peacebuilding, and argued that those resources can (and should) be utilized in the process. Research is far more limited in the area of understanding intervention in terms of ‘thin’ culture, focusing on the cultural differences in shared values and beliefs of those intervening in a society and the political culture of the host country. Various studies have investigated the cultural conflicts between different organizations and agencies involved in international intervention, but the focus has been primarily on cultural conflicts between the civilian and the military components of international presence in intervention-receiving societies, usually leaving the

46 Culture is indeed an elusive concept. For example, Kroeber and Kluckhohn identified a total of 164 meanings of the term. Alfred L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions (New York: Vintage Books, 1963). In this thesis, ‘culture’ is understood as ‘thick culture’, i.e., shared values and beliefs, rather than ‘thin’ culture, as in being of French or Swedish culture. For more, for example, see William Mishler and Pollack Detlef, “On Culture Thick and Thin: Toward a neo-cultural synthesis” in Political Culture in Post-Communist Europe: Attitudes in new democracies, ed. Detlef Pollack (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003). Furthermore, as it is used here the term ‘culture’ can be understood as an institution, meaning ‘political culture’ as in Eckstein’s definition: “Culture is the distinctive, variable set of ways in which societies normatively regulate social behaviour.” See Harry Eckstein, Regarding Politics: Essays on political theory, stability, and change (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992) p. 284. Finally, the term ‘culture’ as used in this thesis is best described as “…the common way that a community of persons makes sense of the world”, as in Jonathan L. Gross and Steve Rayner, Measuring Culture: A paradigm for the analysis of social organization (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985) p. 1.


local political culture outside the analysis. Paris’ theory of peacebuilding as a project of liberal internationalism, in which international peacebuilders impose their values upon the local society, is a notable exception that includes the conflict between the local political culture and the biased prescriptions of international peacebuilding. Other scholars have focused on specific culturally-biased beliefs commonly on the agenda of the international community’s representatives, such as beliefs that democratization, economic interdependence, free elections or civil-society input can build a lasting peace. These types of studies, although indirectly dealing with shared values and beliefs (i.e., the cultural bias of peacebuilders and their compatibility with the cultural setting of the local society), typically mention the local socio-cultural context in the analysis, but rarely focus explicitly on it. In summary, culture has rarely been included in studies of the phenomenon of international intervention in war-torn societies. When it is included, it has been understood as ‘thick’ culture, focusing on cultural practices of specific nations or ethnic groups – inevitably resulting in recommendations for more cultural sensitivity training of peacebuilders. In those few studies where culture has been understood as a system of shared values and beliefs, culture has been used merely as a complement to the traditional explanations, as a residual variable explaining what otherwise could not be explained. Political culture has rarely, if ever, been studied directly and explicitly as the main explanatory variable that accounts for successes and/or failures of international peacebuilding practices.

This thesis aims to include political culture in the analysis and focus on the socio-cultural viability of international intervention in war-torn societies. This is needed for three reasons. First, peacebuilding can be interpreted as a process of social transformation, meaning that it is a process of political, social and cultural change. Therefore, the particular socio-cultural context, i.e., the social, political and cultural practices of the war-torn society that are supposed to be transformed, should be included in the analysis. More often than not, these aspects are completely overlooked, as conflict resolution practices are generally regarded to be universal technical tools; hence, they are applicable to societies regardless of their particular culture. Second, the intervention itself is based on
principles such as humanitarianism, democracy and liberalism that emerge from specific western socio-cultural contexts. Therefore, the intervention is itself ‘culturally biased’. Through a socio-cultural viability analysis, the intervention’s biases can be highlighted as well as its compatibility with the social, political and cultural practices of a war-torn society. Third, the complexity of relations, interactions and politics of post-conflict processes, in which third-party peace-builders attempt to influence the local society and promote social change, cannot be sufficiently understood without considering the aspect of socio-cultural viability of an external input in a local political context. Given that intervention is third-party driven (the authority of intervention is not endogenous), the success and/or failure of intervention, understood broadly in terms of its ability to achieve the goal of social transformation, depends largely on the following aspects: the viability of the approach of the international community’s representatives, the viability of the methods used to influence the local politics and local society and the viability of relations created between local authorities and international peace-builders. In other words, although regularly excluded from the analysis, the concept of socio-cultural viability is, nevertheless, essential for an understanding of the role of international peace-builders, as well as for an explanation of the successes and failures of third-party introduced policies and the effect they have on local politics, local political culture and local society in general.

Accordingly, the focus needs to be shifted to the concept of ‘culture’, meaning ‘political culture’, including a particular focus on cultural change, cultural bias and cultural compatibility, in other words, socio-cultural viability. While there are many theoretical approaches that can be used for understanding and explaining social and political change stemming from the interactions between different political and social actors, or from policy and governance problems – there is one approach that gives promise to doing all of the above within one single theoretical framework and, in addition, is capable of including the concepts of political culture and socio-cultural viability. That approach is the neo-Durkheimian ‘theory of socio-cultural viability’ or ‘GG-CT’. There are three major components of the Cultural Theory framework that equip it to be a potent theoretical and methodological tool for use in mapping of values and beliefs.

---


and for understanding of politics, governance and policy, and ultimately, even for understanding the functioning of a society and socio-cultural change. The first component of this theoretical approach connects the social relations, strategic behaviours and shared values and beliefs (or ‘cultural biases’), through the ‘grid-group’ model of ‘social solidarities’, i.e., viable sets of corresponding relations, behaviours and biases that can also be understood as the four universal cultures: individualism, egalitarianism, fatalism and hierarchy. The second component of the theoretical framework includes a ‘social map’ model that explains how social systems (societies) function and change, based on the idea of a permanent socio-cultural conflict and socio-cultural equilibrium. Finally, the third component includes a number of prescriptions regarding politics, governance and policy, and defines good policy and good governance as policy and governance that are socio-culturally viable.

Cultural Theory is a complex theoretical framework and at this point, it will not be explored further. This will be taken up later in the chapters more directly concerned with Cultural Theory and its development (Chapters Two and Three). At this time only a brief description of the rationale for choosing this theory will be given:

First, post-conflict peacebuilding processes are processes of externally-promoted social and political change. Cultural Theory is a theory developed in part to explain socio-cultural change, and as a reaction to other cultural theories that usually presume stability and consequently are unable to account for change.57

Second, as there are conflicting views about what post-conflict peacebuilding and international intervention in war-torn society actually is, and should be, as well as what the role of international actors is, and should be, the Cultural Theory’s grid-group typology of cultural biases can be used for mapping and understanding of those differences.58

Third, the role of international institutions in post-conflict processes is to influence the politics and society of the intervention-receiving state and to promote social and political change. Yet, the local socio-cultural context is often absent in the analysis of post-conflict intervention. Cultural Theory not

---

58 As noted by the founding fathers of the Cultural Theory, Michael Thompson and Aaron Wildavsky, one of the main uses of the framework is to map the conflicting theoretical propositions. “When theorists disagree, we need a theory that will explain the divergence of the theories they are relying on, and Wildavsky shows, Cultural Theory meets that end” noted Michael Thompson, commenting on Aaron Wildavsky, "Democracy As A Coalition Of Cultures", in Society 31, no. 1 (1993), in Nadia Molenaars and Michael Thompson, "The Cultural Conditions for Democracy and Their Implications for Transitional Societies" in Cultural Theory As Political Science, ed. Michael Thompson, et al. (London: Routledge, 1999) p. 187.
only includes socio-cultural contexts, it explicitly focuses on the connection between socio-cultural context and the success of policies and governance.59

Fourth, as intervention is exogenous (the policies and governance do not come from within the society) the social-map equilibrium model of the Cultural Theory framework might be used to explain the effects of intervention on the society and its socio-cultural balance.60

Fifth, Cultural Theory can do all of the above in one over-all theoretical explanation. In any other theoretical approach, the researcher is forced to focus on particularities of a single or, at most, a few aspects of the process. Cultural Theory offers a holistic tool that promises the ability to include socio-cultural context, capture conflicts and explain change – all within the same framework.

Sixth, this approach has the possibility of providing a rather different and unusual tool for evaluating the effects of intervention. Potentially, it could map and explain political and cultural conflicts that result from third party presence in the political system. As a result, the effect of interventions aimed at the broader goals of socio-cultural transformation can be evaluated. As previously noted, evaluation is otherwise connected to specific policies and measured through impact of these policies, and in so doing regularly excludes some of the broader effects that the international presence has on the local society and local politics.61

Finally, analysis based on the Cultural Theory framework can get at the very essence of complex peacebuilding interventions in deeply divided societies, as it can capture a basic dilemma facing international peacebuilders – the dilemma of socio-cultural viability.

This dilemma was stated in the form of a direct question by cultural theorist Robert Klitgaard who challenged his colleagues with the question of empirical and normative problems of socio-cultural viability, especially in regard to development projects in the Third World. He asked, “How should we take

60 The idea of socio-cultural equilibrium is based on the so-called ‘requisite variety condition’ embedded in the logic of Cultural Theory, which stipulates that all four cultures exist in all societies at all times in constant conflict. The unachievable goal is constant and stable equilibrium, where all cultures are equal in strength. For more, see Chapter Two, or see Michael Thompson et al., Cultural Theory (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) p. 86, 98.
cultural diversity into account when designing development policies? Should we accept the local culture as is, or attempt to change it? When and how can we intentionally preserve or change aspects of an existing cultural mixture? Such questions were asked by the founders of the theory as well. Aaron Wildavsky stated earlier, in the pivotal work Cultural Theory, that one of the most interesting research areas for cultural theorists is Africa where Cultural Theory could be used to analyze social contexts and develop socio-culturally viable policies. Underlying these questions is a concern with interactions between culturally-biased policies promoted by the international community and the socio-cultural settings of societies that are the target of international policies, concerns of central importance to an understanding of complex peacebuilding. As argued above, peacebuilding is a process of socio-cultural change, promoted by the international community through its many representatives, different agencies and organizations. This thesis aims to focus on the socio-cultural viability dilemma, the process of socio-cultural change in war-torn societies and the role of the representatives of the international community in those processes.

In addition, although not a primary goal, this academic study has the ambition of contributing to the Cultural Theory framework itself. To be more precise, particular problems occurring in processes where socio-cultural change is intentionally promoted from the outside through international intervention raises questions about the ability of Cultural Theory to capture and explain socio-cultural change. It is the aim of this research to illuminate (to the degree the dilemma of socio-cultural viability of international peacebuilding can) some parts of the logic behind the theoretical understanding of the process of socio-cultural change.

Statement of Purpose

So far, this thesis has described how new wars provoked new interventionism, and how new interventionism provoked a transformation of peacekeeping into multifunctional peacekeeping that includes peacebuilding and even elements of international administration and international governance of war-torn societies. In addition, the knowledge gap in studies of international post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies has been described. As argued by prominent scholars,

65 The concept of socio-cultural viability dilemma is discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.
there is a need for a broadening of the studies of peacebuilding. Accordingly, there is value in bringing ‘culture’ into studies of third-party driven post-conflict processes and this thesis aspires to make its contribution to this aim. As outlined above, what is needed in order to understand and evaluate this new type of intervention, whose goal is the promotion and achievement of a broader, socio-cultural transformation, is an understanding of the socio-cultural viability of post-conflict intervention in the particular socio-cultural context of war-torn societies, failed states and deeply divided societies. It is for this task the grid-group Cultural Theory framework has been chosen.

The purpose of this thesis is to unveil the socio-cultural viability dilemma facing international civilian intervention in war-torn societies. This is accomplished through the theoretical lens of the Cultural Theory framework, which is first applied to the theory and practice of international intervention in war-torn societies and then, the explanatory value of this approach is tested in the case study of post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.66

In order to analyze the socio-cultural viability dilemma in the context of civilian post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies, the focus will be on the following three research questions:

1. Is there a ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ in the studied case, the post-conflict intervention in Bosnia? Can Cultural Theory and its grid-group model be used to assess the impact of international presence in this process?

2. Can an understanding of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ enhance the understanding of international post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies? What it the essence of modern international peacebuilding?

3. Can a study of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ of international intervention in post-war societies contribute to the Cultural Theory framework itself? Can socio-cultural change be imposed?

Restated and oversimplified, the motivation behind this thesis is to connect the practice of international intervention in war-torn societies, the Cultural Theory framework and the case of post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina. The ambition of the study is to contribute to the understanding of complex peacebuilding operations, to the logic of the Cultural Theory framework and to the explanation of some of the political problems in the chosen case study, that of the post-Dayton process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Discussion regarding the choice of the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina will be outlined in Chapter Four.
Dissertation Outline

This thesis consists of eleven chapters divided into two larger parts. The first part is concerned with the theory and method, and the second part consists of a case study of the post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition, there is a freestanding analysis chapter connecting the two – the theory and the empirical material – and discussing the study’s findings.

Apart from this introductory chapter, the first part of the thesis consists of three more chapters dealing with the theory and method. The second chapter includes a description of the theoretical approach, the Cultural Theory framework. Chapter Three focuses on the development of the theory towards a framework for the study of international intervention in war-torn societies. In that discussion, Cultural Theory and its models are combined with the existing knowledge about war-torn societies in order to gain understanding of the socio-cultural contexts in which intervention occurs. The Cultural Theory framework, its models and its previous applications are also combined with the existing knowledge about post-conflict peacebuilding intervention. This is in order to gain an understanding of the possible types of intervention, i.e., a theoretical understanding of the cultural biased notions that guide the representatives of the international community working in war-torn societies. The fourth chapter is concerned with the methodological concerns and it serves as a preparation for the case study. It is also the place where different Cultural Theory models are operationalized into a framework for empirical research, based on the theoretical prescriptions and the chosen methodological approach.

The second part of this thesis consists of a case study of a complex post-conflict process, which is used to test the explanatory value of the theory. The chosen case is that of post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina and the international involvement in that particular process, as represented by the main managing institution, the Office of the High Representative of the International Community to Bosnia and Herzegovina (OHR). The case study is divided in two sections, an introductory chapter concerned with the Bosnian political culture and the socio-cultural context at the end of the war, followed by a chronological analysis of the process, further divided in four chapters, tracking the four High Representatives of the International Community (HR). Each of those four chapters is, in turn, divided into a description of the main events in Bosnian politics in the period under study, followed by a theoretically-driven analysis in which those events and their meanings are interpreted with the help of the theoretical framework. Following is a tenth chapter consisting of the concluding empirical analysis and a discussion regarding the current situation and prospects for the future of the process in Bosnia.

The last chapter of this thesis, Chapter Eleven, is a freestanding analytical chapter. There, the findings of the case study are interpreted so as to revisit the theoretical approach and evaluate its explanatory value, to evaluate the successes and failures of the civilian international intervention in the process in
Bosnia, and to discuss the usefulness of the concept of socio-cultural viability dilemma in the studies of international post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies in general. In other words, this chapter consists of an attempt to answer the research questions and thus fulfil the purpose of the study.
Chapter Two: Theory

The study of political culture represents one of the major investigative fields in contemporary political science. However, the path towards academic recognition has not been easy. Historically, the concept of political culture has gone through a number of periods of progress and decline. Its antecedents can be traced to the philosophers of ancient Greece who viewed culture as being central to an understanding of societal functioning. Such philosophers included Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Polybius and Plutarch who all studied differences between cities and nations and their elites and leaders. Unfortunately, the knowledge they gained was largely lost due to the hegemonic dominance of Christianity, a religion that divided people into ‘saved’ and ‘damned’ categories, rather than according to their cultural differences. Centuries later, during the Renaissance and Enlightenment, the concept of political culture re-emerged on the European continent in the writings of thinkers such as Machiavelli. Later, it is found in the writings of Montesquieu, Rousseau, Tocqueville and Durkheim. Their groundbreaking work connected human actions to the physical and/or social context. However, this progress in the study of political culture was interrupted by a number of developments, notably by the emergence of the Nazi and Marxist ideologies, the historicism approach and the German psycho-cultural approach. These developments suppressed the value of culture as an explanatory device by focusing on particular variables such as race, class, the subconscious process and the spread of a universal secular-rational culture in order to explain developments in politics and society, rather than on cultural particularities of different societies. The study of political culture re-emerged once again in the behaviourism school of the 1950s and the 1960s, primarily through the American voter studies conducted at the University of Michigan and the cross-cultural value survey studies of Almond and Verba and later of Roland Inglehart. These scholars focused on empirical studies of values and beliefs:

1 As noted by Gabriel Almond, one of the pioneers of the cultural approach in political science, in Garbrieal A. Almond, "Foreword" in Culture Matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky, ed. Richard J. Ellis and Michael Thompson (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1997) p. xi.
2 Ibid. p. vii.
3 Ibid. p. viii.
4 The national-socialism focused on race, Marxism on class, historicism on the universal spread of one secular-rational culture and the psycho-cultural approach focused on early socialization, family structure and subconscious process as the explanatory variable, explaining everything from the shared values and beliefs, to the differences concerning the political institutions and political systems. Ibid. p. viii-ix.
5 Ibid. p. ix.
Almond and Verba identifying the link between civic culture and democracy, and Roland Inglehart identifying the link between modernization, post-modernity and values and beliefs. In the following decades, those approaches were attacked, both conceptually and methodologically, both by the Rational Choice scholars and by the Marxist scholars. Political culture studies based on values and beliefs were accused of being tautological, unable to explain change, of ignoring institutions and power relations, and, ultimately, they were deemed to be 'unscientific'. In addition to value surveys, there were attempts to theorize about political cultures based on their origins and effects, rather than observed individual values and beliefs. Elazar’s research on the typology of American political cultures is an example of such a research project. He found that there was a ‘moralist’, an ‘individualistic’ and a ‘traditionalistic’ political culture in different regions of the United States. This approach was heavily criticized for having unclear concepts and lacking empirical support. Nevertheless, the studies of political culture continued and became more refined, while the debate about the explanatory value of cultural approaches continued and increased. At the start of the 1990s, numerous books and articles that focused on the merits of cultural explanations were being published. Some criticisms were harsh and probably invalid, for example, Laitin’s judgement that political culture is a “degenerative research program” that is “unproductive, unclear and tautological”. Other criticisms were more defensible as culture remained difficult to define, measure, study and understand. The most damaging criticism can be cast as the ‘chicken and egg’ cause-and-effect conundrum: “Does democracy cause a certain political culture, or do certain cultures produce democracy?” Neither the methodologically individualistic value surveys nor the typological approaches of Elazar and others could answer this question. Not even Putnam’s

---

10 Almond wrote that there were "perhaps some 35 or 40 book-length treatments of political culture of an empirical and theoretical sort, perhaps 100 article-length treatments in journals and symposia, and more than 1,000 citations in the literature", as cited in Ronald P. Formisano, "The Concept of Political Culture", in Journal of Interdisciplinary History 31, no. 3 (2001).
12 See, for example, a review of criticisms compiled by Chilton in Stephen Chilton, "Defining Political Culture", in Western Political Quarterly 41, no. 3 (1988).
approach to the study of the Italian democracy,\textsuperscript{14} although revolutionizing the studies of political culture, satisfied the critics.\textsuperscript{15} As noted by Wiarda, the concept of political culture still lacked a “global and integrating theoretical framework.”\textsuperscript{16}

In the 1990s, in response to the criticism of cultural explanations, a new approach to the studies of political cultures based on social anthropology emerged, namely, the Cultural Theory\textsuperscript{17} framework of Michael Thompson, Aaron Wildavsky and Richard Ellis. This theory came with a promise of being a more ‘scientific’ approach to studies of political cultures, inasmuch as it was typological, not focused on nations but rather on different types of political cultures existing within nations. Their framework was universal, in other words, not limited to individuals, institutions or nations. Furthermore, it was broad and ambitious, treating culture as more than ‘a residual variable’,\textsuperscript{18} not just using it as an explanation when other approaches fail. Thus, at the beginning of the 1990s, Cultural Theory emerged as the competing ‘general theory’ to the then-dominant school of thought, namely, the Rational Choice approach.\textsuperscript{19} As a theory of political culture and politics in general, Cultural Theory and its models held more promise than the competing cultural approaches of the past. It is a simple and ambitious theoretical framework about individual choice, social organization, politics, policies and governance; and ultimately, it is a theory about the functioning of social systems. Consequently, it has gained popularity in political science and is now ranked as one of the main approaches for inclusion of culture in political studies, ranking alongside of value-survey study approaches such as Inglehart’s World Value Survey studies and the civic culture approaches such as the ‘social capital’ studies of Robert Putnam.

\textsuperscript{14} In one of the most famous research projects on political culture, Putnam studied differences in institutional performance in Italian regions and connected those differences with the different history and the political culture (civic traditions) of those regions. See Robert D. Putnam et al., \textit{Making Democracy Work: Civic traditions in modern Italy} (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992).

\textsuperscript{15} An entire special volume of \textit{Politics and Society} was used to present a critique of Putnam’s work in 1996. For more, see Margaret Levi, "Introduction" \textit{Politics & Society} 24, no. 1 (1996).


\textsuperscript{17} There is some confusion if Cultural Theory is a theory, or a model or a framework. This issue is debated at length by Olson. In this dissertation, the term Cultural Theory is capitalized, in order to differentiate it from the terms ‘cultural’ and ‘theory’. For more on the status of Cultural Theory, see Vincent Ostrom and Elinor Ostrom, "Cultures: Frameworks, Theories and Models" in \textit{Culture Matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky}, ed. Richard J. Ellis and Michael Thompson (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1997) pp. 79-90.

\textsuperscript{18} Ruth Lane, "Political Culture: Residual Category or General Theory?", in \textit{Comparative Political Studies} 25, no. 2 (1992).

Grid-Group Cultural Theory Framework

The Cultural Theory framework rests on the ‘grid-group’ model whose roots are found in Emile Durkheim’s work on sociology of religion that outlined the way society shapes individuals’ thinking. According to Durkheim, people form their ideas about God based on the cohesiveness of the society. Individual action is based on values and beliefs, which are in turn defined by the institutional form of organization. Furthermore, these forms of organization can be defined, measured and used for understanding and explaining different values and beliefs, possibly even for predicting behaviour. In addition, Durkheim defined two dimensions of social organization: 1) ‘social regulation’, the extent to which social life is governed by role, rule and social facts and 2) ‘social integration’, the extent to which individuals are held accountable to larger collectives. These ideas created the epistemological and ontological foundations for the understanding of a ‘social solidarity’, the institutionalized form of social organization.

However, Durkheim never went far beyond defining the original concepts. It remained for British anthropologist Mary Douglas to make practical use of these concepts in analytical work, through her ‘group-grid model’. In her most famous work, *Natural Symbols*, Douglas cross-tabulated Durkheim’s two dimensions of social organization and created a two-by-two matrix of cultures or, to use Douglas’ term, ‘ways of life’. The end result was the ‘group-grid model’, with the grid dimension referring to the acceptance of legitimacy of external prescriptions and the group dimension referring to the extent individuals are bound in groups. Although often cited as the birthplace of the Cultural Theory, this presentation was only an embryo of work to come, since the model was not an explanatory theory at the time. Douglas herself later stated that *Natural Symbols*.

---

24 The “legitimacy of external prescriptions” refers to the varying ease with which persons accept that other persons’ judgments are valid for, and binding on, them. For a career-enlisted person in a military service, for instance, this legitimacy is apt to be high because he or she will have chosen a life that routinely involves accepting the instructions of officers with few questions. See Charles Lockhart, “Cultural Contributions to Explaining Institutional Form, Political Change and Rational Decisions”, in *Comparative Political Studies* 32 (1999).
Symbols was somewhat “confused and difficult”. The true birth of the model did not emerge until her later work Cultural Bias. In that work, she challenged fellow anthropologists to theorize about cultural diversity and compare cultures with the help of a new framework based on the group and grid dimensions along which each culture could be positioned. From this, the four-field typology of social relations was born and the resulting four ways of life or cultures: 1) the ‘individualist’ (low group / low grid), 2) the ‘fatalist’ (low group / high grid), 3) the ‘egalitarian’ (high group / low grid) and 4) the ‘hierarchist’ (high group / high grid).

The model was initially used as a tool to map differences in the way individuals make choices in their everyday lives, and was perceived as the “taxonomy of social context and their supporting cosmologies.” Cultural theorists have used the typology to explain how and why individuals can have quite differing views on everything from basic human nature and environmental concerns to views about risk, technology, consumption and more. The four ways of life (or cultures), i.e., the four different cosmologies and their typical social relations, were defined through four ideal types, archetypes of each of the four ways of life:

1) The individualistic type. This way of life is characterized by low group membership and few external constraints. Individuals are bound by neither group incorporation nor clearly prescribed roles. The ideal type is a self-made manufacturer. The individualists consider themselves to be the masters of their own destinies and they are pragmatic materialists.

2) The egalitarian type. This way of life, sometimes referred to as the sectarian type, is characterized by high group membership and few external constraints. Individuals are bound by incorporation in groups yet their behaviour is not constrained by prescribed roles. An example is a member in a western-style commune. The individual members has strong bounds to their group (the commune), yet their lives are not controlled by external prescriptions. Possibilities for influence over their own lives are perceived as existent, inasmuch as egalitarians participate in collective decision-making.

29 See Figure 1.
31 For an excellent overview of cultural biases in regard to a variety of different concepts, see John Dixon et al., Responses to Governance: Governing corporations, societies and the world (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003).
33 Ibid. pp. 9-10.
3) The *hierarchical* type. This way of life is characterized by high group membership and many external constraints. An example is a high caste Hindu who has strong bounds to his/her group (family, caste) while his/her life is strongly regulated by the social context (strong traditions).\(^{34}\)

4) The *fatalistic* type. This way of life is characterized by low group membership and many external constraints. An example is an un-unionized weaver. He/she is not strongly bound to groups, while external prescriptions guide his/her everyday life. The possibility for any kind of influence is perceived as poor.\(^{35}\)

The above essentially synthesizes the characteristics of the basic grid-group typology of ways of life.\(^{36}\) At that time, it was a simple classification scheme designed to compare systematically the modes of social organization and the corresponding shared values and beliefs. As in the case of most other cultural approaches, the critics accused the model of being deterministic, incapable of explaining change and lacking empirical support.\(^{37}\) However, later developments transformed the model into a powerful tool for the understanding and explanation of complex social phenomena, including social and political change. Among other things, these new theoretical developments discarded the term ‘ways of life’, re-instated the term ‘social solidarities’\(^{38}\) and argued for the separation of social solidarities into three separate, but very much inter-connected, concepts: namely, 1) ‘cultural bias’, 2) ‘social relations’ and 3) ‘strategic behaviours’.\(^{39}\) This facilitated analysis of the way values and beliefs affect behaviours, which in turn affect the way people organize social relations, and vice-versa. Or, in other words, everything affects everything. Furthermore,


\(^{35}\) Ibid. pp. 8-9.

\(^{36}\) It should be noted that there is a fifth way of life as well. There is also the full autonomy of the hermit who voluntarily excludes himself from any social interactions. However, this category is used only theoretically and as is many other studies, the hermit will be completely disregarded in this analysis. For more about the fifth way of life, see ibid. p.10. See also Michael Thompson and Richard J. Ellis, "Introduction" in *Culture Matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky*, ed. Richard J. Ellis and Michael Thompson (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1997) pp. 5-7.


\(^{38}\) Social solidarity is a better term as the theory goes beyond explanation that is based primarily on the way individuals engage in social relations. The way people live their lives is replaced with the way people engage in dialogue and justify their actions. It must also be noted that there are few more terms used in the Cultural Theory community. Cosmologies, rationalities, cultures, solidarities, ways of life, biases and modes of organization are all used, depending on the way theory is understood and empirically applied.

this approach provided for a conceptualization of change in biases, behaviours or relations, as being a result of change in one or two of the other categories.⁴⁰

---

**Figure 1 – Three Aspects of Institutionalized Social Organization**

This division of social solidarities into three levels of analysis, as depicted in Figure 1, is the very basis of the explanatory value of the Cultural Theory. Together with the typology, the theory constructs a framework that enables scholars to map the values and beliefs of actors and/or institutions, the relations they create and the strategies they use in connection to anything that is human and social. Cultural biases can be understood as four distinct ways that define the way people think and speak about nature, human nature, society, societal issues, societal problems, needs and resources, risks, blame, envy, economic growth, apathy, information, learning and so forth. The basic features of each of the four cultural biases, which define the different social solidarities, are summarized as follows:

1) The *individualists’* dominant motivation is to win the highest level of material success and to be recognized and acclaimed by other materially successful people.⁴¹ Individualists see nature as forgiving, able to absorb whatever we throw at it.⁴² Hence, managing institutions can act in a *laissez-faire* manner.⁴³ As human beings are viewed in all circumstances as self-seeking; incentives can be used to channel their efforts.⁴⁴ When things go
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⁴⁰ Karl Dake and Michael Thompson, "Making Ends Meet, in the Household and on the Planet", in *GeoJournal* 47, no. 3 (1999).
⁴¹ Primary motivation for each of the social solidarities was outlined by Dixon, in John Dixon et al., *Responses to Governance: Governing corporations, societies and the world* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003) p. 66.
⁴³ Behaviour of the managing institution, for each of the social solidarities, was outlined in ibid. pp. 27-32.
⁴⁴ View of human nature, for each social solidarity, has been outlined in ibid. pp. 33-37.
wrong, individualists blame personal incompetence.\textsuperscript{45} Economic growth is regarded as possible and desirable and resources are unlimited.\textsuperscript{46} Risk is perceived as an opportunity – without risk, there would be no possibilities for gain.\textsuperscript{47}

2) For the egalitarians, the dominant motivation is to achieve the recognition and acclaim of people in the group to which they belong based on their popularity, commitment and trust. Egalitarians view nature as unforgiving, where the least jolt may cause total collapse. Consequently, the managing institutions must treat the ecosystem with great care. Human beings are viewed as born good, corrupted by power and evil institutions, in both the market and the public sphere. When things go wrong, the egalitarians blame the system since they reject authority. Economic growth is regarded as unimportant, or at least as less important than equality. Natural resources are limited and overexploited by the system. Egalitarians are not risk-takers; they view nature as unforgiving.

3) In the case of the hierarchists, the dominant motivation is to be approved by authority figures, to be recognized as a member of a hierarchy that promises to satisfy their physical and psychological security needs. They view nature as forgiving, but vulnerable to extreme interruptions. The managing institutions should, therefore, regulate and minimize unusual occurrences. Human beings are viewed as born sinful but they can be redeemed by good institutions. When things go wrong, the hierarchists blame no one (blame shedding) or they blame deviants. Economic growth is, as in the case of the individualists considered possible and desirable, but the hierarchists see increases in wealth as a result of group sacrifice, not a result of individual competence. Resources are, as in the case of the egalitarians considered limited, but the hierarchists are ready to trust the experts within the system to make the call about resource use. Risks are to be considered, but they are manageable, and experts within the system are once again to be trusted.

4) On the other hand, the fatalists’ dominant motivation is survival against the odds. They view nature as a part of a random world. The managing

\textsuperscript{45} Views on responsibility of each social solidarity were discussed by Aaron Wildavsky, "A Cultural Theory of Responsibility" in Bureaucracy and Public Choice, ed. Jan-Erik Lane, Sage modern politics series (London: Sage, 1987) and Aaron Wildavsky and Daniel Polisar, "From Individual to System Blame, Analysis of Historical Change in the Law of Tort", in Journal of Policy History 1, no. 2 (1989).

\textsuperscript{46} Views in regard to economic growth and resources were defined in Michael Thompson et al., Cultural Theory (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) pp. 39-51.

\textsuperscript{47} Views in regard to risks were discussed by Michiel Schwarz and Michael Thompson, Divided We Stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990).
institutions cannot manage or learn, only cope with erratic events. Human beings are viewed as unpredictable and, therefore, not to be trusted. When things go wrong, the fatalists blame fate and bad luck. Economic growth is regarded as generally desirable, but unlikely to be profitable, except by chance or luck. Risk taking is viewed as unnecessary since there are no possibilities for gain. The preferred strategy is avoidance of risk taking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatalism</th>
<th>Individualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 – Typology of Cultural Biases

The four cultural biases (basic shared values and beliefs), corresponding to the four social solidarities, which were summarized above, are usually illustrated as in Figure 2 above. The cultural bias is closely connected to (and dependent on) the way people organize, create and maintain social relations. Here, the focus is directly put on the grid and group dimensions, i.e., willingness to engage in group activities, the acceptability of external prescriptions and on the resulting type of social organization (see Figure 3 below). The types of social organization (networks, enclaves, positional and isolates) correspond to the cultural biases. The relationship is summarized below:

1) ‘Networks’ corresponds to the individualistic cultural bias: both the grid and the group are low, meaning that people are not bound in strong groups and the external prescriptions are few and weak. The networks are created, maintained and utilized by individualists seeking personal materialistic gain and respect, based on merit and competence. This freedom to create temporary utility-based relations results in the egocentric network as the primary way of social organization. This means of socializing is also referred to as ‘equal individualization’.

2) ‘Enclaves’ corresponds to the egalitarian cultural bias: the group is high and the grid is low, meaning that people are bound in strong groups but the external prescriptions are few and weak. The enclaves are created and maintained by the egalitarians that seek people with similar values and beliefs and organize in highly participative-bounded groups. Respect is awarded by virtue of membership. Power relations within the enclave are flat.
and all members have equal value. This manner of socializing is also referred to as ‘collectivized equality’.

3) ‘Positional’ (or ‘pyramid’) corresponds to the hierarchical cultural bias: both the grid and the group are high, meaning that people are bound in strong groups and their lives are controlled by strong and many external prescriptions. The positional hierarchical relations are created and maintained by adherents of the hierarchal cultural bias, seeking order and stability through pyramid-like social order. Respect is awarded to the loyal, rule-obeying members. This way of socializing is also referred to as ‘collectivized inequality’.

4) ‘Isolates’ corresponds to the fatalistic cultural bias where the group is low and the grid is high, meaning that people are not bound in strong groups and external prescriptions are many and strong. The isolates are excluded, voluntarily or involuntarily, from group activities, yet their lives are controlled by factors outside their control. They view social cooperation as problematic; they neither give nor receive respect. This way of socializing is also referred to as ‘unequal individualization’.

![Figure 3 – Typology of Social Relations](image)

Finally, the way people choose their behavioural strategy, the tools that they use in the pursuit of their goals, is also included in the model, as corresponding to strategic behaviours, illustrated in Figure 4 below. Every set of cultural bias and mode of social organization has its own typical strategic behaviour. This time, the dimensions of group and grid are translated into ‘competition’ and
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‘transactions’. If there is free and unfettered competition, the group dimension will be low, where competition is fettered, the group dimension will be high. Similarly, the grid dimension corresponds to symmetry of transactions, as illustrated in Figure 4 below. When transactions are symmetrical, the grid will be low, when transactions are asymmetrical, it will be high. Thus, the adherents of fatalist and individualist solidarities engage in egocentric competition, whereas, the adherents of hierarchical and egalitarian solidarities do not. The latter seek progress through the collective order, rather than through competition, with the difference that order can be based on equality or inequality. Similarly, fatalist and hierarchies do not pursue symmetrical transactions. They accept inequality as being determined by things out of their own control, such as inherited social position or luck. In contrast, the egalitarians and individualists do not accept inequality (the individualists reject inequality of opportunity, the egalitarians reject inequality of outcome) and they seek symmetrical transactions. In summation, this results in four different ways of choosing strategic behaviours and four different management strategies.

Possibly, the easiest way of understanding strategic behaviours is as ‘social constructions of the hammer’ in the saying, “When all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail!” Stated simply and bluntly: the individualists believe in laissez-faire, the hierarchists in expertise and regulation, the egalitarians in training, education and information (their hammer is consensus-seeking dialogue and persuasion, based on shared moral standards), and the fatalists have no hammer (their goal is survival; their behavioural strategy is avoidance of problems and isolation from collective efforts).

![Figure 4 – Typology of Strategic Behaviours](image)


The basic Cultural Theory model provides four ideal types of corresponding social relations, cultural biases and strategic behaviours. Thus, it successfully connects these three aspects of social life in one cohesive analytical framework. The result is a model suitable for mapping social diversity. In essence, the theory and the model can explain how and why different people have different views about societal issues and societal problems, how and why they seek solutions to societal problems in so different ways, and how and why they organize in different ways when attempting to solve the problem.

Moreover, the explanatory ambition of the Cultural Theory framework does not stop there. The framework was developed even further when the model was translated for use in political science by Aaron Wildavsky, Michael Thompson and Richard Ellis. At the beginning, there were the original claims of Emile Durkheim’s socio-cultural approach, reinterpreted in the grid-group typology of Mary Douglas. Then, it was argued that culture matters and everything humans do or want is, in one way or another, culturally biased. This implied that it is possible to distinguish a ‘limited number of cultural types’ and that the model is universal, since the group and grid dimensions of social organization grasp the fundamental nature of social being. Then, Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky added a set of five theoretical claims, which made the theory suitable for grander purposes. First, they postulated a ‘compatibility condition’, stipulating that the cultural biases and social relations cannot be combined contrary to each other, i.e., that there is an inherited and constant strive towards coherency. Second, they added an ‘impossibility theorem’ that states that there are five, and only five, ways of life that are viable. (They added the fifth way of life, the full autonomy of the hermit). Third, they included a ‘requisite variety condition’ that stipulates that the ways of life need each other to be viable – without others, people cannot identify themselves. Fourth, they introduced a theoretical argument about the concept of cultural change, a comprehensive explanation of how and why people shift their allegiance from one social solidarity to one of the other three solidarities. Finally, they aggregated from the basic model and developed ideas about how societies work, i.e., how different cultural combinations create different political cultures.

59 Ibid. p. 3.
60 Ibid. p. 4.
61 Ibid. pp. 69-81.
The ‘compatibility condition’ postulates that cultural biases and social relations, as well as strategic behaviours, cannot be combined in opposition to each other. This claim adds to the model some new explanatory powers. Bearers of culture (individuals or institutions) are all striving towards cultural consistence and coherence. Any observable discrepancies between relations, behaviours or biases are either temporary or count as cases of ‘stolen rhetoric’. For example, someone may display individualistic values and beliefs (cultural bias), while interacting with others in a way typical of hierarchical social solidarity. This can be explained in two different ways. First, the individual could be caught in the process of change. In this case the observed discrepancy is only temporary and soon, either the bias or the preferred way of creation of social relations will change in order to achieve coherence. The other explanation is that the discrepancy is a case of ‘stolen rhetoric’, i.e., the cultural bias is actually hierarchic, but the displayed individualist values and beliefs exist for strategic purposes. The expressed bias is used purposely and untruthfully in order to gain support from an individualistic audience. This axiomatic claim that the behaviours, biases and relations must support each other enables explanation (even prediction) of behaviour, as long as there is knowledge about relations and biases – and vice versa.

The ‘impossibility theorem’ is the very basis of the model – restated. It asserts that there are five and only five viable ways of life. Underlying all human organization are only five ways people can relate to each other. Every observable variation can be explained as a stage in the process of change or as a variation in the degree of adherence to different solidarities. There can be no position outside the model, no sixth viable way of life. This claim stretches the ambition of Cultural Theory, as every possible link between behaviours, relations and values can be captured with the theoretical model. Together with the universality claim mentioned above, stretching the theory to all levels from the
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64 As mentioned earlier, in addition to the four ideal types of the original grid-group model, Thompson et al. argued for inclusion of the hermit, an individual who voluntarily excludes himself/herself from any social interactions. Michael Thompson et al., Cultural Theory (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) p. 10. In addition, the hermit is supposed to be placed at the centre of the social map, a position that is essential for understanding of micro-changes. Michael Thompson and Richard J. Ellis, "Introduction" in Culture Matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky, ed. Richard J. Ellis and Michael Thompson (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1997) pp. 6-10. However, Mary Douglas argued against an inclusion of the hermit, stating that hermit should be disregarded and “taken off the social map”. As quoted in Chapter One, note 26, in Michael Thompson et al., Cultural Theory (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) p. 16. In this study, as in most other empirical applications of the Cultural Theory framework, the autonomy of the hermit is completely disregarded, due to the fact that hermits do not participate in social interactions. This way of life is therefore not interesting for empirical studies of this type.
individual to the global, the impossibility theorem creates a model that is suitable for application to more or less everything that is human and social.

On the other hand, the ‘requisite variety condition’ contributes to the model in a completely different manner – it makes the theory normative. It postulates that all four social solidarities are present in all societies and situations, and that the observed differences are merely differences in degree to which certain ways of life dominate a particular society or a situation. Different social solidarities must exist for two reasons. First, every way of life has its blind spots and needs the other ways of life for correction. Monocultures are otherwise prone to self-destruction. An unchecked individualism creates anarchy and unchecked hierarchy has no flexibility. Second, the presence of other ways of life is a precondition for cultural identity. Without others, one cannot define one’s own identity. Thus, there is constant competition in every society, a constant cultural rivalry of social solidarities where the domination of the public sphere is at stake. Individuals shift from box to box in the model and, since the comparative strengths of different ways of life constantly change, there is a ‘permanent dynamic imbalance’. The (unreachable) goal is balance and equilibrium in which all ways of life exist and coexist without conflict. This gives the theory a new, normative dimension: a good society has the voices of all four social solidarities present in the public life; a good democracy is culturally pluralistic; and a good policy is constructed for (and presented to) the adherents of all four social solidarities. Based on the requisite variety condition, Cultural Theory scholars developed a new way of viewing the Cultural Theory model. They conceived the grid-group model to be a ‘social map’, a plane field where solidarities compete, rather than merely a heuristic device for the creation of ideal-types. At each corner, there is a ‘singularity’ acting as a magnet, attracting adherents from other solidarities. In-between the four singularities, there is a social space where the social solidarities compete for new adherents. Through speech and action, the adherents of social solidarities constantly push and pull others on the social map from one corner to the other. Hence, the model is not merely dynamic – it is extremely unstable; changes are the rule, rather than the exception.
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66 For more, see the section on political cultures below.
The instability of the model is further explained through the ‘theory of surprise’
that describes how cultural change occurs. The original grid-group model was
a model for studies of stable systems captured at one point in time. For that
reason, like most other frameworks based on the concept culture, it has often
been criticized for being deterministic. Granted that the Cultural Theory
included instability through the requisite variety condition and through its ideas
about constant disequilibrium, the question is: How and why does the cultural
change occur? The proffered solution is the theory of surprise, which postulates
that the adherents to a way of life, normally resistant to change, shift from one
box to the other because of repeated failures and disappointments. When
adherents of different social solidarities interact with adherents of other social
solidarities, they influence each other. If successful, adherents of a social
solidarity will reinforce their values and beliefs, thereby reinforcing the strength
of their preferred social solidarity. If repeatedly unsuccessful, the adherents of a
social solidarity will be negatively surprised, see the successes of adherents of
the other social solidarities and change their allegiance accordingly. All in all,
there are twelve possible micro-changes: from each box in the matrix to each of
the remaining three boxes in the model. The founders of the theory illustrated
each of the changes with real-life examples, such as ‘rags to riches’ moves from
fatalism to individualism, ‘bureaucratization’ moves from individualism to
hierarchy or ‘gamekeeper turned poacher’ moves from hierarchy to indivi-
dualism’.71

In addition, the model was aggregated and applied to political cultures,
societies and the understanding of how they function and change. The Cultural
Theory framework proposes that there are two ways to aggregate from the
individual level to the collective level (organizations and societies). First, there
is the notion of ‘cultural regimes’.72 A cultural regime is a specific mixture of
adherents of the four social solidarities found in a specific society. Second, a
conceptual approach defines ‘cultural alliances’ that constitute different political
cultures.73 In a cultural alliance, two social solidarities create a stable relation,
support each other and dominate over the other two social solidarities. In their
basic model of political cultures, Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky described five
basic cultural alliances.

70 It can be noted that theory of surprise is not the only mechanism for change. There is also the
idea of ‘stolen rhetoric’ and ‘stolen behaviour’, the notion of ‘incoherent individual’, as well as an
elaboration on ‘changing alliances’ developed by Charles Lockhart. See Charles Lockhart,
"Political Culture and Political Change" in Culture Matters: Essays in honor of Aaron Wildavsky,
72 As outlined in Chapter Five, note 7, p. 100, in ibid.
73 Ibid. pp. 86-89.
Four alliances are depicted in the Figure 5 above. There is also a fifth alliance (not depicted), between individualism and hierarchy. It consists of political markets assisted by bureaucracies, as in the ‘classic liberalism’ of the United States or in the ‘establishment’ political culture of the United Kingdom. An alliance between the hierarchists and the egalitarians would create a modern social-democratic ‘welfare state’. The fatalism-hierarchy combination would result in ‘totalitarianism’. Fatalism together with individualism would result in an ‘authoritarian’ regime. It is important to note that alliances between cultures that share common positions on the group or the grid dimensions are not necessarily more viable or easier to achieve. Simply because individualism and egalitarianism are low on the grid dimension, does not necessarily mean they would form a more stable relationship than, say, individualism and hierarchy. Diagonal alliances are viable and plausible, since the two diagonal combinations stand for inclusion and exclusion – or ‘grip’, as it was defined by Michael Thompson. Usually, the egalitarians and fatalist are outsiders in any system, and tend to blame the system for their mishaps. Individualism and hierarchy are insiders in the system, with the hierarchists enjoying its safety and the individualists attempting to benefit from it, personally and materially.

The discussion above presents the basic Cultural Theory model as developed by its pioneering scholars. However, applying the model to empirical research has not been without its share of problems. Failed attempts to operationalize the model have caused a number of critical reviews and heated debates. This has resulted in refinements of the theory and in a division of the cultural theory community into at least two different camps or, one might say, two different Cultural Theories. The next section will deal with these criticisms and with consequent developments of the theory.
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**Table: Typology of Cultural Alliances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totalitarianism</th>
<th>Social Democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>Egalitarianism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5 – Typology of Cultural Alliances**
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75 Ibid. pp. 16-17.
Cultural Theory and Political Science

How should the Cultural Theory framework be understood in terms of its place within political science? What are its ambitions and possibilities? What are the areas where it could (and should) be used? According to its proponents, Cultural Theory can, on the one hand, be epistemologically individualistic but, on the other hand, also disregard the individual and focus only on the social solidarities. In relation to other schools of thought Cultural Theory can be understood as a part, or a typological refinement, of the Rational Choice School or the New Institutionalism paradigm, but it can also be seen to stand on its own as a completely new approach in the social sciences and political science. As a tool, Cultural Theory can be used both practically, such as in policy relevant studies, and theoretically, as in the conceptualisation and understanding of complex social phenomena. Thus, Cultural Theory has the potential of being used as either a full explanatory theory or merely as a heuristic device. In other words, it can be used both in its extremely hard or its extremely soft form – as well as everything in between. Accordingly, it can be envisioned both as a ‘grand theory’ that seeks to explain and predict human behaviour and as a ‘good little typology’, as Douglas humbly referred to it at times. There are quite a few faces of Cultural Theory.

In regard to its epistemology and its compatibility with the other theoretical approaches in political science, there is an ongoing discussion about Cultural Theory and its place. Cultural Theory came about as a response to the inability of the Rational Choice (and its methodological individualism) to capture the variance in social action. At first glance, these two theoretical approaches are epistemologically and ontologically incompatible. However, first Wildavsky, and later Sun-Ki Chai, showed that this is not necessarily the case. Wildavsky argued that Rational Choice explains behaviour according to individual preferences, while Cultural Theory can explain how those preferences are created and why they are perceived as viable by the individual. It is the social context that decides what is rational. In an insightful article, Sun-Ki Chai pointed to the shortcomings of the Rational Choice approach, namely, its inability to explain large-scale collective action, such as voting in elections or the participation in large-scale demonstrations or rebellions. In both of those cases, it appears that the rational choice for any individual is to remain inactive,

since participation is potentially costly and has minimal effect on the outcome – the outcome will benefit the individual regardless of his/her participation. Such shortcomings of the Rational Choice approach have led its theorists to define a weaker version of the approach that allows the social context to influence the decision-making process. In this version, ideologies, as well as altruism are accepted as possible factors in the preference formation process. This solves some of the problems of the approach but creates others. In order to maintain the ability to predict human behaviour, the Rational Choice scholars had to address a new question: “What accounts for preferences and beliefs and how are they to be determined in each particular context?” According to Wildavsky, this is where culture comes in, “for what are variations in preference creation and belief systems if not variations in culture?” He argued that acceptance of culture as an explanation for individual preference creation has always been problematic in the Rational Choice approach, inasmuch as culture has been used to explain individual choices post-hoc. Culture was credited only for the cases where the basic logic of individual egocentric rationality failed, after the choice had already been made. According to Wildavsky, Cultural Theory and its group-grid typology of social solidarities offers a solution to the problem since it limits the varieties of cultures and clearly specifies the content of the different cultures. This opens the door for the Rational Choice approach to include a mathematical, pre-defined model, thereby solving some of the problems in explaining origins of preferences, without producing tautologies and post-hoc solutions.

To sum up: one interpretation of the Cultural Theory sees itself as part of (or is at least complementary to) the Rational Choice approach in political science, and it is thus epistemologically individualistic. The preferred social relations of individuals can be determined in order to predict their cultural biases or preferred strategic behaviour, and vice-versa. It is a tool for systematic prediction of individual preferences. On the other hand, Per Selle and Gunnar Grendstad have compared the Cultural Theory approach to the New Institutionalism approaches of Powell and DiMaggio and March and Olsen. These scholars view the Cultural Theory approach as a neo-institutional approach inasmuch as
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82 Ibid.
84 Ibid.
the base of the theory is the effect of social relations on individual preference formation – institutions (social relations) are primary determinates of behaviours. The distinguishing aspect of Cultural Theory and its model is that it constitutes a typological version of neo-institutionalism. Furthermore, the four social solidarities, when supported by viable combinations of cultural biases, social relations and strategic behaviours, constitute the \textit{only} generalizable institutions. Thus, the Cultural Theory is a theory of institutions; its four types of social organization are to be understood as the ‘theoretical population of institutions’. Selle and Grendstad go even further and argue that the Cultural Theory with its typology of cultures, i.e., institutions, is comparatively better than approaches developed by Powell and DiMaggio, and March and Olsen. They argue that the Cultural Theory approach “provides a medium of constrained diversity between infinite variance and total unity, restores functionalism within the typology” and “forces continuous comparison”, thus solving many of the problems of other neo-institutional theories.

The Rational Choice and New-Institutionalism theories are inherently in conflict as a result of the individualism-collectivism difference in their epistemological, ontological and methodological points of departure. The Cultural Theory framework can therefore be seen as a tool that brings them together, bridging this heretofore un-bridgeable divide. Indeed, one of the main attractions of the Cultural Theory is its promise of a resolution of the agent-structure problem through its focus on cultural biases and social relations rather than on agents or structures. As the cultural biases and the social relations are connected to actors and structures as well as to individuals and institutions, they constitute a new unit of analysis. This is, in a sense, a restatement of the ‘universality principle’ mentioned above. The Cultural Theory framework is a tool that enables zooming in on everything from individual preferences, household consumption, firms, organizations, political parties, to ethnic groups, states, regions and civilizations. In every form of social interaction, there will be four distinct social solidarities. The units of analysis, whatever unit is used (for example, individuals, households, institutions, parties, ethnic groups, religious groups, or states), will all have identifiable preferred modes of social organization and corresponding cultural biases, as well as corresponding strategic behaviours. Cultural theory allows for micro-, meso- and macro- analysis. According to this way of understanding the Cultural Theory framework, it stands on its own as it cannot be subsumed under Rational Choice or under Neo-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{88} Gunnar Grendstad, \textit{Prescribing the Institutional Population by Modes of Individuals} (Bergen: LOS-senteret, 1992).
\item \textsuperscript{90} Most cultural theorists would rather refer to it as ‘side-stepping’ the actor-structure problem rather than solving it, as in Michael Thompson et al., eds., \textit{Cultural Theory as Political Science} (London: Routledge, 1999) p. 8.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
institutionalism, although it has elements of both and as it is compatible with both of these two paradigms.

The debate and development of the Cultural Theory approach does not end with the debate outlined above. Wildavsky’s understanding of the place of the Cultural Theory within the Rational Choice School has led to empirical applications of the theory based on methodological individualism. In these applications mass data acquired through surveys tested the theoretical link between social relations (position on the grid and group dimensions) and cultural bias (values and beliefs). Although many of these studies show that the Cultural Theory framework has merit, other research has shown that empirical evidence in support of the basic claims of the theory is unsatisfying. Problems have occurred at almost every step of the logic behind the model. The positions on grid and group dimensions are not easy to measure, as these two dimensions are easily confused in the construction of survey questions. The position on the grid-group matrix does not always result in the corresponding values and beliefs since individuals do not necessarily show coherent cultural biases. Some of these failures are attributed to poor empirical operationalization. It has been argued that grid and group are measurable but the methodological tools are not yet developed to a sufficient degree. If this be the case, additional work on measurement scales, questions, indicators and so forth should eventually solve the problem. On the other hand, some of these criticisms have led to further refinements of the theory. For example, Michael Thompson has added a notion of the ‘incoherent individual’ – an individual might be hierarchal at work and
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94 Sige Oltedal et al., "Explaining Risk Perception: An evaluation of cultural theory" in Rotunde (Trondheim, Norway: Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Department of Psychology 2004).


egalitarian at home. It is the context and the preferred social organization that
determine the cultural bias. Consequently, individuals living in multiple contexts
with multiple ways of organization will show different cultural biases. This is, to
a degree, contradictory to the earlier outlined theoretical principles. Individuals
are supposed to have sets of values and beliefs corresponding to their way of
life; incoherencies should not exist in any mentally-healthy socially-adjusted
individuals. However, since incoherent individuals seem to be quite normal
people leading quite normal lives, the initial solution to the problem was to
understand the incoherent individual as an individual caught up in the process of
change.\textsuperscript{97} Michael Thompson opened up the possibility of individuals being
permanently incoherent, as they can adhere to different social solidarities in
different contexts. In addition, another quantitative study has shown that
individuals regularly show a mix of different cultural biases. In his study based
on mass data, Eero Olli found not only coherent and incoherent individuals but
he further sorted the incoherent types into ‘sequential’ and ‘synthetic’ types.
Whereas a coherent individual acts as the original theory predicted, a sequential
individual justifies his/her way of life by expressing a combination of biases,
with the ability to switch between them depending on context. A synthetic
individual expresses support and rejection of different cultural biases based on
knowledge of all cultural biases, i.e., not coherent with his/her own way of life,
nor based on a specific social context.\textsuperscript{98} Ollie concluded that surveys where the
support for social solidarities is measured are not, from a methodological stand-
point, correctly constructed. He recommended a methodological refinement, a
measurement of the rejection of cultural biases, rather than measurement of the
acceptance of different cultural biases.\textsuperscript{99} However, this refinement of
measurements of individual adherence to social solidarities, advanced as it
might be, leads the Cultural Theory framework away from its original purpose
of being a simple and an elegant theory. Much of its explanatory and predictive
power disappears if it is accepted that a person can show one, two, three or all
four cultural biases.\textsuperscript{100}

On the other hand, this is not the only solution. The criticism and the
inadequate empirical results have led some of the Cultural Theory scholars to
turn away from methodological individualism all together.\textsuperscript{101} They no longer
speak of egalitarian individuals or egalitarian groups of individuals. The
empirical research has shown that it is difficult, if not impossible, to label people
according to the four categories, regardless of the measurement method.

\textsuperscript{97} See section concerned with mechanisms for change above.
\textsuperscript{98} Eero Olli, "Cultural Theory Specified - The Coherent, Sequential and Synthetic Individual
Approaches" (Masters thesis, University of Bergen, 1995).
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{100} Introductory chapter in op. cit. Michael Thompson et al., eds., \textit{Cultural Theory as Political
\textsuperscript{101} Steve Reyner, as quoted in ibid. p. 12.
Douglas herself addressed the misinterpretation of the Cultural Theory and countered by presenting an idea of 'culture as dialogue', rather than culture as a label for individuals, groups of individuals or whole societies. According to Douglas, the focus should be on dialogue in connection to accountability, with the central issue being the allocation of praise and blame.\textsuperscript{102} Hence, the theory is not primarily concerned with how people live their lives and make their choices, but rather with how societal dialogue, discourses, meta-narratives and constructed truths are created and reproduced, accepted and rejected. This is in line with the original grid-group analysis model that was developed years earlier, before it was adapted to political science by Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky. As was propounded then, the model was all about classification of social contexts in which individuals are caught up in the process of their social life. Whether individuals can be caught in different ways in different contexts was not addressed by the model since the purpose of the model was classification of shared values and beliefs, rather than the explanation and prediction of behaviour. Its purpose was practical: to understand the different standpoints in policy debates and to show how and why agreements sometimes cannot be reached despite extensive dialogue.\textsuperscript{103} This much softer approach is on the other side of the scale concerning the epistemological position of Cultural Theory. Between the Wildavskian ‘Rational Choice Cultural Theory’, which is positivist, explanatory, predictive, quantitative and methodologically individualistic, and the Douglassian ‘grid-group analysis’, which is a hermeneutic and interpretive model and a classification scheme, there are a number of different ways the theory and its model can be understood and used. Perhaps the most influential of those, described by Thompson, Grendstad and Selle, is based on the requisite variety condition and on a vision of the theoretical model as a social map and defines ‘social solidarities’ (instead of actors or institutions) as the ‘prime movers’.\textsuperscript{104}

In this approach, neither individuals nor institutions are in the focus; the different ways people relate to each other are. The observed individual preferences are not individual (something people create within themselves, the product of the mind) but are created in the social interactions between people. Hence, methodological individualism does not apply. Individuals, organizations and/or institutions can be labelled \textit{individualist}, \textit{hierarchists}, \textit{egalitarian} or \textit{fatalist} – only as a simplification in description, not as exclusive categories since an individual, depending on the particular social context, can be classed in all of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{103}] Michael Thompson et al., eds., \textit{Cultural Theory as Political Science} (London: Routledge, 1999) p. 3.
\item[\textsuperscript{104}] Ibid. p. 12.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
four categories. It is the social context that is the central unit of analysis. In addition, the same scholars have redefined the Cultural Theory framework into a ‘user-friendly’ theory, one which the researcher needs to decide how much Cultural Theory is needed for a particular application. In some cases, such as mapping of household consumption styles, the Cultural Theory must be used in its entirety, including biases, relations and behaviours, including all five social solidarities (even the hermit), including both quantitative and qualitative methodology. A policy discourse analysis requires only analysis of biases; the social relations and strategic behaviours can be disregarded. Furthermore, only three active solidarities may be considered, since the hermits exclude themselves from social life and the fatalists remain silent in policy discourses. On the other hand, a study of policy design requires that the fatalists must be included because their policy input, although silent, bears some relevance for a successful policy design. In regard to studies of politics and governance, or “strange goings-ons within government ministries or political parties,” as the authors defined it; the researcher needs to include all three levels of analysis (biases, relations and behaviours) and focus on discrepancies between them, i.e. look for stolen rhetoric and stolen behaviours. Notwithstanding the differences in the applications of the Cultural Theory framework and its overall complexity, the theory does allow a user-friendly approach as it gives the researcher freedom to choose which part of the Cultural Theory framework will be used and how.

To recapitulate, several different versions of Cultural Theory exist, each based on the grid-group model and each based on the link between social relations and cultural biases. One particular complication in the study of Cultural Theory and its various versions is that there are many different sets of terms used in the different variations of the theory. The name itself, ‘grid-group cultural theory’, is a combination of the ‘grid-group analysis’ introduced by Douglas and the Cultural Theory introduced by Wildavsky. Other ways of referring to the theory include Thompson’s preferred ‘theory of socio-cultural viability’ (in his edited book Cultural Theory as Political Science) Thompson also used the term ‘theory of institutionalized social interaction’). In addition,

107 The fatalists are often disregarded in the studies of policy, management and governance as they represent a ‘passive way of life’. The notable exception is Hood who argued that fatalists are indeed crucial for the understanding of public management. Christopher Hood, The Art of the State: Culture, rhetoric, and public management (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) pp. 145-168.
111 Michael Thompson et al., eds., Cultural Theory as Political Science (London: Routledge, 1999).
some scholars use ‘neo-Durkheimian theory of politics’ or even ‘Douglassian theory’. The four ‘ways of life’, as they were originally termed, are also referred to as cultures, rationalities, solidarities, cosmologies and ways of organizing, and these are in turn described by different terms as well. The confusion in terminology comes from the confusion of different variations of the theory. For those strictly believing in coherency between relations and biases, labels are less important. If something is fatalistic, it will be fatalistic in regard to cultural bias, social organization and strategic behaviour. However, for those trying to distinguish the three different levels of analysis, there is a point in using different terms for the different levels. Yet another problem with the terminology of Cultural Theory is the existence of preconceived notions about the terms used to describe the four solidarities. Individualism, egalitarianism, fatalism and hierarchy are terms used in other contexts as well. People usually understand the terms hierarchy and fatalism as negative, as they associate them with social control, lack of freedom and/or passivity. Similarly, people associate the terms individualism and egalitarianism with freedom and equality, and thus regard them as positive. However, in some other social contexts people might associate fatalism primarily with survival and hierarchy primarily with stability and order, and thus view them as positives. In a similar vein, individualism might be associated with an immoral and selfish ego-centrism and egalitarianism with inefficiency, and consequently be understood as negative terms. Clearly, there are no absolute better or worse ways of life. They are all socio-culturally viable in some social contexts and unviable in others. Furthermore, all social solidarities, in the right proportions, are necessary for the functioning of a good society – even fatalism has its functions. On the other hand, they are all potentially destructive when completely lacking, or completely dominating.

113 Individualism is always individualism and its corresponding social relations are called individualist social relations, competition, egocentric networks or markets. The egalitarian way of life is sometimes referred to as a sectarian or factionalist way of life, the egalitarians are also called communards or dissenting groups. The corresponding social relations are referred to as egalitarian, sectarian or enclavist social relations. The fatalists are sometimes referred to as isolates or insulated, and their relations are called everything from fatalistic, isolate to atomized subordination. The hierarchist way of life is also called a positional solidarity or positional culture, with its corresponding preferred social relations referred to as positional or hierarchical social relations. Finally, Thompson also introduced a dimension called manipulation or grip that connects the diagonals in the model, where fatalism is called survival individualist, egalitarianism survival collectivist, hierarchy is referred to as manipulation collectivist and individualist solidarity is labelled manipulative individualist. Virginie Mamadouh, "Grid-Group Cultural Theory: An introduction", in GeoJournal 47, no. 3 (1999).
114 In defence of the hierarchical way of life, which is often incorrectly perceived as negative, Mary Douglas declared that she adheres to this social solidarity for the most part. As quoted in Paul Bauman, "Anthropology with a Difference: Mary Douglas at 80", in Commonwealth 128, no. 14 (2000) pp. 11-17, 2000.
Different variations of the Cultural Theory framework and its typological model have been used to further the knowledge about a wide range of issues in a number of academic disciplines. There are hundreds of different empirical applications so far. Areas of social sciences concerned with risk and environment, household consumption, management and control, historic analysis of regime change have all benefited from grid-group analysis. The next section of this chapter will summarise some earlier Cultural Theory applications that are of relevance for this study. In order to apply the Cultural Theory framework to the theory and practice of post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies, there is a need for a Cultural Theory conceptualization of political cultures, democracy, policy and governance.

**Cultural Theory and Political Cultures**

The characteristics of the politics in war-torn societies are central to understanding post-conflict processes and the role of the representatives of the international community in them. The political culture of a war-torn society is, after all, the social context in which intervention from the outside takes place. In essence, it represents the socio-cultural context for the interveners and their policies. As previously mentioned, the Cultural Theory understanding of political cultures is derived from the concepts ‘cultural regimes’ (any particular mixture of strengths of four solidarities found in any given society) and ‘cultural alliances’ (any stable alliance between the dominating solidarities). Different combinations of alliances and regimes provide different cultural settings that correspond to some earlier classifications of political cultures, primarily those of Elazar who classified American sub-cultures as being ‘entrepreneurial’, ‘moralist’ and ‘traditionalist’ political cultures. These were later re-defined by
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cultural theorists as individualism-hierarchy, egalitarianism-hierarchy and fatalism-hierarchy alliances. Other classifications include the individualism-egalitarianism alliance of the ‘frontier’ political culture as well as the three mono-cultural political cultures of ‘anarchy’ (unchecked individualism exemplified by ‘Bleeding Kansas’ border wars), ‘totalitarian’ (unchecked hierarchy exemplified by the USSR) and the ‘enclavist’ societies (unchecked egalitarianism exemplified by Mao’s China or Red-Khmers in Cambodia). Finally, there are political cultures with high levels of fatalism, such as the ‘clientelistic’, ‘obstructive’ and ‘paternalistic’ political cultures. In a sense, the four categories of Cultural Theory are used in a taxonomic way that resembles the “periodic table of elements” in chemistry, in order to explain the regimes and alliances of different, well-known and well-studied political cultures. The classification is shown in Figure 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regimes and alliances</th>
<th>Resulting Political Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>Anarchist political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian</td>
<td>Enclavist political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Totalitarian political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist-Egalitarian</td>
<td>Frontier political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist-Hierarchical</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial political culture. Establishment political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist-Fatalist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical-Fatalist</td>
<td>Traditionalist political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical-Egalitarian</td>
<td>Moralistic political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egalitarian-Fatalist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist-Egalitarian-Hierarchical</td>
<td>Pluralistic political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralistic political culture with large doses of fatalism</td>
<td>Paternalistic political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial/Establishment political cultures with large doses of fatalism</td>
<td>Clientistic political culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier political culture with large doses of fatalism</td>
<td>Obstructive political culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 – Typology of Political Cultures

Each of these political cultures has clear examples from the real life as there are societies where the public sphere functions (or functioned) in a manner that reveals the dominance of one, two or more social solidarities. Different alliances produce different types of societies, in relation to everything from the way the public sphere is defined to the way public goods are managed and distributed. In addition, the typology seems to be exhaustive, in that there seems to be no political cultures left outside the list. Furthermore, the pioneers of Cultural Theory have shown that a typology of political cultures based on the grid-group Cultural Theory it is compatible with both Elazar’s and Almond and Verba’s typologies and even resolves some of their problems. With the help of the model, the origin of political cultures can be explained at least equally well, if not better, than before.

On the other hand, it is important to note that there are great differences depending on historical particularities within each political culture. The American political culture is very different from the British political culture, even though both of them consist of an alliance between the individualist and hierarchical social solidarities. In Europe, a number of societies have similar cultural regimes, yet they are different in terms of political culture. Even a small difference in degree of dominance of a social solidarity can cause a difference in the character of a political culture. The hierarchical social solidarity is expressed in different ways in the United States, United Kingdom, Sweden, India, or for that matter, in Bosnia. In India, hierarchist social solidarity is understood through the caste system and strong traditions. In the United States, the United Kingdom and Sweden, hierarchy is conceived as a strong state bureaucracy. In Bosnia, as it will be demonstrated later, the hierarchical social solidarity is expressed through ethnic nationalism, which constricts people to many strict rules of accepted behaviour within and between the ethnic groups, and through vertical power structures where people are expected to follow the
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122 The typology is adapted from Virginie Mamadouh, "National Political Cultures in the European Union" in Cultural Theory as Political Science, ed. Michael Thompson, et al. (London: Routledge, 1999)
123 Ibid. p. 151. Although Mamadouh describes her typology of political cultures as ‘tentative’ rather than conclusive.
rule of the authority. Similarly, in different cultural and historical contexts, the ideal types manifest themselves in rather different modes. Having general categories that apply to every social context regardless of geography, national culture or history does not mean that geography, national culture or history are excluded — to the contrary, they are highly relevant for the understanding of how different cultural types express themselves in different contexts.\textsuperscript{128}

Through the work of Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky, as well as the later work of Virgine Mamadouh, the Cultural Theory framework seems to have proven its ability to capture the variance of political cultures in different societies through its focus on sub-cultures and the mixtures of sub-cultures that constitute national political cultures. Even within the European Union, where most states are similar to each other inasmuch as they are democratic, pluralist societies, Cultural Theory has been successfully used to explain the differences between the political cultures of nations, however small they may be.\textsuperscript{129} In the case of global comparison, as attempted by the pioneers of the Cultural Theory, the differences are even more apparent.\textsuperscript{130} In addition to mapping different types of societies, Cultural Theory also provides a theory of a good, functioning society. The idea of a socio-cultural equilibrium, as defined by the requisite variety condition, enables an understanding of how societies function. As mentioned above, four cultures compete for the dominance of the public space in every society. As mono-cultures are prone to self-destruction, alliances of at least two cultures are needed to ensure a degree of stability. Good societies have even broader alliances, allowing for all cultures to exist and express themselves in the public sphere. The normative aspects of Cultural Theory prescribe cultural pluralism as the ‘holy grail’ of good, democratic societies.

**Cultural Theory and Democracy**

Democratization is perceived as a central part of any post-conflict recovery process.\textsuperscript{131} Therefore, the concepts of democracy and democratization are central for the understanding of the Cultural Theory of international involvement in post-conflict societies. Those involved in the post-conflict processes — the local authorities and the representatives of the international community alike — gladly speak about democracy and democratization. The question is: What do


\textsuperscript{130} In the original comparison, Thompson, Ellis and Wildavsky used the extremes of variance of cultural regimes and alliances such as Bleeding Kansas, Khmer Rouge, USSR, Swedish social democracy, American exceptionalism and so forth. Michael Thompson et al., *Cultural Theory* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) pp. 87-88.

\textsuperscript{131} Charles T. Call and Susan E. Cook, "On Democratization and Peacebuilding", in *Global Governance* 9, no. 2 (2003).
they mean? What are the images of democracy corresponding to four different social solidarities of the Cultural Theory?

As mentioned above, the Cultural Theory framework stipulates that there are no stable and long lasting mono-cultural societies. As all cultures need other cultures to balance their weaknesses and keep them on the ground, none of the four possible monocultures can be democratic.132 The true utopian democracy is found on the other side of the scale, in a society with all four social solidarities present and three of those (all but fatalism) equally dominant, so to speak. In-between, there are a number of combinations of cultural regimes and cultural alliances that could be possibly democratic, at least in the narrowest meaning of the term. This is what cultural theorists call a ‘democracy feasibility space’,133 a square within the square of the grid-group model. Within its lines, there are different types of democracies; outside the square democracy will not be feasible, i.e., it will be non-existent or at least unstable. Within the square, there are different kinds of democracies, depending on the exact position. As previously mentioned, the true pluralist democracy, with all four social solidarities equally represented, is in the middle. Close to the hierarchical corner, democracy resembles a ‘guardian’ model of democracy.134 Close to the individualist corner, there is a ‘protective’ or ‘procedural’ type of democracy135 and close to the egalitarian corner of the square, democracy would resemble a ‘participatory’ type of democracy.136 These three types of democracy correspond to the three active social solidarities.

In addition to these three types of democracy, there is an application of the Cultural Theory regarding perceptions of the adherents of four social solidarities about democracy and the democratic game.137 For the fatalist social solidarity, democracy and democratization are unimportant since its adherents believe and expect that, no matter which political system is in place, decisions will always

133 Steven Ney and Nadia Molenaars, "Cultural Theory as a Theory of Democracy", in Innovation 12, no. 4 (1999).
134 Going back to Plato’s Republic and the definition of guardian democracy, where a knowledgeable few, by reason of their insight and virtue, are particularly qualified to govern.
be made by others. The individualist social solidarity defines democracy as a free political market where bargaining among actors occurs, based on their preferences and their self-interest. The hierarchical social solidarity promotes democracy as a game where leaders make decisions and citizens obey and control decision-makers only retroactively via elections. For the egalitarians, democracy is a way of shaping common preferences by integrating the views of all participants through a consensus-seeking dialogue.\textsuperscript{138}

Furthermore, the Cultural Theory framework does not merely classify all the different views regarding democracy. It is also a normative theory of democracy, inasmuch as the \textit{requisite variety condition} defines what a ‘good democracy’ is.\textsuperscript{139} Once again, all four social solidarities must exist and function properly, providing some input to the system. They need each other to balance their weaknesses and cover each other’s blind spots.\textsuperscript{140} Thus, non-democracies are non-democracies because they lack the input and control from one or more social solidarities and, correspondingly, democracies are democracies because they have, at least to a certain degree, the input and control from two or more social solidarities.\textsuperscript{141} Even the fatalist social solidarity is healthy when present to a certain degree, as other active social solidarities use adherents of fatalistic social solidarity as a ‘pool of resources’.\textsuperscript{142} Nevertheless, this implies that democratization, the process of transition from non-democracy to democracy is a process of establishing a balance of strengths in all four solidarities. The democratization process, often part of international involvement in war-torn societies, can thus be understood as a process of changing the existing political culture. Notwithstanding, the adherents of different social solidarities see democracy differently and try to promote their understanding of democracy as the right one, the one that should be accepted by all. Through these conflicting views and values, alliances are formed and a level of stability between strengths of different solidarities is reached – thus creating a stable and democratic system. The type of democracy created is dependant on the specific mixture of social solidarities in the alliance. Different social solidarities are neither inherently democratic nor inherently undemocratic; they simply view and understand democracy and democratization differently. In a post-conflict environment, where democratization is perceived as central for the peace process, the Cultural Theory understanding of democracy argues that different perceptions of democracy, and the democratic game, are likely to exist and to be in conflict.

\textsuperscript{139} Aaron Wildavsky, "Democracy As A Coalition Of Cultures", in \textit{Society} 31, no. 1 (1993).
\textsuperscript{140} Steven Ney and Nadia Molenaars, "Cultural Theory as a Theory of Democracy", in \textit{Innovation} 12, no. 4 (1999).
Cultural Theory, Policy and Public Management

Democratization is a process of social and political change, as is the post-conflict process in general. Social and political changes can be unintentional, resulting from the internal processes that derive from inter-cultural interactions and conflicts as well as from discrepancies between expected result and experienced result, as explained by the theory of surprise. Social and political change can also be intentional, actively promoted and supported through politics and policies, as the elites that adhere to a social solidarity attempt to influence the social context in order to win new adherents. Given that international interventions in war-torn societies promote political and social change, this process can be understood as an implementation process for the international community’s policies that are aimed at transforming the intervention-receiving society. Understanding the role of international intervention in regards to social and political change is dependent, therefore, on understanding the views about policy process and policy implementation.

On the topic of the policy process, the Cultural Theory framework stipulates that there are three different and distinct ways of actively doing policy, each corresponding to each of the three active ways of life. As problems occur, adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity will demand, “Structure it!” The individualist social solidarity will guide its adherents to cry out “Let’s make things better!” The egalitarian social solidarity leads to an “It’s not fair!” mantra. For the fatalist, social solidarity represents a passive way, a way of not doing policy. In the face of any problem, the adherents of the fatalist social solidarity react with ‘survival without resistance’, a “Why bother?” mantra. Concerning policy implementation strategies, the individualists’ preferred method is pricing, the hierarchists’ is regulation and the egalitarians’ is education. The adherents of the fatalist social solidarity do not have a preferred implementation method, other than merely pretending to do something. Regarding the policy implementation process, the hierarchists prefer a top-down model, the egalitarians choose a bottom-up model and the individualists prefer, through the mechanisms of the market, a combined top-down/bottom-up model. The individualists base their policy process on interests, the egalitarians on values, the hierarchists on legal-rational principles while the fatalistic policy model best resembles the so-called ‘garbage-can’ policy model. In addition, Hood described four types of public management styles as, ‘boss-ism’ (hierarchy), ‘choice-ism’ (individualism), ‘group-ism’ (egalitarianism) and
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‘chance-ism’ (fatalism). Boss-ism, Hood argues, manages public policy in terms of oversight and control. For hierarchies, control “… implies a ladder of authority, conscious oversight and inspection, formal power to approve or reject, to pronounce on disputes or complaints, to forbid, command, permit and punish.” Choice-ism is based on competition and rivalry. Public management for individualists is all about providing ‘effective accountability’ and ‘efficiency’ in public services by “… making producers responsive to customers in market-like relationships, just as business firms sometimes claim to be accountable to their customers.” Group-ism is egalitarian public management, which relies on mutuality and peer pressure to control public officials. Choice-ist and boss-ist public institutions, egalitarians claim, have “… no social cohesion, and will consequently lack the capacity to broker social compromises or even to survive when they are pitted against rival organisations in extreme circumstances.” For the egalitarians, decisions are best taken collectively: peer review processes, collegiate decision-making and the imprecise boundaries between formally hierarchical job descriptions are all hallmarks of group-ist decision-making structures. Chance-ism, or ‘contrived randomness’, is the fatalist view of public management. Fatalists seek to prevent any undesired forms of co-operation and collusion by injecting a dose of mistrust. This entails randomising instances of control (such as random audits and inspections) with the aim of introducing unpredictability.

Aside from mapping different types of policy processes, policy tools and public management styles, the most interesting ideas about policy process embedded in the Cultural Theory framework are the ideas about successes and failures of policies. The successful policy succeeds because it is a socio-culturally viable policy. The failed policy fails because it is not understood, or agreement on it is not reached or that its prescriptions are not obeyed. This occurs because the receivers of the policy are associating and identifying with other social solidarities, i.e., the policy is not socio-culturally viable in relation to its socio-cultural context. In addition, policies fail if they are extremely socio-culturally viable, so to speak. If a policy is mono-cultural and it corresponds only to the dominant social solidarity, it might fail even though it has the support of the majority. The adherents of other social solidarities, even though they are in minority, would see to it by rebelling against the proposed policy and revealing its blind-spots. This reasoning comes from the normative aspects of the Cultural Theory framework. In the same manner as democracies must

149 Ibid. p. 51.
150 Ibid. p. 55.
151 Ibid. p. 60.
152 Ibid. pp. 49-72.
153 Ibid. pp. 49-72
include all four social solidarities to be truly pluralistic, the policy process must be balanced in order to produce a socio-culturally viable policy option. It must be formulated so that it gains the support from the dominant social solidarity, or the dominant alliance of solidarities, yet it must not be so rigid that it completely excludes the adherents of other solidarities and reveals its blind spots, causing conflicts and thereby failing to deliver the desired results.\textsuperscript{154} Thus, the Cultural Theory framework implies that policies implemented by the representatives of the international community in a war-torn society must be socio-culturally viable, that is, be in harmony with the socio-cultural context – the local political culture. If not viable in their socio-cultural context, these policies are likely to cause conflicts and ultimately will fail.

**Cultural Theory and Governance**

This conceptualization, which sees success or failure of policy processes being connected to the socio-cultural viability of policies in a specific socio-cultural context, is the starting point for the understanding of the society as a social map, a playing field where four social solidarities compete for the dominance over the society. It is through the mechanisms of policy and governance that the political game is played by the major actors on the social map, with those who successfully implement their policies and governance winning new adherents and dominating the public space.\textsuperscript{155} The governance of the public sphere is, therefore, central to comprehending the functioning of a society, specifically understanding the way adherents of a dominating solidarity govern and how those that are governed respond to governance – even when they do not adhere to the same social solidarity. Two key questions are at hand: How do the adherents of different social solidarities view and understand public interest and good societal structures? How do the adherents of different social solidarities respond when confronted with the views and understanding of the adherents of other solidarities?\textsuperscript{156}

The public interest is knowable, according to adherents of hierarchical social solidarity. It can be promoted and protected, but only if there is a continuum between the past, present and future. This continuum can only be ensured by knowledgeable elites (experts) since humans are generally born evil, the hierarchists contend, and must be redeemed by good institutions and/or good


\textsuperscript{155} Cultural theory as theory of governance was developed by John Dixon. This section is based almost entirely on his volume from 2003. John Dixon et al., *Responses to Governance: Governing corporations, societies and the world* (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003).

\textsuperscript{156} Ibid. pp. 241-242.
elites. The governing mode is therefore an ‘expert-led command mode’. The egalitarians also view public interest as knowable and something that can be promoted and protected. However, they require inclusion of, and consensus between, the government and the civil society, both from those within the system and those outside, and that this inclusion/consensus be based on common values and agreed categorical interests. The governing mode is, therefore, a ‘participatory-consensus mode’. In the view of the adherents of the fatalist social solidarity, the public interest is unknowable because of presumed capriciousness and uncertainty of the social context. It cannot be promoted nor protected, they assert, and the society can only be governed by elites who exercise power as they see fit, but without legitimacy because legitimacy can not exist. The fatalists have no preference concerning the governing mode. The individualists see public interest as knowable, but only as expressed in the marketplace. It is a mathematical summation of the private interests. The society is governable, but only if the government is minimal and if the governing elites constrain themselves to ensuring the basic security and legal frameworks, allowing the market mechanisms to determine the rest. The governing mode is therefore a ‘market mode’. Simplified, the only way a good society can be governed, according to the hierarchists, is by authority and expertise; according to the egalitarians, by collective decision-making; and according to the individualists, by market mechanisms that sum up the private interest to a collective will. The fatalists do not believe in good societies or in good governance.

Concerning the responses to governance, the adherents of each of the solidarities would react differently in the case of a failure of their own governing mode, but also quite differently if facing a prospect of failure of the governing mode preferred by adherents of other social solidarities. The hierarchists would express loyalty towards elites and blame deviants if their own mode of governance fails. If faced with a failure of the governing mode of other social solidarities, they would see themselves as rational saviours of the common good and they would attempt to impose a formal hierarchical governance structure. When facing a failure of their preferred governing mode, the egalitarians would voice blame accusing risk-takers and would pursue empowerment of more people, trying to engage them in the political process. If facing failures of other solidarities’ governing modes, they would see themselves as passionate saviours of the collective categorical interests. The individualists would blame bad luck or rogue buyers and sellers, if facing a failure of the market. In the event of a failure of the governing mode of other social solidarities, they would see themselves as common-sense savours of their own self-interests. The fatalists
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when faced with a prospect of failure of their passive governing mode, that is, if faced with successes of the governing modes of others, would react with denial. If faced with failures of the governing modes of others, they would see themselves as prophets of doom, telling others, “I told you so!”

Thus, Cultural Theory of governance prescribes that, during an intervention in a war-torn society, the representatives of the international community will be involved in the governance of the society. They will be involved in a political game marked by the successes and failures of different governance modes, which are employed by different social solidarities, producing different reactions from adherents of other social solidarities. Together with the theoretical prescriptions regarding policy processes, the Cultural Theory of governance enables a different and distinct understanding of socio-political conflicts, which underlie complex socio-political process, such as those in war-torn societies.

**Cultural Theory – a General Theory**

In summation, the Cultural Theory framework developed from the grid-group static model, which was aimed at explaining cultural diversity, into a full-blown general theory, whose aspirations were to explain diversity, societal dynamics and socio-cultural change. In essence, there are still two basic models, one linking the patterns of social organization with the shared values and beliefs and the preferred strategic behaviours, and the other categorizing these patterns and their corresponding biases into the four distinct, necessary, competitive and coherent social solidarities, i.e., into four sets of bias-relation-behaviour combinations. The grid-group model came first and was only a device for mapping and understanding of social solidarities and cultural diversity. The theory itself came later and described the connection between social relations, cultural biases and strategic behaviours.

In comparison to the other cultural approaches used in political science, the Cultural Theory framework distinguishes itself through its simplicity, parsimony and its ambition. It is simple, as it is built on a rather uncomplicated model (depicted in the Figure 1 above), which connects sets of values and beliefs, social relations and strategic behaviours. It is parsimonious, as it constraints the variety of human and social phenomena to four distinct types (described above in Figures 2 through 5). Finally, it is ambitious, as it aims to be employed for understanding, explaining, predicting and even prescribing. The grid-group model is suitable for cross-cultural comparison, and is useful for understanding differences in social practices and differences in views regarding social processes, i.e., social conflicts. Nevertheless, it is the theory behind the model that connects biases, relations and behaviours and explains existence of differences between them, depending on the other existence of the other two. In

its most positivistic alternative, biases and relations are perceived to predict behaviour, and vice-versa. Finally, the Cultural Theory approach is also a normative approach, prescribing what a good policy, good democracy and a good society should look like, based on the ideas of pluralism, cultural balance and cultural equilibrium. This is possibly the most interesting aspect of the Cultural Theory framework, as it enables an innovative approach to the understanding and explaining of existence of different political cultures, different social systems and the understanding of societal dynamics and socio-cultural change. Cultural Theory, a theoretical framework that seems more ambitious and more promising than the competing cultural approaches, attempts to provide a ‘global and integrating theoretical framework’ for the use of the concept of culture in the studies of politics. In conceptualising a social system (society) as a social map where the four social solidarities exist and constantly compete with each other for the support of the people and the dominance of the public sphere, the framework enables an explanation of social conflicts, socio-cultural change and, ultimately, socio-cultural viability of politics, governance and policy.

Furthermore, a wide range of earlier empirical applications, together with the groundbreaking work of the architects of the Cultural Theory framework, provides a comprehensive set of prescriptions that makes the understanding of different solidarities and their corresponding cultural biases less complicated. This mass of earlier knowledge enables more rapid comprehension of how the four different solidarities think and function. Based on that knowledge, the theory has value for deductive tasks through its application to new concepts. It is also important to note that while social relations are directly connected to the two dimensions of the model, grid and group, the cultural biases and strategic behaviours are not. These are merely observed patterns of coherency between values and beliefs, management strategies and social relations, and are not directly derived from willingness to engage in collective activities or to the degree of existence of social constraints. Thus, the deductive applications on new concepts and the creation of new theoretical prescriptions are not necessarily connected to the dimensions of the grid-group model. They can be deduced from a mass of earlier applications and earlier accumulated knowledge. The trick is to learn social solidarities and view the world through a Cultural Theory lens in order to start seeing four different categories. If done properly, the social solidarities of hierarchy, individualism, fatalism and egalitarianism will start appearing before the eyes of the researcher in more-or-less everything that is human and social. The next chapter includes such an exercise, as Cultural Theory and its earlier applications are used to develop a Cultural Theory of post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies.

\[162\] See Michael Thompson, "Inherent Relationality: An anti-dualist approach to institutions" (Bergen: LOS-Centre (The Norwegian Research Center in Organization and Management) 1996).
Chapter Three: Cultural Theory and International Intervention

This chapter applies the Cultural Theory framework to the theory and practice of post-conflict peacebuilding in order to construct a ‘Cultural Theory of international post-conflict intervention in war-torn societies’. This is accomplished in three steps. First, the Cultural Theory framework is employed to define the socio-cultural characteristics of war-torn societies, based on its earlier applications to political cultures and the social map model that defines how social systems (societies) function and change. Second, the Cultural Theory framework is used to deduce a typology of international involvement in war-torn societies, based on the earlier empirical applications of the theory and the basic theoretical prescriptions regarding the four ideal types of the grid group model. Third, Cultural Theory prescriptions regarding the possibilities for successful international intervention in war-torn societies are discussed, based on the application of the theory on policy process and governance.

Socio-Cultural Context of War-Torn Societies

According to the Cultural Theory framework, societies can have a variety of political cultures and political systems depending on the specific regimes and alliances of different social solidarities. A war-torn society deemed to be in need of outside help is a special case in terms of its political culture and its political system, due to the very fact that it needs help from the outside and thus is not a functional social system in a functioning state. The most central aspect for understanding how failed states and war-torn societies function – or do not function – is the degree to which the state is able to provide the basic public goods and services to its citizens. According to the Harvard University Failed States Project, the basic goods and services are, first and foremost, human security and then predictable, recognizable and systematic mechanisms for settling disputes, i.e., the provision of a functioning judicial system. After those needs are met, functioning states provide their citizens with the possibility to participate freely and openly in politics and the political process, as well as providing for other political goods and services, such as health care, schools and education, roads, railways and other physical infrastructure, communication

---

systems, and banking systems. 2 Strong states perform well in all those respects. Weak states, failed states and collapsed states are states that are unable to provide these political and public goods to a satisfying degree. Weak states succeed in some areas and perform poorly in others. For example, such states might provide the basic security while they fail to provide good health care or possibilities for free participation in the political process. Failed states are very weak states where the government cannot (or will not) provide for more than a bare minimum of public goods and the state ceases to function due to the enduring character of unsolved social problems. These states are characterized by several factors such as: inter-communal animosities and identity politics, the inability of the state to control its borders, civil wars and/or internal unrests as government forces fight insurgencies and/or minority groups, a regime that is preying on its own constituency, flawed institutions and increased criminal violence, privatization of public goods (as schools and hospitals are run by communities rather than the state), declining Gross Domestic Product (GDP), corruption, economic chaos and lost legitimacy of the state. 3 Collapsed states are those rare cases of failed states where states fail completely and the political goods are obtained through private or ad-hoc means. 4 Warlords take over, gain control over different territories and build their own security apparatus. They sanction market and trading arrangements and even establish an attenuated form of international relations. The state ceases to perform its tasks and the territory of what had been a nation-state exhibits a ‘vacuum of authority’. 5 The Harvard scale, which ranges from strong to collapsed states, reveals a fundamental characteristic of war-torn societies: their inability to satisfy the needs of its citizens and their inability to settle inter-communal disputes. 6 Thus, war-torn societies are war-torn due to the collapse of the state and are marked by internal unrest, civil war and the emergence of non-state authorities that take over the tasks of the state authority, such as ethnic communities or clans under the leadership of local warlords. Furthermore, collapsed states and war-torn societies are characterized by identity politics, protracted violence and the breakdown of the social fabric of the society. Identity politics were defined as “movements which mobilize around ethnic, racial or religious identity for the purpose of claiming state power”. 7 These movements are backward-looking,
fragmentative and exclusive movements that are built on nostalgia and myths of historical heroism and (real or imagined) memories of injustice. They gain strength from insecurity. Thus, identity politics are diametrically different from what Kaldor calls ‘politics of ideas’, which are forward-looking inclusive movements (such as socialism or environmentalism) whose vision of a better future fuels the movement. Identity politics are combined with protracted violent inter-communal conflict (which can be both low and high in intensity); in which long-standing animosities and deep-rooted fears create what Lederach refers to as a ‘deeply divided society’, a society where war is perceived as a fight for survival, both in terms of individual life and group identity. In such an environment, group leadership is supported uncritically as there is a belief that domination is necessary for the survival of one’s own group – “if we do not dominate, we will be dominated” – and politics becomes extremely fragmented, exclusive and revolves around the single issue of identity. To sum up, war-torn societies are non-functional states, unable to provide basic public goods and services to their citizens, have fragmented and dangerous polities where politics and public management functions poorly (if at all), producing violence and suffering rather than settling conflicts and encouraging development.

Clearly, collapsed states and war-torn societies recovering from a ‘new war’ do not fall into the category of pluralistic societies, which are characterized by a weak fatalist social solidarity and an equal representation of the other three social solidarities. Such pluralistic societies would be strong states and would not need help from outside, given that truly pluralistic societies by definition have all the needed tools to manage any the social problems they may encounter, including the destruction of life and property caused by disasters, including warfare. This is confirmed by the peace and conflict theory known as the ‘Democratic Peace Proposition’ (DPP). This theory is based on an observed correlation between political systems and occurrences of war, and it prescribes that democratic societies do not go to war to begin with. Assuming that the Democratic Peace Proposition is correct, truly pluralistic societies do not end up in civil wars and destructive armed conflicts since they have the ability to
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10 Ibid. p. 15.
12 DPP is a criticized concept. For an overview of the arguments for and against DPP, see Michael E. Brown et al., *Debating the Democratic Peace, An International Security reader* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1996).
solve their social problems and political conflicts without resorting to violence.\textsuperscript{13} All other types of societies possibly could end up in armed conflict. Thus, they all have the potential to be receivers of outside help in post-war reconstruction. Yet, an overview of different political cultures, as defined by Cultural Theory, reveals that some political cultures are more likely than others to become failed states and some societies are more likely than others to encounter internal unrests and internal violent conflicts.

For example, the Cultural Theory ‘requisite variety condition’ specifies that monocultures are prone to self-destruction.\textsuperscript{14} Given this, there are three types of political cultures likely to end up in disorder and breakdown of society, become failed or collapsed states and thus become candidates for an international intervention. These three types are: 1) anarchic societies with sole dominance by the individualistic social solidarity, 2) enclavist societies dominated by the egalitarian social solidarity, and 3) totalitarian societies dominated by the hierarchist social solidarity. ‘Bleeding Kansas’ (i.e., the 1850s Missouri-Kansas border wars), the Khmer Rouge regime and the Soviet Union are all examples of social systems that were unable to provide for their citizens. An uncontrolled anarchy cannot provide basic security, a pure enclavist society destroys the institutions of the state and a pure hierarchy is unable to provide any economic growth.\textsuperscript{15}

On the other hand, societies dominated by stable alliances of two social solidarities with a degree of input from a third active social solidarity, such as entrepreneurial, establishment, moralistic and even frontier political cultures, would probably not be subjected to large and complex international interventions. The societies with these political cultures would probably be able to recover by their own forces, even when they are severely damaged by violent incidents, for example, by aggression outside or rebellion from within. With all of the three active ways of life being active in such societies, the societies themselves would be able to solve their problems, presumably even when these problems are very difficult. Possibly, these societies would need humanitarian aid in the aftermath of war, but they would probably not be candidates for a complex civilian international intervention that includes elements of international governance and international administration. The corollary to this is that societies with large doses of fatalistic social solidarity, such as traditionalistic, clientelistic and paternalistic political cultures, are possible candidates for an outside intervention. Such societies could encounter great difficulties in handling of a post-war recovery process, as adherents of the fatalist social solidarity are passive and prone to isolationist social relations. By definition, the adherents


\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. pp. 87-88.
of fatalist social solidarity exclude themselves from grand social and political projects, such as the post-conflict recovery processes.

The overview of the social maps of different types of societies and their political cultures leads to the conclusion that there are only four types of cultural regimes and alliances that are unlikely to be failed states or war-torn societies and, thus, unlikely to be receivers of civilian international intervention. These four types are the pluralist, entrepreneurial, frontier and moralist political cultures. All other societies are possible candidates for international intervention, with the anarchist, enclavist and totalitarian political cultures being the most likely due to their tendency to self-destruct given that they lack the balancing effect of socio-cultural pluralism. Similarly, as in the case of the Cultural Theory understanding of democracy via the concept of democracy feasibility space, strong states exist in a square within the square of the social map, weak states exist close to the border between the feasibility space and the failed and collapsed states exist outside the feasibility space, close to the edges of the social map.

It should be noted that this reasoning is just a logical exercise and should be considered only as a guideline for the understanding of possible socio-cultural contexts of war-torn societies. In order to understand the social map of war-torn societies better, there is a need for a theoretical understanding of the effects of war on a society.

**Effects of War on the Social Map**

A war constitutes a human and social disaster. As such, it is easy to conceive of it being connected to the high-grid solidarity of fatalism, given that major disasters and catastrophes are likely to lead to collective failures and breakdown of social structures. Yet, the Cultural Theory’s ‘universality principle’ allows for analysis of the effects of war on all four social solidarities. This principle allows zooming in on a subject and conceptualizing its Cultural Theory classification. In so doing, the social phenomenon of war can be seen to have the capability to produce, strengthen or reinforce all four social solidarities.

An armed conflict can strengthen the individualistic social solidarity inasmuch as wars can cause an economic upswing and an increased wealth for some people, thereby producing the fuel for the individualistic meta-narrative of materialistic dreams to become a reality.\(^\text{16}\) An increase in strength of the egalitarian social solidarity can also be an effect of war, inasmuch as people can come together behind a common idea, share the burdens and hardships of war and collectively enjoy the winnings in the aftermath of war.\(^\text{17}\) Wars can cause an
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\(^{17}\) For more on how troubles of war make people come together in egalitarian groups, see Ozren Zunec, *Rat i drustvo* (Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk, 1998) p. 201.
increase in strength of the hierarchical social solidarity, given that wars, by
definition, militarize the society and increase the societal restrictions on freedom
of choice. There are usually stricter rules of what is socially acceptable
behaviour in wartime than in times of peace. Finally, warfare is likely to
increase or reinforce the strength of the fatalistic social solidarity since the
hardships of war can cause people to isolate themselves from the public sphere
and lose faith in collective action, especially in the case of a society finding
itself on the losing side of the battle. Considering that the ‘new wars’ are
characterized by atrocities on the civilian population and by a deliberate and
severe breaking of social ties, the logical results of such a conflict is an
increased attraction of the fatalistic social solidarity. Under such conditions, the
fatalist meta-narratives about capriciousness of the world and the incapability of
authorities to fulfil the needs of the people are likely to be reinforced.

There are, of course, many other examples of wars that can produce,
reinforce and strengthen any combination of social solidarities within a society.
In general, successful warfare should move the society higher on the group
dimension while unsuccessful warfare should move the society lower on the
grid dimension. The success of a group activity such as war should make
individuals more prone to engage in a group activity, while a failure reinforces
the belief that every man is for himself. Regarding the grid dimension, a
legitimate war with a broad support of the people should push the society lower
on the grid dimension while a forced war, without legitimacy and without the
support of the people, should push the society higher on the grid dimension.

While wars can cause changes of strength in all four social solidarities, the
effects are more specific and limited in those war-torn societies considered as
candidates for a complex civilian intervention. Since normally
those who win wars do not require massive outside intervention in the post-war
reconstruction process, there are only two possible effects of war on an
intervention-receiving society: either strengthened fatalistic social solidarity or
strengthened hierarchical social solidarity. The first (strengthened fatalistic
social solidarity) occurs when the destruction and suffering is massive and
people are mostly focused on their own survival and feel that it is only chance
and luck that decide who survives, who dies, who succeeds and who fails. In
such a context, people isolate themselves from the public sphere because
inclusion in social life brings increased suffering and increased danger. Indi-
viduals learn survival strategies and keep their heads down in a belief that they
have no control over their own situations. The second (strengthened hierarchical
social solidarity) results from an increase of the importance of the military, as
the civilian public life becomes militarized. In addition, the fragmented political
elites (warlords) gather support through inflammatory war propaganda and those
who are not obedient and supportive members of the collective become targets
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18 As described by Kaldor, in Mary Kaldor, New and Old Wars: Organized violence in a global era
of criticism and blame-casting. In the face of extreme danger, people organize
themselves into leaders and followers, with leaders leading as they see fit in
exchange for support, while the followers obey orders and provide support to
those in charge in exchange for protection and, ultimately, for survival.19

A Cultural Theory understanding of societal systems leads to the conclusion
that collapsed states and war-torn societies are extreme cases of imbalance of
socio-cultural regimes and socio-cultural alliances. In a post-war period, these
states are likely to be characterized by extreme positions on the social map, with
elements of individualistic anarchy, hierarchical totalitarianism or enclavist
segregation, and with a high number of adherents of the fatalist social solidarity.
Nevertheless, the exact mixture of cultural regimes and alliances in a war-torn
society is dependent on the pre-war political culture, the effect of war on socio-
cultural outlook of a society and, of course, the way the war ended, i.e., win or
loss and the type of the peace settlement. In undertaking empirical research, all
three of these components should be considered in order to determine the socio-
cultural context of a post-war society. On the other hand, the Cultural Theory
framework also provides a tool for a typological understanding of the different
approaches to war-torn societies and different understandings of the role of
international community in post-conflict processes.

Culturally Biased International Peacebuilding

As mentioned in the introductory chapter of this thesis, the contemporary
practice of international post-conflict peacebuilding emerged due to the inability
of the traditional peacekeeping to tackle the challenges of war-torn societies
affected by the new wars. The practice of traditional peacekeeping was heavily
criticized20 and resulting adaptations of the practice in the field led to a diversifi-
cation of types of post-conflict international involvement and a diversification of
thinking about the possibilities of the international community to aid war-torn
societies.

One approach to the possibilities for creation of a sustainable peace is based
on the idea of liberal peace, grounded in the Democratic Peace Proposition and
the liberal school of thought in Western philosophy. The basic idea is that
economic development and economic interdependence lead to a lasting peace.21
Political and economic liberalization are viewed as effective antidotes to violent

19 As described by Lederach, in John Paul Lederach, "Conflict Transformation in Protracted
Internal Conflicts: The case for a comprehensive framework" in Conflict Transformation, ed.
20 For an overview of criticism, see Tom Woodhouse, "Critiques of Conflict Resolution and Peace-
keeping" in Peacekeeping and Conflict Resolution, ed. Tom Woodhouse and Oliver Ramsbotham,
21 Necla Tschirgi, "Post-conflict Peacebuilding Revisited: Achievements, limitations and
challenges" in WSP International/IPA Peacebuilding Forum Conference (New York: International
conflicts and the promotion of democracy, free elections, constitutionalism, rule of law, property rights, good governance, and neo-liberal economics are viewed as the ground for the international peacebuilding strategies. According to Necla Tschirgi, liberal peace constitutes a normative framework that underpinned the peacebuilding activities in the 1990s.22 Roland Paris, another peacebuilding theoretician, found in a comparative case study that the paradigm of liberal internationalism guides the activities in the field, throughout the world. Furthermore, he argued that it should continue to do so, although there were obvious problems with this approach, such as overemphasis on early elections.23 However, the liberal ideology argues for a minimal role of the state, as it promotes market mechanisms as the correct tool for the incorporation of individual interests into a collective will. Thus, scholars have argued that this actually promotes violence in the context of a war-torn society, in which liberalization might increase insecurity.24 Tentatively, it can be concluded that the liberal peace approach, in its purist form, resembles the Cultural Theory prescriptions regarding the cultural bias of the adherents of individualist social solidarity. On one hand, the goals are individualistically biased (democracy, free trade, liberalization, market solutions); on the other hand, the criticisms identify typical individualist blind-spots – egalitarians point to lack of justice and hierarchists point to lack of control and structure.

Yet another line of reasoning concerning the creation of sustainable peace in war-torn societies is represented by the work of John Paul Lederach and his theory of peacebuilding in deeply divided societies. If understood as a criticism of the liberal peace doctrine, his ideas of ‘peacebuilding from below’ are based on an argument that peace must come from within the society, through NGOs and civil society, based primarily on concepts of rebuilding social relationships and reconciliation.25 Many other scholars join Lederach in the argument that the practice of peacebuilding should not be based on liberalization and market solutions alone, but rather on empowerment of local civil society capacity. True peace does not come from the top, but rather it is to be found in mechanisms

24 See, for example, Anna Jarstad, "Dilemmas of War-To-Democracy Transitions" (paper presented at the State Conflict and Democracy, Lund, Sweden, 2006).
aimed at a long-term, all-inclusive quest for truth and justice.\textsuperscript{26} Tentatively, it can be concluded that the ‘peacebuilding from below’ approach, in its purist form, resembles the Cultural Theory prescriptions regarding the cultural bias of the adherents of egalitarian social solidarity. On one hand, the goals are egalitarian biased (justice, reconciliation, equality, inclusiveness); on the other hand, the criticisms point to typical egalitarian blind-spots – individualists criticize them for their short-term ineffectiveness\textsuperscript{27} and hierarchists criticize them for lack of structure and organization.\textsuperscript{28}

Most recently, a school of thought (arising from the practice of the ‘international administration’ or ‘transitional administration’ approach) has emerged that promotes governance and administration of territories, based on the historical predecessors of trusteeships, free cities and internationally-administrated contested territories.\textsuperscript{29} This is the result of both the liberal peace school of peacebuilding and the ‘peacebuilding from below’ school proving insufficient in some cases of complex post-conflict processes. Consequently, the international community opted to introduce ‘transitional administration’ and/or ‘international administration’ of war-torn societies (such as in the cases of Kosovo and East Timor). This line of thought about post-conflict reconstruction has prompted scholars to argue for a new approach to management of state failure, which would encompass direct governing and administration of failed and collapsed states until the states would be able to take over the responsibilities of the state. In this approach to post-conflict peacebuilding, peace is understood as institution-building and state-building, and the role of the

\textsuperscript{26} For more on bottom-up peacebuilding, for example, see Thania Paffenholz and Kristina Lundqvist, Community-Based Bottom-Up Peacebuilding: The development of the Life and Peace Institute’s approach to peacebuilding and Lessons Learned from the Somalia experience (1990-2000), vol. 5, Horn of Africa Series (Uppsala: Life & Peace Institute, 2003), See also Andrew Rigby, Justice and Reconciliation: After the violence (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001). See also Thomas F. Keating and Andy W. Knight, Building Sustainable Peace (New York: United Nations University Press, 2004).

\textsuperscript{27} See, for example, Roberto Belloni, "Civil Society and Peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina", in Journal of Peace Research 38, no. 2 (2001).

\textsuperscript{28} See, for example, Mari Fitzduff, "Civil Society and Peacebuilding - the New Fifth Estate?" (Paper presented at the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, 2004).

\textsuperscript{29} Throughout the history of the UN, the League of Nations and even before, the international community has directly administered a number of territories in the process of post-colonization, post-war recovery and disputes between states. For an overview, see Ramendra Nath Chowdhuri, International Mandates and Trusteeship Systems: A comparative study (Hague: 1955). See also Tom Parker, "The Ultimate Intervention: Revitalizing the UN Trusteeship Council for the 21st Century" (Oslo, Norway: Norwegian School of Management 2003). The practice of direct international administration was abandoned with the abolishment of the trusteeship council of the UN in 1996, but there are scholars who study the practice of contemporary post-conflict intervention as a project revitalization of the trusteeship council for the purpose of tackling the problem of failed and collapsed states. See ibid. See also, for example, Richard Caplan, International Governance of War-Torn Territories: Rule and reconstruction (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) and Edward Mortimer, "International Administration of War-Torn Societies", in Global Governance, no. 10 (2004).
international community is not only to introduce liberalization and democratization or to engage in bottom-up peacebuilding and civil society work, but also to replace the failed state and conduct its tasks until the state is rebuilt. Tentatively, it can be concluded that the peacebuilding through international administration approach, in its purist form, resembles the Cultural Theory prescriptions regarding the cultural bias of the adherents of hierarchical social solidarity. On one hand, the goals are hierarchically biased (strong state, strong institutions, security, guardianship and protectorates); on the other hand, the criticisms point to typical hierarchical blind-spots – individualists criticize them for bureaucratic ineffectiveness, and egalitarians criticize them on moral and ethical grounds, including concepts of colonialism, imperialism and racism.

Yet another way of understanding these three traditions of thought regarding peacebuilding and international intervention can be connected to the constructivist school of thought in international relations. As Wendt argued in his *Social Theory of International Relations*, there are three ideal type cultures of anarchy: Hobbsian, Lockean and Kantian.30 Although it will not be elaborated much further at this point, these three cultures of anarchy are seemingly compatible with the three cultural biases of the Cultural Theory framework: the Lockean understanding of the world roughly corresponds to the individualist cultural bias, the Kantian understanding corresponds to the egalitarian cultural bias and the Hobbsian understanding of the world roughly corresponds to the high-grid cultural biases of hierarchy and fatalism.31 In the following section of this chapter, these three types of thinking about war-torn societies and the possibilities of the international community to create a sustainable and lasting peace are combined with the Cultural Theory framework and the end result is a typology of international intervention in post-conflict societies. The ideal types of intervention are primarily based on the basic prescriptions of Cultural Theory concerning different views about human nature. The positions outlined above on democracy, policy process and governance are included, as well as knowledge about post-conflict international interventions found in peace and conflict research and writings in international relations. The known definitions of peace, different theories about what causes armed conflicts and different views about the post-conflict peacebuilding process are used in order to complement the Cultural Theory typology.
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31 Investigating the philosophical connections between these great thinkers and the Cultural Theory’s definitions of ideal type cultural biases is a task deserving a more detailed inquiry. However, it can be noted that cultural biases of individualism, egalitarianism, fatalism and hierarchy have been connected to Locke, Kant and Hobbes as well as other great thinkers such as Rousseau, Parsons, Weber and others. See for example Michael Thompson et al., *Cultural Theory* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) part II, pp. 101-212.
Intervention Approach of Adherents of Hierarchical Social Solidarity

Hierarchical Cultural Bias

The adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity define human beings as bad, born evil and only possibly redeemed by good institutions. 32 People are incapable on their own and are in need of guidance by rules and regulations, strong institutions and knowledgeable elites. Thus, the adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity are drawn to the narrative that describes evil human beings as the ultimate cause of inter-communal conflict. 33 In addition, they might accept that poorly designed institutions that are not able to control the population can be a contributing factor. Similarly, they accept that the elites can be bad and lead the people to war, sacrificing lives of others for their own personal gain. In the case of an inter-communal conflict, the adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity also subscribe to the myths about differences between the groups in conflict since history is crucially important to them. 34 Ethnic groups might be identified by them as being ‘bad’, ‘conflict-prone’, and historically ‘incapable of peaceful coexistence’ with others. 35 The narrative of blaming deviants and deviant groups as a source of the problem is also in line with the hierarchical cultural bias. 36 If a functioning system is brought down by a revolt of marginalized groups through separatism or terrorism, the adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity would not accept the marginalized group’s right to rebel against the majority group (i.e., against the system). Furthermore, in the case of a civil unrest or an inter-communal conflict, they tend to blame those that are outsiders in the system, the rebelling minority group for example. 37 The adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity would perceive peace as the existence of stability and order, achieved through strengthening of the institutional structure.

34 Time perspectives of the four social solidarities are outlined in John Dixon et al., Responses to Governance: Governing corporations, societies and the world (Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2003).
35 Such arguments are often used by propaganda-machineries in different inter-communal conflicts, most obvious examples being in the Balkans and in Rwanda. In some cases, we have also seen how representatives of the international community accept milder versions of such arguing. For example, a respected American political commentator declared in Washington Post that “Bosnia is a scary place… where World War I began and where the wars of Europe persist, an ember of hate still glowing for reasons that defy reason itself.” See Richard Cohen, “Send in the Troops”, in Washington Post, November 28 1995 Even American presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton repeatedly expressed similar opinions about the causes of conflicts in the Balkans. See Michael E. Brown, Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2001) p. 13.
37 This is in line with a traditional non-intervention policy in international politics. In case of rebellions, the authority of the state was usually supported by the international community.
setting. In inter-communal conflicts, this would result in conflict management mechanisms of balance of power and strengthening of the institutions that regulate the behaviour of different groups.\textsuperscript{38} If the system is strong and balanced, the people will be submissive to the collective, obedient to the social rules and government regulations and there would be no conflict and no warfare. The lasting and sustainable peace is therefore found in institution building, strong government, good elites, clear rules for inter-group relations, and the creation of power-sharing mechanisms and institutional checks and balances. In practical terms, all of the above translates into an acknowledgement of group differences, an acceptance of territorial management of conflict, strong and clearly defined power-sharing mechanisms, a development of institutional control mechanisms and a consociational democratic system.\textsuperscript{39} The peacebuilders that adhere to the hierarchical social solidarity see themselves as guardians and institution builders. Their role is to control the local society and to build the necessary institutions that will continue to control the local elites and the local population in the future, when the intervention is over.\textsuperscript{40} The peacebuilding process is seen as a medium-long process,\textsuperscript{41} shorter than a process of reconciliation and re-integration of society but longer than processes for improving and creating procedures that allow for a correct functioning of the market mechanisms. International involvement is viewed as a solution that has the ability to correct ‘bad behaviour’ of elites, to replace the authority of the state (rejected by deviant and/or marginalized groups) and, ultimately, to build a stable and strong system (both social and political).

The hierarchical social solidarity rejects the narratives of the other social solidarities. Adherents of hierarchical social solidarity find narratives about the inherent goodness of man to be incorrect and naïve. Accordingly, they do not accept democratic procedures, as such, to be a solution to all problems. To the contrary, they might view a democratization process as risky, because it may decrease stability. Furthermore, they do not believe that an active and developed civil society (with participation from below and consensus-seeking dialogue between the groups) can remove the risk of renewed fighting. They find that particular approach unrealistic as it entails a process whose length and scope

\textsuperscript{38} This translates to state-building and institution-building agendas in peacebuilding. For an elaborate discussion on necessity for building strong institutions, see Roland Paris, \textit{At War's End: Building peace after civil conflict} (Cambridge University Press, 2004) pp. 151-212.

\textsuperscript{39} A consociational democratic system is a system where minority participation is ensured through institutional mechanisms, first and foremost the right of veto. For more, see Arend Lijphart, "Consociational Democracy", in \textit{World Politics} 21, no. 2 (1969).

\textsuperscript{40} Guardian model of democracy is the preferred model of democracy according to the hierarchical cultural bias. See more in Frank Hendriks and Zouridis Stavros, "Cultural Biases and New Media for the Public Domain" in \textit{Cultural Theory as Political Science}, ed. Michael Thompson, et al. (London: Routledge, 1999) p. 125.

\textsuperscript{41} Time perspective of adherents of different social solidarities is outlined in Michiel Schwarz and Michael Thompson, \textit{Divided We Stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 67.
would be much longer and broader, extensive and almost indefinite. In that sense, the adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity are pragmatists, believing that a lasting peace is best built through creation of mechanisms that will ensure a well functioning, balanced and stable system of government.

*Supported by hierarchical social relations*

The adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity, when in charge of a peace-building process, create a pyramid-like hierarchical organization. Both in their contacts with the representatives of other agencies in the field and with the local authorities, they attempt to organize a structure where command and control is in focus. They seek to build few relationships with top-level officials. On the other hand, if faced with a prospect of failure, they would use to the fullest extent the power given to them by virtue of their position. If the local governmental elites are unable to live up to the task, i.e., if the elites do not respect the legal-rational authority and the knowledge of the experts, then the adherents of hierarchical social solidarity would look for opportunities to correct this kind of behaviour. They would seek to establish a higher position in the pyramid, gain more power and use this power to force others into obedience.

*Supported by hierarchical strategic behaviours*

Concerning the preferred strategic behaviour, adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity would attempt to influence the behaviours of others through rules and regulations. They would engage in construction of the legal and administrative practices that can control the behaviour of local elites and would base their authority on the legal framework that guides the process. When failing, they use their ‘hammer’, their all-purpose tool – straightforward and top-down regulation. The adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity believe that society is governable and social contexts can be influenced and changed through strong institutions that control the people and punish them when they act contrary to rules and regulations.

**Intervention Approach of Adherents of Egalitarian Social Solidarity**

*Egalitarian Cultural Bias*

The adherents of the egalitarian social solidarity see people as good, capable and primarily in need of access. Accordingly, they would acclaim active participation to be a solution to all problems in the public arena. Given that they have an inherent collectivist view of the social life, their definition of public interest

---

is quite wide, practically encompassing almost all aspects of society. The egalitarians are drawn to the narrative that defines injustice and discrimination as the primary cause of conflict. This is consistent with their belief that the government is always malignant and that elites are always bad – power always corrupts. Most of what is wrong, they claim, comes from inequality of access and, accordingly, they cry for justice in connection to distribution of resources. In the case of inter-communal conflicts, egalitarians consider the causes of inter-group conflict to be institutional or market discrimination as well as the lack of opportunities for participation of certain groups. Thus, their focus is on the underlying causes of a conflict. The egalitarians’ view of human nature is that humans are born good and then corrupted by evil institutions. They reject the notion that there are objective, real differences between groups, based on history or biology. Instead they see the differences as social constructions produced by elites with the goal of control, and they place the blame on the system (the authorities). Simply put, the egalitarians believe that all people are equal and must be treated as such. Thus, their definition of peace is closely connected with notions of equality, but not equality of opportunity (as is the case with individualist cultural bias), but with their specific definition of true equality – equality of outcome. The peacebuilding process after an inter-communal conflict is therefore all about the civil society solutions that enable participation and that lead to integration, reconciliation, forgiveness, justice and equality between groups. The path to peace is not found in negotiation compromises between elites or in good rules that regulate behaviour, but are based on a higher moral stance – notions of inherent goodness and equality between human beings, regardless of their group membership. The peacebuilding process is therefore defined as a broad and long-term, almost indefinite process. The adherents of the egalitarian social solidarity involved in a peacebuilding process will see themselves as teachers. Standing on a higher moral ground, they seek to educate the people and make them understand their collective interest, which is defined by the egalitarians as peace and cooperation through collective action and through participation in the public arena. They perceive international interventions as a moral obligation of the international community to get involved.

---

43 On definition of public and private, see the introductory chapter in Michael Thompson et al., eds., Cultural Theory as Political Science (London: Routledge, 1999).
45 Ibid.
47 Time perspective of adherents of different social solidarities is outlined in Michiel Schwarz and Michael Thompson, Divided We Stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 67.
and teach good values, participative democracy, basic human rights, equality and justice.

The egalitarian cultural bias rejects the narratives of other social solidarities. They find arguments about causes of war based on group differences and inherent malignance of human beings as inaccurate, even offensive. Thus, they judge that the approach of the hierarchists, which includes intrusive intervention with the international community forcing solutions on the local society, to be counter-productive because the result is not based on the collective will of the people. Furthermore, they are reluctant to accept the ideas of an individualistically biased intervention since they see it as utterly inefficient, possibly even counter-productive. There can be no lasting peace based on the rules of the market, which could possibly increase competition and thus increase inequalities. The lasting peace, they assert, is to be found in cooperation, a deeper understanding between the parties in conflict and through a commitment to collective action, driven from the bottom-up, by the civil society.

Supported by Egalitarian Social Relations

The adherents of the egalitarian social solidarity, if in charge of a peacebuilding process, would seek out a wide range of actors with similar moral stance. In their contacts with other representatives of the international community and in contacts with the local political elites, their inclination would be that those willing to participate would be invited to the table. Egalitarians would deal with lower-level officials and even directly with the population, through the NGOs and civil society. In contact with other organizations and agencies working in the same process, they would try to create many tight relationships between different actors who would be perceived as being equally important.

Supported by Egalitarian Strategic Behaviours

Concerning the preferred strategic behaviour, adherents of the egalitarian social solidarity would attempt to influence the behaviours of others through information and education. They would engage in consensus seeking negotiations, confident in the moral superiority of their own point of view, expecting others to learn and accept their will and their values. When faced with a prospect of failure, they would use their ‘hammer’, their all-purpose tool – education and consensus-seeking dialogue. In the view of the adherents of the egalitarian social solidarity, society is governable and its social context can be influenced by the people, if they are acting collectively and if their action is based on higher moral values, i.e., if they seek justice and equality.
Intervention Approach of Adherents of Individualistic Social Solidarity

*Individualistic Cultural Bias*

The adherents of the individualist social solidarity define people as good, capable and needing nothing more than opportunities.⁴⁸ They see market mechanisms as a solution to all that is private. They envision a non-intrusive and small government, which allows for individual preferences to sum up to a collective definition of public interest, as a solution to all problems in the public arena. Thus, the adherents of the individualist social solidarity are drawn to the narrative that defines incompetent governing elites as the primary cause of inter-communal conflict.⁴⁹ Such elites’ actions (or inactions), they believe, might be combined with an inadequate institutional setting that allows for errors in the translation of the individual choices into the collective (other problems might hamper rational decision-making, such as problems associated with the ‘security dilemma’⁵⁰). In connection to ethnic conflicts, the institutional setting, i.e., poor market mechanisms, is blamed for the discrimination of groups in both the economic and political market.⁵¹ The individualist definition of peace is closely connected with freedoms of the individual. Rational people would not choose war, since the war decreases resources for all. Consequently, if people were allowed to make free choices, there would be no wars. Furthermore, people are perceived as self-seeking. Therefore, the sum of their individual choices must lead to cooperation, since cooperation increases wealth and well-being for all. The path to peace, according to the individualist cultural bias, is based on market mechanisms that allow rational individuals to make free choices. Free and fair elections, freedom of movement, organization, trade and freedom of information are seen as ultimately leading to a lasting and sustainable peace. The peacebuilding process is defined as a short-term process⁵² in which the international community has a limited role. The adherents of the individualist social solidarity see themselves as providers of a temporary assistance, as a pool of resources created by the international community, invited by the local society with the specific task of providing solutions to specific problems. The international involvement can temporarily aid in providing and maintaining security and can temporarily assist with expertise in the process of creation of

---

⁴⁹ The individualists blame personal incompetence. For more on perspective on blame, see ibid. pp. 59-61.
⁵² Once again, time perspective of adherents of different social solidarities is outlined in Michiel Schwarz and Michael Thompson, *Divided We Stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 67.
correct market mechanisms, by organizing elections, through facilitation of negotiations or through mediating the negotiations between the parties.

The individualist cultural bias rejects the narratives of the other social solidarities. They find arguments about the causes of war based on group differences and inherent malignance of human beings as inaccurate and offensive. Granted that individuals might be incapable, but such generalization about groups of people is unacceptable in their frame of reference. Thus, they find intrusive intervention to be counter-productive, since the results do not express the will of the people, either through markets or the electoral process. Any interference that sets market mechanisms and democratic procedures aside is not productive. It can be tolerated only when it is indisputably aimed at correcting the behaviour of the incompetent elites who stand in the way and represent obstacles to correct functioning of market mechanisms. The individualists also reject the egalitarian cultural bias, particularly because it focuses on what individualists perceive as the private sphere, thus limiting individual freedom.

Supported by Individualistic Social Relations

The adherents of the individualistic social solidarity, when in charge of a peacebuilding process, would create egocentric networks. Among their contacts with the representatives of other agencies working in the field and with the local authorities, they would ‘invite to the table’ those who share the same interests and are willing to help. Eternally optimistic about the possibility of achieving their goals, the individualists would seek out, without regard for their position or their right to participate, persons perceived to be capable and able to contribute, and would avoid others. This would result in their dealing with both top-level and low-level officials, in both civil society and in public office, in both business (private) and politics (public) and from both (or all) groups in the conflict. The effect of this would be that there will be many loose relationships between different actors, organized in egocentric temporary networks.

Supported by Individualistic Strategic Behaviours

Concerning the preferred strategic behaviour, the adherents of the individualistic social solidarity will attempt to influence the behaviours of others through negotiations based on rational arguments. They will gladly engage in competition between opinions, confident in rationality and logic of their own meta-narrative, expecting others to be rational and accept their arguments. When faced with a prospect of failure, they will use their ‘hammer’, their all-purpose tool – the economic incentives. Supporters of the individualistic social solidarity believe that society is governable and social contexts can be influenced through economic incentives that alter the calculations of rational actors and thus enable them to make the right choices.
Fatalist Social Solidarity in Peacebuilding Processes

Fatalist Cultural Bias

The fatalistic cultural bias defines people as untrustworthy, incapable and in need of luck in order to succeed. Its adherents see the public sphere as threatening, an arena where people get hurt. They will be drawn to the narrative that defines war as an unpredictable, but natural phenomenon, an inevitable consequence of human nature. They would be attracted to the cyclic theories about the causes of war, as they view wars as something that occurs regardless of the will of the people, a part of a capricious, unpredictable world. Their definition of peace is closely connected with the ‘absence of war’ rationale. Not believing in the prospects of prosperity and success, in terms of economic development or reconciliation between the groups, they are satisfied with mere physical security since it ensures the achievement of the goal of survival. The path to peace, according to the fatalist cultural bias, is predetermined by higher powers, luck or chance. It follows then, they contend, that little or nothing can be done to build a lasting peace – managing institutions (representatives of the international community) can only pretend to do something and only time will tell if peace becomes stable or if armed conflict explodes again. The peace-building process is, therefore, not defined in terms of time limits. Peace-builders that adhere to fatalistic social solidarity see themselves as drops of water in a sea, unable to influence events. They try to survive: they create policies that will enable them to raise funds and stay longer, hoping that things outside their control will provide the wanted result, namely, a lasting peace. The international involvement cannot build peace and it cannot influence the local society, the fatalists claim. It can only fool the people (in the local society as well as in the international community) that something is being done in the name of peace.

The fatalist cultural bias rejects the narratives of the other social solidarities. The causes of war are neither institutional nor structural; likewise they are not caused by bad elites. It is bad luck, bad history, bad neighbours and other things that cannot be controlled that are to be blamed. They also reject the other solidarities’ notions of peace and their ideas about how it can be reached. The ideas that democratization, reconciliation through dialogue and participation in the civil society could lead to a lasting peace are considered naïve. The regulation of behaviour through the institutional arrangements is the only

53 Once again, the myths of human nature corresponding to the four social solidarities are discussed in Michael Thompson et al., Cultural Theory (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1990) pp. 33-37.

54 On blame, see ibid. pp. 59-61.

55 Once again, the time perspective of adherents of different social solidarities is outlined in Michiel Schwarz and Michael Thompson, Divided We Stand: Redefining politics, technology and social choice (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) p. 67.
accepted narrative. Yet even here, the fatalists wonder who will regulate and conclude that those people, whether they are the old elites, new elites or the international peacebuilders and experts, have bad intentions and cannot be trusted. Thus, they reject the idea that someone could regulate and prevent bad things from happening. While not endorsing the approach, they could possibly tolerate a hierarchical approach since it neither requires nor expects active participation.

**Supported by Fatalistic Social Relations**

The adherents of the fatalistic social solidarity, when in charge of a peace-building process, would isolate themselves from the risks they see in participation. In their contacts both with other international agencies active in the process and with the local authorities, fatalists would not attempt to organize in a meaningful manner. Eternally pessimistic concerning possibilities of achieving their goals, the fatalists would follow the flow and hold to the status-quo, without any grand ideas about achieving dramatic changes. Accordingly, they would create as few and as loose relationships as possible.

**Supported by Fatalistic Strategic Behaviours**

The preferred strategic behaviour for adherents of the fatalistic social solidarity is to avoid attention, keep their heads down and avoid taking unnecessary risks. They would engage in a competition of meta-narratives with the adherents of other social solidarities, acting as prophets of doom. When faced with a prospect of failure, i.e., the prospect of a disaster due to their inactivity, they use their ‘hammer’, their all-purpose tool – isolation and avoidance of the problem. Supporters of the fatalist social solidarity believe that society is not governable and social contexts cannot be influenced.

The four ideal types of intervention outlined above will be operationalized further in a number of variables in the next chapter, which is concerned with methodology of the case study. At this time, it can be concluded that there are four distinct, theoretically prescribed types of intervention in war-torn societies, deducted from the basic prescriptions of the four social solidarities of the Cultural Theory model. The question for empirical research is which social solidarities dominate a post-conflict international intervention and a peace-building project. In the following section, a brief logic regarding the success and failures of intervention is outlined, based on the Cultural Theory understanding of the types of intervention and socio-cultural contexts and on its prescriptions regarding successes and failures of policies and governance modes.
Socio-cultural Viability of International Intervention

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Cultural Theory of policy and the Cultural Theory of governance define what is ‘good policy’ and ‘good governance’, through the notion of socio-cultural viability. A policy will succeed if it is viable, i.e., in line with its socio-cultural context. A governance institution will be perceived and accepted as legitimate if it is socio-culturally viable, i.e., in line with its socio-cultural context. In the post-conflict process in a war-torn society, the representatives of the international community arrive, introduce policies and engage in the process of governance. They do so based on their cultural biases, their preferred social relations and their preferred behavioural strategies. The local society, on the other hand, represents a socio-cultural context that is presumably different, especially given that a war-torn society is a collapsed state, a non-functioning extreme case of imbalance between existences of different social solidarities. In addition, the very goal of international intervention in a war-torn society is to promote a social and political change, enabling a transformation from protracted war to sustainable peace.

Thus, there are two options for possible interactions between the representatives of the international community and the local society, and there are two possible results in terms of socio-cultural change. First, the representatives of the international community can attempt to balance the imbalance in the local society. In that case, they would attempt to introduce policies and engage in governance of the society in a diametrically different manner than the manner preferred by the local authorities. While the possible and intended benefit is correction of the imbalance as the local society learns new ways of governance and changes, there is a risk of misunderstandings, conflicts and policy failure. The second of the two options is that the representatives of the international community can instead adapt to the local socio-cultural context, introduce policies and engage in governance in a manner similar to that preferred by the local authorities and local social elites in order to achieve socio-cultural viability, policy success and governance legitimacy. The possible benefit is short-term policy success; the possible risk is failure to correct the imbalance in the local society in the long run as the socio-culturally viable policies reinforce the dominant social solidarities. In this case, it is the representatives of the international community who are learning and changing, rather than the local authorities and the local society in general.

In other words, the Cultural Theory framework defines a basic problem of international intervention whose goal is promotion of political and social change, a problem that can be labelled as a ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’. On one hand, the representatives of the international community can attempt to teach the locals and thus risk failure. On the other, the representatives of the international community can attempt to learn from the locals and thus risk reinforcing the social solidarities already dominant in the society, consequently failing to achieve major social and political change. The question for empirical
research is to define which of the two is occurring in a specific case and with which effects.

All in all, the Cultural Theory framework constitutes a general theory, presumably able to explain the dynamics of international involvement in politics of war-torn societies, based on the concept of socio-cultural viability of intervention. Cultural Theory can be used to gain an understanding of a war-torn society – its politics and its societal dynamics. Furthermore, it can be used to gain an understanding of the type of international intervention – its cultural bias, preferred social relations and preferred strategic behaviours. Finally, Cultural Theory can be used to evaluate the success of intervention and its effects on the local society, based on analysis of compatibility between the type of intervention and the local society, i.e., a study of socio-cultural viability. The next chapter is concerned with some methodological issues connected with the case study. It also includes a final framework for empirical research – a brief final operationalization of the theory for the purpose of the case study.
Chapter Four: Method and Framework for Analysis

The methodological approach used in the case study is theoretically driven. It is qualitative, interpretive and based on inherent methodological prescriptions of the Cultural Theory framework. First, the ‘grid-group model’ is in itself a methodological tool, a heuristic device for understanding and mapping diversity of social relations, strategic behaviours and shared values and beliefs. Second, the ‘social map model’ is a methodological tool for understanding social systems and societies. Third, the theoretically-prescribed ‘mechanisms for change’ constitute a methodological tool for understanding of socio-cultural change.

As mentioned before, the chosen case study is a study of international involvement in post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina. In addition to a discussion about the method used in the case study, this chapter will include a discussion about the choice of case, type of case study and the sources of empirical material. Finally, the framework for the analysis of the case, a methodological and theoretical operationalization based on the Cultural Theory social map model and earlier outlined ideal types of international intervention, will be specified and presented.

Method

As outlined in Chapter Two, the Cultural Theory framework has its origins in anthropology and sociology. One of the main ideas driving the founders of the theory in the development of this approach was to bring a more systematic methodological tool to the studies of culture. Until then, the academic work in these disciplines lacked a model that would enable systematic comparison.¹ Later, as the Cultural Theory framework entered political science, the efforts to use it in a more positivistic, methodologically stringent manner continued and became more refined.² The theory began to be utilized to produce hypotheses about shared values, beliefs and behaviours that were tested on mass data. Empirical studies were designed to test the theory and to improve its validity.

However, quantitative measurements based on survey data provided mixed results, as mentioned earlier in this thesis. The theory regularly proved that it

had merit, but the measuring of the exact position on the grid and group dimensions proved to be a difficult task, providing inconsistent results and exposing it to harsh and valid criticism. The response was to turn against methodological individualism and all attempts to prove or disprove the internal logic of the theory through statistical methods and mass data. The point was no longer to classify people into four boxes and predict their behaviours, values or beliefs. Instead, the Cultural Theory was seen as a framework enabling simplification, capturing complex social contexts and societal phenomena that otherwise could not be easily understood and explained. Thus, the methods applied in the Cultural Theory based studies might be quantitative large-N statistical mass-data studies, but they should primarily be qualitative and interpretative. Rather than explaining and predicting human behaviour on an individual level, cultural theorists argue that the framework should primarily be used for the purpose of mapping and understanding of complex social contexts and social conflicts.

The choice of method in this study is in line with this argument. Although a large-N statistical study of values and beliefs could have provided results, it was not chosen for three different reasons. First, the choice of method was based on the above-mentioned difficulties concerning measurement of the grid and group dimensions through survey data. There are still no adequate tools for capturing the two dimensions of the model. Until there are, every attempt to use a large-N statistical value survey method will most likely end up in debates over the internal validity of the theoretical framework itself, i.e., about the connection between the two dimensions of social organization and the four social solidarities. This is not the purpose of this study – the internal validity of the Cultural Theory framework is taken for granted. In addition, there are practical reasons for not conducting a value survey study. As the focus of this thesis is primarily about socio-cultural change over time, survey methodology is not an appropriate tool since surveys can only be conducted in the present time; i.e., the researcher cannot go back to the past and survey a population. It would indeed be very interesting to map the values and beliefs of Bosnians and the representatives of the international community directly after the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995, and then continue to map the changes in

---


values and beliefs over time – regardless of the preferred theoretical approach used to interpret the data. Such a study could discover and measure the changes over time and possibly even connect them with the changing role of the international agencies. Unfortunately, there are no such data as there were no studies of that kind undertaken at that time. The first comprehensive value surveys of Bosnian population were conducted only in the year 2000 by the Early Warning System and Prism Research Institute.\(^7\) In addition, there are no comparable and systematic studies of values and beliefs of representatives of the international community working in Bosnia.

Moreover, the point of this empirical case study is not to test the theory, but to use the theory to explore the case, in order to use the case study and explore the theory – possibly refine and improve it. As the goal is neither to test the theory, nor simply to use the theory – it is to test the theory’s explanatory value through an exploration of this particular case.\(^8\) Thus, the purpose of this study is in itself interpretative, as it aims to assess the usefulness of the Cultural Theory framework for explaining the dynamics in a complex social, political and cultural process.

In other words, the chosen qualitative and interpretative approach to empirical studies is based on a particular understanding of the merits of the Cultural Theory framework. The theory is a tool for simplifying complex social contexts and one that promises a deeper understanding of dynamic processes within complex social contexts. The primary goal is to understand policy and politics, dialogue and discourses, relations and behaviours – not necessarily to define the values and beliefs of a perfect representative sample of the population, or to evaluate specific policies against the observed shared values and beliefs of a sample of the population. The goal of this research is not to test the internal validity of the theory, i.e., to conclude if the theory is ‘right’ or ‘wrong’, but to conduct a test of the explanatory value of the theory, i.e., to see how much it can explain, to determine which way it can contribute to conceptual understanding of the studied phenomena and to assess how useful it is as an approach to empirical studies of this kind.

**Choice of Case**

In developing the design of this study, three important choices had to be made. First, there was a choice of the number of cases that would be included. Originally, the theme for this study emerged from an interest in the post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Yet, it was not clear that the only case included in the study would be the Bosnian case. A comparative empirical study of a few cases might have better grasped the diversity of situations where post-

---

\(^7\) Early Warning System is a project of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), available at www.undp.ba.
\(^8\) The way theory is tested is further discussed in later sections of this chapter.
conflict interventions occur. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the motivation for the use of a new theoretical approach was in part the diversity between the cases. If Bosnia, Kosovo, East Timor and/or Afghanistan had been compared, the results would probably better justify the development of a new theoretical tool for analysis of interventions in war-torn societies. However, the case in question, ten years of the post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina, provided enough variance over time to satisfy the ambitions of this study. Comparisons are made over time within the case, through process-tracing, rather than between the cases. In addition, practical reasons such as constraints in terms of time, costs and availability of information made a comparative approach far less feasible. These factors led to the choice to conduct a single case study and to use process-tracing in order to discover variance over time and enable comparisons within the case. Comparative ambitions are, of course, a possible and logical path for future research projects.

The second choice was the question of the selection of the case. Since it was possible to study only one case, the question was which case could be considered the most representative one. Obviously, there is no one case capable of representing all cases of international involvement in post-conflict processes. The practice of peacebuilding is diverse and dependent on the particular context. Even if there was a median case, exactly in-between the extremes in regard to the depth of post-conflict problems, conflict intensity, type of peace agreement, type of international involvement, complexity of the political process, available resources or the clarity of mandate, the argument that that case could be representative for all cases could still not be made. Nevertheless, even if there is no one representative case, there are still valid criteria for selection of cases. One proposed by Robert E. Stake is to choose a case based on the promise of the 'opportunities for learning'. He argued that researchers should choose a case that is most likely to provide new insights. Thus, it is conceivable that the right choice is the case that is simply ‘the most accessible’. In this light, one of the reasons for choosing Bosnia as the target case in this dissertation is purely pragmatic: Bosnia is the most accessible case, since the author of this thesis speaks the local language.

12 Ibid.
In addition, Stake asked a legitimate question: “Isn’t it better to learn a lot from an atypical case then little from a seemingly typical case?” While the Bosnian case is an atypical case, as any other possible case, it is also a ‘crucial’ or ‘paradigmatic’ case. It was the first case of ad-hoc international administration. It was also one of the first cases of ‘humanitarian international intervention’ of the post-Cold War era. Furthermore, it was the first case of a new war that was managed by the international community and afterwards administered by a conglomerate of international agencies, NGOs and governmental agencies (rather than being awarded as a protectorate to a single state, as was usual in the decolonization period). As such, it has been used by international agencies almost as a laboratory, as many different approaches were tested throughout the years. Since Bosnia, all other international interventions, whether in East Timor, Kosovo, Afghanistan or Iraq, have included practices that have been used in Bosnia at one time or the other.

Thus, the Bosnian case is the case that promises greatest learning opportunities for a study such as this one – a study of socio-cultural viability based on the Cultural Theory framework. Moreover, Bosnia is the only case of a complex civilian international intervention that has continued long enough to create opportunities for a deeper understanding. Other cases that come to mind are not as suitable for this kind of a study. For example, Kosovo does not have a clear constitutional status and Afghanistan and Iraq are recent cases where the military issues and security concerns still dominate the process. These post-conflict processes have not yet reached a point where the representatives of the international community are close to completing their tasks and leaving the country. Clearly, it is too soon for an evaluation of the broader goals of intervention in those cases.

**Type of Case Study**

The fact that the case of Bosnia can provide more learning experiences than other, less familiar or less developed processes was not the only factor behind the choice of this process. Bosnia was also chosen in order to learn about the phenomena of international intervention in post-war societies. Even though it

---


14 There are four criteria for information-oriented selection of cases, extreme cases, maximum variance cases, critical cases and paradigmatic cases. See Bent Flyvbjerg, "Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research" *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, no. 2 (2006).


16 See, for example, ICG, "Kosovo: Let’s Learn from Bosnia" in *ICG Europe Report* (17 May 1999). See also Paddy Ashdown, "What Baghdad Can Learn from Bosnia", in The Guardian, April 22 2003. See also Andrew Rathmell, "Planning Post-Conflict Reconstruction in Iraq: What can we learn?", in *International Affairs* 81, no. 2 (2005).
can not be considered a representative case, Bosnia is certainly ‘a case of something’.\footnote{Famous question Becker proposes every researcher should ask himself before engaging in case study research, “What is this a case of?” See Howard Saul Becker and Pamela Richards, \textit{Writing for Social Scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).} Therefore, there are some possibilities for generalization. Single-case studies have often been misunderstood as studies based on a ‘sample of one’, thus criticized as indicative, anecdotal, exploratory, opportunistic, idiosyncratic and ultimately, unscientific.\footnote{As noted in David A. Buchanon, “The Logic of Political Action: An experiment with the epistemology of the particular”, in \textit{British Journal of Management} 10 (1999) See also Bent Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research”, in \textit{Qualitative Inquiry} 12, no. 2 (2006).} The problem is defined as lack of external validity or generalizability, which is one of the basic criterions in the positivist research tradition.\footnote{As noted in David A. Buchanon, “The Logic of Political Action: An experiment with the epistemology of the particular”, in \textit{British Journal of Management} 10 (1999). See also Bent Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research”, in \textit{Qualitative Inquiry} 12, no. 2 (2006).} However, as Yin noted, case studies should not be considered as a sample of a number of cases since they rely on a different kind of generalization than statistical studies do. Namely, case studies rely on ‘analytical generalization’ where the researcher strives to generalize the results of a case study to a broader theory, rather than to a broader population, which the case is supposed to represent.\footnote{Robert K. Yin, \textit{Case Study Research: Design and Methods}, 2. ed., vol. 5, \textit{Applied Social Research Methods Series} (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 1994).}

The issue of possibilities for generalization from a single case is further defined by the type of case study. There are many different accounts of types of case studies and they can be summarized in five categories. First, there is the ‘case description’ where the researcher’s interest is limited to the case itself, an ‘athoretical case study’.\footnote{Arend Lijphart, “The Comparable-Case Strategy in Comparative Research”, in \textit{Comparative Political Studies} 8 (1975).} Second, there are studies defined as ‘case exploration’ where the researcher uses a theory in order to explore the case. The case is still in focus and the main purpose of such a study is to learn about the case, but the theory is explicitly used in order to analyze and interpret the case, thus making the case study interpretive.\footnote{Ibid.} Third, case studies can be used to derive hypothesis and to develop theories. These are the ‘heuristic case studies’.\footnote{Ibid.} Fourth, case studies can be used in order to test the theory, as any particular case still has the ability to confirm or infirm a general theory, even if it is a single case.\footnote{Ibid.} Fifth, case studies can be used to ‘explore and refine’ a theory, with the goal of conducting a ‘plausibility probe’, positioned somewhere in-between the
goal of a more rigorous testing the theory and the goal of atheoretical
description of the case.25 In this dissertation, a single case study will be used in a
manner partly resembling ‘case exploration’, as the Cultural Theory is used in
order to explore the case of Bosnia. The theory leads the investigation, as it is
used in both the selection of the material and the selection of the cases within
the case. At the same time, there is an ambition of ‘exploring and refining’ the
theory, as the results of the case study will be used to evaluate the Cultural
Theory framework and possibly contribute to it. In addition, this study
constitutes a test of the ‘explanatory value’ of the theory, inasmuch as process-
tracing and within-the-case-comparison will be used to assess the usefulness of
the theoretical approach in empirical research.

In conclusion, a case study of the process in Bosnia is chosen because it
promises learning opportunities and possibly even analytical generalization
(according to Stake and Yin). The case study method itself is used for both
theoretical exploring of the case and for using the case for exploring and refining the theory (as defined by Lijphart and Eckstein). Exploring the case in
order to learn, generalize, and explore and refine the theory can be summarized
as testing the explanatory value of the theory, in other words, not quite testing the theory, yet much than simply describing the case. Here, the explanatory value of the theory is tested through exploring and learning, thereby assessing the usefulness of the theory in this particular kind of empirical research.

**Explanatory Value**

This approach to the use of theory in social sciences is based on the notion that
there are criteria for a good theory and criteria for theory testing, beyond that of
the strict Popperian falsification of hypothesis.26 Also, there are criteria for
evaluation of theories other than their consistency with the empirical evidence,
_albeit_ empirical support is the most important factor for judging the value of a
theory. Such criteria are often defined as simplicity and parsimony, testability,29
generalizability,28 practical implications30 and so forth.31 In this thesis, the
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26 Popperian falsification is a positivist, traditional view of the scientific progress, usually found in
natural sciences. According to Popper, theories can not be confirmed, only falsified. A confirmed
theory should be re-tested until it is falsified. Falsification thus leads to scientific progress. See Karl

27 The Ockham’s razor principle, which states that a theory that is based on few assumptions is
better than a theory based on many assumptions and a theory using few concepts is better than a
theory using many.

28 How broad a theory is? How many phenomena can it explain? Will H. Moore, "Evaluating
Theory in Political Science" (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University 2001).

29 Hypothetical yield, i.e., how many testable hypotheses a theory can produce. A theory that can
produce many is better than a theory that can produce few, ceteris paribus.
Cultural Theory framework will be evaluated on the basis of its alleged parsimony, simplicity and generality. In addition, the explanatory value of the theory will be tested, rather than the theory and its internal validity. Theory testing is in that sense different, inasmuch as there are no hypotheses that can be falsified in a Popperian sense of the term. As George and Bennett concluded, the theories, when tested in case study methodology, often include complex casual relationships that are extremely difficult to test empirically.\(^{32}\) This, ‘enigmatic causality’ includes complex interactions among numerous variables, low-probability relations between variables and endogeneity or feedback effects.\(^{33}\) Such theories are difficult to test in large-N studies as well and it is almost impossible to falsify such a theory in a single case study. Even if it fails in a single case, the theory might be correct in its internal logic and resulting assumptions about causality between variables. Specific context of the anomalous case, poor operationalization and a poorly-defined scope of the theory might be reasons for failure. Thus, George and Bennett argue that theory testing in case study methodology is rarely used for the purpose of decisive refutation of a theory, but rather to identify if and how the scope of the theory should be narrowed or expanded.\(^{34}\)

The possibilities for falsification of the theory in this dissertation are not as clear as they would be in a large-N study, yet they still exist, inasmuch as this dissertation could show that Cultural Theory did not perform well in the empirical case study and its explanatory value could prove to be small or nonexistent. In order to determine the success of the theory and its explanatory value, the following criteria should be satisfied. To begin with, there is a general test of the Cultural Theory framework – the coherency of the link between social relations, strategic behaviours and cultural biases. Cultural Theory could be refuted as a poor explanatory theory if there were no observed links between social relations, cultural biases and strategic behaviours. For instance, if there was a study that showed that similar cultural biases exists in different context with diametrically different ways of creating and maintaining social relations, “faith in Cultural Theory would be greatly weakened” as it was once stated by the founders of the theory.\(^{35}\) In addition to this general test of the theory, there are few criteria specific for this study, derived from the research questions and the statement of purpose. The Cultural Theory framework can prove to be

\(^{30}\) A theory that can provide practical knowledge for practitioners. A theory that yields more practical implications is better than a theory that produces few, ceteris paribus.


\(^{33}\) Ibid. pp. 116-117.

\(^{34}\) Ibid. p. 115.

poorly suited for evaluation of the successes and failures of internationally introduced policies, if those policies succeed and/or fail regardless of their socio-cultural viability, i.e., compatibility with their socio-cultural context. Furthermore, the theory would be poorly suited for enhancement of the understanding of post-conflict international intervention in war-torn societies if the proposed culturally biased approaches to post-conflict peacebuilding were non-existent, difficult or impossible to recognize and distinguish from each other. In addition, the theory would be poorly suited for enhancement of the understanding of peacebuilding if there were no connection between cultural bias of international peacebuilders and the local socio-cultural context, i.e., if peacebuilding strategies were universally applicable and independent of the context to which they are applied.

If there is no variance between possible approaches used, no connection between the approach used and the result, and no socio-cultural changes resulting from the link between socio-cultural context and the approach used, then clearly the theory is not performing well. If there is variance between approaches used, a connection between approaches used and achieved results, and socio-cultural changes that can be explained by the link between context and approaches used, then the theory is performing. In addition, it must be noted that whether the theory is merely ‘poorly suited’, ‘performing’ or ‘performing well’ in connection to each of the three main research questions, it is not judged comparatively against some specific rivaling theories, but rather on the merits of proposed generalizability, simplicity and parsimony. In accordance with the argument of George and Bennett outlined above, a single case study can neither definitely confirm nor definitely refute a theory. Rather, Cultural Theory is used to expand the scope of studies of peacebuilding and international interventions in war-torn societies. Thereby, its abilities to contribute to the studies of war-torn societies and to explain the role of the international peacebuilders in post-conflict peacebuilding processes are put to the test.

**Design of the Case Study**

The case study consists of two parts, a brief historical overview and a four-part analysis of the post-conflict process in Bosnia; the latter being the main part of the study. An overview of the Bosnian political history was conducted in order to find out which social solidarities dominated the Bosnian politics and society, i.e., what was the outlook of the Bosnian socio-cultural context at the start of the post-conflict process. The chosen method for the historical background study was a brief literature study based on secondary sources, i.e., writings of others. However, the Bosnian political history is, as is the political history of the whole Balkans region, a controversial subject. Scholars, politicians and people in general do not agree about much concerning past events, and different ethnic groups write their own histories as a part of their state-building and nation-
building agendas. Thus, the choice of method and sources caused considerable reliability problems and those problems did not allow for a more detailed and conclusive study. The historical background chapter should therefore be viewed as what it is, a background chapter, primarily aiming to inform the reader of the past and thus enhance the understanding of the case. The conclusions found at the end of this chapter are based on a tentative analysis and they serve merely as preliminary propositions.

The main part of the case study, the exploration of the Bosnian post-conflict process through the Cultural Theory analytical framework was done in four steps, through chronological process-tracing, covering four time periods from the start of the process in 1995 until 2006, the presumed start of the end of the civilian intervention to Bosnia. For practical reasons, these four periods are defined by arrival and departure of four High Representatives to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Carl Bildt of Sweden, Carlos Westendorp of Spain, Wolfgang Petritsch of Austria and Lord Paddy Ashdown of the United Kingdom. The most recent period, since Christian Schwarz-Schilling from Germany became the High Representative is mentioned at the end of the case study but is not studied in a separate chapter. Although this arrangement produces a disproportionate timeline as different High Representatives stayed in Bosnia for different periods of time, there are several reasons why this was the most practical method for tracing the Bosnian process. First, upon the replacement of the current High Representative, international agencies and organizations as well as Bosnian media, Bosnian politicians and Bosnian scholars usually took the opportunity to summarize the work of the outgoing High Representative (HR) and define the priorities for the next period. The time of arrival and departure of a different HR has therefore been thoroughly described in the material. Second, the institution of the Office of the High Representative is built around the person, the High Representative himself. Each of the High Representatives attempted to leave his own characteristic mark on the process. As they landed in Sarajevo, each presented their own ideas about what was wrong in Bosnia and what needed to be done in order to improve and speed up the process. Therefore, the arrival of a High Representative is a natural moment when new priorities were discussed and set. Third, the Office of the High Representative (OHR) is widely considered as the most important international institution in Bosnia, as well as the most important and most powerful institution in Bosnian politics – second not even to the Bosnian presidency. Thus, by its importance alone, changes in the approach of the OHR are most crucial for the understanding of the changes in the entire post-conflict process.

Some other options, such as to classify the process in Bosnia year-by-year or according to the local elections cycle, major events in the process or by different approaches used by the international community, were considered but rejected. For example, to have ten different chapters covering the ten years of the process
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was rejected for practical reasons. Similarly, using the local elections cycle was not practical as the cycle has been changed: at times, various elections were held every two, three or four years, as well as there were extra elections due to the dissolving of the parliament. Looking at the process through major events was also considered, but the choosing which events were of such a calibre that the whole process could be defined by them presented its own difficulties, even larger than the difficulties experienced in the chosen design, which followed the changes of the High Representative. Finally, different classifications of the international approaches found in literature also follow the changes of the High Representatives and, even when other criteria are used, the resulting classification is easily connected to the arrival and departure of different High Representatives.

Once the four periods of the process were defined, it was necessary to make further choices within the chosen case, due to size, scope and length of the post-conflict process in Bosnia. It would have been practically impossible to conduct a general study of all events in the Bosnian politics and society. Even more difficult would have been to attempt to describe them in writing. Nevertheless, the aim was always to focus on the big-picture, the role of international intervention in the Bosnian society and the politics in general, rather than in particular, specified areas of operations. The solution was to study the Bosnian process in its entirety, by choosing and describing only those events that have been so important that they have defined the process, or those events that have been crucial in provoking change, or those events that are good illustrations of a general situation or general trends.

In selecting both the opportunities for learning and the illustrations of a general situation or general trends, the choices have been theoretically driven. The Cultural Theory prescriptions have been used in order to decide what needs to be learned and which situations and trends need to be described. In other words, the theory was used in order to explore the case and thus gain knowledge about aspects of the process that are of value for a Cultural Theory explanation.

Credibility of Explanation

In practical terms, identifying ideal types as well as tracing changes in relations, biases and behaviours over time is a process of gathering knowledge and learning. In this case, knowledge about the Bosnian society and politics, and knowledge about the role of the representatives of the international community in the Bosnian society and politics, is gathered and then interpreted with the help of a theoretical framework. Because of the broad scope of what is being studied, the approach could not be particularistic and the focus had to be on the big-picture. This approach created a new problem, as there was an endless mass of information. Everything that had occurred in Bosnia, everything that has been said about the process and every contact between representatives of the international community and the local society had some value and could have
been used and interpreted. Clearly, one of the choices was what material to select and what material to ignore. Thus, the choice of technique for gathering knowledge and learning, as well as the process of selection of material, were of crucial importance for the design of the study. The central issue is the validity and reliability of sources used in the research process.

Nevertheless, before discussing the sources used in this study, one reservation needs to be made concerning the ‘trinity of generalizability, validity and reliability’ in qualitative research. As Valerie J. Janesick argues, these terms are appropriate for quantitative research, and in that realm they are natural, easily understood and easily applied in the research process. When this terminology is applied in the realm of qualitative research, it only produces unnecessary confusion and unrealistic demands on the researcher. The generalizability in connection to case studies is discussed above in connection to the discussion about the case study design. As described there, the principle of generalizability based on representativity does not apply for a case study research. An analytical generalizability, on the other hand, is both possible and desirable.

The validity, when discussed in connection to a qualitative study, is all about the link between explanation and description, i.e., about how the explanation fits the description. The better term is therefore not validity, but credibility of interpretation. As there is no single correct interpretation, the credibility of explanation is the only criteria of a good and valid research. Interpretations cannot be valid – they can only be credible. The reliability, when discussed in connection to interpretative quantitative study, has to do with the truthfulness of the sources. In a qualitative study, it is all about the interpretation of what is observed. Once again, the question is one concerned with the credibility of the interpretation, rather than with the truthfulness of the sources. The reinterpretation of validity and reliability as a question of credibility of logic in the description and interpretation of the empirical material is indeed appropriate for this study and its design. Once again, the idea is not to test the theory itself, nor is the case chosen to represent a population of cases. The aim is to test the explanatory value of the theoretical approach, to see how much it can explain in a credible and logical manner. The result is a description and an analysis of events and developments, which are supposed to be judged in terms of their credibility. The question is: Does this approach enhance the understanding of this particular case, and the understanding of the studied phenomena? Is the explanation credible and ultimately, does it make sense?

The credibility of research findings is based on the quality of interpretation. The interpretive tradition in a qualitative research is based on the assumption
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that the researcher can break out of his/her social context and get into the head of the actors that are being studied, in order to understand the actor’s motives, beliefs, desires, thoughts and so forth. This interpretative method, often referred to as ‘emphatic identification’ or ‘internalization’, is the very basis of the *verstehen* tradition in social sciences. Somewhat, the researcher is supposed to engage in psychological re-enacting of what goes on in the minds of the actors that are studied. This is indeed a demanding endeavour. Nevertheless, in the case of the Cultural Theory framework, this process is made easier by the three levels of analysis. As specific values and beliefs are connected with specific relations and behaviours, constant checking of the one against the other makes the interpretation process easier. Consequently, the understanding of the social context and the studies of behaviours, relations and biases promise a possibility for better and more credible interpretations. Difficulties in interpretation occur only in cases where there are incoherent sets of non-corresponding biases, relations and behaviours. Only then are the researchers’ skills to use emphatic identification truly tested. Otherwise, the inherent triangulation that comes from the three levels of analysis in the Cultural Theory framework provides a possibility to check the interpretations concerned with one level of analysis against the other two.

However, the reinterpretation of validity and reliability towards the concept of credibility of interpretation and triangulation inherent in the Cultural Theory framework does not imply that interpretation is easy, as there remains a problem with the quality of the empirical material. There is still a demand for a systematic and thorough gathering and handling of empirical material, even if it does not necessarily imply that material or interpretations that comes thereof are (or are not) correct and true. In this study, an extensive triangulation was conducted in the process of material gathering in order to gain as much knowledge about the process as possible and in order to avoid mistakes in choosing events and developments that were significant for the understanding of the process as a whole.

**Selection of Sources**

The method of triangulation is most commonly used for validation in the findings of qualitative research in social sciences. The basic idea behind this method is to check the findings with the help of a multitude of methodological approaches. This idea was consequently broaden to include four different types of triangulation: method, theory, investigator and data source triangulation. In
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this thesis, there was only one investigator, conducting a single case-study based on a single theory, using one methodological approach. Thus, the credibility of the empirical findings was enhanced only through data source triangulation.

Six different sources of information were used in the case study, in order to achieve data source triangulation. First, all published official documents of the OHR and the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) were gathered. Hundreds of HR decisions, PIC meetings conclusions, HR reports to the UN Secretary General, HR reports to the EU Commission, OHR implementation plans, policy documents and so forth were collected and analyzed.

Second, all other outgoing communication from the OHR, including press releases, articles about the HR, interviews with the HR and HR speeches were gathered and analyzed. In contrast to official documents, this source was much more informative and, consequently, it was used in the presentation of the empirical findings more frequently.

Third, media reporting about the Bosnian process was used. As it was practically impossible to read everything reported in the media, a semi-systematic approach was used in order to collect the information. For international personnel not fluent in the local language, the OHR provided a daily media monitoring service and published a weekly bulletin that covered and summarized the main news reported in the Bosnian media. Even though the media monitoring and the OHR bulletins did not cover the entire process and the “OHR does not guarantee the accuracy of the news summaries contained in the BiH Media Round-up,” these sources have been invaluable in the process of sorting out what is important and what is not. The articles and media reports that were deemed important have thereafter been sought in the original language, in the original publication and in the summaries published by the Bosnian press agencies. In addition, during the time spent in Bosnia, the Media Centre library and archives were regularly visited. This archive contains all media reporting in Bosnia, including the major broadcast media and print sources, in some cases dating back to the 1940s. Finally, additional media sources such as the occasional internationally-reported stories and occasional TV documentaries were also used in order to determine the major events that have defined the process and provoked a change in behaviours, biases and relations of either representatives of the international community or local authorities.

Fourth, field trips to Bosnia were conducted at least once a year and for at least one-month long period, some years for a period of 2-3 months. All together, some 11 months were spent in Bosnia from late 1990s until the last field trip in 2006. During these visits, media debates and the general political and social situation were closely followed, with the intention of staying in touch with the general sentiments and opinions about the post-conflict process in order
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42 Disclaimer available at OHR media department web site, at www.ohr.int, last accessed on 10 November 2006.

to be able to better interpret the written material from those periods when a direct access to the Bosnian debates was not possible.

Fifth, secondary sources such as academic writings about the Bosnian process were used as a source of information and as a source for validation of the preliminary findings. The ESI\textsuperscript{44} and ICG\textsuperscript{45} reports focusing on particular crisis and major developments were particularly helpful in yet another regard, being a guideline as to which events and crisis were of crucial importance for the process as a whole, and in which way. The autobiographies of the Dayton negotiators and the two High Representatives were also helpful, inasmuch as they provided information about the developments in the process and inasmuch as they offer an understanding about which developments were perceived as vital for the process. In addition, other secondary sources such as summaries and chronologies of Bosnian political developments were used in order to determine what events should be included in the study.

Sixth, a number of informal interviews with OHR employees, United Nations Mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMBiH) employees, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) employees as well as Bosnian intellectuals, academics, journalists and of course, ordinary people, were conducted in order to confirm the preliminary findings of the empirical studies, to check facts and to gain new knowledge about the process. These interviews were not formal, scheduled or structured. Their form resembled an informal, normal conversation and dialogue. Consequently, the results of these interviews are not included in the presentation of the empirical findings. They served as an informal source of information that probably could not be gathered otherwise, and primarily, they served as a validation method for confirming previously gathered information, interpreted material and previously established understanding of events and developments.

In this way, the triangulation of data sources has enabled a certain degree of certainty that none of the major events in the process were missed. It is highly unlikely that there were unnoticed events that caused a change in the character of the international involvement to Bosnia or the character of local socio-cultural context. Nevertheless, not all studied events could have been included in the presentation of the empirical material. Only the most important events and crises, and the events that are illustrative of a general trend, were included in the descriptions and in the consequent interpretations. These interpretations were conducted with the help of the theoretical and methodological operationalization on the basis of the Cultural Theory framework.

\textsuperscript{44} European Stability Initiative (ESI) is an EU sponsored research project covering the South-Eastern Europe that produces high-quality analysis of the political processes in Balkan countries. See www.esiweb.org, last accessed on 10 November 2006.

\textsuperscript{45} International Crisis Group (ICG) is an international think-tank that has been active in Bosnia almost since the start of the process in 1995, producing reports of exceptional quality, exemplified by the fact that their policy recommendations often found their way into the official policy documents of international agencies. See www.crisisweb.org, last accessed on 10 November 2006.
Framework for Empirical Analysis

As outlined earlier, in Chapter Three, there are four ideal types of civilian international post-war interventions in war-torn societies, corresponding to fatalism, individualism, hierarchy and egalitarianism, i.e., the four social solidarities of the Cultural Theory framework. These ideal types include coherent sets of shared values and beliefs on a wide range of issues, supported through corresponding social relations and corresponding strategic behaviours. Variables of relevance for mapping and understanding cultural biases, social relations and strategic behaviours come from the basic Cultural Theory, from applications on democracy, politics, policy and governance, as well as from deduced corresponding biases in connection to war, peace, peacebuilding, the role of the international community and so forth.\textsuperscript{46} All of these categories are operationalized as variables in the empirical case study, as outlined below in Figure 7. In addition, this section of the chapter includes an operationalization of the social map model, i.e., a graphic illustration of social solidarities and major social actors in the society. The social map is completed with an illustration of the ‘socio-cultural viability space’, a space where actors exist in a viable way, creating policies and meaningful governance, supported by the socio-cultural context.

\textsuperscript{46} For origin of each of the classifications, see Chapter Three.
### Operationalization of Intervention Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Social solidarities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural bias</strong></td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human nature</td>
<td>Good, self-seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths to peace</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of the process</td>
<td>Economic integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of international community</td>
<td>Technical assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basis of authority of intervention</td>
<td>Competence and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time span of intervention</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of intervention</td>
<td>Narrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability required</td>
<td>Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy style</td>
<td>Procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Management Mode</td>
<td>Choice-ism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy based on:</td>
<td>Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance challenge</td>
<td>To enable markets to function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of politics</td>
<td>“I decide what I want to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social organization</td>
<td>Ego-centric networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Many and loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited to the table</td>
<td>All who are want to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Individualist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy style</td>
<td>Top-down and Bottom-up, through the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy implementation tools</td>
<td>Pricing, economic incentives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7 – List of Variables*
In fact, there are only four variables, the four ideal types of intervention. However, they are too general for practical use; thus, they are broken down into all of the above outlined variables, which are used in the empirical analysis as guidelines for interpretation. Furthermore, breaking down the social solidarities into a number of variables is useful inasmuch as there are three components of social solidarities – cultural biases, relations and behaviours – that are assumed coherent if there is no apparent reason to believe otherwise. In other words, a larger number of variables make interpretation easier as it limits insecurity. If social relations resemble the ideal type of one of the four social solidarities, the adherence to this solidarity is easily confirmed or refuted through additional studies of the expressed cultural bias or preferred strategic behaviour. As mentioned earlier, only in cases when there is incoherence is there a need for further studies in order to determine whether there are errors in the original interpretation, whether this is a case of ‘stolen rhetoric’, or whether the adherent is caught in the process of change.

However, the operationalization of four ideal types into variables is only a part of the final operationalization. The next step is to operationalize the social map model, which captures the socio-cultural context, major social and political actors within the society and the process of socio-cultural change.

**Operationalization of the Social Map**

On of the main contribution of this case study is in its focus on changes over time, i.e., the dynamic nature of the relations between local socio-cultural context and the international involvement in it. The Cultural Theory framework enables studies of complex relationships, dynamics and change, based on the theoretical ‘requisite variety condition’, ideas about ‘socio-cultural equilibrium’ and the understanding of the grid-group model as a ‘social map’ model. In addition, there are theoretically prescribed ‘mechanisms for change’, defined as ‘negative surprises’ that originate in ‘repeated failures’.

All together, these models and theoretical prescriptions enable capturing and explaining of socio-cultural change. The requisite variety condition defines the social map where singularities, the social solidarities in their most extreme form, pull the adherents across the map through the attractiveness of their bias, effectiveness of their relations and their behaviours. In this particular study, the concept of ‘socio-cultural viability space’ is used to describe the social space where the existence of social actors is viable, i.e., the positions on the map where social actors are effective in creating and maintaining social relations in their preferred way, and where they are able to gain support for their cultural bias. This way of illustrating ‘socio-cultural viability space’ is inspired by the idea of the ‘socio-cultural feasibility space’, used to describe the square within
the square of the map where democracy is possible and plausible. The resulting graphic operationalization is outlined in Figure 8 below:

This particular graphic operationalization of the model corresponds to the perfect equilibrium, or the perfect utopian democracy of the true pluralist political culture. All four social solidarities are of equal strength and the socio-cultural viability space is perfectly shaped, positioned exactly in the middle of the map. In such a society, most social actors are viable and only those that are extreme (close to the edges of the map) are unviable, i.e., unable to gain support for their biases and unable to create meaningful social relations. However, such a society does not exist, as the theory prescribes an inherent instability. Needless to say, each of the other, possible political cultures outlined in Chapter Two, has its own social map, meaning a socio-cultural viability space that is shaped according to the strengths of the dominant social solidarities. In order to understand the social map model in its entirety, another illustration is needed. This time, the example of the social map is based on the Cultural Theory understanding of a typical moralist political culture, as illustrated in Figure 9 below.
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Figure 9 – Social Map of a Moralist Political Culture

The social map depicted above is the one of the moralist political culture with an alliance between the egalitarian and hierarchical social solidarities. The viability space is not perfectly positioned in the middle of the map, but stretched between the top right and bottom right corner of the map. In addition, this social map even includes social actors, within and outside the socio-cultural viability space.

In sum: the operationalization of the social map for specific use in this study consists of an illustration of the four singularities, the socio-cultural viability space of a society – a social space where biases, behaviour and relations are viable, producing results and gaining support. It also includes a variety of different social and political actors, acting as ‘bearers of culture’, that is, as the adherents of different social solidarities.

Operationalization of Socio-Cultural Change

The last step of the development of the framework for analysis of the case is an operationalization of the mechanisms for change and their inclusion on the social map. Socio-cultural change is caused through interactions between the four social solidarities, acting through their adherents who promote their meta-narratives and compete against those who are adhering to the other singularities. While mechanisms for change are explained in the second chapter of this thesis, their inclusion in the social map model was not. Whether a change occurs through ‘stolen rhetoric’, incoherencies between biases and relations or through repeated failures, or any other mechanism, there are only two different directions for change considering the socio-cultural viability space: either towards or away from the position of socio-cultural viability. An adherent of a weaker social solidarity might discover the attraction of the stronger solidarity through
interactions with its adherents, and convert in order to achieve socio-cultural viability. An adherent of a dominant social solidarity might leave the socio-culturally viable position in two ways; either due to the viability space changing while his/her position remains the same (inability to adapt to new circumstances) or through failure to reach success, despite socio-culturally viable speech and action. As explained in Chapter Two, this is possible as socio-culturally viable actors might become mono-cultural and reveal the blind-spots of their approach.

Changes of the social map, its viability space and political culture occur for two different reasons. First, as adherents of different social solidarities interact with others, change and move to new positions on the map, they influence their surroundings and thus alter the viability space. In time, if enough adherents change their adherence to new solidarities, singularities will weaken and ultimately, the cultural alliances will be broken and created, thus changing the political culture. Second, there might be a change in the socio-cultural context as such. An event, positive or negative, might suddenly change the social map and increase the attractiveness of a singularity, while weakening others. Natural disasters, wars, catastrophes, as well as economic or political development and progress, technological advances, changes in the international system and so forth, might bring about a drastic change that will increase the strength of one social solidarity to a degree that the viability space, political culture and the entire social map changes.

Before moving further, two more clarifications concerning the operationalization of the social map are necessary at this point. First, the social map model is used as a graphic operationalization of the Cultural Theory framework, as an illustration of a combination of its aspects. In qualitative research using interpretative methodology, such as the case here, use of the Cultural Theory models is not an exact science. The image of the social map, the appearance of the viability space and the positions of social actors on the map cannot be exactly defined, only roughly approximated and illustrated according to the interpretations. Second, this way of operationalization of the Cultural Theory framework is based on the idea of the ‘user friendly’ cultural theory, discussed in Chapter Two. Different elements from the framework are used, while others are left aside. For example, the hermit is excluded from the social map. In addition, this particular understanding of the framework is based both on the softer, ‘culture as dialogue’ idea, which is used when discourses and actions are studied, as well as the more positivist and functional ‘social map’ model, which is closer to the Cultural Theory of Wildavsky, Thompson and Ellis. Apart from these methodological delimitations, there are a few more delimitations produced by the design of this study.

Delimitations

A case study of Bosnia and Herzegovina, due to the complexity of the studied process, the length of time it is covering and due to the theoretical and methodological design of the study, cannot cover everything in the process. A number of rather limiting choices had to be made, a few of which deserve to be mentioned and explained.

The first limiting choice that was made in the case study was the choice of focus on the main political actors in Bosnia, the international institution of the OHR and the Bosnian political elites. It would be interesting to study a variety of international actors, as they presumably adhere to a variety of social solidarities. Similarly, it would be interesting to study the Bosnian society in its entirety, including civil society, the media, intellectual elites, business sector and other non-governmental institutions. For practical reasons, this was not possible. However, the post-conflict process in Bosnia is defined by interactions between the OHR and the local authorities. Other international institutions are coordinated by the OHR and although interesting and important, they are not the primary determinates of the developments in the process (other than in some cases where the OSCE, the UNMBiH and the international military forces present in Bosnia possibly had a crucial role in determining the outcome of a development). Concerning the Bosnian society, the local political elites, namely the three nationalist parties, had for the most part been in full control of the state apparatus, the economy, the media and the public sector in general. Both in regard to international intervention and in regard to the local society, biases, relations and behaviours of the actors other than the OHR and local political elites will not be part of the focus of this study, although they will be mentioned at times where their biases and behaviours mattered for the relation between the OHR and local elites.

Second, a very important aspect of the Bosnian political process will be excluded, namely the different agendas of the different ethnic groups. As there are three ethnic groups organized in two regions, or entities, with completely different agendas and interests, a deeper analysis of the differences between them concerning the issues under study is not really dealt with in this analysis. Though the differences between them could also be a subject of an in-depth analysis, in this research study these differences will be touched upon only sporadically, when they are of crucial importance. This is, of course, unfortunate as the OHR for the most part had a good, functioning relationship with leaders of one ethnic group, while in conflict with the leadership of the other two groups. As the focus of this study is on crisis, major events and the changes they have produced, it should be noted that the absence of these aspects might result in particular conflicts being somewhat over-represented in the presentation of the empirical findings.

Third, the events that had occurred in the Bosnian war are also excluded from this study. This study includes a brief overview of Bosnian political history.
with the goal of understanding the Bosnian political culture and a detailed description and analysis of the post-conflict process. The conflict itself is left aside, although knowledge about the war and inter-ethnic relations the war had produced is important for the understanding of the post-war process. For practical reasons, this most important aspect of Bosnian politics is left out, as even the briefest presentation of the origins and dynamics of the inter-group conflict in Bosnia would require a study of its own. What will be included is a brief description of the end of the war, the events that led to the signing of the peace agreement.

Most of these delimitations can be justified by the Cultural Theory’s ‘universality principle’. Basically, it states that Cultural Theory and its grid-group model can be applied to concepts and social phenomena regardless of the level of analysis (individual, group, organization, institution, society, state, global level). Cultural Theory is a general theory and the grid and group dimensions are universal, existing in everything that is human and social, with the exception of hermits who exclude themselves from the social process and experience no group and no grid. Therefore, many of the concepts usually included in the studies of failed states and war-torn societies, as well as international intervention and peacebuilding, are excluded in the theorizing preceding the case study. For example, an understanding of nationalism as a concept and nationalistic movements as a social phenomenon is crucial for the understanding of politics in deeply divided societies and collapsed states. Yet, there is no single understanding of nationalism and nationalistic movements. The Cultural Theory universality principle leads to a conclusion that there are four different types of nationalism, four ways people engage in nationalistic movements, although it seems logical that nationalism, being a group activity, corresponds to the high-group solidarities of egalitarianism and/or hierarchy. Similarly, beliefs regarding the causes of war, views on peace, human rights, reconciliation and so forth can be sorted accordingly to the model. Thus, most of these concepts, otherwise crucial for the understanding of the post-conflict processes are not explicitly included in this case study. However, they are included implicitly and the aspects of the process they affect are discovered and highlighted in the empirical study, through the grid group model. In other words, the Cultural Theory and its models represent a higher level of abstraction, capturing also views and values that are usually attributed to ideologies, interests, traditions, ethnicity, and so forth.
The Case Study of Bosnia and Herzegovina
Chapter Five: Introduction and Historical Background

Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH) has seen many skirmishes, hostilities and outright warfare throughout its history from the early Roman times, to the times of the Ottoman Empire, until the present. In 1878, following the end of the Russo-Turkish War, in an effort to hinder any Russian domination of the Balkans, Austria-Hungary was given a mandate to occupy and govern this – at the time – Turkish province. In 1908, Bosnia was annexed by the Austro-Hungarian Empire and this hardened the relations with Serbia, which had claims on the province. The hostility between the two countries came to a head with the assassination of Austrian archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914 by a Serb nationalist. It was this pivotal event that started the World War I and at the end of the war Bosnia joined Serbia and Croatia in the process of creation of a larger entity, which would eventually be named Yugoslavia.

During World War II Bosnia and Herzegovina came under Nazi control ruled by a puppet regime in Croatia, a period marked by guerrilla war between partisan fighters and Fascist occupiers and their local allies. At the end of World War II, it came under the umbrella of one single state, and was one of the six republics of the communist Yugoslavia under the rule of Marshall Tito. Upon Tito’s death in 1980, Yugoslavia began to splinter. Its disintegration was hastened by Serbian Slobodan Milosevic’s rise to power in 1986 and the emergence of aggressive Serb nationalism leading to intra-state ethnic strife. In 1991 Slovenia and Croatia both declared independence from Yugoslavia, and in early 1992 the Bosnian government held a referendum on independence. Its voters chose independence, and President Alija Izetbegovic declared Bosnia and Herzegovina an independent state, in spite of objections by Serb representatives. Almost immediately, the Bosnian Serbs responded with force in an effort to partition the state along ethnic lines.

For the next three and a half years, Bosnia endured the bloodiest war seen on the European continent since the end of the Second World War. The country was an ethnic mixture of Bosniaks (44%), Serbs (31%), and Croats (17%), and this mix contributed to the duration and ferociousness of the conflict. As both the Croatian and the Serbian president desired a partition of Bosnia between Croatia and Serbia the war ended up in brutal attempts to carve out ethnically pure enclaves. Those attempts included ruthless campaigns of ethnic cleansing, expulsion and massacre of the other ethnic groups, first and foremost the Bosniaks, the ethnic group which sought to keep Bosnia a unified state.

In the later sections of this chapter the events that ended the BH conflict will be outlined and explored more deeply. Suffice it to say at this point that this bloodiest war in Europe since the end of the Second World War resulted in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The end of this horrendous conflict came into sight with the initialling of the Dayton Accords at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21 of 1995, and was formally ratified on 14 December of 1995 in Paris, with the signing of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (GFAP).

The General Framework Agreement was a result of a decisive United States diplomacy effort. Throughout the war, the US had perceived the Bosnian war to be a European problem and that EU and UN negotiators should lead the international community’s mediation efforts. Even before the outbreak of the war, the international community had become involved. At the time of the 1992 European Community (EC) summit in Lisbon, the EU adopted in response to the BH situation the Carrington-Cutiliero plan, which was initially accepted by all three sides – only later to be rejected by President Izetbegovic and the representatives of the Bosniak side upon their return to Sarajevo from Lisbon. Later in 1993, after the war broke out, the representatives of all three Bosnian ethnic groups signed the Vence-Owen plan, which was subsequently rejected in a session of the Bosnian Serb parliament, in a manoeuvre engineered by Bosnian Serb President Radovan Karadzic. Both of these plans were attempts to save a unified Bosnia, in one form or the other. Though based on different power-sharing arrangements, decentralization and cantonization of territory, each had a clear goal to keep Bosnia a unified and multi-ethnic state. Subsequently, later in 1993, the Owen-Stoltenberg plan was discussed. This was the first plan to include a division into mini-states, but it was shelved because the Bosniak side rejected it on the rationale that it effectively divided the country, awarding 52% of the territory to the Serb side. Each of these European-led efforts to resolve the conflict resulted in failure. As the fighting escalated with increasing brutality, the situation in Bosnia was becoming unbearable. At this point, the US began to be involved in attempts to resolve the conflict, given that the EU and UN appeared paralysed and unable to act to counter the genocide occurring in Bosnia (exemplified by the Srebrenica massacre and the continued shelling of civilian targets in Sarajevo). At first, the US involvement was limited to
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guaranteering the safety of the UN personnel on the ground, threatened by the Serb military.\(^9\) Later, US policy toward the BH conflict hardened and it opted to threaten the Serb side with military intervention. Eventually these threats resulted in NATO air strikes.\(^10\) Finally, in 1995, the US took a much more aggressive and leading role in negotiation efforts. Richard C. Holbrook, a high-ranking American diplomat and former assistant US secretary of state, took the helm of the American negotiating team. Working together with the EU through its representative, Swedish diplomat Carl Bildt, Holbrook and his team helped forge a new comprehensive peace plan.\(^11\)

Clearly, the negotiations at Wright-Patterson Airbase were crucial to the peace process, but they are but one link in the mediation process. In fact, the negotiations at Dayton were a culmination of a long process of negotiation efforts that were undertaken for months, in some aspects even for years, before the final negotiation result was reached. In the lead-up to the Dayton Accord and the General Agreement, a number of issues of crucial importance for the success of the final negotiations had been settled earlier. The first step was the creation of the ‘Contact Group’ consisting of the US, France, Germany, the UK and Russia, aimed at coordinating international negotiation efforts. Already in 1994 the Contact Group brokered the ‘Washington Agreement’, which was signed between the Croats and Bosniaks.\(^12\) It effectively ended the Bosniak-Croat conflict and created a Bosniak-Croat Federation that later became one of the two Bosnian entities. The Washington Agreement also meant that earlier proposed solutions, such as the Owen-Stoltenberg plan that divided Bosnia into three mini-states, were no longer applicable. Given that the agreement successfully ended the fighting between Bosniaks and Croats, the Dayton Agreement can be seen as an extension of the Washington Agreement to the whole of Bosnia.\(^13\) In addition, a series of complex pre-negotiations occurred before the final round in Dayton and in them the US diplomatic team secured the exclusion of the representatives of the Bosnian Serbs and the Bosnian Croats. Thereafter, the US-led team conducted practically all negotiations directly with the three presidents (Izetbegovic of Bosnia, Tudjman of Croatia and Milosevic of Serbia). This was an important and successful strategy as the US negotiators were able to put individual pressure on both Tudjman and Milosevic. The US coerced cooperation from Tudjman on the Croatian side by-condoning its attacking the Serb-held territories in Croatia, and from Milosevic on the Serb side by the threat of continuing the economic sanctions against Serbia and increasing international
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pressure concerning Kosovo. Had there not been such leverages and had the Bosnia Serb representatives who were facing war crime accusations been at the table, the final agreement would probably have been much more difficult to achieve. Given that Tudjman and Milosevic were forced to the table due to the particular situations in their own backyards, both were much more cooperative and ready to compromise, as illustrated by a number of concessions made in the last days of the negotiations in Dayton.

Furthermore, the parties had previously agreed that Bosnia would remain as a single sovereign state but would be divided in two rather autonomous administrative units or ‘entities’, one of which to be controlled by Serbs and the other by Bosniaks and Croats. Eventually, it was also pre-agreed that the Serb entity would receive 49% of the territory while the Bosniak-Croat entity would get the remaining 51% of Bosnia. As the Serb side held much more than half of Bosnia, this did not reflect the situation on the ground at the time it was proposed. However, the Bosniak and Croat armies were slowly taking territory from the Serbs who were wearying of war, especially towards the end of summer of 1995 when the Croat offensive on Krajina produced a massive new flow of refugees, and when the NATO bombings severely limited the Serbian war-waging capacity. These principle territorial agreements were necessary for the success of the final negotiations in Dayton and Bosniak, Croat and Serb presidents accepted them, regardless of different protests that were coming from Bosnia, as all sides found it difficult to accept losses of their controlled territories.

In addition, in the run-up to the final round of negotiations in Dayton, a number of different working groups created by the negotiation team worked with Zagreb, Belgrade and Sarajevo on issues including the establishment of the Office of the High Representative, details in regard to organization of the first elections, refugee return issues, human rights legislation and so forth. As the negotiations in Dayton started, much of the work had already been done, and the final negotiations were supposed to finalize the details. Key details to be settled were the final inter-entity boundary line, the details concerning the coming

15 Richard Holbrooke recalls that Milosevic accepted propositions, such as broadening of the Bosniak-controlled area around Sarajevo, with little resistance. Similarly, Tudjman had accepted a number of solutions perceived as damaging to the interests of the Bosnian Croats. Richard C. Holbrooke, To End a War (New York: Random House, 1998) pp. 296-297.
16 Carl Bildt, Uppdrag Fred (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) p. 156.
17 Since the start of the war, the Serb side held approximately 70% of Bosnia. Michael Moodie, "The Balkan Tragedy", in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 541 (1995).
19 Carl Bildt, Uppdrag Fred (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) p. 156.
20 Ibid. p. 177.
implementation process and the details of the proposed Bosnian constitution draft that had to be specified, settled and accepted by all three sides.\textsuperscript{21}

Even though much of the groundwork had been laid, the negotiations in Dayton were difficult as the delegations representing the three conflicting parties refused to alter their positions in relation to most of the issues at the table. The most contentious and seemingly unsolvable problems were the territorial issues in connection to the determination of the inter-entity boundary line, such as the question of the eastern Bosniak enclaves of Srebrenica and Gorazde, two towns of crucial symbolic importance for the Bosniaks, which were surrounded by Serb territories.\textsuperscript{22} There was also the town of Brcko in the north, positioned on the ‘corridor’ that binds the eastern and the western Serb territory together. In addition, the issue of ethnically-mixed larger towns, such as Sarajevo and Mostar, had to be settled in a manner that would be acceptable to all parties. In twenty-one days of negotiations, these issues were debated between the three delegations and the negotiation team – the three presidents rarely met directly. The negotiators used this technique in order to avoid unnecessary contact between bitter enemies, as it was feared that such contacts would most probably result in a failure to reach any compromises.\textsuperscript{23} Another strategy employed by the negotiators was to have the negotiations take place behind closed doors with no information leaking to the press. This enabled the negotiators to put maximum pressure on the leaders of the three delegations. As both Bildt and Holbrooke recalled in their memoirs, most issues were settled after considerable pressure was applied by the international negotiators.\textsuperscript{24} Milosevic was forced to give up the area around Sarajevo under Serb control, even though all earlier peace plans defined Sarajevo as a free zone, to be shared by all three ethnic groups and the Bosnian Serbs had expected a similar solution from Dayton. Izetbegovic was forced to accept Republika Srpska as the official name for the Serb entity against his will, as the term \textit{Republika} implied that Bosnia was a federation or

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item These two small towns were UN safe areas as well, until Srebrenica was run over by the Serb army in the summer of 1995. See the map of Bosnia, appendix I.
\item As Dayton negotiations started, after first ceremonial speeches of Izetbegovic, Milosevic and Tudjman, the exchange between the three presidents immediately started leaning towards the issue of guilt for the war and which side committed most atrocities. US Secretary of State Waren Christopher, who was chairing this first and only official meeting of all negotiation delegations, was forced to stop this debate and close the meeting, as there was a risk that negotiations would end before they had even begun. Carl Bildt, \textit{Uppdrag Fred} (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) pp.188-189.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Tudjman was forced to make considerable territorial concessions in western Herzegovina and in northern Bosnia, in order to make the 49% – 51% formula work.

In order to achieve these concessions, the negotiators threatened to declare the negotiations a failure and publicly blame whichever side did not accept the proposed solutions. They also used threats of sanctions, including even renewed NATO air strikes. This aggressive arm-twisting eventually succeeded and all issues were resolved with the exception of the status of Brcko, a small town in the north that was of vital importance for the Serb side. As Brcko connected eastern and western Republika Srpska, the Bosniak side feared that allowing territorial integrity of the Republika Srpska could lead to a final division of the country. Towards the end of negotiations, it became clear that Brcko was the issue that would make or break the peace agreement. Eventually, the negotiating team’s solution came in the proposal for international arbitration to determine, at a later date, the status of Brcko.

After twenty-one days of negotiations behind closed doors, it was revealed to the world press and the Bosnian population that an agreement had been reached. The TV images of Milosevic, Tudjman and Izetbegovic shaking hands with the US president – and with each other – left Bosnians of all ethnic groups wondering if this agreement was going to hold, or would it ultimately meet failure as the three earlier agreements had.

In the press release the details of the now-successful negotiations were revealed in the historic Dayton Peace Agreement (henceforth, simply referred to as Dayton, or DPA) and its twelve annexes. Carl Bildt, the EU negotiator at Dayton and later the first High Representative to Bosnia, has referred to Dayton as the “most ambitious document of its kind in modern history, perhaps in history as a whole.” Its high ambition lies in the fact that Dayton aimed not only to stop the fighting but also to reverse the ethnic cleansing and to create a new functioning multi-ethnic and democratic state. Apart from the military and
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25 The word Republika was important for the Serbs as the old federal Yugoslav constitution defines Republics as sovereign, with the right to leave the federation – in contrast to provinces such as Kosovo, which were autonomous but had no right to secede. The word Srpska was perceived as important as it connects ethnicity with territory, thus implying that there are no other constituent peoples in Republika Srpska than the Serbs. Republika Srpska was a controversial name for the Serb entity and Bosniak side argued vigorously against it. Since then, Richard Holbrooke had repeatedly said that allowing Serbs to choose this name for the entity is one of the biggest mistakes committed in Dayton, as symbolic value of the wording created numerous difficulties in perceptions about the DPA implementation process. See Richard C. Holbrooke, “An Unfinished Process: Lessons learned and the need for constitutional change” in Beyond Dayton: The Balkans and Euro-Atlantic Integration (Washington D.C.: United States Institute for Peace 2005).

26 “General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina” in OHR Documents (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995) Annex II, Article V.
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territorial issues usually found in peace agreements, such as provisions regarding the demarcation of inter-group boundary line, cessation of hostilities, demobilization of fighters and confidence building measures, the agreement included a new constitution and specified an ambitious human-rights legal framework, requiring the return of refugees and displaced persons. As Susan Woodward noted, Dayton was based on four different strategies for peace: peacekeeping, training and equipment, just peace and the Marshall plan. First, Dayton is an agreement based on ideas of classic peacekeeping, inasmuch as the military annexes include the deployment of NATO-led IFOR (Implementation Force). Second, it is based on ideas about military balance as a strategy for lasting peace, inasmuch as Dayton includes the lifting of the arms embargo and setting-up a training and equipment program, designed to strengthen the Bosnian army and correct the imbalance between Bosniaks and Croats on one side, and the heavily equipped Serbs on the other. Third, it finds its inspiration in the concept of a just peace, inasmuch as the agreement stresses the importance of cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY). The Tribunal prohibits individuals accused of war-crimes from running in elections and holding office and defines the legal framework for human rights and protection of minorities as the cornerstone of the new Bosnian state. Fourth, Dayton had its antecedents in the post-World War Two Marshall Plan inasmuch as the international community, through the World Bank, OHR, International Police Task Force (IPTF) and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) committed itself to a massive reconstruction and reform program. For the agreement’s civilian provisions, implementation of a ‘just peace’ and a Marshall plan for Bosnia were seen as strategies for achieving lasting and stable peace. In essence, this can be seen as an expression of the international community’s ambition to transform the Bosnian society into a multi-ethnic, modern and democratic state, an ultimate expression of the ‘new interventionism’ paradigm in international politics.

The Dayton Peace Agreement had to deal not only with post-war transition but also with the ongoing battlefield situation. In light of the earlier failures of the EU and UN sponsored negotiation efforts, the US diplomatic team accepted the realities of the Bosnian war, including the results of ethnic cleansing, in order to be able to create a viable territorial settlement. For example, the head of the US negotiating team, Richard Holbrooke, welcomed some of the shifts in the situation on the battlefield that had occurred towards the end of the war on the basis that this made a division of territory between the Serb side and the Bosniak-Croat side less problematic. Also, the US government sent a signal to the Croat leadership in Zagreb that an offensive on Krajina would not be
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stopped from the outside.31 In western Bosnia, Holbrooke encouraged the Bosniak and Croat leaders to speed up their offensives in order to get closer to the 49% - 51% formula before the final negotiations started.32 Similarly, when the Bosnian army was too aggressive in their offensive, Holbrooke interfered and urged the Bosniak and Croat leaders to stop the offensive. He feared that the offensive might result in the taking of Banja Luka, the largest town in the Republika Srpska, which would make the proposed and pre-agreed formula for a territorial settlement virtually impossible.33 In Dayton, the negotiators not only accepted a territorial division along ethnic lines but also accepted ethnicity as the main building stone of the Bosnian political system. The agreement created a Bosnia, which would be based on ideas of consensual democracy and power-sharing mechanisms. Ironically, this resulted in some solutions that were, in effect, contrary to the basic democratic principles. In a state that is obligated to the highest standards of human rights and minority protection, the rules for the presidency stipulate it be held by a Bosniak, Serb or Croat member, effectively prohibiting other minorities from holding this highest office. Minorities such as Jews, Romas, and Albanians are excluded from the political process. Even people from ethnically-mixed families who choose not to define themselves as members of any ethnic group find themselves without proper representation in the political system. Yet another example deals with the question of the citizens’ constituencies. The Bosnian constitution defined Bosnia as a state composed of Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats, but the constitution also defined citizens of Republika Srpska as ‘Serbs and others’, whereas citizens of the Federation are ‘Bosniaks, Croats and others’.34 This was not a technical error, but a necessary compromise between the parties in Dayton over the issue of the reintegration of returning refugees. Similar unsolved problems and confusing solutions exist throughout the Dayton Agreement. Although comprehensive and ambitious, Dayton should be seen as a document resulting from a long and difficult process of conflict management rather than conflict resolution. The best interest of the Bosnian peoples, regardless of their ethnicity, should have also included the creation of preconditions for a functioning state, an effective and efficient government and a stable political system. These interests were not the focus of negotiations in Dayton. The mediation between the three different visions of national interests, as defined by the three parties, dominated the negotiation process. Furthermore, most accounts of the negotiations process describe the way territorial issues completely overshadowed other issues on the table. As
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Bildt remembered, surprisingly there were many instances when Milosevic was ready to accept huge compromises, for example, on constitutional matters, while toughening up and refusing compromises in connection to negotiations regarding the map, especially in the last days of the negotiations.35

In the course of the negotiations, the representatives of the three ethnic groups were not very concerned with the design of the international post-conflict intervention. Consequently, differing views about the role of civilian post-conflict presence in Bosnia were worked out between the US and EU negotiation teams, rather than with the representatives of the Bosnian ethnic groups. As mentioned above, the Dayton Agreement was built on combined and sometimes conflicting strategies concerning peacekeeping and the balance of powers, as well as differences over the quest for a just peace and the implementation of a Marshall Plan type of development and aid programs. Even though the three negotiating delegations showed little or no interest in technical aspects of the agreement – which organizations should be in charge of which part of the agreement, how broad a mandate and which responsibility should be given to international organizations and agencies – the US and the EU took diametrically different positions. The US approach was dominated by a belief that the military aspects of the agreement, including a peacekeeping mission to be conducted by NATO and a number of regional stabilization measures, were the key for security and thus for the creation of a lasting peace. Hence, the US vision of the post-conflict process was fairly narrow and specific: American forces were supposed to exit Bosnia within a year after the start of the process.36 Their mission was narrow in scope with a clearly defined mandate regarding security and demobilization issues. Organizing free and fair elections was perceived as the solution to all other, non-security related problems.37 The American position believed that Bosnians would choose the ‘right’ leaders once security was ensured and, therefore, extensive intervention would no longer be needed.38

On the other hand, the European team was sceptical of such a narrow definition of what would be required to ensure peace. Bildt and his EU team argued for the need to broaden the process, to include an economic, political and even a social agenda.39 The EU representatives believed that obtaining a ‘just peace’ and implementing a large and comprehensive aid and development project required that the post-conflict process be wide in scope and be supported

37 Visible from the fact that the strongest mandate was given to the OSCE in charge of elections, as well as the first elections were supposed to be held as soon as possible. See "General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina" in *OHR Documents* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995)
39 Ibid. p. 185.
by a long-term commitment by agencies and organizations working on civilian aspects of the post-conflict intervention. Thus, there was a conflict between the EU and the US definition of the mandate of the civilian international authority. On the US side, attempts were made to limit the mandate of the civilian authority in order to limit the scope of intervention and avoid the infamous and dreaded ‘mission-creep’ effect. The US vision included a body that would serve merely as a contact point between international organizations and agencies and would have no authority or mandate of its own. The EU side argued for a clear and comprehensive civilian mandate in order to pursue the broader goals of the process. The solution was a compromise. The Office of The High Representative of the International Community (OHR) to Bosnia and Herzegovina was created in Annex XI of the Dayton Peace Agreement, with a mandate to monitor the implementation process, coordinate international efforts, facilitate resolution of conflicts between the parties and act as an interpreter of the agreement, if so was needed. This definition of the civilian implementation authority was much broader than the US-proposed agency, which was without any of its own powers or tasks, but it was still a rather vaguely defined authority, without a clear mandate and explicitly prohibited from getting involved in military issues, which were under the command of the American-led IFOR operation. While the OHR had the authority to interpret the agreement, it had no authority to make binding decisions as, for example, the OSCE had in connection to the elections nor did the OHR have the decisional authority over any international organization or agency involved and was limited to coordinating international efforts. Similarly, while the OHR had the authority to monitor the implementation of the agreement, it had no authority to exercise power over the local Bosnian institutions and structures.

In conclusion, the Dayton Peace Agreement is a comprehensive agreement designed to manage the Bosnian conflict. It created a legal framework for the international intervention that included both a traditional military operation and a comprehensive civilian involvement with the goal of creation of a modern, reformed and democratic state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In connection to the civilian aspects of the agreement, a number of organizations were mandated to implement different annexes of the agreement and an ad-hoc international agency, the Office of the High Representative, was authorized to lead the international civilian efforts in Bosnia. However, the Dayton Agreement was a

43 "General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina" in *OHR Documents* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995) Annex X.
44 The OSCE received a clearly defined mandate and right to the override local legislation in connection to the elections and the electoral process. See ibid. Annex III.
complex cease-fire agreement – an exercise in conflict management, rather than conflict resolution. Though the agreement was reached, it did not solve the most basic issue of the conflict, namely, integration versus partition of Bosnia; and in addition, it created a complex and flawed constitutional framework for the future state of Bosnia. Thus, the implementation of the civilian provisions of the agreement was largely dependent on the coming international military and civilian intervention, and most importantly, on the ability and willingness of local authorities to accept the provisions of the agreement and to cooperate with the representatives of the international community and of course, with each other.

Essentially, the parties’ ability and willingness to accept the agreement, and the civilian international presence in the coming process, depended on the character of the Bosnian political system and the Bosnian socio-cultural context. At this point, a brief description of Bosnian political history will be given in order to understand better the Bosnian socio-cultural context, as it was at the time of the signing of the peace agreement and the start of the post-conflict process.

Bosnian Political History

Bosnian political history is usually described as a history of the rule of others. For approximately 500 years, Bosnia was a part of the Ottoman Empire. After the period of Turkish rule, Bosnia and Herzegovina was caught between the Ottoman and Hapsburg Empires from 1878 until 1908, when Austria ruled the country while it was legally still a Turkish territory. In 1908, the province was finally annexed by the Hapsburg monarchy. After the First World War, Bosnia became a part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (KSHS), which consequently transformed into the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (K. Yugoslavia). During the Second World War, Bosnia became one of the six republics in communist Yugoslavia, known as the Social Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ). After the fall of communism and subsequent break-up of Yugoslavia, the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (RBiH) declared independency in April 1992. Directly upon the declaration of independency, the war in Bosnia started and three years later, in the fall of 1995, the Dayton Peace Agreement was signed and the current Bosnia and Herzegovina (BH) was constituted. For the first time in their history, the people of Bosnia are ruling their own country or, at least, they are supposed to.

45 Before the Turkish rule, in the medieval times, there was an independent Bosnian state with rather fluctuant borders. First mentions of that state were found in the 9th century, and its political and economic peak was in the late 13th century under the King Tvrtko. Ivan Lovrenovic, Unutarnja Zemlja: Kratki pregled kulturne povijesti Bosne i Hercegovine, 2 ed. (Zagreb: Durieux, 1999) pp. 40-78. Some historians today are pointing to this first Bosnian state as the historical source of the modern Bosnian state. However, that state existed such long time ago and its history is so poorly known today, that it is probably of no relevance for the modern Bosnian political system and the Bosnian contemporary political culture. Thus, this ancient history will not be included in this study.
Throughout these seven periods, the Bosnian people experienced regular occurrences of external aggression and internal unrests. These wars and unrests have given rise to the three ethnic groups (Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks) and they defined the relations between them. Historical circumstances of regular occurrences of war and a constant rule from the outside had also defined the Bosnia’s political arena and the Bosnian political culture. Though some of the older historical periods are not directly relevant to the current situation in Bosnia, an overview of the historical developments can shed light on the contemporary Bosnian political culture and, accordingly, could lead to presumptions about the likely responses to the civilian international post-conflict intervention. The first historical period in which the roots of the Bosnian political culture can be found is the 500-year period of rule of the Ottoman Empire.

The Turkish Rule

Bosnian province in the Ottoman Empire was often referred to as the ‘tamni vilajet’ – the ‘province of perpetual darkness’. It was perceived as a ‘backward and uncivilized’ territory. Still, scholars describe the early periods of the Turkish rule as positive for the people of Bosnia. The extreme hardships of the medieval times were disappearing as the result of administrative progress, creation of cities and towns, the increasing standard of living for the peasants and a spiritual revival that was promoted by the Turks. On balance, Bosnia benefited from the Ottoman conquests in the Balkans. During this positive first period of the Ottoman rule, a significant percentage of the population voluntarily accepted Islam and the territory of Bosnia became ethnically, religiously and culturally diverse. The two dominant religious and cultural traditions – the Oriental-Islamic and the Christian-European – developed and coexisted in peace.

In the second period of the Turkish rule, from the end of the Vienna War 1699 until the ‘Tanzimat’ reforms of the 1860s, Bosnia endured some 200 years of extreme difficulties. After the Turks lost the Vienna War, Bosnia became the border province between the Turkish Empire and Austria and, therefore, was the scene of constant conflict between the two superpowers at the time. Sometimes low in intensity, sometimes high, these conflicts caused poverty and misery in the province. A large number of Muslim refugees from parts of the Balkans that Austria had won in the war also contributed to the poor economic and unstable

political situation. Because of the wars and unrests that plagued the entire Ottoman Empire at this time, the Turkish rulers dramatically increased taxation and forced young Bosnian men into the Turkish army. They waged wars against the neighbouring countries, and also participated in other, distant wars, such as the Turkish-Russian War. During this period, thousands of young Bosnians died in both Europe and Asia, fighting for the Ottoman Empire. This prolonged and difficult situation made Bosnia a politically complex province and peaceful coexistence within Bosnia was becoming less and less stable. Internal unrests between the Islamic and Christian religious groups surfaced more often and with a higher intensity. Aside from such internal problems, the Turkish rulers were becoming a force of conservatism through totalitarian rule, rather than being the progressive force they were centuries ago at the time of their arrival to the Balkans. Those who opposed the rulers and all those who refused to join the Turkish army were severely punished, executed in the most horrific ways or driven out of the country. Extremely high levels of taxation by corrupt local Turkish administrators caused revolts and rebellions even from those who had accepted Islam. As Ivo Andric noted in his dissertation on the effects of Turkish rule on the spiritual life in Bosnia: the Bosnian peasant, regardless of religious belonging, was “turned into a habitual liar” by the Turkish rule and by the venality of the Turkish justice system. The practice of arbitrary and severe punishments demoralized the peasant population and forced it to withdraw to the ‘windowless mountains’, in a life of solitude. This theme of isolationism runs through a number of descriptions of the latter stages of the Turkish rule. In a similar manner, Ivan Lovrenovic described the socio-cultural effects of this long and difficult historical period, as “resulting in more and more drastic paradoxes, general backwardness and provincialism” while the effects in regard to mental and spiritual state of people “… created isolationist complexes and elements of division.”

Not only did the peasantry suffer during this period. Another recent study of the Bosniak historical experience of politics underlines the extent of the effects of Turkish rule on all societal groups, including the local political and intellectual elites. In a detailed study of texts written by Bosniak intellectuals during this period, Esad Zgodic found that the Bosniak experience of politics could be summoned as, first and foremost, an experience of politics as war, due to the geo-political position of Bosnia within the Turkish Empire. Moreover, Bosnians learned to experience politics as state repression, due to totalitarian character of

49 Ibid. pp. 100-102.
50 This period of Turkish tyranny is described in detail by Ivo Andric in his Nobel Prize winning novel, *Na Drini Cuprija* (Beograd Narodna Knjiga, 2003).
52 Ibid. p. 102.
the Turkish regime and, finally, as an experience of politics through distance towards politics.\textsuperscript{53} In reference to the last conclusion that Bosnian experience of politics is based on apathy and political neutralism, Zgodic attributes the realm of apolitical personal survival as the primary motivation behind the lack of meaningful political organization.\textsuperscript{54}

One bright spot in the darkness of the Ottoman Bosnia might have been the third and last period of the Turkish rule, the period after the Tanzimat reforms that came to Bosnia around 1860. This period was the first real attempt to modernize Bosnia. The Ottoman Empire, faced with many domestic problems, attempted to reinvent itself through a comprehensive reform, which included introduction of a European style army, the codification of customary land tenure relations, the reorganization of taxation and a provincial administration, judiciary and education.\textsuperscript{55} As Karcic notes, this attempt to borrow the modern western features of society, without changing the traditionalistic mentality of the people had moderate success all over the Ottoman Empire\textsuperscript{56} – more so in Bosnia than in other places because the people of the Islamic faith opposed the reforms, while the Christians of Bosnia found them not comprehensive enough.\textsuperscript{57} In other words, the Tanzimat reforms were adding fuel to the emerging inter-group conflict in the country. The reforms were forced through anyway and produced some positive effects, such as the emergence of the first newspapers, improvement of the education system and the revival of the Christian culture. New churches were built and Christian schools were re-opened. However, these positive effects were overshadowed by a strong anti-modernization movement within the Islamic population, by wars with the neighbouring countries and most of all, by the fact that reforms were coerced and were perceived by the majority of ordinary people to be a burden since the reforms came with increased taxation.\textsuperscript{58} In a sense, the later periods of the Turkish rule politicized the Bosnian intellectuals, but the experience of politics was an experience of oppression, poor administration, corruption and injustice, rather than an experience of a meaningful social organization.\textsuperscript{59}

**The Hapsburgs Rule**

In the beginning of the 1870s, a peasant revolt that had started in Herzegovina spread to other parts of the country, and from 1875-1878 even to parts of Serbia,
Montenegro and other Balkan provinces within the Ottoman Empire. In 1878, Russia and Austria were drawn into the conflict and, with the help of these powerful allies; the people of the Balkans forced the Turkish army to retreat. The revolt and the subsequent war eventually resulted in a peace treaty between Turkey, Austria and Russia. As a part of that treaty, Bosnia was temporarily awarded to Austria with Turkish approval, in order to keep the province from elapsing into internal war. The main motivation for the occupation was regional security. Legally, Bosnia was still a part of the Turkish Empire, but it was occupied and ruled by the Hapsburgs Empire.

The entrance of the Austrian occupiers was not smooth, as Orthodox Serbs as well as Muslim peasants attempted to fight the occupiers, while the Catholic Croats welcomed the occupation as it united them with Croatia, already a part of the monarchy. The resistance lasted for three months and ended in defeat for the joint Serb and Muslim forces. During the whole process of liberation from the Turks and the entrance of the Hapsburg monarchy, the internal conflicts between the three ethno-confessional groups were constantly deepening as these religious groups more sharply defined their national identities and as their separate agendas were moving further and further apart from each other. The Croats were, as mentioned above, looking forward to unification with Croatia under the Hapsburg rule, the Muslims were aiming at getting increased self-rule under the Ottoman Empire while remaining in it, and the Serbs desired to unite with Serbia, either directly or through unification of all South-Slavs into a larger entity, an entity that would later become Yugoslavia. The increased feelings of national identity represent a shift towards a higher degree of collective organization. However, as Bosnians of all ethnic groups organized, they did so in strongly-bonded ethnic groups, with the political goals of redrawing the borders to achieve the paramount goal of group unity.

During the three decades of Hapsburg rule several developments occurred that would have great relevance for modern Bosnia, namely, 1) a modernization project, 2) the lack of clarity regarding Bosnia’s status and 3) a nation building project. First, a grand modernization project was instigated by the Hapsburgs. When Austria first occupied Bosnia, it did not fully understand the magnitude of
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the task ahead. In order to keep order, as agreed in the peace treaty, the
Austrians found it necessary to ‘civilize’ the province.\(^65\) In addition, the Haps-
burg monarchy had intentions to annex Bosnia.\(^66\) In order to be able to do so,
Bosnia had to be modernized. Therefore, and because of a large rebellion of the
Muslim and Orthodox population in 1882,\(^67\) the monarchy decided to pursue a
more conciliatory approach and a more pragmatic stand towards Bosnia. The
purely military occupation that was agreed in the peace treaty changed into a
civilian endeavour labelled as a grand project of ‘civilization and modern-
ization’. Benyamin Kallay, a Hungarian aristocrat who was a respected civil
servant, scholar and diplomat, was chosen for this task. He proposed a strategy
of annexation, a gradual and moderate reform of the administration, a modern-
ization of the economy and communications, and a strengthening of the civil
authorities.\(^68\) Thousands of Austrian administrators came to Bosnia at this time
in order to implement this grand project. Some 121 bridges and 1,022 kilometres
of modern roads were built in Bosnia.\(^69\) The first industries, mainly in forestry
and mining, started up and Bosnia began to develop in the direction of Central
European industrialization levels. By 1912, there were some 65,000 industrial
workers in the country.\(^70\) At the start of the Hapsburg rule only thirty years
earlier, there had been virtually none.

Second, Austria had only a temporary cu-
stody of the country while it legally
remained under the Turkish rule. This meant that Bosnia in this period did not
have a clear status, a constitution or a legal framework.\(^71\) For a period of 30
years, Bosnia was neither a sovereign country nor a province; it had neither self-
government nor any possibility for a meaningful political organization.

The third, and possibly the most interesting aspect of the Austrian rule in
Bosnia, was the attempt to create a Bosnian nation by Benyamin Kallay.
Because of a constant danger of inter-communal conflicts between ethnic groups
in Bosnia, the Austrian occupiers attempted to create an inter-confessional
national identity of ‘Bosnian’. This was not the first time in history such a
project was attempted. The Ottoman rulers had referred to all the people of
Bosnia as ‘Bosniaks’ regardless of their confession. Nevertheless, within the

\(^{65}\) Ivan Lovrenovic, \textit{Unutarnja Zemlja: Kratki pregled kulturne povijesti Bosne i Hercegovine}, 2 ed.
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\(^{71}\) Under the rules of the agreement with Turkey, the Turkish legal framework was to be used in
Bosnia even under the Austrian rule. This had often caused conflicts with Austrian law as
institutional reforms attempted by the Austrians often did not find support in Turkish Bosnian legal
country, the Catholics, Orthodox and Muslim groups continued to refer to each other according to confession. This time, Kallay went much further than simply attempting to introduce a new terminology. The monarchy actively promoted the idea of a Bosnian nation through, for example, creation of Bosnian newspapers and through changes in the curriculum in schools. However, the ethnic differentiation and the creation of ethnic identities had already advanced too far. Influenced by nationalisms in the neighbouring countries of Croatia and Serbia, the Bosnian Christians did not accept the idea of a Bosnian nation. The project found supporters only within the Muslim community and, even there, only to a certain degree. In the beginning of the 1900s, Austrian administrators abolished the grand Bosnian nation-building project.\textsuperscript{72} A couple of years later, in 1907, the monarchy acknowledged the Serb and the Croat nation, defining the language of the Bosnians as ‘Serbo-Croatian’ rather than ‘Bosnian’, while the Muslim population remained a confessional group (referred to as ‘Muslim’, a religious designation) rather than a nation (referred to as ‘Bosniak’ or ‘Bosnian’, a non-religious ethnic identity term).\textsuperscript{73}

The final years of the Hapsburg rule had both positive and negative effects on Bosnia as a society. On October 5 of 1908, the Crown annexed Bosnia and thereby recognized it as an administrative unit within the Monarchy.\textsuperscript{74} This move had catastrophic effects for the relation of the Hapsburgs with Serbia whose ambitions of unification of all Serbs were thereby shattered. This situation had once again caused inter-ethnic tensions in Bosnia, as some of the Bosnian Serbs started organizing for a liberation war against the Hapsburgs. They were assisted from Belgrade but at that time their intended goal was thwarted by Russia and other superpowers of the time, desirous of avoiding a major war. Still, the tensions could not be suppressed indefinitely and the failure to solve the problem between European superpowers resulted in an increase in Serb nationalism in Bosnia, which culminated in the assassination of Prince Ferdinand in 1914 and the consequent outbreak of the First World War.\textsuperscript{75}

Despite the disastrous ending of the Hapsburg rule of Bosnia and despite the inter-ethnic conflict it had caused, the annexation and the period between 1908 and 1912 was also of great benefit for the Bosnian people. As the authorities in Budapest and Vienna felt that they held Bosnia more securely, they allowed much greater freedoms to develop in the province. The first Bosnian constitution was written and Bosnia got its first parliament. The first political parties emerged and, even though the parliament had no real power, political debates and a general intellectual exchange started to develop, first and foremost in Sarajevo but even in other urban areas. Pluralism was increasing, as there was a

\textsuperscript{73} Fikret Karcic, \textit{The Bosniaks and the Challenges of Modernity: Late Ottoman and Hapsburg times} (Sarajevo: El-Kalem, 1999) pp. 101-103.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid. p. 151.
new class of entrepreneurs maturing on the waves of industrialization process, becoming a force in the Bosnian public life.76 This is confirmed by historical descriptions of the effects of industrialization. For example, Karcic concluded that one major effect was that “personal achievements rather than hereditary status became important criteria for social promotion.”77 In this short period of industrialization, new ways of conducting affairs and creation of social relations had started to influence the society in general. In addition, even the Bosnian parliamentarians created alliances that across ethnic lines. The politics of Bosnia was still very much based on ethno-nationalism and connected to religion as all the parties were ethno-national, but there are some records of political debates that were cross-national. This aspect of the Bosnian politics of the time was further developed in the years ahead, when dissatisfaction with the Hapsburg monarchy led many Croats and Muslims to start accepting the idea of an unified state for all South-Slavs.78 However, the start of the First World War ended this short six-year positive period in the development of a pluralistic political culture in Bosnia.

The First Yugoslavia

Bosnia entered into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians and the subsequent Kingdom of Yugoslavia, not by its own will but through high-level political machinations of the victors of the First World War. The country was severely damaged by the war and on the verge of famine. During the next twenty-three years, between the two world wars, the effects of the Austrian modernization were rendered non-existent and the country retreated into backwardness and isolationism.

The first attempts to create a land of all South-Slavs were characterized by internal struggle for power. Serbia, the largest and the strongest component of Yugoslavia and its monarch soon started to dominate the political scene of Yugoslavia and this caused conflicts with the other constitutive peoples, the Croats and the Slovenians. Even though Bosnia was the starting point of the liberation war against the Turks (revolts from 1870s) as well as the liberation war against the Hapsburg monarchy (assassination of Prince Ferdinand), it received few of the freedoms that resulted from these wars. In the first Yugoslavia, Bosnia was not even recognized as a province and it had no self-rule. The original name of the country, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenians, implies that there was no Bosnians, Bosnian nation or, for that matter, Bosnian Muslims who were at that time still referred to as ‘Turks’. Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats found some newly-won freedoms and had
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possibilities to engage in the public life of the new country through Belgrade and Zagreb, while Sarajevo did not represent any significant centre of political, or any other, power. Bosnia suffered even more when King Alexander, after a political struggle with the Croat leadership, proclaimed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and dissolved the parliament, thus effectively introducing a totalitarian regime. In an administrative reform program that was supposed to strengthen the Belgrade authority and suppress the emerging nationalist divisions, the King divided the province into nine regions called ‘Banovina’; Bosnia being divided between regions that were either Croat or Serb majority-dominated. After the assassination of King Alexander in 1934, the Croats negotiated back some of their autonomy in a new administrative unit of ‘Banovina Croatia’. In these negotiations, Bosnia as such was not represented and this resulted in a division of Bosnia between Croatia and Serbia. Parts of Bosnia were in Banovina Croatia and parts were under a direct rule of Belgrade. The historical borders of Bosnia were not recognized in the new constitutional order. This administrative reform was legitimized by the idea of a pan-Yugoslavism introduced by King Alexander. For the third time in history, the people of Bosnia were forced to give up their own national identities – the Turks had attempted to define all Bosnians as Bosniaks, Benyamin Kallay had attempted to promote the idea of a Bosnian nation and King Alexander had attempted to force all Yugoslav peoples, including all of the Bosnians, to be Yugoslavs.

The effects of the First World War, the political turmoil and the crises of national and ethnic identities in Bosnia during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia were not the only negative aspects of this historical period. Poor economic performance was an equally important factor in the negative development of the time. The Hapsburg monarchy modernized and civilized the province to a certain degree, but after the war most of the economic upswing disintegrated. Bosnia’s low political status in the new Yugoslav state was reflected in the economy as well. In times of global depression, no efforts were made to continue on the path of modernization. For example, no new roads or railroads were built, only seven percent of the Yugoslav companies existed in Bosnia, few schools and no higher education (except for a small agricultural faculty) existed in Bosnia; and the few cultural institutions created at the time of the Austrian rule were closed, the Bosnian national museum being the most important example. Furthermore, the biggest economic and social problem in Bosnia was still the situation of Bosnian peasants. Austrians modernized the urban areas and prepared the country for industrialization but, unfortunately, they did not manage to reform land
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ownership legislation. The situation in Bosnian villages, as late as in the run-up to World War Two, still resembled the feudal system during the Turkish rule.83 Poor economic performance and political turmoil caused huge social problems as well. Crime and corruption were crippling the administration, and communities were resorting to violence to solve their political and/or inter-ethnic problems. As Ivan Lovrenovic noted in his analysis of this historical period: “Permanent political struggle, parliamentary crisis, assassinations and violence as a mean of politics, inter-ethnic competition and hostility … all lead to increase in corruption and crime as well as general misery and backwardness.”84 Muhamed Sudzuka, a Bosnian intellectual from that time analyzed the main problem in Bosnia in 1933 as being a direct result of inability to organize in a meaningful manner. He found that failed attempts to organize modern political parties led to the creation of nationalistic parties that deepened the problem inasmuch as they were built on principles of exclusion and hate. Their rule soon became profitable for members of their own group, but totalitarian and oppressive for members of all other groups. These nationalistic and exclusive doctrines eventually led from “popular ecstasy” that came about with the end of the First World War and liberation from occupiers, to “spiritual depression”, with “pessimism that enters all levels, sceptic towards all that is political, doubt in possibilities that we who destroyed the foreign rule, could ever build our own.”85

The period of the First Yugoslavia seems to be a truly disastrous period in the political history of Bosnia. Most historical documents testify to increased poverty, corruption, crime and general misery, and even to cultural, educational and intellectual poverty that spread throughout Bosnia. It is possible to speculate that this desperate situation enabled the popularity of the communist movement in the years to come. It is probably no accident that the people of Bosnia willingly ‘converted’ from nationalism to communism, while the people of both Croatia and Serbia stood behind their own nationalist movements for much longer.

The Communist Era

The communist era, when Bosnia was a part of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRJ) led by Josip Broz Tito came about as a result of the Second World War. During the war, the Bosnian ethnic groups were engaged in a bloody internal conflict. The Croats were fighting along side Nazi-Germany organized in the ‘Ustasja’ movement, persecuting the Serbs who were perceived as being an ‘inferior race’ in the Nazi ideology. Hundreds of thousands of Serbs
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had fallen victims to the Croat and German holocaust. The Bosnian Muslims remained somewhat neutral in the war. In some cases their neutral stance was the result of the isolation and relative safety of their own communities; in other cases the neutral stance was slanted more toward the Croat and the Nazi side. This was largely in response to the Nazi statebuilding project of an Independent State of Croatia (NDH) that viewed the Muslims as the ‘Croats of Islamic faith’ and, in so doing, offered Bosnian Muslims some protection against the German occupiers as well the Serbs. The Serbs organized behind the remains of the army of Kingdom of Yugoslavia, which transformed itself into a guerrilla-warfare nationalist ‘Chetnik’ movement, fighting the Croats and the Germans at first, and aligning with the Germans against the communist partisans later.

All of these internal divisions created a fertile ground for the popularity of the communist partisan movement. The movement started in south Serbia, but it soon moved to Bosnia where the partisans offered protection to all, and from all. They protected the Serbs from the Ustasja, and the Croats and Muslims from the Chetniks, as well as protecting everyone from the German occupiers. This complex situation of a war of ‘all against all’ within Bosnia caused the population to sympathize with the communist ideology and to join the partisan movement. The movement grew and from 1943 towards the end of the war, more and more people supported the communists rather than nationalist Ustasja or Chetnik movements. As isolationism was the main characteristic of social organization in Bosnia, this development seems somewhat of a mystery. However, as Rothschild and Wingfield wrote, the communists could win authentic support through “appeal of collectivism to Yugoslavia’s mountaineer folk, the attraction of an image of wealth through industrialization to marginalized peasantry; and the readiness of hitherto apathetic, alienated, or ‘pre-political’ sectors of the population to be politicized in the turbulent, yet exhilarating, setting of war.”

In other words, appeals of collectivism and freedom of oppression were offered to the Bosnian population. The Bosnians accepted them, embracing these new and promising discourses. Furthermore, in the meeting of the ‘Anti-
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fascist Council for Peoples Liberation of Bosnia and Herzegovina’ (ZAVNOBiH) in 1943, the communist party declared Bosnia and Herzegovina to be a political-administrative entity within Yugoslavia, with clearly defined borders and with three constitutive peoples, the Serbs, the Croats and the Muslims. Thereby, the pause in the existence of Bosnia as a political and administrative unit was over, as well as decades of national identity crisis of the Muslim population who were now being officially recognized. The communist option seemed new and the hardships of past times, as well as the current desperate situation of war of ‘all against all’, pushed the people to believe in the possibilities of a dramatic change.

Together with the fact that Yugoslav partisans came out of the war as victors without the help of allied forces and that they installed the new communist regime by themselves, instead of it being installed by the Soviets, resulted in the Yugoslav communists enjoying a great deal of popular consent and legitimacy for their rule. However, the exhilaration experienced in the war did not last long in the post-war period. The reasons for this are many. First, the partisans did not fulfil their promises made during the war; shortly after the war the people of Bosnia experienced the totalitarian side of the new regime. Some 250,000 people were executed by the communists at the very end of the war because of their affiliation with Germans, Ustasja or Chetnik movements throughout Yugoslavia. Many of those were also Bosnians, of all three confessions. Furthermore, the first communist economic reforms were oppressive, as they included a total centralization of the economy, an agrarian land reform and a property reform. The land was nationalized and peasants were forced into agrarian unions. They were forced to work on their own land, while the fruits of their labour went directly to the state. Similar nationalization of property occurred in the urban areas as well. Peasants in some parts of Bosnia rebelled in 1950 and were labelled as ‘enemies of socialism’ by the regime. Severe punishments followed, in some cases by death. This backlash and disappointment in the new regime lead once again into isolationism and withdrawal from public life by a majority of Bosnians, especially the Muslims and the Croats, who did not enjoy direct access to power in Belgrade as did the Serbs.

Nevertheless, after the split between Tito and Stalin in 1948 and the peasant rebellion of 1950, the communists realized the magnitude of the economic problems and the impossibility to solve them through the centralized five-year plans. The regime slowly started to ease the burdening process of centralization. In the reform of 1952, the leadership in Belgrade allowed peasants to withdraw
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from agrarian unions and opened up its economy for trade with western
countries. Some 7,000 out of 8,000 agrarian unions were immediately dissolved
as peasants withdrew from them. People across the whole society felt a wave of
increased freedoms.96 In the following years, Yugoslavia slowly developed its
own version of communism, without involvement of the Soviet Union and with
strong economic ties to the west. The western countries were generous to
Yugoslavia with loans and aid, and the general economic situation in the country
dramatically improved. Even some western ideas and the western ways of life
were, although officially repudiated, making inroads into Yugoslavia.97 By
1955, the Yugoslav economy was decentralized and the Republics were in
charge. The level of individual freedom became higher than in any other
communist state. On the other hand, the decentralization of the economy and
bad planning of the earlier five-year plans caused an economic crisis that was
threatening the whole country and a huge debate about the future of Yugoslavia
surfaced. The issues were centralization versus decentralization, restriction
versus expanding of individual freedom and issues of equality of regions and
republics and investment in northern, developed parts of the country.98 However,
this Yugoslav debate was happening largely in Zagreb and in Belgrade – it is
unclear how much the Bosnian people participated in it.

In the Yugoslavia of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the positive develop-
ment of increased freedom led to the re-emergence of ethno-nationalist move-
ments. Most notably in Croatia, the republican government and the communist
party came into a direct conflict, evidenced by the student demonstrations that
were taking place on the streets of Zagreb in the ‘Croatian Spring’ movement.
The republican government was becoming increasingly anti-Yugoslav and Tito
was forced to intervene and purge the republican government and the commu-
nist party.99 Practically, this included the capturing and imprisonment of the
demonstrations’ leaders, some government officials and some of the Croat
intellectual elites. The events of the late 1960s turned the tide and Yugoslavia
was once again turning towards totalitarianism. The pluralistic freedoms of the
1960s were gone and the people had once again experienced disappointments.100

This Yugoslav process resembles a general development in Eastern Europe,
where public debates flourished in many countries and resulted in some
imaginative reforms, such as those in Czechoslovakia. Consequently, the Soviets
invaded Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and that drastic move lead to decomposi-
tion of the Marxist ideology.101 People all over Eastern Europe increasingly
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realized that Marxism was a sham, a set of rituals and formulas, used as a tool of oppression and control. Implication of this development was huge. The legitimation of the communist system became based on mere power alone and, consequently, the people slowly turned their back on the Marxist ideology. Implication of this development was huge. The legitimation of the communist system became based on mere power alone and, consequently, the people slowly turned their back on the Marxist ideology. All over the communist world, this has lead to a social decay expressed in atomization, poor social mobility and elite corruption. Any form of collective endeavours, the society coming together in formations other than the communist party, was perceived as a threat and, therefore, actively checked by the regimes. The nature of the communist rule ensured that the society remained fragmented, with only a minimum of communication between different social groups, and that as far as possible power flowed from the top down, thereby, keeping the society divided and easier to rule. Towards the last decade of communism in Eastern Europe, the people in most communist countries completely turned away from politics and took comfort in the privacy of their homes.

This pathology of the communist regime existed in similar form in Yugoslavia as well. In Bosnia, the years of the communist rule can be divided into two periods. The first, lasting from 1945 until late 1960s, was a period of more or less direct rule from Belgrade. A time when most people in power came from Serbia and the repression of the people was severe, partly because of the above-described communist economic policies, but also because of a fresh memory of the war and suppressed, yet still present, ethnic animosities. This changed in 1966, at a communist party congress in the Bosnian town of Mostar. As dissatisfaction of the Croats and Muslims grew, the response from the communist regime was an increase of numbers of Croatian communists in key positions. The Bosnian Muslims benefited as well from this relaxed approach, as they gained final recognition as a constituent people in the Yugoslav constitution of 1974. Furthermore, the communists started investing in Bosnia, continuing the modernization process started by the Hapsburgs and interrupted by the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In the next decade, Bosnia received 3,000 km of asphalted road, large investments in heavy industry and investments in education system, including creation of universities and public libraries, and other infra-structure investments. Even those living in most remote mountain villages received electrical and water services. These reforms and investments marked the start of a second, more positive period of the communist Bosnia and the population of the country was once again supportive of the communist system.
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Yet, there were no great debates at the level of the Yugoslav debate a decade ago. Bosnia was profiting from Tito’s decision to invest in the poor parts of the country with the goal of greater equality between the republics, so the preferred strategy of Bosnians became a strategy of compliance and obedience. For decades to come, the Bosnians were the least critical of the Yugoslav regime. Thus, the second period of the communist rule was characterized by economic progress, a passive obedience of the people and a general de-politization of the society.

The End of Communism

Following the considerable rise in collective self-esteem that came about when Sarajevo became the centre of the world during the 1984 winter Olympics, the process of the break-up of Yugoslavia started, causing political turmoil in the whole country. As Milosevic came to power, the demands of freedom from Croatia and Slovenia grew and unrests re-emerged in Kosovo. In this new era of changes in both Yugoslavia and in communist Europe in general, the people of Bosnia rediscovered politics. At first, they were mere observers of events unfolding outside Bosnia, but as the break-up of Yugoslavia came closer and the religious freedoms increased, people started organizing in new political constellations along ethno-confessional separation lines. The Croats aligned with the Croatian leadership through the HDZ party, a Bosnian branch of the Croatian nationalist movement. The Serbs organized in the SDS party, a nationalist party resembling the Serb minority party in Croatia, with close ties to the Milosevic regime in Belgrade. The Bosnian Muslims started the SDA party, with a partly religious and partly multi-cultural agenda.108 The SDA was dominated by members of the ‘Young Muslims’, a religious intellectual group that had been persecuted and prosecuted by the communist regime years earlier. The Croatian HDZ was dominated by sympathizers of the ‘Croatian Spring’ movement, persecuted by Tito in 1960s and 1970s, and the SDS was dominated by the Serb intellectual and nationalist elites consisting of former communist elites and former communist dissidents. In the first post-communist elections, these three parties won an overwhelming support of the electorate109 for three different reasons: partly because they represented an alternative to communism, partly because they promised protection of the national interests of their groups in the turbulent times of Yugoslavia’s break-up and partly because of the unsolved
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questions of national identities. These questions, which had plagued Bosnia for centuries, were once again becoming the most dominant socio-political issue. Apart from these political developments, which included the introduction of a multi-party democracy, freedom of speech and religious revival, Bosnians had also experienced greater economic freedoms through the introduction of market economy. The reforms of Ante Markovic, the last premier of federal Yugoslavia, had considerable effect on the way of life of ordinary Bosnians. These reforms were later described as merely cosmetic and not sustainable over time, but the ordinary people in Bosnia noticed a dramatic rise in their standard of living and new possibilities for entrepreneurship, resulting in a fast growing middle class consisting of private business owners. Optimism was spreading in the country at the same time as the neighbouring Republic of Croatia declared independence and the Croatian war erupted, and at a time when the Serbian nationalists in Belgrade increasingly started articulating their territorial ambitions towards Bosnia.

In the light of the neighbouring war, a debate about the future of the country flourished in Bosnia. Different voices argued for and against a partition from Yugoslavia based on everything from a nostalgic communist ‘brotherhood and unity’ doctrine to materialistic calculations about economic sustainability of an independent Bosnia to arguments based on history, culture, language, et cetera. Once again, the increased freedoms in society lead to pluralisation of the public discourse in Bosnia. Yet, also once again, the external circumstances pushed the people into a familiar realm of apolitical isolationism. The immediate danger of war that surfaced as the war in Croatia started had pushed Bosnian people to seek security in the familiar structures of their own ethnic communities. The uncertain political situation in Yugoslavia, in general, and in Croatia, in particular, was successfully used by the nationalist parties to gain support in the public debate. Just as the communist regime had used threat of aggression from the outside in order to hold Yugoslavia together, the ethno-nationalist parties of the 1990s used the threat of civil war to gain support of their own groups. The authority that was once represented by the communist party was replaced with a similar authority, represented by the three nationalist movements.

The time of liberalization that had occurred between the communist period and the war was not sufficient for pluralism to take root in the Bosnian political arena. As the danger of war surfaced, the Bosnians rejected pluralism and turned
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to the familiar and strong authority structures, i.e., the nationalist parties that promised protection against attacks from other groups.

The Effects of the War

In April of 1992, the Bosnian people voted for independence in a nation-wide referendum, following which Bosnia declared independence from Yugoslavia. The United Nations, after considerable pressure from the European powers such as Germany and Austria, recognized Bosnia as an independent state. However, the Bosnian Serb nationalist party boycotted the referendum and the Serbs, with the support of the Yugoslav army, took arms against the Croats and Bosniaks. The war, sometimes referred to as a civil war between Bosnian ethnic groups and sometimes referred to as an aggression by Yugoslavia and Croatia against Bosnia, lasted for three and a half years and it ended with the Dayton Peace Agreement, sponsored by the United States and signed by the presidents of Croatia, Yugoslavia and Bosnia.

The start of the war and the developments on the battlefield are, of course, important for the understanding of the Bosnian political post-war situation, but it is not described here for practical reasons. Even the simplest of overviews would require a separate comprehensive study. Here, the focus is on the effects of the war on the Bosnian socio-cultural context, interpreted against the logic concerning the effects of war on societies, presented in Chapter Three of this thesis. Therefore, at this point only the major parameters and effects of the war will be succinctly summarized, rather than a detailed discussion of the course of the war itself.

First, the Bosnian war did not have the legitimacy of the people. The conflict itself originated from the Serbo-Croatian war; it was not caused by Bosnians. Before the violence erupted, hundreds of thousands people from all ethnic
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117 According to Noel Malcolm, as well as most other analysts, the war in Bosnia was indeed a case of aggression from outside. There is a lot of evidence of this, such as the armament of the Bosnian Serbs by Belgrade, documented presence of the Yugoslav army in Bosnia, same policies concerning Bosnia by Belgrade and Pale and so forth. See ibid. pp. 238-239. Yugoslavia is also being sued in the International Court in Hague by Bosnia, for the crime of aggression. However, in general scholarly discourse about the Balkans, most still refer to the Bosnian war as an ‘internal’, ‘inter-communal’ or ‘civil’ war.
groups took part in large demonstrations for peace. A pan-Yugoslav anti-nationalist TV-news program ‘Yutel’ was one of the most watched shows on Bosnian television before it went off the air after the outbreak of fighting, even though it was systematically sabotaged and boycotted in both Belgrade and Zagreb throughout its short existence.\footnote{See Chapter Two in Mark Thompson, Forging War: The media in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Rev. and exp. ed. (Luton: University of Luton Press, 1999). See also Sonja Biserko and Radovan Kupres, “The Press: An unchanged matrix” (Belgrade: Helsinki Committee for Human Rights in Serbia 2004).} In Croatia, the war was perceived as legitimate by both sides, as both Serbs and Croats viewed their fight as a struggle for freedom from oppression and aggression. In Bosnia, the people did not experience oppression in the same way and they viewed the war as something imposed from outside – from Zagreb as the Bosnian Serbs looked at the problem, or from Belgrade as the Croats and the Muslims perceived the situation.\footnote{In reality, both Zagreb and Belgrade had agendas in Bosnia, although Belgrade more explicit and Zagreb more covertly since division of Bosnia could not be supported openly by the Croatian government. Such a move would mean acceptance of redrawing of the maps in former Yugoslavia, an acceptance that could backfire and hurt Croatian territorial integrity. Noel Malcolm, Bosnia: A short history (London: Papermac, 1996) p. 259.} As war erupted, the support of the people naturally increased, due to fears for their own safety and as a result of successful nationalistic propaganda. Members of all ethnic groups eventually perceived the war as a war of liberation. However, the initial lack of legitimacy caused despair and disappointment in politicians and politics in general, as the liberalization process and democratization in general become perceived as the indirect cause of the war. Presumably, people from all three Bosnian ethnic groups would probably agree that politicians and politics, i.e., bad elites, were the ultimate cause of the conflict, although they would primarily cast blame on the leaders of other groups. The wide-spread notion, which existed (and exists) in all three ethnic groups, that “we did not start the war” and that the war was “forced upon us from above” testifies to a lack of legitimacy of the war.

Second, the war caused extremely high losses on all three sides of the conflict, both in terms of material damages and loss of life. It is estimated that 268,000 Bosnians lost their lives\footnote{According to the FB-H Public Health Institute institute, from Zarko Papic, International Support Policies to South-East European Countries: Lessons (not) learned in B-H (Sarajevo: Muller, 2001) p. 15. Nevertheless, these numbers are still a subject of debates. Other accounts provide lower numbers, ranging from 130 000 to 300 000 dead or missing.}, while approximately 1.3 million people left their homes and sought refuge in other parts of the country or abroad.\footnote{See UNHCR, “The State of World Refugees” (New York: UN 1995).} Close to six percent of the pre-war population is dead or missing while over one-half of the population changed their place of residence.\footnote{Zarko Papic, International Support Policies to South-East European Countries: Lessons (not) learned in B-H (Sarajevo: Muller, 2001) p. 15.} The economic losses of the
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war are estimated to be 50-60 billion US dollars in production capacity alone,\textsuperscript{124} while other estimates, including indirect economic losses such as lost GDP and growth, go as high as 100 billion US dollars.\textsuperscript{125} The industrial production dropped more than 90% during the war.\textsuperscript{126} The losses in terms of a destroyed governance system, brain drain, interruption of education and health system and so forth have not yet been estimated, but these losses are surely even greater than the calculations of a purely economic nature. It has been noted that the war had “torn down the social fabric of the society” as a community and its social ties as well as families and neighbourhoods broke apart, while tolerance, coexistence and most other social virtues and “general normality of life ceased to exist” in most parts of the country.\textsuperscript{127} The Bosnian war resulted in not only enormous damages but it also endangered the very survival of the society. As Scimecca and Sherman denote, the survival of a society is risked by certain threats: physical disappearance, apathy of the population, Hobbsian war of all against all and absorption of a society in another society.\textsuperscript{128} Bosnia, according to Zunec, easily fulfilled all of these criteria.\textsuperscript{129} Through death and displacement, almost half of Bosnia’s population disappeared. The post-war population was showing collective post-traumatic stress and the people were living day-by-day, dependent on humanitarian aid which, in its own way, is a kind of lottery (just as snipers and grenades were); a lottery where good luck or bad luck decides if someone lives or dies. Finally, both Croatia and Serbia wanted to merge Bosnia into their own territories; thus, they presented a constant danger to Bosnia’s territorial sovereignty.\textsuperscript{130} This desperate situation has led the society into a permanent state of fear, or as Ozren Kebo described it: “Sarajevo as a representative sample of Bosnian provincialism, still lives in fear … As the logical consequence of violence without any limits, fear is becoming the most dominant emotion of the people.”\textsuperscript{131} Fears, violence, destruction, despair, apathy, danger, poverty – the picture of Bosnia at the end of the war was as grim as it possibly could be; a place where the dangers to mere survival were the main concern of the people.

Third, no side succeeded in winning the war. The terms of the cessation of the war, which the Dayton Peace Agreement achieved, meant that the Serbs did
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\textsuperscript{129} Ozren Zunec, \textit{Rat i drustvo} (Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk, 1998).
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid. p. 201.
\textsuperscript{131} Ozren Kebo, “Uz ovaj broj”, in \textit{DANI}, (February 1997).
not remain in Yugoslavia nor did the Croats merge with Croatia. Bosnia remained a single sovereign country, but the Bosniak side did not succeed in keeping the country united. The creation of two entities, the Republika Srpska and the Federation, resulted in a permanent division along ethnic lines and it actually rewarded the practices of ethnic cleansing, a practice the Bosnian Muslims suffered from the most.\footnote{For an assessment of the problems caused by the Dayton Peace Agreement, see Richard C. Holbrooke, "An Unfinished Process: Lessons learned and the need for constitutional change" in \textit{Beyond Dayton: The Balkans and Euro-Atlantic Integration} (Washington D.C.: United States Institute for Peace 2005). See also Sumantra Bose, \textit{Bosnia after Dayton: Nationalist partition and international intervention} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). See also ICG, "Is Dayton Failing? Bosnia Four Years after the Peace Agreement" in \textit{Europe Report} (Sarajevo: International Crisis Group, 28 October 1999).} No group had fulfilled their defined national interest and each of the groups was forced to accept a solution that was, in one way or the other, directly opposed to their national interests. The effects of the war were devastating to the embryos of positive development that had emerged between the end of communism and Yugoslavia’s break-up when the democratisation process was just starting to take hold. The emergence of pluralism was abruptly halted and replaced by a society where people blamed politics as such for their suffering, and the political elites engaged in a nationalistic propaganda, hate-speech and intentional spread of fear. Hate-speech is usually defined as \"(re)producing the opposition between the national self and the others\"\footnote{Mariana Lenkova, "Hate Speech in the Balkans" (Vienna: The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights 1998).}, or more elegantly put as \"a culture of disagreement in advance, emanating animosity in all forms.\"\footnote{Ozren Kebo, "Hate Speech in the Media- Political and Journalistic Kitsch" (Sarajevo: Media Online, 2 June 2005).} As Dayton resulted in a cease-fire, without resolving the basic conflict, these wartime discourses of hate and fear continued to dominate the Bosnian public life. The end of the war had not dramatically change inter-ethnic group relations.

In conclusion, the Bosnian war was not legitimate and certainly was not broadly supported by the Bosnian population. Moreover, it resulted in enormous suffering and destruction, in terms of loss of life, destruction of property and destruction of social fabric of the society. Finally, the basic inter-group conflict remained unsolved even though the war ended because members of all ethnic groups perceived the results of the Dayton negotiations as a defeat.

**Bosnian Political History - A Tentative Cultural Theory**

**Analysis**

An analysis of Bosnian political history leads to a very preliminary conclusion that Bosnia is a society characterized by a high position on the grid dimension, a society where the societal pressures on the individual are, and almost always...
were, very high. Since the early days of the Turkish rule, the people of Bosnia have been prone to isolationism from public life and politics, a practice caused by repeated experience of repression, injustice and erratic eruptions of violence and war. This period can therefore be described as a period of dominance of a strong fatalist social solidarity. The Bosnian society remained mono-cultural through centuries without collapsing, as mono-cultural societies do, because it was balanced by a totalitarian administration of the Ottoman regime. In addition, the fatalist political culture from the times of the Ottomans has not always had sole dominance over the society. Even in the later parts of the Turkish rule, the Bosnians experienced some degree of modernization and, so to speak, discovered politics as something other than oppression, primarily through a process of creation of national identities.

In the times of the Hapsburg rule, Bosnia was further modernized and, as the Austrians called it, ‘civilized’. Nevertheless, the people were still denied their basic freedoms and the political process revolved around a single issue: the issue of national identity. In a sense, the modernization process that brought about an increase in collective action weakened the fatalist social solidarity, only to strengthen the hierarchical social solidarity, expressed through hierarchical mode of social organization, embedded in the ideology of exclusivist ethnic nationalism. The people of Bosnia did not accept the low-grid social organization modes and low-grid values and beliefs. The process of industrialization did create a small and vocal middle-class, a class that represented a promise of strengthening individualistic social solidarity. However, these changes did not last long because the First World War erupted and stopped this promising development.

Throughout the history of Bosnia, every move away from fatalism seems to have been followed by deep disappointments and a reinforcement of the dominating fatalistic social solidarity. The Turkish reforms failed and the following rebellions and wars increased the suffering of the people. The Hapsburg times pushed Bosnia away from the darkness and backwardness only to end with the outbreak of the First World War, a war that caused enormous suffering for Bosnians of all confessions. After the war, the first Yugoslavia emerged, a state that represented a step back in development for Bosnia, from modernity and industrialization to feudal relations similar to those of medieval times. The improvements that came about as a result of the Hapsburg grand projects were followed by disappointments of the Yugoslav rule.

The Second World War was a time when the fatalism of the inter-war years combined with the turbulent and dangerous times of all-against-all warfare. This created the necessary conditions for a major change in the positioning on the group-grid matrix. The communist discourse of freedom of oppression and equality for all people found a fertile ground in the Bosnian peasantry. The partisan movement gained wide and popular support in Bosnia, much more so than in other parts of Yugoslavia. The war against the Nazis and the domestic quislings was won and the conditions for permanent shift away from fatalism
were in place. Yet, the communists failed to deliver on their promises and the post-war period resulted in more oppression. Once again, as the high expectations were not met, the Bosnians reacted with isolation from politics, typical of adherents of the fatalist social solidarity. A decade or so later, the direct and hard repression of the people decreased and Bosnia eventually found itself on the receiving end of grand development projects. Slowly, the people found it in their interest to engage in politics and public life. Yet, they did so only in a conformist fashion, simply playing by the rules of the game that were defined by a totalitarian communist regime. The Yugoslav regime was, as all other communist regimes were, surviving based on power and based on a policy of fragmentation of the society. This type of hierarchy needsfatalists to rule and fatalism to contrast its ideology against. Thus, a long period of a stable alliance between the ruling hierarchical elites and the fatalist population followed as the Bosnian political culture became traditionalistic and authoritarian. The stability of this alliance was interrupted by external developments, the end of the Cold War and the global weakening of communism.

At the end of the communist period, a window of opportunity appeared and the Bosnian people rediscovered politics once again, this time through the post-communist liberation, liberalization and democratization. As the democratic process took hold and an economic upswing started creating a vocal middle-class, new nationalist parties emerged and stopped this positive development. They took over the role of representatives of hierarchical social solidarity from the communist party and continued ruling in a similar manner, this time focused on ethnicity and nationalist ideology, rather than on Marxism and communist ideology of the former regime. As a result, nationalism led to war and the high expectations of the people were once again crushed. The dominance of nationalism and the disastrous effects of the war on the society removed all signs of progress towards pluralism that had been made in the short period between the end of communism and the war, as an alliance of hierarchy and fatalism continued dominating the society. The ruling nationalists used hate speech and spread fear in order to gain support, as they were promising protection against brutal aggression from the enemy, the other ethnic groups. The signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement and the arrival of a massive international peacebuilding mission once again opened a window of opportunity for Bosnians to move down the grid dimension and only time (as well as this thesis) will tell if that opportunity will result in change, or in disappointment and reinforcement of existing combination of social solidarities.

In every period throughout the history of Bosnia, wars and oppression by outsiders led to disappointments and reinforcements of fatalism and isolationism. However, seeds of major cultural changes sprouted, whenever they were so allowed, in all these historical periods as well. It is remarkable that low-grid social solidarities emerged and grew in strength in every short period of freedom and prosperity, sometimes as short as five or ten years, as in the case of the post-annexation Hapsburg period or the short period between the breakdown of
communism and the emergence of nationalism. This indicates that, even though
dominated by a strong fatalistic social solidarity for centuries and seemingly
incapable to change, Bosnia as a society is very vital and indeed prone to socio-
cultural change. The slightest improvements in the public administration and/or
the economic situation always provided a strengthening of the three active social
solidarities. That they could not gain enough strength to become a permanent
feature of the political culture is due to historical circumstances; at least once
every 40 years Bosnians experienced a major war that decimated the population
and destroyed all material wealth. The Cultural Theory understanding of the
Bosnian political history does not lead to any deterministic views about Bosnia’s
future. To the contrary, the political and cultural history of Bosnia only shows
that this society, as any other society, has possibilities to develop a balanced
cultural mix and transform into a viable and pluralist society. Yet, this Cultural
Theory overview does provide an understanding of how the Bosnian social map
functions, how people perceive power and authority and how the Bosnian
political culture expresses itself. Thus, both the promise of a development
towards a more balanced mixture of different social solidarities, as well as the
dangers of withdrawal from public life, isolationism, apathy and fatalism existed
as the international community entered the Bosnian political arena in 1995.

As exemplified in the overview of the Dayton negotiations, the representa-
tives of the international community used a number of different approaches to
peacebuilding as the war was ending. At Dayton, they perceived their own role
in the coming civilian post-conflict process in at least two different ways, as
assistants in a narrow process of implementation of the agreement, and as
teachers in a broader process of political, economic and social change. The
continuation of the empirical part of this thesis will focus on the interactions
between the approaches of the representatives of the international community
and the Bosnian socio-cultural context, starting with the period directly
following the end of the war, the period when Swedish diplomat Carl Bildt was
the High Representative of the International Community to Bosnia and
Herzegovina.
Chapter Six: Carl Bildt and the Conditionality Principle

This chapter covers the first 18-month period of the post-war international intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was under the tenure of Carl Bildt as the High Representative of the International Community. This period is studied and analysed with the help of Cultural Theory framework. The focus is put on the events and crises that have formed and defined the social relations and strategic behaviours of the local authorities and the representatives of the international community involved in the Bosnian post-conflict political process.

The first section of the chapter consists of a description of the main events that have defined, in one way or the other, the relationship between local authorities and the representatives of the international community. There were four such crises or events. The first two crises came directly after the start of the process with the approaching deadlines for the release of prisoners of war (POWs) and for the implementation of the territorial provisions of the Dayton Agreement. The third defining crisis was the management of the internal political conflict within the Serb nationalist SDS party leadership. The fourth event defining the positions of the local and international actors was the organization of the first post-war elections and the consequent start up of the new, joint state institutions.

The second section of this chapter consists of a Cultural Theory reinterpretation of the empirical material. Here, the meaning of the speech and action of the international and local elites is translated into the language of the Cultural Theory, i.e., interpreted and sorted according to the Cultural Theory models outlined in Chapter Four. This is done in order to determine the position of local and international actors on the social map and to analyse changes of these positions over time.

The Arrival the First High Representative

The Office of the High Representative officially started its activities on December 21, 1995, when the Swedish diplomat Carl Bildt, formerly the leader of the European negotiating team in Dayton, arrived in Sarajevo and made his first telephone call as the international community’s High Representative (HR), to Bosnia’s President Alija Izetbegovic. At this time, the OHR had no real office and no equipment. Its first physical office was in the ‘Feroelectro’ building in

\[^1\] OHR, "1995" in OHR Chronology (Sarajevo: OHR Archives 1995).
the centre of Sarajevo and was a very rudimentary office with plastic foil as windows, no water, heat or electricity, no phones and no computers. However, in a matter of weeks, the office was functioning and had almost sixty employees. The OHR’s mandate was defined in the text of Dayton but its political strategy was not. While no one had illusions that the process was going to be easy, considering the complexity of the Bosnian conflict and difficulties in the negotiations in Dayton, many high-level officials, especially those representing the United States, had hoped for a swift implementation of the peace agreement according to the timeline set out in Dayton. The intention was indeed ambitious: to implement the military aspects of the agreement, to jumpstart the economic recovery process, to organize the first elections, to create new joint institutions of the state and to withdraw the Implementation Forces (IFOR) – all in the first year of the process. Other civilian aspects of the process were to be implemented by the parties themselves. At first, this was supposed to be done through the ‘Joint Commissions’ that included representatives of all three parties and, later, after the first elections were conducted, through the new joint state institutions – with the OHR acting merely as an assistant, mediator and facilitator, as defined in the text of Dayton.

Specific aspects of the civilian process were assigned to international organizations. The OSCE was in charge of organizing elections, the World Bank in charge of the enormous physical reconstruction project, the UNMBIH in charge of creating an International Police Task Force (IPTF) and the UNHCR was in charge of the implementation of Annex IV, concerned with the refugee return process. In addition to these designated agencies, a large number of other international agencies and non-governmental organizations were invited to come to Bosnia to focus on projects within their own areas of expertise, such as refugees, human rights, civil society, migration, women’s rights, health services, and
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Nearly 500 non-profit organizations participated in the Priority Reconstruction Program run by the World Bank alone. All these international-initiated civilian efforts were to be coordinated by the OHR, while the IFOR dealt with military matters. Clearly, the position of the OHR within the Bosnian socio-political environment, given that mandate, was crucial for the success of the whole process.

At the time of the beginning of the OHR's activities, the local authorities attempted to define their own interpretations of the DPA and as such responded to the Agreement with mixed reactions and a great deal of confusion and uncertainty. Initially, the public debate in Bosnia focused on the arrival of IFOR troops and possibilities of ending the war, but shortly thereafter the positions of local elites regarding the Dayton agreement were consolidated and presented to the public. Though all three armies had lowered their weapons as the thousands of heavily-armed IFOR troops arrived, the political leaderships of the disputing parties had continued the contentious debate regarding the political future of the country. The Serb nationalist SDS party, led by Radovan Karadzic, had reluctantly accepted the agreement, doing so only after considerable pressure exercised by Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic. The SDS acceptance of Dayton came with a disclaimer about its temporality. Thus, the leadership had sent a clear message to its constituency that it considered the Republika Srpska to be, and to remain, independent of the Sarajevo government and that the Serbs would continue to pursue unification with Serbia, although through “political means” rather than through war. The Croats and the Bosniak leaders also presented their own interpretations of the agreement and saw it as unsatisfactory and considered it only a stop-gap solution. On the Croat side, response was mixed. The president of the Bosniak-Croat Federation, Kresimir Zubak, and the president of the HDZ party, Dario Kodric, rejected the agreement, describing it as a document that legalizes ethnic cleansing in vital parts of northern Bosnia.
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where the Croats were in majority before the war. When their party accepted the division of the country into entities that effectively awarded them full control over three Croat cantons and partial control over two mixed cantons, both of these high-ranking politicians resigned from their posts in protest. The HDZ party accepted the agreement in rhetoric, but in reality, it had continued to pursue the establishment of parallel institutions of the Herzeg-Bosna, a Croat wartime state-building project. The response of the Bosniak side was mixed as well. Even though the SDA party accepted the agreement as it was signed, a split between two fractions within the Bosniak community was revealing itself. The first fraction pursued the idea of a multi-ethnic Bosnia and was represented by Haris Silajdzic, who resigned from SDA in January 1996 in protest over its decision concerning the design of the Council of Ministers (CoM), a decision that had accepted a weakening of state institutions on behalf of the entities. On the other hand, the more religious and nationalist fraction, closer to President Izetbegovic, accepted the Dayton Agreement including its territorial division of the country.

Given that the Dayton Agreement was being interpreted differently by the local elites, it was obvious that the basic pre-war conflict over the composition of the Bosnian state remerged as the main dividing issue in the country. Though the weapons were silent, the basic conflict persisted as the three parties continued pursuing the same goals as before the war started in the early 1990s.

16 Both Kodric and Zubak are Croats from Northern Bosnia and the agreement meant that their constituency, mainly refugees due to the situation in the battlefield, permanently lost their homes. Carl Bildt, *Uppdrag Fred* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) p. 215.
17 Davor Wagner, "Bosnian HDZ accepted Zubak's and Kordic's resignation" in *Bosnews Digest* (Balkan Institute, 6 December 1995).
18 Later, in 1997, an internal OSCE study observed that the Croat-held areas were everything from military and security to business issues, a part of Croatia, rather than the Federation. Cited in Florian Beiber, "Bosnia-Herzegovina - Developments towards a more integrated state", in *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 22, no. 1 (2002).
19 Both Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats had to accept formally the agreement after it was signed by their representatives at Dayton, President of Serbia Milosevic and President Tudjman of Croatia. Bosniak ratification was a non-issue as it was signed directly by Bosnian President Izetbegovic. Haris Silajdzic was one of the main politicians in the Bosniak community. Together with Izetbegovic and other prominent Bosniaks, he formed the SDA party in 1990 and he consequently held positions of Bosnian Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs.
20 The question was about a vote regarding the number of ministers in the central government. Silajdzic was promoting a stronger and more capable central government while his own party, the SDA, accepted a solution that provided fewer ministers. See interview in Adil Kulenovic, "Bosnia Has to Fly with Two Wings", in *Vreme*, 29 January 1996. See also "Bosnian Prime Minister Quits", in *Cable News Network (CNN)*, 21 January 1996.
21 The split between moderates and nationalists within the SDA was basically the same conflict that existed throughout the later stages of the war and the Dayton negotiations. For more on factions within the Bosniak community and the SDA party, see analysis in Nezur Curak, "DANI on the internal situation in the SDA party", in *Balkan Media and Policy Monitor*, no. 49-50 (1997). See also Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A short history* (London: Papermac, 1996) pp. 218-223 See also Carl Bildt, *Uppdrag Fred* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) p. 233, p. 367.
Most of the Croat and Serb elites desired and sought unification with Croatia and Serbia, while most of the Bosniak elite wanted a unified Bosnia. However, the Serb side seemed to be most coherent in defining their long-term interests, as the leading SDS party and most of its political opposition argued for a division of the country, creation of its own state or reunification with Yugoslavia.23 Croat and Bosniak groups were less unified, exemplified by the resignations of high-ranking officials from the largest parties in both the Croat and the Bosniak ethnic groups.

These different interpretations of the agreement’s meaning for the future of Bosnia immediately escalated into a political conflict, in which all three sides used media, mainly television, to spread fear and deepen the gap between the ethnic groups. The nationalistic elites successfully used hate propaganda in the run-up to and throughout the war in order to gather support from their own groups. All three sides regularly used derogatory names for other ethnic groups and blamed the others for the war and all the problems that derived thereof.24 This practice continued and was even intensified after the war. In the first months after the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement, elites from all three groups engaged in insults, derogatory speech, blame casting and generalizations, and all defined and cast collective guilt on the other ethnic groups. Their interpretations of the Dayton Agreement were dominated by hate-speech. Evidence of this is found in the arguments that the elites – from all three ethnic groups – presented to their people, namely, that the agreement was being forced by outsiders, if not actually the result of enemy conspiracies and was, at any rate, not to be fully trusted.25 As neither the Bosnian Serb nor the Bosnian Croat leadership fully participated in Dayton, conspiracy theories became an easy tool to avoid accountability for the effects of Dayton and to justify obstruction and non-compliance.26

Furthermore, the security situation in Bosnia was in an extremely poor state at this time. Although there was no open military confrontation, the local authorities continued to harass minorities, the police continued the practice of arbitrary arrests, there was no freedom of movement to speak of, the practice of ethnic cleansing continued as members of minority ethnic group were being

---

26 Ibid.
expelled from their homes and so forth. 27 The early days of the Bosnian peace are often described by inverting Clausewitz's famous definition of “war as a continuation of politics” 28 into “continuation of war by political means”. 29

It was in this uneasy situation that the institution of the OHR was established and the civilian post-conflict process started according to the deadlines set in Dayton and Paris. Hardly welcoming, it was an environment where all three sides understood the text and the meaning of Dayton in diametrically different ways and where the elites used the media under their control to gather the support of the own group through propaganda and hate-speech about the other groups. Furthermore, there was poor security and no freedom of movement.

**Phase One – Sarajevo Suburbs and POW’s**

The first major task of the civilian part of the process came on thirtieth day of the timeline set in Dayton, commonly referred to as ‘D+30’. 30 This was the day when all prisoners of war were to have been released. Notwithstanding the deadline, all three sides were still holding large numbers of POWs. For example, there were some 860 Serb and Croat soldiers in Bosniak prisons. Despite the pressures from the OHR, the Sarajevo government refused to release the prisoners on the claim that they were war criminals, rather than prisoners of war, even though the Red Cross (ICRC) had defined them to be POWs. 31 Because of their POW status, these prisoners were supposed to be included in the general amnesty agreed upon in Dayton. The refusal to recognize and release these prisoners, one of the obligations under Dayton, was an immediate test of the readiness of the parties in conflict to fulfill their commitments to the Agreement – and they failed to do so. Though the IFOR as it established control over the Bosnian territory was not meeting military resistance from the warring parties, it was becoming clear that the implementation of the civilian provisions of the agreement was not going to be as smooth. The local authorities were interpreting and reinterpreting the Dayton text in a manner not consistent with the intentions of the designers of the agreement, as illustrated by their speech and actions in

---


29 As the term is used by for example Valery Perry, "A Survey of Reconciliation Process in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Gap between People and Politics" (paper presented at the 11th International Conference - Reconciliation, London, Ontario, 14-15 May 2005).


connection to the release of POW. The intention of Dayton was that only a few prisoners, those classified as war-criminals and who were to be indicted by the war-crimes tribunal in The Hague, were supposed to be exempt from the POW release program. However, all sides started defining and redefining the term ‘war-criminal’, determined not to release any POWs, or at least not until the other side did.

It was clear that the first deadline (the release of POWs) would not be met and the second deadline concerning the implementation of the territorial settlement (the takeover of territories by different sides accordingly to the new map of Bosnia negotiated in Dayton) was also presenting problems. By February of 1996, a number of areas were scheduled to be handed over from one side to the other, mainly the Sarajevo suburbs, areas around Gorazde in eastern Bosnia, smaller parts of the Posavina region in the north of the country and a few smaller towns in the northwest. In the weeks following the signing of Dayton, the Serb radical political forces in Pale\(^\text{32}\) announced that this part of the agreement was unacceptable because the Serbs could not live under ‘the Muslim rule’ and that the takeover would result in mass exodus of the Serb population.\(^\text{33}\)

In true war rhetoric, they claimed that all Serbs must be united under the Serb rule and even demanded that the OHR provide caskets so that they could bring their dead with them, as not even cemeteries should be left on enemy territory.\(^\text{34}\)

Given this open refusal by the Serb side to implement what was agreed upon in Dayton, the OHR faced the first major test of the Dayton implementation process. The threat of military action by IFOR ensured that the takeover would take place as agreed in Dayton, even if the Serb side took to arms. However, the announced mass exodus of the Serb population from Sarajevo area would result in thousands of new refugees, and, more importantly, it would mean that the integration and reconciliation would be impossible to establish. The end result, therefore, of the Dayton implementation process would be a continued division along ethnically-defined territorial boundaries. The possible human catastrophe and the political implications for the future peace process forced the OHR to act swiftly, regardless of the practical problems facing its personnel in their devastated and badly equipped offices.

On February 4 of 1996, the OHR issued the first joint statement by the HR and the IFOR commander in which they outlined their mutual strategy concerning the takeover of the Sarajevo suburbs. Four points were made clear in order to create the groundwork for a peaceful and smooth transfer. First, at ninety days from the start of the process, referred to as ‘D+91’, the Federation police forces would take over full responsibility for the transferred areas. Their mandate

\(^{32}\) Pale is a small town outside Sarajevo that became the capitol of Republika Srpska during the war. See map of Bosnia, appendix.

\(^{33}\) Patrick Moore, "Bosnian Serb Parliament Rejects Dayton Maps" in OMRI Daily Digest (Open Media Research Institute, 18 December 1995).

\(^{34}\) Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Dayton Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) p. 73.
would be to disarm any armed groups or persons, other than the Federation armed forces or police, and hand them over to the IFOR. Second, during a 45-day period (from D+45 to D+91) the International Police Task Force (IPTF) would oversee, in consultation with the IFOR and OHR, the preparation for a gradual transition to an integrated and representative Federation police force in these areas. Meanwhile, the Serb civilian authorities, including the police forces, could remain in place, provided they acted in accordance with the constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the constitution of the Federation. Third, the IPTF was given the leading role in all aspects of police and judicial matters, in accordance with their mandate, in order to ensure orderly replacement of the existing police structures. Fourth, the IFOR would maintain an enhanced presence in the concerned areas in order to support the agreement. Finally, the High Representative and the IFOR commander concluded the joint statement by calling on the parties to resume dialogue on the issue of reintegration of Sarajevo, based on the Dayton Agreement.35

In a second press release, which came in connection with the meeting of the Joint Civilian Commission for Sarajevo (JCCS)36 in Sarajevo on February 22, High Representative Carl Bildt singled out and welcomed the statements by the Presidency of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Assembly of the Republika Srpska in which appeals were made to the Serbs in the suburbs of Sarajevo to remain in their homes. Bildt also talked directly to the people of Bosnia in an attempt to provide a balance to nationalist propaganda, hate-speech and fear mongering. He endeavoured to calm the situation and to offer a contrasting, more optimistic image, promising that the IPTF and IFOR would do their utmost to secure a smooth transition of the areas in accordance with the signed agreements. He promised protection for the Serb civilians by the international police force, no checkpoints and full freedom of movement in and out of the areas to be transferred. Furthermore, he stated:

I appeal to every family and every individual to carefully take their own decision on their own future. The fears of war are still there, but so should be possibilities of peace. The statements and declarations by all political leaders, as well as the firm commitment of the representatives of the international community, should give them confidence in their future as equal citizens of a united Sarajevo.37

35 OHR, "Joint Statement by the High Representative and Commander IFOR" in *OHR Press Releases* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 4 February 1996).
36 Joint Civilian Commission consist of both Serb, Croat and Bosniak members and its purpose is to oversee and implement parts of the Dayton Peace Agreement regarding territorial issues. Its main task was implementation of the transfer of areas around Sarajevo from Serb to Federation authorities. "General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina" in *OHR Documents* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995) Annex X, Article II.
Similarly, on the same day the JCCS meeting welcomed the developments regarding the transfer of areas around Sarajevo. The members of the commission reassured the Serb population that all roads would remain open and that people could (and should) remain in Sarajevo and build an integrated capital of the state, as agreed in Dayton. The commission also noted that any citizen fearing the transfer period could leave the city and return on a later date.38

Clearly, the situation was not under control, but there was a degree of optimism in the communication coming out of the OHR at this time. Reassurances to the Serb population in and around Sarajevo were made. Specifically, the International Police Task Force (IPTF) was active in the process and the Joint Civilian Commission (JCCS) was holding regular meetings and also was reassuring the population in regard to their safety. In order to enable a swift transfer and to make Sarajevo a multiethnic capital of a multiethnic state, certain assurances were made, namely, to guarantee security, to provide free movement and, as soon as feasible, to include members of all ethnic groups in the police and in all political institutions in the city of Sarajevo. Carl Bildt as High Representative repeatedly and clearly advised the people of Sarajevo to consider the situation rationally, not give into irrational fears but stay in their homes. Those people who chose to leave immediately, he cautioned, would risk losing their homes needlessly. The better decision, he advised was to stay, if not permanently, at least until the situation was more settled as, he pointed out, the roads to the Republika Srpska would remain open even after the transfer.

This optimistic view was crushed in the weeks that followed as a grimmer reality set in. The OHR and other international agencies involved in the process were proven wrong by a number of incidents. Paradoxically, although most Serbs in Sarajevo presumably wanted to stay and avoid becoming refugees after the war ended, a couple of weeks after all the measures for a secure transfer were undertaken, almost all of the hundred thousand Serbs from these areas left, taking with them all the personal possessions they could.39 Mixed messages were being sent out to the people. Authorities such as the Presidency of Bosnia and the Assembly of the Republika Srpska, in televised addresses to the people, promised cooperation and urged the Sarajevo Serbs to stay. Yet, at the same time, the Serb radicals headed by Radovan Karadzic were holding rallies, scaring people with scenarios of slaughter and urging them to leave. It was reported that in some cases the Pale authorities had even used violence against members of their own ethnic group.40 The Bosniak side was not blameless either, inasmuch as some implicit threats were made towards the Serb civilian population and given the fact that a month or so before the takeover, the

---

39 Chris Hedges, "Fiery Farewell as Bosnian Area Changes Hands", in New York Times, 19 March 1996
40 As reported by Jackie Shymanski, "Plenty of blame going around for ravaged Bosnia suburb", in Cable News Network (CNN), 11 March 1996.
Federation police arrested two high-ranking officers of the Serb army.\(^{41}\) Just a couple of days after the hopeful and productive meetings of the JCCS, the Serb civilians along with the Serb armed forces and police started moving out of the area, carrying everything they could and destroying the rest. Even factories, such as the Volkswagen plant in Vogosca suburb were moved to other locations in the Republika Srpska. Fires were raging all over the area as homes were being set aflame, and fire fighters from the Federation side were not allowed into the area.\(^{42}\) After the transfer, the Federation police allowed looters and vandals to enter the suburbs. The result was that even those few Serbs that initially intended to stay chose to leave.\(^{43}\) Obviously, the process of transfer was not going as intended, despite careful planning and all the extensive assurances from the OHR and other international actors. The result was a severe disappointment, which was given verbal expression by Admiral Leighton Smith, the NATO commander in Bosnia, who in referring to the Bosnian Serb government stated that he “…just can't believe that a government would systematically scare the hell out of their people and threaten them.”\(^{44}\)

At this time, the HR called for an emergency meeting with representatives from the local authorities and the IPTF, IFOR and UNMBIH. The meeting resulted in the harshest possible condemnation of lawless activities in the areas around Sarajevo. Once again they stressed the guarantees of security by the IPTF and IFOR, this time in a more specific manner. Precisely, they identified two of the areas closest to downtown Sarajevo, Ilidza and Grbavica, where they agreed to increase the presence of the both the IPTF and the IFOR in order to save these parts of the town from total destruction.\(^{45}\) This plan did not meet whole-hearted endorsement from the parties involved. The IFOR was reluctant to take a more active part in securing these areas, as it was perceived to be a task for the civilian authorities and international police – not the military forces. Also, the American commanders were reluctant to engage the Serb police forces fearing it could lead to an open confrontation with the Serb side. They agreed to become involved more actively only after the process of transfer of areas was already underway.\(^{46}\) By then it was too late and the process of transfer of authority resulted in a complete failure. Bildt would later say on a number of occasions that the transfer of areas around Sarajevo, and the following mass  


\(^{42}\) Wolfgang Petritsch, *Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Daytona Do Evrope* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) p. 73


\(^{44}\) As cited by Jackie Shymanski, "Serb Suburb Changes Hands after Days of Lawlessness", in *Cable News Network (CNN)*, 12 March 1996.

\(^{45}\) OHR, "Meeting to decide on lawless activities in areas of Sarajevo which are to be transferred" in *OHR Press Releases* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 10 March 1996).

exodus of Serb population from the area, was his biggest failure as the HR. First and foremost, this failure was evidenced immediately by almost 100,000 refugees fleeing not from the war itself but rather from the implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement. It had also resulted in Sarajevo being lost as an example of multi-ethnicity. Most importantly, it had demonstrated the weaknesses of the DPA implementation mechanisms and reinforced the local radical leaders’ sense of power, despite the signing of the peace agreement and the successful implementation of the military parts of the agreement. Consequently, similar events took place in most of the other areas around inter-entity borders that were scheduled to be transferred from one side to the other. Looting, fires and refugee flows occurred around the inter-entity boundary line throughout Bosnia.

The local authorities on all three sides used this first major crisis to define their role and their authority. The actions of the Serb and Bosniak leaderships testify to their un-willingness to implement the civilian provisions of the agreement. Furthermore, the Serb radicals used this crisis to reaffirm their power after being weakened by the very fact that they were excluded from the negotiations in Dayton. Even more interestingly, the Sarajevo authorities that were supposed to be in favour of a multi-ethnic Bosnia, acted contrary to their rhetoric – allowing and even welcoming the Serb exodus.

In a later television interview, Haris Silajdzic, formerly the second strongest man in the SDA leadership commented on the developments around the inter-entity boundary line in 1996:

The Dayton accord is being implemented in the wrong direction, one that might lead to a final dissolution of BH. What is going on now is a sheer inversion of priorities. The first goal of the peace accord was maintaining BH as a unified and sovereign state, but the international community, instead of securing external borders, by its acts reinforces the separation lines between the BH entities. Responsibility for the state's disintegration is partly on the BH state leadership which is neither reacting to nor opposing such occurrences at all.

The High Representative faced yet another crisis, which concerned the other major issue in this phase of the peace process, namely, the release of POWs. The strategy of non-compliance was becoming obvious in most aspects of the civilian part of the DPA implementation, as evidenced by the fact that only some of the prisoners of war had been released. Months after the original deadline, after numerous meetings and negotiations, some 219 prisoners were still being...

49 For example, Mrkonjic Grad and Sipovo in north western Bosnia, which went from Croat control back to the Serbs, were looted and burned before the takeover as in the case of the Sarajevo suburbs.
50 As Carl Bildt recalled, only one editorial in a Sarajevo daily newspaper commented the Serb exodus as a negative development. All other media and all other public figures were either silent, or welcoming the exodus. Carl Bildt, *Uppdrag Fred* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997) p. 278.
51 "RTVSA, "Circle 99", in, 18 March 1996."
held behind bars. Since measures to enforce compliance with earlier agreements repeatedly failed, the HR called for an immediate release of those not accused of war crimes and he called on the parties to verify the legal basis for detentions and to clarify the judicial situation for those regarded as such. He also stressed the importance of this issue inasmuch as he stated that the issue would be raised at the coming Contact Group meeting in Moscow. With disappointing results concerning the takeover of the Sarajevo suburbs, the OHR took the lead in the POW question and threatened the local authorities with possible sanctions.

On March 25, the OHR issued a statement with a much harsher tone, in which the HR welcomed the release of some prisoners of war but strongly condemned the continued detention of others. He also condemned “a pattern of arbitrary arrests” that had been taking place, making it impossible to achieve freedom of movement. Finally, he outlined a significant change in the policy of international community in Bosnia that was agreed on and endorsed by the Contact Group at its Moscow meeting, in the following statement:

The last week has demonstrated that there are teeth in the civilian implementation efforts also. Eager as we are to fund reintegration and reconciliation we are unwilling to fund reluctance of refusal to implement the Peace Agreement.

With this statement, the High Representative set the tone for the upcoming Second Donors Conference in Brussels — donor funds would be contingent upon compliance with the agreed-upon release of POWs and other detainees. Bluntly put, the message Bildt conveyed to local authorities was to ‘release the prisoners and receive international economic support for reconstruction of the country, or risk losing all international reconstruction aid.’ At the First Donors Conference in Brussels, convened right after the DPA signing, the HR announced five priorities for donors, one of which was the implementation condition that “there is a clear relationship between the economic help we are ready to give and the full respect for the Peace Agreement that we demand.” This condition was now being tested in connection to the Second Donors Conference because if there

52 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative Carl Bildt following the Third Meeting of the Joint Interim Commission in Sarajevo" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 16 March 1996).
53 Ibid.
54 Ibid.
55 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative on releasing of all prisoners" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, March 25th 1996).
56 Ibid.
57 OHR, "Speech by the High Representative at Second European Union / World Bank Donors Conference for BIH" in Speeches of the High Representative (Brussels: OHR Archives, April 13th 1996)
58 Once before, the German government and Deputy HR Michael Sterner had cancelled an international meeting on Federation manners in order to put pressure on the parties.
were no compliance then the conference itself would be annulled. Such a move would not have been without some controversy. At the time, Bildt was in the US to report on the progress of the process and found that the Americans had misgivings about any proposed cancellation of the Donors Conference. The argument was that such a move could create a crisis in the whole process. Once again, it was a delicate situation. The message about the failures of the peace process could affect the American voters, which was very important factor for the US administration in 1996, an election year in the US. Even so, the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) approved the new strategy and the conditionality instrument was used for the first time. The Second Donors Conference was about to be cancelled. Fortunately, all three parties immediately started releasing prisoners and detainees except for those on the ICTY list of war criminals.59

In two follow-up statements on April 8 and 10, the HR gave ‘the green light’ for the Donors Pledging Conference in Brussels. He hailed the decisions of the Federation and even the Republika Srpska to comply with the requirements of the DPA concerning POWs.60 This was the first time negative economic incentives were successfully used to force the implementation of the DPA. This gave the OHR a new tool to force compliance of those local authorities that were obstructing the process.

Phase Two – Economic Reform

The second phase of the peace process during Carl Bildt’s time as the HR can be described as a beginning of a quest for a long-term strategy. The Office of the High Representative focused on handling of crises and on the practicalities with establishing its offices during the first couple of months of its existence, the so-called Phase-One. Thereafter came Phase Two, the processes of political reintegration and infrastructural rebuilding. As Carl Bildt later wrote:

It was important to define strategic goals. There was otherwise a risk that the work of the OHR in the peace process would become a stumbling between crises, and the international attention would be focused on the immediate rather than decisive.61

The goals of Phase Two were outlined by the HR at the PIC meeting at the Brussels Donors Conference. At that meeting the aims of the peacebuilding process were being redefined to broaden the tasks of the civilian international involvement and to include the process of economic transition as well:

60 OHR, “Statements by the High Representative - March 8th, March 10th” in *OHR Press Releases* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives 1996).
... we must press on with the implementation of proper economic policies in all of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is only with a sound macroeconomic environment, sound monetary policies, sound economic reform policies and an absence of barriers to trade and entrepreneurship that the aid we are ready to give can have the effect that we all wished for. The country has to overcome not only the legacy of a war, but also the legacy of a corrupt and inefficient socialist system of economic management.62

The practical work in Phase Two began with the previously established Joint Interim Commission (JIC), a body consisting of the highest-ranking politicians from the executive branch of government of both entities and of all three ethnic groups.63 The first few meetings were not very productive since they were dominated by discussions about events around Sarajevo suburbs. However, it did give the representatives of the three parties the opportunity to get to know one another in a more informal manner. Despite their inefficiency, the importance of these initial meetings was great because they symbolized possibilities for future cooperation.64 On the third meeting of the commission, the HR outlined the priorities for the cooperation between the parties. Aside from political issues of release of the POWs, cooperation with ICTY and the amendments of the entity constitutions according to the DPA, the HR stressed the necessity of moving forward on economic issues. The questions regarding the payment system and a joint customs regime, the development of trade links between the entities, the reparation of roads and railroads as well as inter-entity links for electricity and water supply systems, were put on the table.65 This was the first time the priorities in the economic recovery process were defined, in terms of both short-term reconstruction and long-term cooperation. The work of the JIC continued through an establishment of working groups such as the Working Group on Social Security and Personal Documentation, consisting of competent ministers from all parties. This working group met on April 11 and discussed problems related to uncoordinated systems of public records and issuance of the same.66 Such groups were created in a number of areas and held their inaugural meetings during this period. Once again, despite the failure of the transfer of Sarajevo suburbs, there were grounds for optimism. Even though meetings of the JIC and its working groups encountered a number of practical

63 “The Joint Interim Commission shall be composed of four persons from the Federation, three persons from the Republika Srpska, and one representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina” in OHR Documents (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995) Annex IV.
65 OHR, "Statement of The High Representative following the Third Meeting of the Joint Interim Commission in Sarajevo" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, March 16th 1996).
problems, such as deciding the sites for the meetings and ensuring the safety for the participants, meetings did take place and negotiations on a number of issues were underway. The process was seemingly gaining momentum, largely due to the efforts of the HR who travelled to Banja Luka in the north-west of the country and met with the Prime Minister Kasagic of the Republika Srpska. Kasagic was, as Banja Luka Serbs generally were, a more moderate nationalist than the radical SDS party line around Radovan Karadzic in Pale. In this manner, by politically outmanoeuvring and isolating the radicals and Serb President Karadzic, the HR successfully drew the Serb side to the negotiating table and pushed the process further.

However, developments in the field interfered with the plans of the representatives of the international community once again. After a short period of marginalization and isolation in connection to the negotiations in Dayton, Karadzic came back to the political scene in connection to the Sarajevo suburb crisis. Gaining political strength from those events, he held a speech at the Assembly of the Republika Srpska on April 1, 1996, where he repeated the radical nationalist goal of “all Serbs in one state”. He also attacked the representatives of the international community and claimed they interpreted the DPA against the interests of the Serbs. More importantly, he criticized Prime Minister Kasagic for the way he handled contacts with international agencies and the Federation. This resulted in the creation of a committee for contacts between the Republika Srpska and the other parties in the process, under the leadership of one of Karadzic’s closest allies in Pale. Suddenly, the Serb representatives stopped attending the meetings of the JIC, its working groups, and all other meetings concerning the civilian aspects of the peace process. A demand was made for an official invitation to the next Donors Conference. Furthermore, the Serb representatives demanded a guarantee that all funds would be divided equally between the Federation and the Republika Srpska. Otherwise, they threatened, the Serbs would not take part in the conference. This ultimatum was rejected. Consequently, no Serb representative attended the important Donors Conference. Insisting on the continuation of the process, the HR moved his office to Banja Luka for one week in the beginning of May, demonstrating that OHR works not only in and for Sarajevo, but the whole of Bosnia. Moreover, the major reason for this temporary relocation was to show support for Prime Minister Kasagic and the moderate Serbs. The response from Pale came almost immediately. On May 18, Karadzic, acting as the president of the Republika

---

68 In the first weeks after the signing of the DPA, Karadzic did not make any appearances in the media. His first appearance was on January 6th, in connection to the Orthodox Christmas. As reported by the Davor Wagner, “I am here and I will stay here’, claims Karadzic” in Bosnet Digest (Balkan Institute, 9 January 1996).
70 Ibid. p. 295.
Srpska invoked his constitutional powers and dismissed the Prime Minister and appointed one of his own men as his replacement.71

These events precipitated the third major crisis of the DPA implementation process, a crisis in which the OHR was drawn into an internal political battle within the ruling Serb party, the SDS. On one side were the reform-friendly Biljana Plavsic, Kasagic and the Banja Luka group, on the other President Karadzic, Momcilo Krajisnik and the Pale group.72 Instead of pushing for the economic reforms, the OHR found itself on the verge of a total collapse of the process once again, as the JIC ceased all activities and the process came to a stand still.

The next couple of months had been intended to be the time for the second phase of the implementation process and to be concerned with the start-up of the economic reform and reconstruction process. Instead, the long-term goals of the OHR were put on hold, and all efforts were focused on removing Karadzic from the political scene, on the basis of indictment by the ICTY. Eventually, the battle was won, but only after threatening Yugoslav President Milosevic with renewed economic sanctions.73 The earlier threats of sanctions or exclusion the Republika Srpska from reconstruction programs no longer produced results, as the SDS leadership willingly excluded the Republika Srpska from the Donors Conference. It was only when the HR found a way to put pressure by increasing the stakes and threatening Belgrade with reintroduction of full economic sanctions against the former Yugoslavia that results were produced. The strategy was successful and after a meeting between Milosevic and the Bosnian SDS leadership on June 30, 1996, a letter of resignation came from Karadzic, and all powers were transferred to Vice-President Biljana Plavsic in Banja Luka.74 The political battle ended successfully, but the involvement of the OHR altered its role from that outlined in the DPA. For the first time, the OHR had become involved deeply in an internal political issue. This produced an unwanted effect, best illustrated by an anecdote that was later described by Carl Bildt. While he was meeting with Banja Luka Serbs and trying to convince them not to obey the decisions coming from the Pale Serbs, he found himself in a situation where the local politicians started to ask him “And what should we do now?” In effect, the High Representative was acting as a political adviser, helping one fraction to win power against the other, within a local political party. Realizing the inappro-

71 The new Prime-Minister was Gojko Klickovic. See OHR, "OHR Weekly Briefing -May" (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, May 1996).

72 It must be noted though, that even the moderate Banja Luka Serbs shared the same nationalist goal of independent Republika Srpska. They were moderate nationalists, moderate only in a sense that they wanted reform and accepted the Dayton Peace Agreement, or at least their interpretation of it.


74 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative, Carl Bildt on replacing Mr. Karadzic" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, June 30th 1996).
priateness of this, the HR then tried to keep a lower profile.\textsuperscript{75} However, by winning this battle against Radovan Karadzic, the OHR found itself for the first time in a situation of being a political actor in Bosnia, deeply involved in internal political matters, rather than coordinating and leading the international expertise, monitoring and facilitating the process.

This third major crisis was handled with success: the economic conditionality functioned yet again, although with much higher stakes, with the result that work on economic reform could continue. However, valuable time had been lost. Since the SDS had boycotted the Donors Conference in Brussels, the Republika Srpska did not take part in the beginning of the reconstruction process.\textsuperscript{76} This meant that almost all of the reconstruction aid and donated funds during the first year went to the Federation side.\textsuperscript{77} One other conflict with local authorities was evident from the descriptions regarding the OHR’s work on the issues connected with economic reforms as well. While the OHR pushed for aid programs, aiming to create economic and financial conditions for long-term development, the local authorities pushed for obtaining funds for more immediate needs.\textsuperscript{78} In most cases, the local side won the argument and the aid money was spent. Some 1.8 billion US dollars were pledged during the first year, but mostly for reparation of infrastructure and keeping the economy floating, and not for long-term strategic economic reform. Those reforms, created by the experts from a variety of international organizations that were assembled by the OHR, and appropriately named Quick Start Package (QSP)\textsuperscript{79} had to be put on hold until after the first general elections were completed so as to obtain the approval of the newly formed institutions, the state and the entity parliaments.

\textbf{Phase Three – First Elections and the OBN}

With a reconstruction process and the military implementation of the DPA on the way, the attention of the civilian agencies working in Bosnia turned to the first post-war elections. The OSCE was responsible for the organizational side of the task, ensuring democratic, free and fair elections. The HR had thus taken a strategic role. Elections had already been given the highest priority at Dayton

\textsuperscript{76} OHR, “Key Events Since Dayton” (Sarajevo: OHR Archives 1996).
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid. pp. 338.
\textsuperscript{79} QSP included both constitutional reforms that were meant to complete the Dayton constitution, new legislation regarding such matters as state symbols, citizenship, joint institutions protocol et cetera; and a package of economic reforms that included legislation for the new Central Bank, custom system, protection of foreign investment et cetera. See ibid. pp. 347-348.
as they were seen as being the key to making the whole peace process work. The idea behind early elections was that people would have the opportunity to vote out the nationalists and wartime leaders and new moderate political parties would then be able to lead the country towards peace, reintegration and reconciliation. Seen more pragmatically, the elections were the way to legitimise the Dayton constitution and the institutions it introduced. The US pushed for early elections as a part of their exit-strategy. In June, the US-led OSCE mission announced that national and local elections were to take place in September. Most experts agreed that this was much too soon, but since the American administration wanted its troops out of Bosnia within one year after the signing of the DPA, and since the Bosnian elections were to be held in an American election year, the speeding up of the process was seen as a necessity. The election date was set. While the OSCE had organized the first elections with a minimum of political agenda, the OHR recognized the dangers with probable election results. In light of their earlier experiences in which the hard-core nationalists spread fear within their own ethnic groups in order to gain political support, the OHR attempted to limit the power of ruling elites, i.e., the three nationalist parties. In June, the HR stated:

We must work hard at improving the conditions for elections. I am particularly concerned with the situation in television, where more needs to be done in order to assure equitable access for all political parties and to provide relevant and objective information to the voters of the country.

The conflict between the OHR and the local nationalist structures was deepening. The Bosnian elites on all three sides maintained their power by the means of strong nationalist propaganda-machineries. In response, the OHR decided to

---

80 As Timothy Donais notes, “Elections were widely seen as the vehicle through which Bosnians of all ethnicities would begin to put the fear and hatred of civil war behind them and start to rebuild their country”. Timothy Donais, "Division and Democracy: Bosnia's Post-Dayton Elections", in YCISS Occasional Papers 61 (1999) p. 2.
82 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative welcoming the decision by OSCE Chairman-In-Office to certify national elections in BiH on September 14" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, June 25th 1996).
85 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative welcoming the decision by OSCE Chairman-In-Office to certify national elections in BiH on September 14" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, June 25th 1996).
enter this arena and break the nationalist media monopoly by developing the Open Broadcast Network (OBN), which was created with the intention to offer the small independent television stations a chance to gain access to a larger audience. Unfortunately, there were few small independent stations, and those that existed were often even more radical than the state-owned broadcast media. Given this context, the OHR ended up creating a completely new television network, one that was effectively owned and run by the representatives of the international community. Although it was always presented and promoted as a network of independent TV stations, the OBN was immediately nicknamed ‘Bildt’s television’ by the Bosnian people. The name lingered on for many years after Carl Bildt left Bosnia.86

There is no doubt that the agenda of the OHR and OBN was to help the opposition win the elections. Months before the OBN was created and elections were organized, the OHR had already defined the goal of its involvement in the Bosnian political arena. As early as April, HR Bildt had stated:

> The third phase thereafter will be the phase of the election campaign. When I hope that the different political parties of the country will have the maturity to talk more about what they have in common across the bitter lines of ethnic divisions than play on the fears that we all know are there - and which are much too easily exploited by those politicians who refuse to see the long-term needs of their country.87

The ‘politicians who refuse to see the long-term needs of their country’ were, of course, the leaders of the three nationalist parties. As owners of a television network, the international agencies had the opportunity to inform the population and thereby to influence the results and possibly even to remove the nationalist elites from power. Sensing that power, the nationalist parties attempted to stop the establishment of the OBN since it would be a direct threat to their media monopoly. For example, necessary licenses and frequencies could not even be applied for from the local authorities, much less be rewarded. Finally, the deadlock was solved with the cooperation of the OSCE. Bildt convinced the OSCE Chairman-In-Office to use his power of making binding decisions, which was mandated in the DPA, to override legislation and grant the OBN all the necessary licenses.88 This was the first time an international agency had bypassed the local authorities and local legislation. Even so, the OBN was

---

86 See for example Damir Hrasnica, "Prodaja Nicije Televizije", in DANI, 1 December 2000 See also Mario Marusic, "Gasi se Bildtova Televizija", in Vjesnik, 26 October 2000.
87 OHR, "Speech by the High Representative at Second European Union / World Bank Donors Conference for BIH" in Speeches of the High Representative (Brussels: OHR Archives, April 13th 1996).
88 OSCE had the power to make binding decisions in connection to elections, through the Provisional Election Commission (PEC). See "General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina" in OHR Documents (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1995) Annex III, Article III.
obstructed in every way possible, with the result that it started broadcasting only a couple of weeks before the elections. Consequently, its impact was minimal, at the cost of close to ten million dollars. Bildt later stated that in reality the OBN did not have a chance of influencing results due to all the delays.89

As the OBN failed to influence the public debate in connection to the elections, the local nationalist elites had almost full control of the electoral process. In the Republika Srpska, reporting by the official Bosnian Serb media was so offensive and was so biased in favour of the ruling SDS party that Bildt accused them of broadcasting propaganda that “even Stalin would be ashamed of.”90 To make matters worse, the opposition parties were denied media access, the voter registration process was tampered with and most importantly, the absentee votes were manipulated to such a degree as to make municipal elections impossible, forcing the OSCE to postpone them in the last minute.91 The political campaigns were focused almost exclusively on the partition-integration debate. The Serb SDS leadership, including Biljana Plavsic and the Banja Luka moderates, openly campaigned for secession from Bosnia, even after the Election Appeals Sub-Commission ruled that this was a breach of the electoral rules. It was only after the OSCE threatened to remove from the lists the leaders of the SDS party if they continued to propagate for secession that Plavsic retracted her statements – but only a day before the elections.92 The HDZ continued campaigning for the parallel institutions of the so-called ‘Herceg-Bosna’.93 The Bosniak parties, including the SDA, campaigned consistently for the re-integration of the whole of Bosnia-Herzegovina. However, the SDA party continued its dual policy of promoting multi-ethnic Bosnia in rhetoric, while relying on ethno-nationalistic campaign to gain support of its electorate by campaigning on the nationalist-religious slogan “for our faith on our land”.94 In summary, the election campaigns were conducted in an environment of inter-ethnic hatred and there were no signs of cooperation across the ethnic boundaries and no efforts made by any side to promote inter-ethnic reconciliation. For example, there were no parties seriously attempting to run in both entities, although such a campaign would have received a massive support of the international community.

However, there were challenges to the main nationalist parties within all three groups. In the Republika Srpska, there was a broad political coalition behind the opposition leader Mladen Ivanic. Although the SDS did not use violence and intimidation against him, Ivanic’s chances against him, Ivanic’s chances were small since his

92 Ibid.
93 Ibid. See also ICG Europe Report (International Crisis Group, 22 September 1996).
94 Ibid.
resources, mainly access to the media, could not match the resources of the SDS. In the Croat areas, the domination of the HDZ was even larger than the domination of the SDS in the Republika Srpska. The few opposition parties that ran against HDZ were all their allies, and often even more radical. In the Bosniak-controlled territory, the SDA and Izetbegovic were challenged by two popular politicians, Haris Silajdzic (a former member of the SDA leadership) from the newly formed “Party for Bosnia” (SBiH) and Zlatko Lagumdžija from the Social Democratic Party (SDP), which had the most explicit multi-ethnic agenda. The SDA response to its opposition was the harshest. As Silajdzic’s popularity presented a real threat to the SDA, his campaign was fiercely opposed, including the use of intimidation and violence. On one occasion, Silajdzic himself was beaten by SDA supporters while attempting to campaign in an SDA stronghold in north-western Bosnia.95

Despite widespread allegations of fraud, unequal access to the media, hate-language and violent incidents, the first post-war general elections were carried out and proclaimed as free and fair by the OSCE and the OHR.96 The results were disappointing for the representatives of the international community, as 75% of the voters supported the three ruling nationalist parties.97 Together with other, smaller radical nationalist parties, the total support for the ethno-nationalist option was about 95% of the votes. Some 86% of the parliament seats were, thus, in the hands of the main nationalist parties.98 The non-nationalist opposition suffered failure on all three sides and the OHR had to start the creation of the new state institutions, the fourth phase in the process, with less-than-willing radical nationalists in office. The Croat HDZ and Serb SDS saw the election results as being a demonstration of popular support for their separatist agendas, and therein an endorsement of their non-compliance with the international efforts to strengthen the joint institutions and promote cooperation across inter-entity separation lines (cooperation between different ethnic groups). Rather than ratifying the new institutions created in Dayton as had been intended by the authors of the agreement, the 1996 elections, as some analysts noted, had done little more than to ratify the continued rule of nationalists on all sides of the conflict.99 Furthermore, the belief that elections could be used as a means for a change from radical nationalism to a more moderate, modern and democratic

---

96 Yet with certain reservations, as there were clear evidence that elections have been manipulated by all three sides. For example, the election results showed 103% voter turnout in the Croat-Bosniak Federation (?). In North-western SDA stronghold, Velika Kladusa, ballots containing votes for the opposition parties were destroyed. The refugee voter lists and absentee ballots have been manipulated throughout Bosnia. And so forth. For an overview of the problems with the first elections, see Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A short history* (London: Papermac, 1996).
political environment was crushed in this Bosnian post-war political reality. The critics pointed out that the elections had been premature and were mistakenly taken for a symbolic proof of progress in the process of democratisation.100 The Bosnian socio-political context, where fear and hate were dominant emotions constantly reproduced by the nationalist wartime leaders and the nationalist biased media, was clearly not a fertile ground for these policies. Ironically, the elections did not produce political change and democratization, but rather the opposite – the elections cemented the current situation and strengthened the rule of the authoritarian nationalist regimes.

Phase Four – State Institutions

With elections completed, the task of establishing new institutions in accordance with the Dayton-inspired new constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina had to start, despite the results of the elections. The priorities were set by the HR, although not as ambitiously as they probably would have had there been a change of local leadership.

Although the nationalist parties on all sides accepted Dayton and proclaimed that they were willing to cooperate in the new state institutions, they each interpreted the agreement differently and hindered any attempt for the other side’s interpretation to gain ground. While the Bosniak side wanted a much stronger central government and viewed the entities as a temporary evil, the Serbs and the Croats viewed the central government as a temporary evil. In the process of institution building, both the Croats and Serbs tried to hamper any development and to minimize the power and competence of the central government. As Krajisnik of the SDS, the newly elected Serb representative to the joint presidency, openly stated: “The presidency will facilitate trade, utility service and transportation links … but it is not going to integrate Bosnia.”102 The minimal cooperation from the Serb and Croat leadership would test the OHR’s ability to facilitate implementation of the constitutional arrangements. The first step in that process is the most illustrative. The place for the first meeting of the new three member presidency immediately became a major issue. Izetbegovic,

101 OHR, "Speech by the High Representative to the Peace Implementation Conference" in HR Speeches (OHR Archives, 8 December 1995).
the Bosniak representative, insisted that the meeting had to take place in the old presidency building and Krajisnik, the Serb representative, firmly stood on his position that he would not be coming to Sarajevo under any circumstance. The symbolism in holding this first meeting in the old presidency building was great for it would mean that the Serb representative would have to come back to the same place that he had demonstratively left when Bosnia was on the way to declaring independence in 1992. HR Bildt was forced to act as a negotiator, shuttling between the sides before an agreement could be reached. On one occasion, Bildt actually wandered through the streets of Sarajevo searching for a suitable building. Eventually, he came up with a number of suggested locations. After much negotiation and hard pressure exerted upon the Serb side, a compromise was reached. The first meeting could take place in Hotel Saraj, a small newly-opened hotel close to the centre of Sarajevo. Once in place and sitting in three different rooms, the issue became who would go into the meeting room first. After a couple of hours of negotiation, an agreement was reached. On a signal from the OHR personnel, all three members of the presidency would leave their rooms at the same time and they would enter the meeting room essentially at the same time. For the second ceremonial meeting, this time at the Sarajevo theatre building, the biggest issue was the seating of the members of the presidency when they were signing their first official documents. The Bosniak member insisted on sitting in the middle, since he was the chair of the joint presidency, while the Serb member refused to be seated next to the Bosniak member. He wanted the Croat member to sit in the middle. While this conflict was being solved by the HR, hundreds of distinguished guests, the entire diplomatic core in Sarajevo and the press were left waiting outside the building for more than three hours. Finally, a compromise was reached and the embarrassing delay ended. The three members of the joint presidency stood before the cameras in front of one chair at the table, only to sit down when signing the document: the Bosniak member first, the Croat member second and the Serb member third.

Similar procedural issues occurred in the first meetings of other joint institutions as well. Some small symbolic steps in the process of reintegration of the country were made, but real progress was either slow or non-existent. The meetings were not about policy, economic recovery or refugee return but instead, as the journalists reported, were centred on the difficulties regarding protocol, like the incidents described above. Nevertheless, meetings were being held and the new state institutions started functioning, if only for the sake of the cameras and the watchful eye of the OHR, IFOR, American embassy and other powerful international actors. Yet, ironically, the local authorities used the

104 OHR, "Statement by the High Representative congratulating the members of the new Presidency of BiH on their first and historic session" in *OHR Press Releases* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 30 September 1996).
meetings merely as a way to continue engaging their enemies through the media. As the Serb member of the presidency summarized his impressions of the meaning of meetings in joint institutions, “We have been given ultimatums by the international community, such as being told where we should meet, that were never part of the Dayton agreement, and that favour the Muslims.”\(^{106}\) Similarly, the Bosniak side was dissatisfied by the slow progress in the process of strengthening the state of Bosnia and they blamed the representatives of the international community for the weakening of the state and for allowing the Serbs and Croats to continue pursuing their own state-building projects.\(^{107}\) In summation, the main characteristics of the process at this time were the constant conflicts between the parties themselves, as well as between the parties and the OHR.

The second year of the peace process began with continued work on the establishment of joint institutions and a return to the goal of the second phase – jumpstarting the economy. The refugee process that was supposed to speed up in this period was still non-existent, especially in the case of minority returns. At this point approximately half a year remained in Carl Bildt’s tenure as HR in Bosnia. He referred to this time as a period of ‘peace consolidation’, as even the Implementation Force (IFOR) was undergoing transformation into a Stabilisation Force (SFOR). No new and controversial policies were introduced as the work on the joint institutions and the work on the QSP continued, with the three sides constantly in conflict and the OHR constantly shuttling between them, constantly pressuring them into compliance. The preparations for the postponed municipal elections were on the way and most of the debates were about the refugee voter registration, the electoral rules and regulations, improvements of free speech and free movement – aside from the ever-present partition versus integration debate.

Towards the End of Carl Bildt’s Mandate

At the start of the process, the Office of the High Representative had no office and the only employees were Carl Bildt, his deputy Michael Steiner and their closest assistants. In a matter of weeks, the office was functioning with almost sixty employees. By the beginning of 1997, the office had 250 employees, a large carpool and a top-of-the-line information system.\(^{108}\) The OHR was expanding in other regards as well. There were regional offices in Banja Luka and Mostar in addition to the first office in Brussels. This resulted in an administration far bigger than Carl Bildt wanted.\(^{109}\) The reason for this increase


\(^{108}\) Ibid. p. 448.

\(^{109}\) Carl Bildt, *Uppdrag Fred* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997)
in activities of the OHR was due to an increase of the workload. While the OHR was meant to monitor and facilitate implementation of the agreement, it repeatedly found itself having to deal with crisis situations. Aside from those mentioned in the examples above, the OHR had to deal with refugee groups forcing their way home, police brutality cases, serious incidents of sudden eruptions of violence between Croats and Bosniaks that were supposed to be allies, and much more. In addition, since the local authorities took a very passive role in the reform process, the OHR went in and drafted legislation in a number of areas. For example, the legislative framework for the new Central Bank of Bosnia and Herzegovina was created by the OHR with cooperation of the International Monetary Fond (IMF) and the legislation concerning economic reforms was drafted by the OHR and put together in the Quick Start Package (QSP). The OHR simply had to grow in order to handle the broadening of the process, even though the US’ conception of its role was that the OHR should be a small office with experts assisting local authorities in resolution of their disputes, through negotiation and mediation.

At the end of his time as the HR, Bildt proclaimed that the process so far was a success. He stated that while a number of failures had occurred, all four of the phases outlined in the beginning of the Dayton implementation were either completed or being implemented. A number of crises were successfully managed and Bosnia was no longer at immediate risk of renewed fighting. The critics pointed to the failure of the transfer of Sarajevo suburbs, the re-election of nationalists, continued political activities by accused war criminals, poor coordination in reconstruction efforts, extremely poor results in the refugee return process and the fact that all significant breakthroughs in the peace process happened only because international agencies forced them through. The minimal steps of reintegration of the society were forced by outsiders, reconciliation was not occurring and despite the democratisation process, the country was in many ways becoming even less democratic, as the local nationalist elites won an overwhelming support from the population and as the role of the OHR expanded. Furthermore, there were some indications that the conflict between the three ethnic groups had deepened even further, as hate-speech and the obstruction of the refugee return process increased in the later parts of this first eighteen-month period. As the contacts between representatives of different ethnic groups increased and as the electoral campaigns took place, there was an increase in nationalist propaganda, followed by an increased number of incidents of human rights violations.

---

110 For an overview of OHR activities, see Press Releases at the OHR archives.
Towards the end of his mandate, Bildt endeavoured to create a better situation for his successor. In connection to the three different PIC conferences, the OHR defined new deadlines for the implementation of different aspects of the Dayton agreement and the QSP, which was still being debated and obstructed in the Bosnian parliaments. First in Paris, the PIC issued a civilian consolidation plan that included definitions of thirteen loosely defined goals of the process. Then, at the following meeting of the PIC in London, this program was presented by the HR in concrete terms and approved by the council. In it, the HR followed the principle guidelines, but focused the language on specific actions, such as the urgency to amend certain laws concerning human rights issues, to create new regulation such as the media regulatory framework, or in some cases even to establish new institutions, such as the Central Bank. The action plan included a number of priorities that were meant to strengthen the state of Bosnia as well, through a set of new state symbols such as the flag, the anthem, the coat of arms and a common currency. Hence, the whole process had started to change character, from a ‘Dayton implementation’ to a broader definition of a ‘peacebuilding and democratisation’ process, including institution building. In other words, the process had changed from the initial implementation of the specific requirements outlined in the text of the Dayton Agreement towards the implementation of the broader goals aiming to ensure a self-sustainable peace. There was also an ambition by the representatives of the international community to change their role, from a crisis-to-crisis ad-hoc reactive approach, to a more proactive approach of defining and promoting the long-term goals of the process. Furthermore, the PIC decided to award the OHR the overall responsibility for the process as problems with overlapping and competition between agencies surfaced. In the early days of the process, the OHR, the OSCE, IFOR, numerous UN agencies and NGOs all worked with issues that were connected, for example, the refugee return process or democratisation. They were often pitted against each other, struggling to achieve clarity in their mandates (and financing) in order to conduct their projects. In 1997, these problems were partially resolved as the OHR received official recognition for leadership of all civilian international efforts. Since then, the international agencies present in Sarajevo have formed a much more coherent and effective working relationship, as the OHR convenes and chairs regular meetings between different international agencies.
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However, in the short period between the creation of the PIC guidelines and the departure of Carl Bildt from office, not much had been accomplished on the practical implementation of these goals. The first half on 1997 passed without any decisive action on behalf of the OHR or any of the local authorities. Most of the time, the OHR dealt with obstruction of the process, such as non-attendance at common institutions meetings. Consequently, at the following PIC conference in Sintra in May of 1997, the council strongly condemned the local Bosnian authorities for the failure to act according to the Paris and London guidelines. The process was at a stand-still and, in an attempt to restart it, the PIC communiqué reinforced the goals outlined earlier, now with clear deadlines as to when different parts of the process needed to be implemented. The conditionality principle, used earlier with varied success, was now being used in connection to all issues on the table. Carl Bildt himself defined this as a 'micro-conditionality'. New common Bosnian passports had to be created and approved by all sides before a set date – if not, it would be impossible for Bosnians to travel as the old Bosnian passport would no longer be recognized abroad. New ambassadors had to be appointed by a set date – if not, the international community would refuse any official contacts with the existing ambassadors. These and other similar measures followed the conditionality principle.

Apart from introducing the new, more fixed deadlines for the implementation of the international policies, the Sintra PIC meeting thanked Carl Bildt for his work and welcomed the new High Representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Spanish diplomat Carlos Westendorp.

**Carl Bildt and the Conditionality Principle: Cultural Theory Analysis**

The following section of this chapter consists of an analysis of the above-described crisis and events that have defined the relationship between the representatives of the international community and the local socio-cultural context, based on the framework for analysis presented in Chapter Four. The idea is to interpret the events and to construct a social map, a graphic description of the Bosnian socio-cultural context, including a description of the position of the local authorities and the representatives of the international community. Thereafter, the interactions between representatives of the international community and the local political elites is analyzed, discussed and explained, in order to assess the changes on the social map they have produced.

---
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Socio-Cultural Context in Post-War Bosnia Herzegovina

At the start of the post-war process, the Bosnian society was characterized by insecurity and threats to survival, on an individual as well as on a collective level. Furthermore, although the ending of the war was a positive development, the results of the negotiations in Dayton produced an increase of uncertainties regarding the future of the country. Neither side had a clear understanding of the Dayton Peace Agreement and the consequent arrival of an overwhelmingly strong international military force, its meaning for their vital, national interests. This uncertain and capricious context, where dangers for survival were still clear and present and where the destiny of the Bosnian state was undecided, resembles the socio-cultural context of other turbulent periods in the Bosnian political history, when the status of the state was uncertain and powerful actors from the outside decided the fate of the Bosnian people. As in connection to historical periods, the people of Bosnia chose to support the authority of their national leaders, allowing them to rule as they saw fit, while participating as little as possible and withdrawing from the public arena to the safety of the private space. At the same time, those who did not chose isolationism and resignation opted to organize hierarchically, into the ethno-national structures of the three dominant nationalist political parties, which promised protection against enemies of national interests on a collective level, as well as they promised social promotion for the individual.

The Bosnian social map directly after the war can thus be characterized as a socio-cultural alliance between a strong hierarchical and a strong fatalist social solidarity, with little or no input from the egalitarian and individualist social solidarities. This description of the Bosnian social map is consistent with the Bosnian political culture, identifiable throughout the Bosnian political history – a traditionalist political culture that was now enhanced by war, by the physical destruction it brought along and by the uncertainties of the start of the post-Dayton process. Furthermore, this political culture was reinforced by the arrival of the representatives of the international community. At the start of post-war process, the local authorities on all three sides positioned themselves at the top right corner of the social map and sought the support of the population through discourses of protection of national interests, promoted through hate-speech and spread of fear. The Bosnian people accepted the portrayed images of clear and present danger from the evil and untrustworthy nationalistic leaders of the other groups, thus reinforcing the perception of the necessity for a strong authority, control and protection from the above.

Presumably, few Bosnians wished for the conflict to continue, yet they made a continuation of the conflict more likely as they accepted and supported the nationalist elites as the only protectors of their national interests. In addition, the pessimistic views concerning the possibilities for reconciliation and a peaceful coexistence of the three ethnic groups were widely spread throughout Bosnia, even within the Bosniak community, the ethnic group most in favour of a multi-
ethnic unified state. Although the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities do not have similar views and values, similar social relations or similar strategic behaviours, they have formed a symbiotic relationship of mutual support where adherents of both social solidarities reinforce their own and the bias of adherents of the other solidarity.

Such a social context, where these two solidarities coexist, reinforce each other and support each other, has a rather narrow socio-cultural viability space. Together, the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities promote an image of an evil man, an untrustworthy world, clear and present dangers for survival and a necessity for strong leadership and control from above, in order to ensure survival. The individualist and egalitarian social solidarities, which promote a more optimistic view of the future and focus on possibilities for cooperation, increase of individual freedom and weakening of elite authority are weak or non-existent in such a context. Their discourses are perceived as naïve, primarily because they presume human beings to be inherently good. In other words, the Bosnian socio-cultural context was a socio-cultural disequilibrium, characterized by strong fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities, expressed through a fatalist isolation focused on survival and a hierarchical organization in radical nationalist movements.

The illustration of the Bosnian social map in Figure 11 below shows the strength of the high-grid social solidarities and weakness of low grid solidarities. The socio-cultural viability space is narrow, implying that the political actors positioned in the middle or low on the social map were not viable. The pluralist, individualist or egalitarian biased political and social actors such as some of the multi-ethnic opposition parties, NGOs and other civil society organizations could not raise support for their views and values, could not organize in a meaningful manner and could not achieve their goals, as their strategic behaviours failed to provide results. This also implies that political actors representing high-grid social solidarities such as the leaders of ethno-nationalist movements, were socio-culturally viable, i.e., successful in their attempts to organize and gain support of the people.
This social map, where socio-cultural viability space is extremely narrow, implies that the state is unable to handle the social problems before it, problems such as the incompatible agendas of different ethnic groups, unsolved inter-communal conflict and enormous material destruction and poverty caused by war. The Bosnian state constituted a failed or collapsed state, as it was not able to provide its citizens with the basic public goods. The representatives of the international community arrived with an explicit goal to rebuild the society, build peace and democracy and teach human rights. The implicit goal was to promote change, transform the local political culture and to adjust the Bosnian social map in order to create a more balanced, pluralistic and, ultimately, a peaceful, functioning and socio-culturally pluralistic self-sustainable state.

**International Intervention**

The start of the civilian post-conflict involvement in Bosnia was characterized by discourses, behaviours and relations consistent with the individualistic and egalitarian social solidarities. The process was initially defined as a narrow, technical and instrumental process, with the specific goal of ‘implementation of the civilian provisions of the Dayton agreement’. The participation of the representatives of the international community was guided by a vaguely defined egalitarian biased vision of reintegration of society through creation of a new, unified state of Bosnia, by means of an impartial approach based on ideas of equality of all Bosnian people, i.e., all Bosnian ethnic groups. This overall goal for the process was repeatedly restated and reinforced in the speeches of the HR, whenever the debate about the future of Bosnia took place. In this central partition-integration debate, the HR promoted integration with resolve. He
condemned discourses promoting partition as ‘dangerous’ and ‘irresponsible’. However, the goals of the process were also defined as a creation of the new state of Bosnia through the creation of the highest of standards of good democratic practices and through a transition to a market driven economy, thus corresponding to the cultural bias of the individualist social solidarity. This is exemplified by the extensive initial focus the representatives of the international community placed on the first post-war elections, democratization, freedom of the media, and through the creation of the economic reform projects based on ideas of liberalization and the necessity for the creation of a modern market economy, all the central elements of the QSP.

The preferred strategic behaviour, i.e., the methods and tools for implementation of the civilian provisions of the peace agreement were combined egalitarian and individualistic at the start of the process. They can be characterized as egalitarian, inasmuch as the implementation of most issues agreed upon in Dayton was supposed to be carried out by joint commissions, where the representatives of all the parties in conflict would make binding decisions based on the principle of consensus. The methods and strategies can also be characterized as individualistically biased, inasmuch as strong emphasis was laid on the elections and the market economy, with free trade and interdependence between different groups as perceived paths to a lasting peace and cooperation. Moreover, the only available tools at the disposal of the HR at this time were the consensus-seeking, alternatively compromise-seeking negotiations. All these strategic behaviours are consistent with low-grid social solidarities.

The social relations that were formed at the beginning of the process resemble the egocentric networks of the individualist social solidarity, as the OHR allied with other organizations in connection to specific issues. It cooperated with the IFOR, OSCE, IMF, NGOs, the World Bank and a variety of UN agencies, as an equal among equals. The relations with local authorities were also corresponding to the two low-grid social solidarities, as the OHR initially attempted to treat all sides equally, despite the inequality regarding their willingness to comply with provisions of the Dayton agreement. Furthermore, the fact that the OHR supported the moderate forces in the local society and actively sought to create relationships with those who were willing to cooperate, rather than with those who had the right to participate by virtue of their position, supports the interpretation of the OHR’s relations as egocentric networks.

Regarding the definition of the OHR’s own role in the political process, the OHR positioned itself between the individualistic and egalitarian social solidarities, balancing different ideas about size, scope and goals of the process. On one hand, there was an individualistic approach promoted by the representatives of the US government that wanted the process to be as narrow and as short as possible, focused on the elections, which would solve the political issues, and on the economic liberalization, which would solve the non-political issues. On the other hand, there was a strong egalitarian discourse, a voice arguing for the necessity of a broader process, based on a belief in reconciliation as a prerequi-
site for a lasting peace and reintegration. While looking for balance between the promoters of these two social solidarities, the OHR had also positioned itself against the hierarchical and fatalistic social solidarities. While both local and international debates about Bosnia included some critical and sceptical voices that presented pessimistic views about the possibilities for a full reintegration of the society and reconciliation between the former enemies, the OHR found itself in a role of providing a voice for more positive and optimistic views about the future.

A Cultural Theory analysis of the type of international intervention at the start of the process, contrasted against the four types of intervention outlined in Chapter Three leads to a conclusion that the representatives of the international community within and around the institution of the OHR represented a combined egalitarian-individualistic type of international intervention, as illustrated in Figure 12 below. Regarding both the preferred social relations and the preferred strategic behaviours, as well as most aspects of cultural bias outlined as variables in the Chapter Four, the representatives of the international community approached the post-war process in Bosnia in a manner corresponding to low-grid social solidarities. This approach, based on an alliance between egalitarianism and individualism resembles the frontier (or pioneer) political culture.121

Thus, the Bosnian social map at the very start of the process depicts a fundamental socio-cultural conflict between the high-grid local socio-cultural context

---

121 The organizational culture of the OHR at the beginning of the post-Dayton process has been described as a pioneer culture. See for example Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Daytona Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) p. 70.
and the low-grid approach of the representatives of the international intervention, as visible in Figure 12 above.

**Interactions and Change**

As the process started and the representatives of the international community begun implementing the civilian provisions of the Dayton agreement, they met obstructive local elites that continued to pursue their wartime goals, and a population that fully supported their leaders, while supporting a pessimist discourse about possibilities for cooperation with other ethnic groups and reintegration of the state. Conflicts and misunderstandings occurred as neither Serb, Croat nor Bosniak elites found the representatives of the international community to act and behave as they wanted and expected. There was a considerable space for interpretation of the role and meaning of the international involvement and the local nationalist elites therefore chose to pursue their own agendas, by the strengthening of control over the own ethnic group, while continuing with a selective compliance with the civilian aspects of the DPA. In addition, processes of internal consolidation occurred within all of the three nationalist parties. The moderates were losing power as all three sides prepared for a prolonged political conflict that was perceived as a continuation of the armed conflict with peaceful means.

The representatives of the international community, confronted with a prospect of complete failure of the initial strategy of consensus-seeking negotiations in joint commissions due to the non-compliance of one side or the other, opted to compete with the local nationalists in the public debate through speeches addressed directly to the Bosnian people, arguing against their nationalist leaders. As this strategy provided poor results, the OHR increasingly started adhering to the individualistically-biased strategic behaviour of economic conditionality, as it had succeeded, at least initially in connection to the release of POWs crisis, to influence the behaviour of the local authorities.

In essence, the first interactions between the adherents of the different social solidarities resulted in conflict, and both the local authorities and the representatives of the international community, when facing failures, attempted to do more of the same, i.e., to intensify the speech, behaviour and relations typical of their preferred social solidarity. In this case, it meant that the HR engaged in more negotiations and higher visibility in the media where he promoted alternatives to the discourses presented by the local authorities. The local elites engaged in more hate-speech, more spread of fear, stronger control of the state apparatus and more obstruction and non-compliance with the internationally introduced policies and discourses. Thus, it can be concluded that the local political elites moved even further away from the pluralist middle of the map, as depicted in Figure 13 below, and the socio-cultural conflict between the local authorities and the representatives of the international community deepened.
Looking deeper at the approach of the international representatives, a Cultural Theory analysis shows that it was initially based on a combined egalitarian and individualistic approach, yet it was not socio-culturally viable and therefore, it was not successful. Thus, the repeated failures that occurred due to incompatibility between the internationally introduced policies and the local socio-cultural context provided incentives for change and the first major shift in the approach of the representatives of the international community occurred, just a few months after the start of the process. The failure of joint commissions and consensus-seeking negotiations led to a shift of the preferred strategic behaviour and the carrots-and-stick approach (aid conditional upon compliance) became the preferred implementation tool, the preferred strategic behaviour. After the failure in connection to the implementation of the territorial aspects of the DPA, the OHR was forced to search for better strategies and the solution was found in the so-called ‘conditionality principle’. This typical individualist market based strategy also corresponding to the ‘choice-ism’ approach to policy process, as policies were based on the notion that rational actors would choose to cooperate in order to gain financial aid. After an initial success in connection to the release of POWs, the OHR continued to use this tool, though with varied success since local elites, especially in the Republika Srpska, valued the economic aid far less than expected, considering the effects of war and wide-spread poverty in the country. Once again, the response to failures was found first and foremost in the raising of the stakes. When aid for compliance started resulting in failures, a new and even harsher variation of an individualist biased strategy was introduced – the threat of economic sanctions and exclusion from all reconstruction efforts. The next step was a threat of economic sanctions higher up in the local Serb hierarchy, addressed directly to the Yugoslav president Milosevic.
Eventually, the strategy of economic conditionality completely failed, as the Serb side willingly excluded Republika Srpska from international reconstruction programs.

Towards the end of Carl Bildt’s time in Bosnia, it became clear that the approach of the OHR did not provide the desired results. The process was defined as an implementation of the Dayton agreement and although all parties accepted Dayton, if only barely in the case of the Serbs, it included a number of provisions that were perceived as damaging to the nationalist agendas of the Bosnian ethnic groups. Therefore, both the original strategic behaviour of consensus-based negotiations in the joint commissions and the economic conditionality that became the preferred implementation later failed to provide results. The perceived image of the role of the OHR in the Bosnian society at this time resembled the image of technical assistants and possibly teachers, while most of the local nationalist elites requested neither assistance nor education. The short-term goals of implementation of specific provisions of the DPA and the long-term goals of changing the local society were both failing due to the inability of the internationally-promoted values and beliefs, discourses and narratives to find enough supporters in the local society. In addition, procedural democracy with the electoral process in focus was being successfully implemented, but the result was contrary to the expected. Thus, the representatives of the international community started adhering to the fatalistic social solidarity, at least to a limited degree, as illustrated in Figure 13 above. Towards the end of the studied period, the *ad-hoc* crisis management became the only meaningful strategy, as neither the short-term nor the long-term goals could be meaningfully pursued because of the inability to influence and control the course of events and the inability to implement policies. All the while, the local nationalist elites consolidated their power and strengthened their rule over their ethnic groups.

**Effects on the Social Map**

At this time, the questions concerned with the influence of an international intervention on the local socio-cultural context can be addressed.

The international presence in Bosnia did not produce any major positive changes in the local socio-cultural context in the first eighteen months of the post-conflict process, the period when Carl Bildt was the High Representative of the International Community. Despite the enormous efforts to instigate change, the discourses presented and promoted by the representatives of the international community failed to take. This is because the egalitarian-individualistic approach was not socio-culturally viable in the high-grid social context of post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. To the contrary, the international presence had actually contributed to the strengthening of the existing and dominating social solidarities. The ambiguous result of the Dayton negotiations caused internal conflicts within the Bosnian political parties. In most cases, the radical option
won those conflicts. Only in the case of the Serbs was there an exception; the most radical SDS leadership lost the battle after an intervention by the OHR, but the moderates that followed had the exact same definition of national interests and the same way of organizing to protect them. Hence, although perceived as a political victory for the representatives of the international community and although it had increased the credibility of the OHR, this change did not represent any major change of the social map. Furthermore, the 1996 elections that were meant to be an opportunity for the people of Bosnia to elect non-nationalist leaders had a reverse effect on the process by strengthening the high-grid social solidarities, as the nationalist sentiment seems to have increased in strength in connection to the elections. Moreover, this first period can be described as an attempt to balance the social map, as the OHR attempted to provide a competing and complementing discourses that would support the individualist and egalitarian social solidarities. It can be argued that the OHR, in so doing, made a natural and internal process of balancing less likely, as it occupied a space that could have been taken by the local adherents of these solidarities.

In sum, all of these events resulted in pressures on the socio-cultural viability space that were contrary to those intended. At the end of Bildt’s mandate, the only visible change on the social map was an increase of strength of the dominant fatalism-hierarchy alliance of the Bosnian political culture and a further narrowing of the socio-cultural viability space, as depicted in Figure 14 below. As nationalist elites seeking division of Bosnia proved their competence to their constituencies, as their policies of non-compliance hampered the process to a degree that meaningfulness of the entire process was being questioned, both in Bosnia and abroad, the viability of the hierarchical bias, social relations and strategic behaviours increased.

*Figure 14 – Changes of the Socio-Cultural Viability Space in the 1st Period*
Nevertheless, it must be noted that the ceasefire was upheld and Bosnia was not at war. Carl Bildt and the OHR contributed to this most important aim of the international intervention in Bosnia Herzegovina. In addition, the OHR had done its best given the mandate it received at Dayton. Carl Bildt had also started a process of reform of the OHR towards the end of his mandate, thus preparing the ground for the coming High Representative.

In conclusion, a Cultural Theory analysis of the first eighteen months of the civilian international intervention to Bosnia shows that: 1) there was a fundamental socio-cultural conflict between the representatives of the international community and the local elites at the start of the process, 2) the OHR, although changing in order to become effective, did not reach a socio-culturally viable position on the Bosnian social map, 3) the local nationalist elites continued ruling their ethnic groups through a hierarchy-fatalism alliance, and, 4) there were no tangible results regarding the broader goals of changing the Bosnian political culture and correcting the imbalances on the Bosnian social map.
Chapter Seven: Carlos Westendorp and the Bonn Powers

This chapter studies and analyzes a two-year period between summer 1997 and summer 1999, the second period of civilian international intervention in Bosnia, which corresponded to the tenure of the Spanish diplomat Carlos Westendorp as the High Representative of the International Community. During this period, there were five particular events or crises that formed and defined the social relations and strategic behaviours of the local and international actors involved in the process. In the first section of the chapter these events are described and, as in Chapter Six, the last section of this chapter consists of a Cultural Theory reinterpretation of the described crisis and events, based on the framework for analysis presented in Chapter Four.

The first identifiable event which affected the relationship between the OHR and the local authorities occurred directly upon the arrival of Carlos Westendorp to Sarajevo, when yet another internal struggle within the Serb leadership broke out. The second crisis resulted from the OHR attempts to break down the nationalist control of the media. The third event was the aftermath of the postponed municipal elections and the early parliamentary elections in the Republika Srpska. The fourth major event in the process came in connection to the introduction and use of the so-called Bonn-Powers. Finally, the fifth crisis was produced by the election results in 1998, the Brcko arbitration decision and the subsequent removal of the new president of the Republika Srpska from his post.

The Arrival of the Second High Representative

At the time when Carlos Westendorp arrived in Sarajevo, the key term to describe the efforts of the international intervention in Bosnia was ‘peace consolidation’. This period had started while Carl Bildt was still in office. While encouraging progress by the utilization of economic conditionality, the Peace Implementation Council (PIC) in Paris, London and Sintra outlined the priorities for this part of the process and defined deadlines for the implementation of a number of specific policies. The peace process was moving from the initial stages of implementation of specific requirements outlined in the Dayton Agreement towards the implementation of the broader goals aiming to ensure a sustainable and peaceful state.

On the other hand, the local socio-political context at the start of HR Westendorp’s mandate was essentially the same as it was directly after the war. Although there were improvements, the major political issue in Bosnia was still
the ethno-political issue of national identity. By the time Carl Bildt left office, the partition-integration debate was as dominant in the local debate as ever before. Eighteen months after the process started, despite all the efforts made by the IFOR, the OHR and the OSCE, local authorities still pursued exactly the same goals they had done before and during the war. Specifically, the Bosniaks argued for a second Dayton conference, desiring that the Republika Srpska be dismantled and areas that were controlled by the Serbs would become cantons, whereas the Serbs pursued the unification of the Republika Srpska with Yugoslavia, and the Croats argued for a creation of the 'third entity', which would mean Croat self-rule and a preservation of the parallel institutions of Herceg-Bosna. It has been said that this, the most important national question, had become the only relevant political question in Bosnia. All other issues in Bosnian politics can, in one way or the other, be reduced to it. The efforts made by donors and representatives of the international community to promote and advance social or economic policies were repeatedly rebuffed and failed, as evidenced by the lack of interest of local authorities in debating and implementing the QSP.

In June 1997, Carlos Westendorp arrived in Bosnia to take up his post as the new HR. Immediately after landing in Sarajevo, Westendorp defined three main goals he intended to prioritize: democracy, freedom of movement and freedom of press. This was not a shift in focus by the OHR for as the outgoing HR Carl Bildt added, the goals already had been defined by the PIC Sintra documents and he referred to the change of the HR as: “… a personality change … the policy remains the same.” In regard to the political strategy of the OHR, Both
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1 ‘Dayton II’ that was supposed to include major constitutional reforms and reconstruction of the Bosnian state was repeatedly mentioned by the Bosniak side as a possible remedy for non-compliance of the Serb side. In 1996, Bildt had repeatedly responded to requests for Dayton II by different Bosniak politicians, denying that possibilities for change of the agreement exist. See, for example, Fuad Cibukcic, “Interview: Carl Bildt, High Representative in BiH: There Shall Be No Dayton 2”, in Vecernje Novine, 12 April 1997. See also Carl Bildt, "I Haven't Legitimized War Criminals", in Wall Street Journal, 14 May 1996.

2 In connection to the first elections, most Serb parties openly campaigned on a platform of division of Bosnia and unification with Serbia. ICG, "Elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina” in ICG Europe Report (International Crisis Group, 22 September 1996).

3 The Croats continued pursuing their ambition of self-rule, first through the continuation of parallel institutions of Herceg Bosna and then more openly, through political campaigns for constitutional reform based on a slogan “no identity without an entity”. For background on Croat interests, the third entity and Herceg Bosna see ICG, "Turning Strife to Advantage: A Blueprint to Integrate the Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina” in ICG Europe Report (Sarajevo: International Crisis Group 2001).


5 OHR, "Landcent Transcript: Joint Press Conference by Carl Bildt and Carlos Westendorp" in HR Press Conferences (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 19 June 1997).

6 Ibid.
Bildt and Westendorp agreed that “we have signs of [conditionality] beginning to change things on the ground … [we] think it's a good instrument.” At this point, it appeared that there were no plans for any dramatic changes in the work of the OHR. The goals and the strategies to reach them were to remain the same.

Yet, in the following weeks, HR Westendorp started changing the internal structure of the OHR. In Dayton, the OHR had been envisioned as a temporary coordinating institution for the representatives of the international community, created for the specific goal of the implementation of the civilian aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement. Over time, it became clear that the OHR was more than that. It had become the main institution for the international community’s strategy in Bosnia, the leading actor in the peace, development and democratization processes. Its internal structure was originally very loose and flat, as many urgent needs to respond to immediate crises had created something that resembled a ‘pioneer’ organizational culture. After Westendorp took office, the organizational culture of the OHR started changing as different departments were formed and the internal organization became clearer and more hierarchical. For example, OHR employees who served during this time speak about the difference in accessibility. They report that while the previous HR had contact with (and was available to) most OHR employees, the new HR created a structure that was much more rigid. HR Westendorp met, first and foremost, with his deputies and department chiefs and the employees rarely, if ever, had direct official contacts with the HR. During Bildt’s tenure, much of his time and effort as HR was spent on negotiations with other, equally powerful or even more powerful, international actors present in Bosnia such as the OSCE, IFOR and different UN agencies. The task of the HR in this regard changed when the PIC officially recognized the OHR as the leading institution in the civilian process in the spring of 1997. This created new possibilities for international representatives in Bosnia to form more efficient and coherent working relationships. In addition, the IFOR had been transformed into the SFOR, which meant that the NATO-led military force had broadened its mandate and became more invested in the civilian parts of the process as well. Earlier, the IFOR had no interest in becoming involved in civilian matters, as illustrated by IFOR’s reluctance to take part in security matters involving the transfer of territories. The OHR that Westendorp had inherited from Bildt was in many aspects different from the OHR during the early days after Dayton. Through a further
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7 OHR, "Landcent Transcript: Joint Press Conference by Carl Bildt and Carlos Westendorp" in HR Press Conferences (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 19 June 1997).
8 Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosnia i Hercegovina: Od Dayton Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) ca 90. See also Carl Bildt, Uppdrag Fred (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1997).
9 OHR, "PIC Sintra Summary" in PIC Documents (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 30 May 1997).
reorganization of the internal structure of the civilian international intervention in general, and the OHR in particular, Westendorp started preparing for the upcoming changes in the character of the international involvement in Bosnia, changes designed to speed up the process.

**Antenna Wars and the RS Crisis**

Westendorp’s intentions as the new High Representative was to act quickly to change the structure of the OHR and to move the process forward according to the deadlines set by the PIC. However, he immediately ran into difficulties due to the evolving situation on the ground. Not only did the policy of obstruction of the process continue, despite the change of the HR, but a grave constitutional crisis in the Republika Srpska made further developments in regard to the Sintra declaration and its deadlines practically impossible. The conflict between Biljana Plavsic and the moderate Serb leadership in Banja, on one side, and the hardcore nationalist Serb leadership in Pale, on the other, which a year earlier had appeared to have been managed by Bildt, had after Westendorp’s arrival in Bosnia once again become the main political crisis in Bosnian politics. Moreover, this time the crisis was deeper and more complex. The power struggle between Pale and Banja Luka started in June 1997. At that time, following Karadzic’s successfully removal from the scene by Bildt, Biljana Plavsic, who was now the Republika Srpska (RS) president, dismissed the RS Minister of Interior on grounds of allegations of corruption but also because he had taken orders directly from Karadzic and the Pale Serbs. 11 These moves resulted in a demand for her resignation from the SDS party leadership. In the days that followed, there were even some reports that the Republika Srpska special police were preparing to arrest Plavsic. 12 As a counter-measure, supported by the OHR and SFOR, Plavsic used her constitutional powers and dissolved the parliament of the Republika Srpska on July 3. 13 Although the cause of this crisis was the dismissal of the RS Minister of Interior, it was actually a consequence of the OHR initiative to reform the Bosnian police forces, to professionalize them and to remove them from the control of the radical nationalists. The initiative was supported by the PIC, IPTF and SFOR, and the OHR expected a swift and full implementation. 14 Plavsic accepted the necessity for police reforms, primarily because the RS police forces were under direct control of her adversaries in Pale. However, there was strong opposition as the Minister of Interior, the government of the Republika Srpska, the Parliament of the Republika Srpska and the SDS party leadership clearly did not accept the proposed reforms.
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12 Ibid.
14 OHR, *Summary SRT News July 8th* (Sarajevo: SRT, 1997), 8 July.
Consequently, a constitutional crisis broke out as Plavsic attempted to call for new elections.

The response from Pale was swift, coming in just a few days. Both the parliament and the government of the Republika Srpska met and ruled Plavsic’s decision to be ‘unconstitutional’.\(^{15}\) The parliament also held a session where they initiated the process of removing Biljana Plavsic from her post as the RS president.\(^{16}\) The crisis became even more embroiled when the constitutional court of the Republika Srpska was asked to investigate the constitutionality of the president’s decision to dissolve the parliament.\(^{17}\) During the next few weeks, while the constitutional court investigated the decision, both sides held large demonstrations in support for one side or the other, sometimes numbering as much as 10,000 people. On occasions, the demonstrations were violent and the SFOR had to intervene and physically separate the different groups of Serb demonstrators.\(^{18}\) The conflict was hardening even more in the media, where Pale leadership used the electronic media they controlled to gain popular support through fallacious and inflammatory means. The Serb Radio Television (SRT), based in Pale, continuously attempted to discredit not only Biljana Plavsic but also the representatives of the international community who supported her. She was called a “traitor”\(^{19}\) who was “dividing the Republika Srpska”\(^{20}\) and the OHR and SFOR were called “occupiers”.\(^{21}\) The crisis came to a head when the RS Constitutional Court ruled that the decision to dissolve the parliament was unconstitutional.\(^{22}\) Biljana Plavsic responded that the constitutional court decision was not acceptable since it was based on a political rather than a legal ground. With the court in this way taking the side of Pale hardliners, the OHR found itself in a rather delicate position given that they had supported the moderates, the losing side in this internal constitutional battle. The OHR asked the European Commission for Democracy through Law\(^{23}\) to provide its opinion
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18 Jamie McIntyre, "NATO: Coup attempt against Bosnian leader thwarted" in CNN News (9 September 1997). See also OHR, "OHR and SFOR act to prevent intimidation at Banja Luka" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 8 September 1997).
19 RS Prime Minister Klickovic called Plavsic actions “high treason”. OHR, "Summary SRT News September 1st" in Local News Issues (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 8 July 1997).
20 As referred to by the Serb Army Chief of Staff, reported in Tanjug, "Republika Srpska Army on Political, Security Situation" (Belgrade, 22 August 1997).
23 The so-called “Venice Commission”, working under auspice of the Council of Europe.
on certain provisions of the constitution of the RS. Its ruling was supportive of Plavsic’s decision\textsuperscript{24} and the OHR continued to support her, despite the ruling of the RS constitutional court, which the commission labelled ‘unconstitutional’ and “clearly a decision taken under political pressure.”\textsuperscript{25} HR Westendorp sent a letter to the Pale officials informing them that the RS Minister of Interior and his deputy were no longer qualified to perform their duties, and he ended with an unequivocal statement: “We don't acknowledge them and demand their removal”.\textsuperscript{26}

Throughout this crisis, Westendorp took a more aggressive stance against the SDS leadership. Furthermore, he used the crisis to change the rules of the game, i.e., to permanently weaken the Pale side of the SDS. The media outlets controlled by the Pale radical nationalists were perceived as the main tool for obstruction of the process and propagated the hate-speech and fear-mongering that dominated the inter-group debate in Bosnia. Indeed, the election results in 1996, in which the extremists won a landslide victory, were usually explained as a result of the nationalist parties’ control over the television.\textsuperscript{27} At this point, when the Serb television started its propaganda against the NATO troops, the OHR used the situation to break the media monopoly. Westendorp asked the SFOR commanders to overtake and shut down some transmitters of Serb Television (SRT) in order to stop the Pale studio from emitting inflammatory propaganda. Since this propaganda was potentially harmful to the NATO forces and because the SFOR had a different mandate than its predecessor IFOR, the military forces accepted the OHR’s suggestion and became involved, using military force to shut down and transfer the TV transmitters from one side to the other. The ‘antenna war’, as the Sarajevo media called it, had started and it turned out to be a potentially dangerous conflict.

The move against the power base of the SDS radicals had put the representatives of the international community on a direct collision course with the Serb Pale leadership. Compared to the earlier conflicts between the OHR and the Serb leadership, this was the first open conflict where the use of the mandate of the OHR was at the crux of the matter. Grave accusations were made by the Serb television against the OHR and SFOR and the local Serb population was encouraged to “cancel hospitality” to “occupying troops”.\textsuperscript{28} This was interpreted as an open call for the Serb population to resist SFOR and many feared that this might lead to an open armed confrontation between the Serbs loyal to the Pale leadership and the SFOR troops. Indeed, a few violent incidents had occurred on a couple of occasions during attempts by one side or the other to take over the

\textsuperscript{24} OHR, "OHR Bulletin" in Chronology (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 15 July 1997).
\textsuperscript{25} OHR, "Press Release" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 16 August 1997).
\textsuperscript{26} OHR, "Carlos Westendorp Sent a Letter to Pale Officials" in Local News Issues (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 22 August 1997).
\textsuperscript{27} See Chapter Six.
\textsuperscript{28} Tanjug, "SFOR Actions in RS, Krajisnik Issues Warning" (Belgrade, 9 August 1997).
TV transmitters of the SRT. The response from the international agencies was fierce. The High Representative threatened to completely suspend SRT and he even implied that the continued crisis between Pale and Banja Luka threatened the very existence of the Republika Srpska. These threats represented the gravest of threats against the Serb ‘national interests’, as they were adding fuel to the idea of Dayton II, a Bosniak-requested renegotiation of the agreement – a situation where the Republika Srpska was supposed to be dismantled and the state reunited.

After these threats and after the SFOR had threatened to use force against those interrupting the takeover of the transmitters, the Pale Serb leadership finally backed down. In the so-called ‘Belgrade agreement’, Plavsic of the Banja Luka Serbs and Krajisnik of the Pale Serbs agreed to settle the conflict through elections. The ‘antenna war’ was also over and the SRT was moved from Pale to a new studio in Banja Luka. Under the auspices of the IPTF, police reform had started and consequently, Pale lost control over the police as well. In response, the SDS leadership expelled Plavsic and her people from the SDS and they started preparing for the coming extraordinary RS parliamentary elections to be held in November 1997, where they anticipated a win over the Banja Luka moderates, now organized in another political party, called SNS (Serbian National Union).

The involvement in the RS constitutional crisis and the ‘antenna war’ testified to a new approach by the OHR in Bosnian politics. Bildt’s approach to similar political crises a year earlier was to be careful not openly to take sides. Even when one side was obviously obstructing the work of the OHR, the objectivity and neutrality of the international involvement was perceived as imperative and necessary for the creation of working relationships with the local elected officials. His successor Westendorp opted for a much more intrusive involvement, one in which the distinction between friend and foe was open and explicit. Bildt attempted to fight the radical nationalists in the media, offering opposing discourses about what is in the best interest of the people of Bosnia. Learning from the failures in this approach, Westendorp successfully used SFOR and the threat of force, as well as political pressure, to attack the power-base of the nationalist parties directly. He engaged in confrontations with local radicals, attempting to remove their tools for control, namely, the police and the media.

30 For more, see Fuad Cibukcic, "Interview: Carl Bildt, High Representative in BiH: There Shall Be No Dayton 2", in Vecernje Novine, 12 April 1997.
31 The so called ‘Belgrade agreement’ was engineered by Slobodan Milosevic. See SRNA, "News Review, Republika Srpska, 25th of August" in SRNA Press Bulletins (Srpska Novinska Agencija, 25 August 1997).
1997 Elections

The first post-war municipal elections were scheduled to be held in 1996, at the same time as the first general elections. On three occasions, the OSCE had postponed these elections because of grave irregularities in the voter registration procedures. The problem was the regulations governing registration of displaced persons and refugees. According to the DPA, the people should vote in the same municipalities as they had lived in before the war in order to prevent a legitimization of wartime ethnic cleansing. This meant that there was a possibility for parties from one ethnic group to win elections in municipalities that ‘belonged’ to other ethnic groups. In other words, there was a risk of creating governments in exile, consisting of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDP). Attempting to prevent this, the nationalist parties tried to influence absentee voters. As in the earlier 1996 general elections, the Serb and Croat authorities had tried to prevent refugees and IDPs from coming to their pre-war municipalities to vote, whereas the Bosniak authorities encouraged members of their own group to do so. In one way or the other, all three groups used the IDP votes to manipulate the results of the elections, to get the result that supported their claim in the partition-integration debate.

In the run-up to the 1997 municipal elections, the fear of massive fraud and electoral engineering seen in the elections a year earlier forced the OSCE to allow IDPs the right to vote in the municipalities in which they had been living during the war, thus changing the Dayton Agreement. As the three parties could not come to an agreement on the IDP issue, the OSCE opted for the middle ground, to allow the people to make the choice themselves. In the RS, 65% of the IDP voters preferred their current municipality; in the Federation, the number was 45%.

The election campaign itself was characterized by repeated threats by different sides to boycott the elections, due to the regulations regarding the absentee votes. The situation culminated in a temporary withdrawal of the Republika Srpska and Federation representatives from the work of the Provisional Election Commission (PEC). They returned to work only after the OHR and the OSCE had exerted pressure (and offered some concessions) on the SDS and

---
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HDZ party leadership. Yet, just four days before the elections were supposed to be held, on September 9, the OBN television reported that both the Croat HDZ and the Serb SDS party had announced that they would not participate in the elections at all. The problem, as they perceived it, was that the Bosniaks could win seats in a number of vital municipalities such as Brcko and Mostar. The crisis was solved at the last minute and all parties took part in the elections, apart from the Croat HDZ party branch in the municipality of Zepce, a small ethnically-mixed community in central Bosnia.

Despite these difficulties and their politically-sensitive nature, the elections were held and proclaimed ‘free and fair’ by the OSCE who had a record number of 2,500 election monitors in place. The results were also perceived as being much more positive than those of the general elections in 1996. In 42 municipalities, the IDP voters won between 20% and 49% of the council seats. Absentee majorities (governments in exile) were only elected in five municipalities in the FBiH and one in the RS (Srebrenica). Still, the ruling nationalist parties scored victories in the overwhelming majority of the municipalities that they controlled (129 out of 136). However, the fact that a number of municipalities had elected mixed-party municipal governments was celebrated as a victory by the OSCE and the OHR.

Nevertheless, the international authority overseeing the electoral rules and regulations was accused of helping to legitimize ethnic cleansing by its interpretation of the DPA that had allowed refugees and IDPs to vote in the municipalities where they currently lived. For representatives of the international community, this was a natural choice, one that allowed the people a free choice as to which municipality they belonged. It was inconceivable, in the view of the international community, to forbid people to register and vote in the municipalities in which they resided and intended to continue to reside. However, the Serb and Croat nationalists used this position by the international authority to establish the actual division of the three ethnic communities, and the Bosniak

38 OHR, "BiH TV News Summary" in Media Monitoring (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 9 September 1997).
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43 ICG, "ICG Analysis of the 1997 Municipal Election Results" in ICG Europe Report (Sarajevo: International Crisis Group, 14 October 1997).
SDA party used it to attempt to erode the power of the SDS and HDZ in the municipalities where the Bosniaks were a majority before the war. The result was referred to as “a perversion of the electoral process”. As ICG noted, the municipal elections were an ethnic census rather than elections. There were hardly any political debates, only calculations about the ethnic majorities and minorities in different municipalities. The people were expected to (and did) vote for their ethnic party. Accordingly, the election results simply reflected the pre-war ethno-demographic structure and the ability of nationalist parties to manipulate votes of IDPs and refugees.\(^45\) Once again, all politics was reduced to a single issue of ethnicity and national identity, as the nationalist parties used the municipal elections to continue the process of ‘majorization’, i.e., consolidation of the war-won territories or reinforcement of the claims for war-lost territories.\(^46\) Some observers noted that there was little reason for celebration, despite the fact that many municipalities elected mixed governments, given the fact that the multi-ethnic non-nationalist parties, such as the Social Democratic SDP, had won only six percent of the vote.\(^47\)

In the next months, the OSCE and the OHR dealt with a number of local crises in those municipalities where absentee votes delivered enough seats to prevent domination by the majority ethnic group. This was perceived as a very positive development because politicians from different ethnic groups would have to cooperate in order to form municipal governments. Furthermore, the OSCE had introduced a rule requiring obligatory minority representation at all levels of local government after the elections in order to further the practice of power-sharing and increase the number of municipalities with mixed government. However, the implementation of this rule became rather problematic because it was unclear how these arrangements were to be implemented. In the end, the OSCE officials had to engage directly in endless negotiations with the majority parties and sometimes even had to decide themselves which positions majority parties had to offer to the minority parties.\(^48\) The local political parties perceived the OSCE’s actions to be a mockery of the election results because as winners, even when winning an overwhelming majority of the vote, could not form local governments as they wished.\(^49\) Furthermore, in municipalities where refugees won the right to form the government as a result of the absentee votes, the municipal governments became paralyzed since the winners could not physically come to the municipality they were supposed to rule. Most notably in Srebrenica, where the Bosniak parties won 25 of the 45 seats in the new
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municipal assembly, the winners of the election risked losing their lives if they attempted to come back and take their seats in the municipal council. As one local Serb politician stated, “…the first night they come back, it means fighting.”

In light of the earlier 1996 elections, in which the results were used to strengthen the control of radical nationalist parties over their ethnic groups and which were marked by widespread fraud and election campaigns filled with hate-language, the representatives of the international community opted for an intrusive policy of electoral engineering. By changing the electoral rules, the OSCE forced ethnic minorities into municipal governments. These changes were designed to compensate for the negative effects of the previous decision to allow the IDPs to vote where they wished – a decision that more or less guaranteed the domination of the majority parties in all municipalities, thus legitimizing ethnic cleansing and making a successful refugee-return process even less likely. Whatever the reason might be, the international community had started acting intrusively and as a corrector of the electoral process. While arguing for democracy and democratization, election results were not being respected in full. The people of Bosnia were perceived to have given their votes to the ‘wrong’ parties, making integration, reconciliation and cooperation impossible. In response the representatives of the international community, who had reluctantly accepted the choice of the Bosnian people in 1996, opted to intervene through electoral engineering to correct the failure of the people to elect the ‘right’ parties into power. This was the first time the electoral process was directly and clearly controlled and corrected.

In November 1997, shortly after the 1997 municipal elections, the early parliamentary elections in the Republika Srpska emerged as the next political battleground. Biljana Plavsic had in the meantime been thrown out of the SDS party and formed her own SNS party (Serbian National Union). Although her main opponent was the SDS, her platform was identical to the platform of the SDS. The vice-president of the party publicly declared that he and his party colleagues “have abandoned the SDS because the program of the SDS was not implemented in practice, although it is good.” Even so, the elections were perceived as a showdown between Plavsic and the SDS as the election campaigns focused on its leaders. The SDS ran on a platform that Plavsic was a traitor dividing the Serbs while Plavsic ran on accusations of Krajisnik and the SDS being corrupt. However, once the SRT moved to Banja Luka and the SDS had lost the control over the public debate in the RS, the election campaigns were conducted in a much more civilized manner and did not resort to extreme hate-speech.

50 Cited in “This Week in Bosnia”, Bosnia Action Coalition, Boston (September 24 1997).
52 Cited in ibid.
In the end, the elections were conducted in an orderly manner and most votes were divided between the main parties in the conflict. The SDS received 31.5% and Plavsic’s new SNS received 21.8%. The other big winner was another extreme nationalist party – the Serb Radical Party (SRS), led by Nikola Poplasen, which received 16.6% of the electoral support.53 As none of the parties gained a majority of the vote, the post-election months opened up a complex parliamentary debate about the formation of the new RS government. The SDS and the Radical Party were initially expected to form the government, but they lacked two seats in the parliament.54 Plavsic and the moderates were not expected to be able to form the government as they would need support from many smaller, ideologically incompatible parties, some of which were even elected to the parliament on minority and absentee votes alone, such as the Bosniak Party for Bosnia (SBiH). As none of the blocks could form the government, the OHR became involved, intervening in the parliamentary process and engineering the election of Milorad Dodik to the post of prime minister. From a small town outside Banja Luka, Dodik was the president of a local socialist party that had gained only 4.3% of the electoral support. During the electoral campaigns, he was described and perceived as a pragmatic, non-nationalist and West-friendly businessman. Hence, the OHR chose to support him and used all of its political power to convince other, smaller parties to cast their votes in his support.55 In addition, Dodik was elected Prime Minister after the official session of the parliament was adjourned by the SDS Speaker of the House. As the SDS parliamentarians left the building, the meeting reopened without them. Dodik was still one vote shy of a majority support. According to the western media, Westendorp’s deputy Jacques Klein had at this time requested SFOR troops to intercept one delegate travelling from Banja Luka to Zagreb and return him to the parliament building.56 In this manner, through questionable political manoeuvring and with full support of the OHR, Dodik was elected as the new Prime Minister of the Republika Srpska and he formed government, based on the support of a very broad coalition, which surprisingly included Bosniak parties as well.57

The election of Milorad Dodik was welcomed with relief by the OHR and representatives of the international community. As the US Secretary of State Madeleine Albright stated; this was a “breath of fresh air” in the Balkans.58 In order to make Dodik’s government work, the international community started

---
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backing him financially and politically in an unprecedented manner. In the first months after the creation of the Dodik government, the OHR arranged a ‘financial lifeboat’ to keep the government afloat so that teacher and civil servant salaries could be paid.\textsuperscript{59} The practice of financial support continued and increased over time.\textsuperscript{60} In the months that followed, the RS government continued to grow in confidence in its fight against the Pale Serb leadership. With the help from the OHR, the IPTF and the SFOR, Dodik had successfully purged the RS industry and removed the SDS loyalists from leading positions in the RS public corporations. He started investigations on smuggling operations and the corrupt companies owned by the Pale leaders, which presumably had been used to finance Radovan Karadzic. In addition, Dodik cleared away SDS hardliners from the police, even in the stronghold of Pale itself, following the killing of one of the police chiefs who investigated corruption claims.\textsuperscript{61} Among his further measures, Dodik closed the Serb Republic News Agency (SRNA) and restructured the SRT, the two main propaganda tools of the Pale Serbs.\textsuperscript{62}

But on the other hand, Dodik’s government was not as moderate as it was perceived to be by the representatives of the international community. While he fought against the power of the Pale Serbs in every way possible, Dodik failed to conduct major reforms and he consequently made more enemies than friends within the Serb ethnic community.\textsuperscript{63} He was still being accused of treason against the Serb cause, accused of giving the international community “more than they asked for”.\textsuperscript{64} He had also attracted internal criticism when most of the smaller parties within the coalition found that Dodik was more interested in gaining and stabilizing his own political power, than in including his alliance partners and sharing the power.\textsuperscript{65} Last but not least, although being a moderate, Dodik was still a nationalist, believing in the Serbian cause, i.e., secession from Bosnia. Furthermore, his government was possible only because of the support of the SNS, a party with a similar agenda as that of the SDS.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, he had done much less than expected in regard to the Serb policies towards Sarajevo, towards other ethnic groups, the return of refugees, and so forth. Certainly, the Republika Srpska was benefiting from the removal of the SDS in terms of
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international aid, democratization, better police and media. Nevertheless, the implementation process of the peace agreement was not progressing, as PIC deadlines were not being implemented and Dodik’s government was obstructing other aspects of the process, such as refugee return and economic reform, almost as much as the SDS had done earlier.67

The first period of Westendorp tenure as the HR was characterized by crisis management in the Republika Srpska, as had Bildt’s. But while the office of the HR interfered in local political battles before, this was the first time it had taken an active role to directly influence the outcomes of local political conflicts and local elections. The relationship between the international and the local authorities was increasingly becoming based on power and position. For the first time, the OHR engaged the elite nationalist leaders in open conflict over competency, position and power in state structures. The result was the removal of the SDS from power, both directly through electoral engineering and indirectly, through the takeover of the SRT transmitters, police reform and by cutting off the SDS financial base. In connection to both the municipal elections and the RS parliamentary elections, the OHR and the OSCE acted as correctors of the electoral process, with the aim of weakening the grip of the nationalist parties.

**PIC Bonn Meeting and the Increase of Powers**

At the same time as different institutional crisis came and passed in the Republika Srpska, the HR tried to meet the deadlines set out in the Sintra declaration. In July and August, Westendorp repeatedly warned the local authorities that they must comply with the requirements of Sintra or face severe consequences.68 Despite warnings, none of the deadlines were met. Despite conditionality, the process was stymied and the state of Bosnia was barely functioning. In the fall of 1997, the public discourse was once again returning to the basic issue of ethnic division. The fact that parties were unable to cooperate and implement the goals of the process was used as evidence that the state of Bosnia was not a viable state and that partition was the only solution. At a joint press conference held by the OHR and other major international agencies, Westendorp stated:

> Any talk of partition or secession in Bosnia must be disregarded. The Dayton Agreement is the basis of our work, and Dayton is the only way forward.69

---


Westendorp further added that:

...there were serious blockages in the implementation of Dayton and the Bonn meeting must provide guidance on how these could be overcome ... the functions and resources of the OHR would be looked at closely during the Bonn meeting to ensure backing for full interpretation of the powers accorded to [the OHR] under the Peace Agreement.70

This statement emerged from the meeting of the PIC steering board where discussions about the mandate of the HR took place. Warnings were once again issued to the Bosnian Presidency and the Bosnian Council of Ministers (CoM). A list with eighteen requirements based on the Sintra deadlines was presented to them by the HR and the document was called a “minimum requirement to signal to the international community in Bonn that the leadership of this country is taking its obligations seriously and is willing to cooperate with the international community in good faith.”71 In conclusion, the PIC steering board finished with some direct words to the representatives of the local authorities: “You must now use the coming weeks to achieve substantial progress and results. Time is running short.”72

Once again, local politicians responded with endless discussions in parliaments and in the media, while state institutions such as the Presidency and the Council of Ministers achieved no tangible results. Consequently, in November 1998 the PIC met in Bonn where they noted that “although much has been made in regard to implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement, the practice of obstruction continued and, for the sake of the process, everything must be done to bring non-compliance to an end.”73 In its final statement, the PIC reaffirmed the earlier-stated goals and deadlines for their implementation but it also extended the mandate of the OHR in order to create mechanisms for fight against obstruction. The HR was given the power to make binding decisions on following issues:

a.) Timing, location and chairmanship of meetings of the common institutions

b.) Interim measures to take effect when parties are unable to reach agreement, which will remain in force until the Presidency or Council of Ministers has adopted a decision consistent with the Peace Agreement on the issue concerned
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c.) Other measures to ensure implementation of the Peace Agreement throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina and its Entities, as well as the smooth running of the common institutions. Such measures may include actions against persons holding public office or officials who are absent from meetings without good cause or who are found by the High Representative to be in violation of legal commitments made under the Peace Agreement or the terms for its implementation.74

This was a major increase in the mandate of the OHR. First, the HR could decide the timing, location and chairmanship for the meetings of joint institutions. This removed the use of obstructive methods, such as failure to hold meetings with the presidency when some members absented themselves claiming security reasons. Second, the power to make interim decisions when parties cannot agree was intended to remove the obstructive strategy of keeping the status quo. Earlier in the process, legislation was routinely being stopped by one side or the other, either on technical grounds or by endless debates, all in order to stop progress. Now, the HR had the power to bypass this political process and declare any legislation proposal as an interim measure until the parliaments did agree. In effect, the HR was granted the power to bypass the Bosnian constitution and its definition of the legislative process. Finally, the HR received an open mandate: “the power to implement measures to ensure implementation of the Peace Agreement.” These sweeping powers were not clearly defined, other than that they might include actions against individuals found by the HR to act in violation of the Peace Agreement.

How these powers were to be used was the key question for the future of the process. At this time, HR Westendorp announced that the Bonn Powers were nothing more than a re-interpretation of the powers already given to the OHR by the Dayton Agreement, but he also noted that there would be changes in the way the OHR was going to work in the future. He told a Bosnian periodical that “… if you read Dayton very carefully … Annex 10 gives me the possibility to interpret my own authorities and powers.”75 He continued to outline his view of the coming changes: “I will stop this process of infinite discussions. In the future, it will look like this: I will give them a term to bring a certain decision, that is, to agree about some decision. If they do not, I will tell them not to worry, that I will decide for them.”76 In another interview, given to the Serb periodical, he reaffirmed: “the authority I have been given is what I have had so far. It [new powers] would require a new [peace] agreement.” Nevertheless, he also continued with a warning:
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Obstruction, blockades, failure to carry out duties... will not be tolerated anymore. So: if you do not agree, do not worry; I will do it for you. If you don't agree systematically, worry not again: I will liberate you from this duty.77

In contrast to these harsh statements, the OHR also announced that the existing mandate of the HR was strengthened in order to enable arbitration and it would be especially applied in areas promoting the independent media, co-operation with the ICTY, the return of refugees, police reconstruction, human rights, and economic recovery.78 The HR added that he would use his new powers very economically, as he stated that:

I won't be using it too frequently, for when you grab some weapon too frequently... its effects decrease. I will only use it as a means of dissuasion.79

There was certainly some confusion in regard to the meaning of these increased powers since the communication coming out of the OHR signalled that things would be much different as the OHR took charge of the process with the new authority to make binding decisions, yet at the same time also signalling that this is nothing new and that these new powers would be used rarely and carefully. The results of the PIC Bonn Conference were received with mixed emotions by the local authorities. Most statements were guardedly positive, since it was unclear what the changes of the OHR mandate would mean in practice. Bosnian Foreign Minister Prlic of the HDZ stated that the results of the Bonn Conference were positive because they confirmed the readiness of the international community to remain in Bosnia and to do more than simply to overcome crises.80 Federation Co-President Ganic of the SDA referred to the changes in the mandate of the OHR as a positive development, since they were expected to eliminate the vacuum in the functioning of the BiH joint institutions.81 Plavsic, the president of the Republika Srpska, reassured the Serb people that the Bonn Conference results, including the increased powers of the OHR, were not upsetting for the Serbian people.82 This carefully-phrased positive statement by the RS president came despite the fact that the Serbs were not even participating in the PIC meeting. They had left Bonn in protest against the inclusion of the Kosovo issue on the agenda.83
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The first test of the strength of the Bonn Powers came soon, as the deadline for the important Law on Citizenship passed during the December session of the Bosnian parliament. The basic disagreement concerned the Serb delegates desire to include in the text of the law the right to dual citizenship (Bosnian and Yugoslavian) for the Bosnian Serbs, as the Croats had the right to dual citizenship (Bosnian and Croatian). Such dual citizenship was strongly opposed by the Bosniak side and an agreement could not be reached. The deadline expired on December 15 when the sixth extraordinary session of the parliament could not come to any agreement. Accordingly, HR Westendorp issued his first official decision on the following day:

It is with regret that I have been informed about the failure of both Houses to accept the Law on Citizenship on Bosnia and Herzegovina within the said deadline.

In accordance with my authority under Annex 10 of the Peace Agreement and Article XI of the Bonn Document, I do hereby decide that the Law on Citizenship of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall enter into force by 1 January 1998 on interim basis, until the Parliamentary Assembly adopts this law in due form, without amendments and no conditions attached.\textsuperscript{84}

He concluded the text of the decision with the following warning for the future of the process:

The Peace Process is, after Sintra and Bonn, entering a new and decisive phase. I am decided to fully use my authorities under Annex 10 of the Dayton Peace Accord and Article 11 of the Bonn Document to insure an efficient implementation and fully count on your full cooperation in this endeavour.\textsuperscript{85}

The reactions to this first OHR decision to impose legislation in response to obstruction by the local parties were interesting. The Serb nationalist Krajisnik stated that the decision of the HR Westendorp to proclaim the Law on Citizenship was “a dangerous, bad and extorted act for which exclusive guilt lies on the Muslim party.” He stressed that only the Parliamentary Assembly of Bosnia is authorized to pass the laws. Furthermore, he asserted that foreign diplomats must insist on abiding by the legal parliamentary procedure. Still, he expressed understanding for the action of the OHR and blamed the Bosniak side for obstructing the process due to their “pathological, unfounded fear towards the right of Serbs to double citizenship.”\textsuperscript{86} The Serb television announced, “It is obvious that Westendorp partially supported [dual citizenship] demand in his letter to the members of the BiH Presidency, since he asked the Parliament to
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sign a statement on the possibility of making a bilateral agreement on dual citizenship.\textsuperscript{87} The Serb side perceived this first OHR decision to be a victory. On the other hand, in reactions by the Bosniak side, the Council of Ministers (CoM) Co-Chairman Silajdzic, commenting on the OHR decision, blamed the Serbian side. He stated on BH TV news, “Law on Citizenship would have been passed a long time ago, if there were no obstruction from Pale.”\textsuperscript{88} Both sides were blaming each other for the fact that the law was not passed and the HR had to use his powers. No side was rejecting the very right for the HR to make decisions, nor the text of the decision itself, other than a comparatively mild critique by Krajisnik, who compared the reactions to the HR’s earlier involvement in the ‘antenna war’. The new legislation, as well as the first practical use of the Bonn Powers, was accepted by politicians on all sides. One representative of the SDP, the opposition party in the Federation, simply concluded that:

> The Westendorp's authority became functional, and this decision [law on citizenship] represents a half-protectorate in BiH.\textsuperscript{89}

This unusual development in which local authorities accepted the new role of the OHR, some even embracing and welcoming it, represents yet another surprise – this time a positive one. There had been a concern that the new powers given to the OHR would create an open conflict with the local nationalist leaders. Surprisingly, expected arguments based on sovereignty of the state and the right of ethnic groups to self-rule did not dominate the public debate. Westendorp still talked about “Bonn Powers as a last resort, exception rather than rule,” but the fact of the matter was that the relation between the internationals and the locals changed as the OHR gained and used the executive power, bypassing the constitutionally-regulated legislative process; while local authorities chose to accept these new powers without decisive resistance.

The practice of the Bonn Powers continued and the next deadline approached a month later. This time is was the issue of automobile licensing. Uniform license plates were for a long time a priority of the OHR since they would put a stop to harassment of people travelling across inter-entity boundaries. Traditional Bosnian license plates contained two letters marking the municipality where the vehicle came from. There were numerous incidents where police, as well as civilians, harassed travellers from other entities, in many cases even vandalizing or stealing cars and trucks. This made freedom of movement and free trade impossible to implement. However, despite the obvious advantages of common, standardized registration plates – and the freedom of movement they would enable – creation of a uniform license plate system was not been enacted
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because freedom of movement was perceived to be in conflict with the separatist agenda of the extreme nationalists. After the HR had imposed the Law on Citizenship and threatened to impose other laws if they did not adhere to the deadlines, the parties met just before the deadline was to pass and signed a 'memorandum of understanding', which meant an immediate implementation and significant improvement of the situation concerning freedom of movement.\footnote{OHR, "Uniform license plates in BiH" in \textit{OHR Press Releases} (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 January 1998).} This event represented a promising development. The parties had come to an agreement because of the mere threat of the Bonn Powers, without the HR actually having to impose a solution against the will of the local elites. However, this was the exception rather than the rule. As it soon became clear, the HR had to make binding decisions in connection to every other PIC deadline.

The next crisis required the HR to act once again in a protectorate-like fashion. Another deadline, this time regarding the Law on the Flag of Bosnia and Herzegovina, passed without agreement in the parliament. The OHR’s response to this missed deadline was swift; the HR imposed the law, i.e., made the choice between three alternatives of the flag design submitted by the committee\footnote{Decision on Committee for the Flag of Bosnia was made on 31st of December 1997. To the committee, the HR appointed “persons of reputable standing and guaranteeing a fair representation of the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, OHR, "Press Statement, 31 December" in \textit{OHR Press Releases} (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 January 1997).} which the HR had created earlier.

Following the discussions at the sixth session of the Parliamentary Assembly today I regretfully have to inform that the Delegates have shown themselves lacking in the courage to take a binding decision on the important and sensitive issue of a common flag for Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the House of Representatives Alternative 1 for the flag secured 16 votes, 16 abstentions and only one vote against. On the basis of this I have decided that there is sufficient legitimacy for me to take a decision now. In accordance with my authority under Annex 10 of the Peace Agreement and Article XI of the Bonn Document, I hereby decide that the Law on the Flag of Bosnia and Herzegovina with alternative one shall enter into force with immediate effect.\footnote{OHR, "Decision imposing the Law on the Flag of BiH" in \textit{OHR Decisions} (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 3 February 1998).}

This was indeed a sensitive issue. The OHR was now making decisions on the basic and most important state matters, such as the state flag. Particularly interesting about this decision is the wording of the document itself. The HR justified his decision on this issue very carefully, mentioning ‘sufficient legitimacy’ since most votes in the parliament were no-votes. Once again, there is evidence of some reluctance on behalf of the OHR to act in a protectorate-like manner. Yet, the common Bosnian flag was created by the committee created by
the OHR, the OHR, commonly referred to as the ‘Westendorp Commission’, and it was designed by foreigners who avoided any connection to the Bosnian history or heritage in the design. The flag was then forced upon the local authorities, just in time for the winter Olympics in Nagano. Observers from abroad and journalists in independent Bosnian media have since used the creation of the Bosnian flag as the clearest example of the intrusive use of the Bonn Powers. Rather illustratively, the Bosnian state has been referred to as the state whose flag was designed by foreigners without any connection to the cultural heritage of the Bosnian people and whose national anthem is only instrumental, as the parties could not agree on the lyrics of the song.

One month later, a new milestone was passed. For the first time, the HR took action against an individual. A mayor in a small town under Croat control was blatantly stopping refugees from returning to their homes. He had rejected requests from the UNHCR and OHR to facilitate refugee return. As a result of such recalcitrance, the HR announced on March 5 that he was removing the mayor from office and requested the Croat party HDZ to appoint a successor “dedicated to implementation of the Dayton Agreement”. The mayor in question resigned on the same day, once again showing that even though they were controversial, the Bonn Powers were proving to be a conflict-solving strategy rather than the conflict-creating strategy that had been feared earlier.

Over the next eighteen-month period with Carl Westendorp in office, the practice of using the Bonn Powers continued and increased. The use of the Bonn Powers decreased only in connection to the NATO bombings in Yugoslavia, when the situation in Bosnia was particularly sensitive because of the presence of the SFOR troops and the large Serb population. During this time, the HR decreased the tempo of the peace implementation process in anticipation of a solution to the Kosovo crisis. Nevertheless, there were thirteen decisions removing officials and elected politicians from office. The local nationalist parties offered little resistance to these removals. Rather, they appointed similar or even more radical replacements and those that were forced to leave their posts were placed on other, equally or more important posts. This was remedied by the OHR later, when the removals from office were accompanied with a general
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ban on holding public office; those removed from office could not run in elections, nor could they be appointed to other public positions. These bans from office were permanent and the only way a person removed from office could come back was if the OHR reversed its decision. This happened, for example, in the case of Cavic, an elected member of the Serb National Assembly, who was removed because he spoke against the Dayton Peace Agreement. He was later pardoned by the OHR and allowed to come back to public office, but only after he had renounced his earlier statements.

Twenty decisions were made imposing legislation, mostly in connection to two main issues: state symbols (such as the flag, the anthem and coat of arms) and property legislation that was crucial for the refugee return process. These decisions were prompted by the deadlines defined in Sintra and other PIC meetings. Each legislation package was initiated by the OHR, approved by the PIC and turned over to the local authorities with an attached deadline for approval by the Bosnian parliament. In parliament and in the media, the Bosnian politicians took opposing sides and endlessly debated the issue. As a deadline approached, the OHR repeatedly warned local authorities and after the deadline had passed, the HR made a binding decision. As time passed, this became the regular way of doing politics in Bosnia, at least in connection to the more sensitive and important reforms. This has led observers to refer to Bosnia as a full-blown international protectorate. Remarkably, the local political structures accepted the decisions of the HR. In most cases, there were heated debates and even implicit threats addressed to the OHR if a decision was made without approval by one side or the other, but as soon as the decision was made, the debates ended and the decision was accepted and forgotten.

1998 Elections and the Arbitration Decision

The use of electoral engineering and attempts to remove the nationalists from power serve as an illustration of the extensive use of the Bonn Powers. The next major event in Bosnian politics was the 1998 general elections. In the run-up to the elections, they were described as vital, as the international community expected ‘return on their investment’ - in other words, they expected a defeat of the nationalist parties. Once again, the OSCE was in charge of the organization of the elections. Together with the OHR, they used their time and resources...
to campaign against the nationalist parties. In the Republika Srpska, Milorad Dodik and his government were still enjoying full support of the OHR and the international agencies since the earlier constitutional crisis. In the Federation, the HDZ was strengthening its parallel institutions of Herceg-Bosna while the SDA pressed the international agencies to do more on the matter of strengthening the state and weakening the power of the entities. In this situation, the OSCE and the OHR used all their resources to try to remove the nationalist parties from power. The Provisional Election Commission (PEC) banned all paid advertising in the broadcast media and required equal visibility of all parties. The OSCE created Political Party Resource Centres where the opposition parties could get help to organize and mobilize their support. In addition, the PEC banned some nationalist politicians from the elections altogether.

In the process of preparations for the general elections, the OHR also attempted to eliminate inflammatory propaganda and the nationalist media control. SRT had been restructured and was not as egregious as before, but other media outlets were still being used to spread fear and hate-speech, and they included smaller privately-owned TV-station as well as larger, publicly-owned companies such as the Croat main TV-station HRT. In the summer of 1998, the OHR drafted legislation that created the International Media Commission (IMC), a body with authority to award and remove broadcast licenses and essentially to monitor and regulate the media market. The IMC was led by OHR-appointed personnel and it initially had about 30% international staff. Aside from awarding broadcast licenses, the IMC created and regulated ‘code of conduct’ for journalists. As well, it acted as a sanctioning body that could respond to complaints against media outlets with fines, requests for apologies and corrections and, in the most severe cases, the termination of media outlets. As the IMC became operational, the media situation in Bosnia improved dramatically. Derogatory speech and blatant nationalist propaganda, so negative that it was sometimes compared with the works of Goebbels, was swiftly removed from Bosnian living rooms as those who spoke in such a manner risked being removed from office, and those media outlets that enabled them to spread such propaganda risked losing their licenses.

In large part thanks to the work of the IMC, PEC and the OHR, the atmosphere surrounding the 1998 elections improved dramatically in contrast to the 1996 and 1997 elections. Instances of fraud were much fewer, hate-speech and fear-mongering were far less dominant and incidents of violence against the opposition parties were at a minimum. This was indeed in large part due to the improved situation in the media, especially in the RS where SRNA was
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dismantled, SRT reformed and other stations forced to respect the basic level of good journalistic practices. But this was also a direct consequence of the Bonn Powers and the ability of the OHR to remove officials from office. This action, along with the OSCE’s power to remove candidates from party lists, which had been done with some HDZ candidates, meant that the international agencies had almost full control of the electoral process.

But despite the careful preparations and the improved situation in almost every aspect of the electoral process, the results showed that the nationalist parties were still the strongest political option, although the support for opposition improved. The SDA and the HDZ won an overwhelming support of their ethnic groups. In Croat politics, Kresimir Zubak who once represented a more moderate force within the HDZ had formed his own party, namely, the Croat Democratic Initiative (HDI). Despite the publicity from his exit from the HDZ in the pre-election period, he failed to erode the electoral support from his former party. In the Republika Srpska, the electorate voted for the most radical of the major political figures, Nikola Poplasen of the Serb Radical Party (PSP), to be the president of the Republika Srpska and the Plavsic campaign suffered a failure. This meant that Dodik’s government was once again in danger, although the situation in the parliament was similar to the situation after the last election, when only a few votes separated the radical nationalist block consisting of the SDS and PSP from the moderate block consisting of Dodik, Plavsic and other smaller parties, including the Bosniak and Croat parties.

The failure to achieve the desired results and to remove the nationalist parties, especially in the Republika Srpska, was interpreted as a complete failure of economic incentives as means to achieve political change. In 1996, the election of the nationalists was blamed on the poor security situation and hate-speech. Now, despite the improvements of security and the quality of the media reporting, the election results were still providing legitimacy for the nationalist parties and their obstructive behaviour. Despite the millions of dollars in aid that were promised, offered and used to support the moderate forces, the Bosnian constituency rejected the possibilities presented to them and voted for their wartime leaders. The result of this choice of the Bosnian people was indeed a defining moment for the relationship between the representatives of the international community and the local society. Failure of economic incentives and the increased powers granted to the HR came together and defined a new intrusive policy towards the local authorities that reshaped the external involvement in Bosnia into a more protectorate-like type of intervention.

After the election results came in, the radical nationalist Poplasen accused Dodik of ‘cooperation with the enemy’ and refused to approve the creation of his
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government. Yet another constitutional crisis presented itself in the Republika Srpska, with the same stakes as before during the Plavsic versus Karadzic struggle for power. Whereas it was clear that the constitution stated that the RS president had to approve the creation of the RS government, a debate about this action ensued. Poplasen’s decision not to approve Dodik’s government, despite his having won the majority of the vote in parliamentary elections, resulted in a debate about the validity of the president’s decision, possibilities for new elections, the role of the RS constitutional court, constitutional reform in general, and so forth. The action of the OHR to solve this crisis was described as by far the bluntest intrusion in Bosnian politics.\(^{107}\) After repeated failures to form the RS government, Westendorp took decisive measures – he removed Poplasen and banned him from holding any office, appointed Dodik as the ‘caretaker Prime Minister’ until the next election two years later; kept the presidency post vacant (rather than allowing Dodik’s opponents to appoint someone else like Poplasen), and decided that all legislation passed by the parliament could be enacted without the presidential signature, as required by the constitution.\(^{108}\) Without a president, with a marginalized role for the RS constitutional court and with heavy international pressure on the RS parliament, the obstructive nature of RS politics was expected to end. However, the action on behalf of the OHR was making the electoral process and the constitution of the RS increasingly irrelevant. This resulted in the RS government being, as noted by journalists and scholars, a government completely unaccountable to the people or institutions of the RS.\(^{109}\) The only accountability of the RS government was thus to the OHR, the only institution that was standing above it, with powers to control its output and punish non-compliance.

In connection to the resolution of the Poplasen crisis, another crucial event redefining the Bosnian peace process took place. Just a day after Dodik’s government was saved by the intrusive intervention of the OHR and the dismissal of Poplasen, a postponed arbitration decision concerning the disputed town of Brcko was made public. Brcko was perceived as extremely important for the Serbs since it was located on the Posavina corridor, connecting the eastern and western parts of the Republika Srpska.\(^{110}\) With Brcko, Republika Srpska was territorially united and all parts of the RS had a direct territorial link with Serbia. Without Brcko, the western parts of the RS, including its largest city Banja Luka, would be territorially detached from Belgrade. Thus, Brcko was essential for the Serb desire to separate from Bosnia, declare independence and/or unite with Serbia. On the other hand, Brcko was a predominantly Bosniak
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town situated in an area (Posavina) dominated by Croats and Bosniaks before the war. As most of Posavina was won in the war and ethnically cleansed by the Serbs, Brcko became both symbolically and geo-politically important for all three groups. The Bosniak side argued that if Brcko was awarded to the Republika Srpska, the international community would effectively be supporting and rewarding ethnic cleansing. The Serb side argued that if Brcko was awarded to the Federation, the Republika Srpska would lose its territorial integrity and that was entirely unacceptable, probably leading to renewed fighting. These contentious questions about the status of Brcko had already caused the arbitrator Vance Owen to postpone the arbitration decision a year later. Now, Owen opted for a middle road, defining Brcko as a district, independent of both the Republika Srpska and the Federation, to be ruled by direct international administration and to be multi-ethnic, i.e., populated by Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks. This decision was received with protests, especially in the Republika Srpska. Dodik immediately resigned in protest, only a day after his government was saved by the OHR.111 Earlier, he had portrayed to the people of the Republika Srpska the image of him and his government conforming to everything the OHR and other international agencies had wanted from them because Dodik wanted to ensure that the arbitration decision about Brcko would not go against the RS. Throughout the election campaign, he had campaigned on a platform that ‘a vote for Dodik is the only vote that can keep Brcko in the RS’. Now, he perceived the action of the international community as a manipulation of the Serb people and RS government, and he offered his resignation. At the time when the Brcko decision was made and scheduled to be implemented, a paradoxical and potentially dangerous situation was at hand – the Republika Srpska had neither a president nor a prime minister. Fortunately, in the following days, the OHR successfully persuaded Dodik to return to his post and this round of the RS crisis, including Brcko and election of Poplasen as president, was over.

Evidently, during the tenures of the two High Representatives (Bildt and Westendorp), the OHR approach to the political process in Bosnia changed. Carl Bildt’s regime was characterized by a reluctance to get involved in internal political and constitutional battles as seen when he decided to ‘keep a low profile’ in connection to the first Plavsic/Pale political battle. Carlos Westendorp, in contrast, chose a high profile type of involvement in the RS politics. Openly and decisively, he disregarded the local legislation and constitutional order and overthrew the results of the elections. Poplasen was elected in free and fair elections, yet his first move as president of RS provoked the OHR to remove him and ban him from office. Even more remarkable is the fact that the OHR left the RS without a president, overriding the constitutional order. This was perceived as necessary in order to ensure a functioning government. It also meant that, in a sense, this government, which had already been perceived as

being installed by the internationals, was now also directly accountable to the OHR and only to the OHR.

Towards The End of Carlos Westendorp’s Mandate

During the last year of Westendorp’s tenure in Sarajevo, the Bonn Powers functioned as the main tool of the representatives of the international community. The OHR had thus changed its relation with local actors; a relation that was now based on power, position and legal authority, rather than rationality of arguments presented in negotiations or based on ability economically to reward compliance and punish non-compliance. These changes were a result of a prolonged learning process. On the other hand, the situation for the local elites had changed in other regards as well.

Three events changed the premises for the main, integration-partition debate. First, as the IFOR transformed into SFOR, it became clear that a strategy of ‘waiting-out’ the international intervention was not going to bear fruit. The SFOR’s mandate was broader and longer than that of the IFOR. Local authorities had until then been obstructing the process in order to tire the internationals into failure. Second, the Brcko arbitration decision did not award the Brcko corridor to the Republika Srpska and the Republika Srpska remained divided in two parts. A straightforward partition of the country was no longer an option for the Serbs. Third, the OSCE election regulation that enabled refugees and displaced persons to vote in their new, post-war municipalities legitimized the results of the practice of ethnic cleansing. Thus, a strategy of 100% return and the resulting returnee vote against the Serb and Croat nationalists that was intended to remove the raison d’être of the Republika Srpska was ultimately not a successful or viable strategy for the Bosniak side.

These three events marked a failure of the local authorities’ strategy to reach their pre-war and their wartime goals. It became clear that the Republika Srpska would not separate from Bosnia easily, but it also became clear that a multi-ethnic Bosnia without ethnically-divided territories could not be created. Both the partition and integration sides in the debate lost the possibility of achieving their goals, at least in the short run. The response was avoidance of accountability, as local authorities on both sides of this issue blamed the OHR and the international community since it was the OHR and the international community that had made the RS unviable as a single state and a return to pre-war Bosnia practically impossible.

In retrospect, it is clear that the international involvement produced and promoted some changes in the local politics, but the international involvement in Bosnia changed as well. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the OHR became a large institution, with hundreds of employees divided into a number of departments. After internal OHR reform, the OHR took the position of leader of the international involvement in Bosnia in a much more structured manner. While Carl Bildt cooperated with the OSCE, UNMBIH and other international organi-
organizations and NGOs temporarily when it was necessary for specific policies; Carlos Westendorp institutionalized meetings with other international actors and chaired their joint meetings where efforts were coordinated in much more structured manner. Based on the PIC statement that the OHR is the leading international institution in the process, Westendorp had successfully reorganized the relationships between international agencies from loose to more coherent networks. This resulted in a change of the policy process as well. Earlier, different agencies freely constructed and implemented their projects with the dysfunctional effect of overlapping each other. Under Westendorp policies were being initiated first and foremost by the OHR, then confirmed by the PIC steering board and implemented through cooperation with other international actors. New legislation, for example, in property laws and refugee issues, was drafted at the OHR, put on the list of priorities by PIC, imposed by the OHR and implemented by OHR, UNHCR and NGOs through a joint body chaired by the OHR and UNHCR, the Reconstruction and Return Task Force (RRTF).

The example of RRTF is telling in one other aspect. NGO representatives were not even allowed to attend the meetings at the very start of RRTF operations. They protested this exclusion loudly since they considered themselves to be main players in the reconstruction and refugee return processes. As one NGO representative commented, “... that was from the RRTF side being authoritarian or saying, we’re the OHR and you will do what you are told.” Furthermore, even after NGOs were welcomed to participate, their representatives often felt less important and marginalized in the meeting room, taking second place to representatives of large agencies, bilateral and multilateral donors. In a study about RRTF work, a NGO representative revealed that “the people from OHR come in suits; the NGOs are often in jeans and flannel shirts”; and “NGOs didn’t get heard as much as they should be cause there was certain arrogance about people who are lawyers or make certain salaries.” Although supposedly a network where all actors would be included and participate, the RRTF seemed to have been a highly-structured institutional arrangement, with clear power positions, rules of inclusion and exclusion. Nevertheless, despite the underlying ‘turf battle’ between the OHR and UNHCR for the control of the group, meetings were conducted orderly, without incidents or open conflicts. Earlier, smaller conflicts between the OHR and OSCE or OHR and IFOR were regularly visible in the public debate. Now, new ways of organizing discouraged competition and encouraged structuring of relations. Missing in this process of institutionalization of relations was, of course, the input and presence of local elites. Ruling politicians, excluded from the policy process, engaged in battles in parliaments and in media and did not struggle to be included in RRTF work, or
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any other internationally-driven policy process. They simply awaited the decisions of the OHR and avoided accountability. It is rather telling that no substantial legislation was pushed through local institutions without intrusion of the OHR during this period.

Furthermore, as the above example shows, those who were working with the OHR personnel experienced a certain dose of arrogance from the side of OHR. This is confirmed by a number of accounts found in the Bosnian media. For example, newspaper articles reported on ‘outrageous’ salaries of the international staff\textsuperscript{115}, and some even accused the international staff of becoming arrogant in the aftermath of the Bonn Powers. The new mandate certainly brought about a change in the organizational culture of the OHR.

In addition, scholars studying the Bosnian peace process started writing about incompetence, poor coordination, \textit{ad-hoc} policy creation and colonial-style relations with the local authorities. Academic articles and books criticizing the changes in the role of the OHR and focusing on its negative effects flooded the market. Some that are quoted in this study carried titles highly descriptive of the situation on the ground – “Democratizing with undemocratic means”,\textsuperscript{116} “Doing democracy a disservice”,\textsuperscript{117} “Travails of the European Raj”,\textsuperscript{118} and so forth. The common theme of all these articles is the focus on negative effects of the application of Bonn Powers.

Significantly, the criticism towards the new way the OHR was involving itself in Bosnian politics came also from local opposition, as they started voicing dissatisfaction with the ‘symbioses’ between the local nationalists and the OHR. Thus, although the OHR supported the opposition parties in all elections, they started portraying the OHR as a part of the problem, not a part of the solution. This is in itself an interesting development. As the nationalistic politicians who presented harsh criticism against the OHR risked being removed from office, the opposition parties started attacking the OHR, as it was viewed as a part of a troubled political system.

Carlos Westendorp responded during his last press conference by defending his actions, arguing that he used his powers sparsely. He pointed to all the successes: improvements in freedom of movement, improvements in the media, common currency and common passports, new state symbols, et cetera. He noted that there was a risk for a ‘dependency syndrome’, but despite all the
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criticism, he defined his time in Bosnia as a success story, just as Carl Bildt had two years earlier.119

Carlos Westendorp and the Bonn Powers: Cultural Theory Analysis

The following section of this chapter will consist of an analysis of the above described crisis and events that have defined the relationship between local and international actors in Bosnia, based on the framework for analysis presented in Chapter Four. The focus will once again be on the position of local and international authorities, but this time focused more on change, with reference to the social map at the start of the Westendorp’s mandate which is depicted in the analysis in the previous chapter. There, it was concluded that the local socio-cultural context, i.e., the Bosnian social map, did not change for the better during the first years of the process. Rather the opposite, the presence of the representatives of the international community and their initial individualist-egalitarian approach resulted in a reinforcement of the existing fatalism-hierarchy alliance in the local society. Furthermore, it was concluded that the OHR changed its position, through learning and repeated failures, from an individualist-egalitarian approach, to a more distinctly individualist approach, towards a combination of individualist and fatalist approach, as ad-hoc crisis management without possibilities to significantly influence the developments in the local society became a part of the work of the OHR.

Interactions and Change

Although the appointment of Westendorp as the HR is often regarded a direct cause of the consequent changes of the OHR’s mandate and role, the change in the character of the civilian international intervention in Bosnia had started before his arrival in Sarajevo. In light of the failures plaguing the first years of the peace process, in early 1997 the Peace Implementation Council had already sought to reorganize the international presence in Bosnia. By recognizing the OHR as the leading institution in the process, social relations between different agencies started changing from egocentric networks towards a more hierarchical, pyramid-like mode of social organization, with clearer distribution of power and division of competency.

Upon taking office in Sarajevo, Westendorp started speeding up the structural reorganization of the international presence in Bosnia, starting with a reorganization of the OHR. In the following period, the OHR started functioning in a different manner than it had under Bildt. Learning from the early failures,
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the OHR and Westendorp opted to act in a more socio-culturally viable manner. As the local political culture consisted of an alliance between strong hierarchical and fatalistic cultural social-solidarities, the international agencies soon learned that their individualistic and egalitarian-biased ideas about the process, the methods of pushing it forward, and the way to create effective relationships did not produce the expected outcome. Through trial and error, they slowly started finding the path towards greater effectiveness – this time, the Bosnian way. This changed strategy resulted in the introduction of the Bonn-powers and with them the position of the institution of the OHR moved to the top-right corner of the social map, where group and grid are high, a socio-culturally viable position earlier reserved for the local nationalist elites, as depicted in Figure 15 below.

With these powers, the OHR had the tools to implement policies and govern from above. The Bonn-powers were a consequent of learning through repeated failures. This process of change occurred gradually. First, the OHR repeatedly chose to be involved in local political battles and actively and openly to support the moderate political alternative. Repeatedly, the international institutions disregarded local authorities, whether legitimate or not, and imposed their own preferred solutions. For example, in the constitutional crisis in the RS, in the organization of the municipal elections and in the Poplasen crisis, the OHR and the OSCE acted authoritatively and bypassed the will of the elected local officials and local courts. Second, the OHR and the PIC decided to broaden the mandate of the OHR to include executive and legislative power, through the introduction of the Bonn-powers that enabled the HR to make binding decisions and remove officials from office. This was a move away from attempting to influence the events through dialogue and negotiation, economic aid and conditionality, and towards influencing events and developments through regulation and legislation – the clearest and most drastic examples of strategic behaviour corresponding to the hierarchical social solidarity. Third, the creation of other internationally-led institutions with the task of acting as institutional checks and balances to control the behaviour of local authorities is also an example of a hierarchically biased approach. The creation and the construction of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina with international judges and the creation of the Independent Media Commission for the purpose of control of the media are clear examples of representatives of the international community starting to act as guardians, rather than facilitators, monitors and coordinators. Through these three changes in the role of the representatives of the international community, the Bosnian political system became a dependent, hierarchically-biased controlled or guardian democracy – controlled and guarded from outside.

In addition, the change to hierarchically approach is visible in all three aspects of social solidarities. On all three levels of analysis, biases, relations and behaviours, the OHR adapted a high-grid high-group position. First, the loose network type of social relations that made coherent and decisive action on behalf of the representatives of the international community impossible a few years
earlier was replaced by more formalized structures, although not yet fully corresponding to the ideal type hierarchical social relations as neither SFOR, OSCE nor UN agencies were under the direct control of the OHR. Second, the egalitarian and individualistic strategic behaviours were replaced by strategic behaviours typical of hierarchical social solidarity, based on command and control, rational-legal authority, top-down ‘boss-ist’ policy process, and, ultimately, on power. Third, even the cultural bias, i.e., shared values and beliefs of the representatives of the international community, started changing as a consequence of the change in other two aspects. Even though still based on broad goals of integration and reconciliation, as the OHR took charge of the process and positioned itself above local authorities as a controller and a guardian, so did the priorities in the process. The bias of international involvement changed and new leading catch phrase was *institution building*. The road to peace, which was once defined as dependent on successful liberalization and introduction of democracy, free speech, free movement and free trade, was now being defined as dependent on the creation of institutional checks and balances that would make it impossible for local authorities to rule as they saw fit. In a sense, the preferred solution changed from *more freedom* to the people, to *restrictions of freedom* for the local authorities.

Despite of the introduction of new institutional arrangements designed to limit the scope of the state and to control them, the nationalist elites successfully remained in power over the course of three rounds of elections and, in some cases, the local nationalist elites even gained support. Only in the case of leadership of the Republika Srpska were the nationalist SDS successfully removed from power. Yet, even in the case of this crucial victory, it must be noted that it was not the ethno-nationalist option that was defeated. Other nationalist parties in the Republika Srpska argued that the SDS was damaging the Serb national interests because of its direct and highly contentious relations with representatives of the international community including the SFOR military forces. As a result of this campaign, a significant percentage of the people of the Republika Srpska voted for other nationalist parties that they perceived to be better suited for the protection of the Serb national interests. Hence, the decline in support for the SDS should not be interpreted as a decline in the nationalist vote or an increased support for the international agenda in Bosnia.

Rather, the nationalist parties other then the SDS increasingly started portraying themselves as the protectors of the Serb national interests, better suited to protect the people against the intrusive international intervention. In so doing, the nationalist elites held on to their basic, hierarchically-biased discourse on the protection of the nationalist interests, for the purpose of gaining support of people, enabling them to avoid getting involved in controversial and potentially damaging policies. They could remain in office and engage in political competition, while doing nothing and avoiding accountability. In addition, the underdeveloped local egalitarian and individualistically biased opposition was portrayed as cooperating with international administration and accordingly
portrayed as harmful to the interests of their own ethnic group. Thus, the high-grid hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities were reinforced by the failures of the international egalitarian and individualist bias and the inability of the local opposition to take its position as the main critic of those in power.

![Figure 15 – Movements of Actors in the Aftermath of Bonn-Powers](image)

As the OHR moved to the top right corner of the map, earlier reserved for nationalist elites, they reacted in two different ways. First, since non-compliance policies and obstruction did not have the effect nationalist elites were hoping for, i.e., the promotion of national interests, the three major parties attempted to renegotiate their relationship with the Bosnian people. Earlier, protection of national interests meant protection against other groups, portrayed as evil and dangerous. As mentioned above, after the OHR started administering Bosnia as a ‘half-protectorate’, and after its policies made nationalist agendas less plausible, the local nationalist elites portrayed themselves as protectors of national interests against the intrusive international intervention. They positioned themselves between the representatives of the international community and the people, acting as interpreters and as a cushion. Second, as non-compliance had failed, nationalist elites also adopted certain elements of the fatalist social solidarity, such as the ‘pretend to be doing something’ policy process type. This is best exemplified by the inability of local parliaments to legislate. The Members of Parliament engaged in endless debates, the legislative process had ceased functioning and every decision was now willingly turned over to the OHR and representatives of the international community. Of course, this resulted in even more decision making by the OHR. The Bonn Powers were supposed to be used economically; after every reform package, Carlos Westendorp expressed hope that next deadline would be met by local authorities.
without OHR intrusion. Nevertheless, the situation in Bosnian politics demanded more intervention and the intervention became more and more intrusive, more and more ‘boss-ist’. Moreover, as the international intervention became more intrusive and more successful in creating and implementing policies that were not in the interest of the nationalist elites, the context for the major nationalist parties changed, and their existence became more uncertain. In addition, the scope of OHR power broadened and the HR could remove individual politicians from office. The uncertainty of the context moved local political elites towards the fatalist social solidarity (as depicted in Figure 15 above), as they realized that their input was no longer valued and events occurred and developed without any possibility of influencing the outcome. In addition, the reaction to change of the OHR’s role was remarkably passive. As described earlier, neither the Bosnian elites nor the people of Bosnia opposed the activities of the OHR, not even when crucial legislation was imposed. To the contrary, they have often welcomed the imposed solutions. What seemed as an intractable political problem was easily bypassed by the OHR and immediately forgotten. These reactions combined represent a typical fatalistic way of coping and surviving, which was displayed throughout the Bosnian politics at this time.

**Effects on the Social Map**

The changes of the approach from socio-culturally unviable low-grid biased intervention to socio-culturally viable high-grid intervention provided some immediate positive results, as well as some less positive, long-term effects, as illustrated by the arrows showing the forces pressuring the socio-cultural viability space in Figure 16 below.

The changes in the mandate of the OHR and the following ‘new way of doing business’, i.e., the protectorate-like arrangements in relationship between representatives of international community and local elites were an effective injection in the halting peace process, successfully influencing the local socio-cultural context in a positive way. As the Bonn Powers became operational, the OHR successfully forced through legislation that improved the situation in a number of crucial areas and made radical nationalist agendas less plausible. The weakening of the control over media produced better, more truthful and less fear spreading public discourses. The new passports and the new license plates enabled freedom of movement and, for the first time since before the war, people could travel freely and without fear. The socio-culturally viable approach was providing results and Bosnians of all ethnic groups greatly benefited from the reforms pushed through by the OHR. In the short-term, changes in the character of the international intervention were positive for the process as they successfully changed some of the elements of the capricious, uncertain and dangerous socio-cultural context. The socio-cultural viability space was stretching downwards from an extremely narrow high-grid position. This meant that new actors, positioned lower on the social map, came within (or closer to) a
socio-culturally viable position, as exemplified by the somewhat lowered level of support for nationalist parties and the increased support for the non-nationalist alternatives towards the end of Westendorp’s tenure.

On the other hand, the local elites accepted the Bonn Powers and the new role of the OHR in the political system in an unexpected way, with passivity and resignation. Even in the society in general, voices arguing for more intervention and more protectorate-like behaviour were heard, as in the case when the popular and opposition-friendly Sarajevo weekly magazine DANI published an article asking the OHR to remove all politicians and introduce a time-limited, full-blown international protectorate in Bosnia. This illustrates the second effect of the Bonn Powers, which was not as positive as the first. Passivity and continued non-compliance had forced the OHR to continue using the Bonn Powers, even to increase their use although they were meant to be used sparingly, and this caused a reinforcement of the dominant, fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities. Despite the positive effects in the socio-cultural context caused by implementation of international policies, the dominant beliefs in the local society were reinforced. In essence, politics were still capricious and dangerous, while democracy was controlled from above, or in this case, from the outside.

Figure 16 – Changes of the Socio-Cultural Viability Space in the 2nd Period

120 They have done so both in 1999 and in 2000, when Petritsch was the High Representative. See Solioz, Christophe "The Challenges of Controled Democracy", in Transitions Online (8 December 2003).
In other words, the socio-cultural viability space was stretched downwards, due to improvements that were accomplished because of the newfound socio-cultural viability of the OHR’s approach. At the same time, the local nationalist elites had moved away from the hierarchical singularity towards the attraction of the fatalist solidarity. The political process was increasingly controlled by the OHR and local authorities responded with obedience and passivity. As Bosnians interpreted the situation, the intrusiveness of the international agencies was reinforcing their fatalist biased beliefs regarding the incapability and maliciousness of their own representatives. It also reinforced the belief that there is no way to meaningfully control the course of events, i.e., the perception of politics and democracy as irrelevant was strengthened. In sum, it can be concluded that the socio-cultural viability space improved, but not dramatically, as improvements on the ground caused by the Bonn Powers came together with a reinforcement of the hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities, also caused by the new role of the representatives of the international community. These beliefs, that politics and democracy are irrelevant, that the politicians are either incapable or evil and that the international protectorate is the only way to improve the lives of ordinary people, dominated the Bosnian public debate. In such a context, the politicians stopped performing governance and the understanding of the situation in the process started revolving around the concept of dependency syndrome. It was into this context that the new High Representative arrived in Sarajevo in the summer of 1999.

In conclusion, a Cultural Theory analysis of the second period of international post-conflict intervention to Bosnia shows that: 1) the OHR changed its position on the social map with the introduction (and use) of Bonn-powers, from adhering to the individualist social solidarity towards adhering to the hierarchical social solidarity, 2) the local nationalist elites changed their position as a result, from adhering to the hierarchical social solidarity towards adhering to the fatalist social solidarity, and 3) the effects on the socio-cultural viability space were dual, as the new OHR implemented policies that improved the situation on the ground, but its new role reinforced the dominant strong social solidarities.
Chapter Eight: Wolfgang Petritsch and the Concept of Ownership

This chapter examines the three-year tenure of the Austrian diplomat Wolfgang Petritsch as the High Representative of the International Community to Bosnia and Herzegovina, the period between the summer of 1999 and the summer of 2002. As was in the previous chapter, the focus will be on the events and crisis that formed, defined and/or changed the social relations and strategic behaviours of the local and international actors involved in the process. The starting point of the consequent analysis section is the social map of Bosnia at the time Petritsch arrived to Bosnia, as outlined in the previous chapter.

The first section of the chapter consists of a description of the main events and crises that have, in one way or the other, defined the relationship between local authorities and the OHR. The first event was a change in rhetoric, occurring directly after the arrival of the new High Representative who immediately introduced the ‘concept ownership’. The second event was the parliamentary elections and the victory of the non-nationalist ‘Alliance for Change’. The third defining crisis was the management of nationalist responses to the change of government. The fourth event that provoked a change of relations between local and international authorities was a result of failures of the new government to take ownership of the process and produce results. Finally, the chapter looks at the attempt to redefine the process during the later periods of Petritsch’s tenure in Bosnia, the so called ‘turn to Brussels’.

Continuing the analytical framework outlined in Chapter Four, the second section of this chapter consist of the Cultural Theory interpretation of the above-described events.

The Arrival of the Third High Representative

At the time Carlos Westendorp left Bosnia, observers within and outside Bosnia judged the shift of focus of the international involvement towards a more intrusive and protectorate-like intervention as negative for the long-term democratization of Bosnia. Although there were tangible improvements because of certain decisive actions, such as those affecting freedom of speech and freedom of movement, there were a number of unexpected effects of the Bonn Powers that attracted criticism. The Bosnian elites on all three sides found that their goals were not viable in a context that included a massive international military and civilian presence and as a result they had become passive. In order to maintain their image of protectors of national interests, they fiercely argued against the
OHR-proposed reforms, without presenting any alternatives. Their pattern was to simply wait for a decision that imposed the reform and thereafter remained silent, accepting, sometimes even welcoming, what was imposed.

The general political debate in the country had on the other hand improved with the increased freedom of speech. Sarajevo’s intellectual elites and the civic opposition parties gained strength from the passivity of nationalist parties and intrusiveness of the OHR. They started accusing the nationalist parties of corruption and backwardness. In light of the changed role of the OHR, they had also started accusing the nationalist elites of being irrelevant political actors. In other words, in a situation where nationalist goals were becoming implausible and nationalist elites were increasingly focusing on survival and staying in power; the improved media, the corruption scandals and the emerging dependency syndrome opened up new possibilities for the local non-nationalist opposition to voice the growing dissatisfaction with the general political situation.

**Concept of Ownership and the Corruption Crisis**

The new High Representative, Austrian diplomat Wolfgang Petritsch, placed the problems with the current functioning of the Bosnian political system high on the agenda as soon as he arrived in Bosnia, in August of 1999. He defined the problem in the following statement to the PIC steering board:

> I have identified what I call the "dependency syndrome": this means that every piece of legislation that I impose with my authority as the High Representative, gives politicians in Bosnia and Herzegovina a perfect excuse not to do their job properly. And every dollar of aid has encouraged some to believe that the international community will pay for everything - and for ever.1

Not only did Petritsch state the problem, he presented a solution — the concept of 'ownership'. As soon as he arrived to Sarajevo, the new HR put forward this new guiding principle for the work of the OHR and development of the Bosnian state. Ownership, he explained, was all about inclusion of Bosnia and Bosnians into the process.

> We have to foster the notion of ownership as the very essence of modern civic society among all Bosnian citizens. And we have to do this by working directly with the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Not just the politicians, who more often than not are the problem. But also with those parts of civic society – embryonic though it might be – who truly want change.2

---

1 OHR, "Speech by the High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina at the Steering Board Ministerial Meeting" in *HR Speeches* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 22 September 1999).
2 Ibid.
This notion was further promoted later, through for example creation of local think-thanks, the Civic Forum and a Consultative Partnership Forum, both of which were meant to provide a direct input of Bosnian citizens into the work of the OHR. However, at his inaugural press conference, the HR Petritsch indicated that the Bonn Powers were not to be discarded. This is clear in his statement about his anticipated use of the Bonn Powers:

"It is a good opportunity to make it perfectly clear here that I am going to use all the powers that are invested in this job. There is going to be a very strong leadership on the part of the Office of the High Representative. As I say, I am going to use the powers if necessary, and will decide when this is necessary, and I am sure, unfortunately, that there are going to be opportunities and situations where this is going to be necessary. But in a long run I tell you one thing: it is extremely important that the leaders of this country finally agree to one common denominator, and this is that we are here to build a common Bosnia and Herzegovina. If there is non-compliance, there will be consequences. There is zero tolerance on my part with extremists and nationalists."

Ownership was immediately promoted as the new buzzword in the process. On the other hand, the HR had also made it clear that this does not mean that Bonn Powers would be used less frequently or more sparingly. His vision was that an intrusive external involvement could be combined with a change in relations between representatives of international community and local authorities, thereby bringing about a change towards local ownership of the process.

However, as so many times earlier, the events on the ground pulled the OHR away from strategic long-term reform to ad-hoc crisis management. This time, it was publication of an article in the New York Times that diverted the attention of the OHR, at the very time of the inauguration of Wolfgang Petritsch. In this article, the corruption problems in Bosnia were revealed and soared to the top of the agenda. According to the author of the article, some 20% of total international aid, approximately 1 billion dollars, was missing since the start of the process. Although everybody was aware of the problems with corruption even before the article, the revelation of the specific facts came to dominate Bosnian politics. The public debate about international aid and the corrupt Bosnian

---

3 Carlos L. Yordán, "Society Building in Bosnia: A Critique of Post-Dayton Peacebuilding Efforts", in *Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations* (Summer/Fall 2003)
5 Chris Hedges, "Leaders in Bosnia are Said to Steal up to $1 Billion", in *New York Times*, 17 August 1999.
6 The OHR conducted investigation into corruption allegations during Carlos Westendorp’s tenure in office and they found considerable problems with corruption in the local society. Yet, the argument was made that donor money was not disappearing, as there were solid mechanisms to monitor spending of international aid. In other words, corruption was recognized as a problem but it was not recognized as the main problem in the process. See Amra Kebo, "Our Efforts Will Be Worthwhile - Interview with Carlos Westendorp", in *Oslobodjenje*, 7 October 1997.
authorities commanded most of the media’s attention. As the article quoted an unpublished study conducted by the OHR, Bosnian journalists and Bosnian leaders alike demanded that Petritsch respond to the allegations and accused the OHR of damaging the international reputation of Bosnia. The HR Petritsch initially avoided this debate, but in time, he skillfully started using the corruption accusations to confront the local elites in a new way. Earlier, the local elites were regularly described as extreme nationalistic, chauvinists and non-democratic. Their sin was obstruction of the democratization process. Now, the local elites were described as obstructive and non-democratic, but also as corrupt and criminal elements of the Bosnian society. In this sense, the moral authority of the international involvement in Bosnia was strengthened, as the OHR started portraying itself as a guardian, working against corrupt and criminal elites for the benefit of the Bosnian people.

The battle against corruption, which was actually a battle against the three nationalist parties, continued in November 1999 as the OHR announced the decision to discharge 22 people in various unrelated positions (one governor, a couple of ministers, a couple of mayors and a number of municipal officials) and from different nationalities (Serbs, Croats and Bosniaks). This was the first group dismissal. Earlier, the OHR had dismissed officials one by one, after repeated warnings. This time, it was done without specific prior warning, other than a general warning that dismissals of those obstructing the process were under preparation. The Sarajevo weekly magazine DANI described the move as a change in policy towards the nationalist parties. In an editorial it was expressed in the following way:

---

7 All major Bosnian independent media, weekly magazines such as DANI and Slobodna Bosna and the daily newspaper Oslobodjenje increasingly started focusing on corruption scandals.
8 "Izetbegovic sends official request for investigation of corruption accusations", in BiH TV Evening News, at 19:30; 25 August 1999. See also Amra Kebo, "Our Efforts Will Be Worthwhile - Interview with Carlos Westendorp", in Oslobodjenje, 7 October 1997.
9 The connection between corruption and nationalist elites has already been made, by journalists, officials as well as scholars. See for example ICG, "Why Will No One Invest in Bosnia and Herzegovina?" in Europe Report (Sarajevo: International Crisis Group 1999). See also Tracy Wilkinson, "Bureaucracy, Corruption Plague Foreign Investment in Bosnia", in Los Angeles Times, 29 March 1998 See also Gary Dempsey, "Rethinking the Dayton Agreement: Bosnia three years later", in Policy Analysis, no. 327 (1998).
11 See Dzenana Karup-Drusko and Emir Suljagic, "Opstrukcija u 22 slike", in DANI, 3 December 1999.
12 Ibid.
While King Westendorp used to clean up the mess local politicians were making and create laws and rules nobody ever thought of … Petritsch seems to have lost his nerve with local obstruction … [and started to act as] Tarrantino’s cleaner Mr. Wolf, effectively removing unpleasant traces and unpleasant people.\textsuperscript{13}

The practice of group removals of obstructive and corrupt officials continued; another 28 people were removed on seven different occasions in 2000 alone.\textsuperscript{14} Reasons for dismissals varied in the 50 dismissal cases in 1999 and 2000, but they all, in one way or another, were connected either to obstruction or corruption.

At the same time as HR Petritsch attempted to engage the nationalist elites through the fight against corruption, the OHR itself was in need of a long-term strategy. The goals and strategies of Sintra, Paris, London and Madrid PIC conferences that were being implemented by Westendorp were no longer current or necessarily pertinent. Freedom of speech, freedom of the media and new state symbols were now all part of the Bosnian society. Thus, the PIC met in Brussels in May of 2000 to review the progress so far and to set the guidelines for the coming work of Wolfgang Petritsch. The focus of the PIC was, among other things, on necessary economic reform and a number of new deadlines were set in regard to everything from the Law on Land Registry, to the Law on Standardization to the Labour Law. The creation of joint state corporations was included in the list of demands to the local authorities, as PIC demanded the launch of BiH Gas Transportation Public Corporation and the creation of the BiH Road Infrastructure Public Corporation.\textsuperscript{15} In addition, the PIC set out deadlines for the parliaments to adopt crucial legislation concerned with the institutional setting, such as the Law on Civil Service, Law on the State Court, Law on Associations and Public Legal Persons and the Ombudsmen Laws. There were also deadlines concerning the legislation regulating media such as the Freedom of Information and Defamation Laws and regulations in the field of education, such as the Harmonized Accreditation Systems.\textsuperscript{16} The PIC conference in Brussels marked the next change of priorities for the work of the OHR. The early PIC meetings were concerned with the implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement as such, focusing on annexes of the agreement and, so to speak, operationalizing them into concrete goals. In Sintra, the PIC went beyond this practice and defined clear deadlines with conditionality associated with each goal. In later conferences, the PIC started moving away from the text of the Dayton Agreement and started justifying their priorities on the basis of the

\textsuperscript{13} "Licnost u fokusu", in \textit{DANI}, 3 December 1999.

\textsuperscript{14} See HR Decisions at the OHR Archives, also available electronically at www.ohr.int.

\textsuperscript{15} OHR, "Annex to the PIC Declaration: required actions" in \textit{PIC Documents} (Brussels: OHR Archives, 24 May 2000).

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
The creation of self-sustaining peace.\textsuperscript{17} The work was still presented as part of the implementation of Dayton Agreement, but more ‘in the spirit of Dayton’, not necessarily the letter of it. As Petritsch was starting his term in office, the PIC meeting in Brussels set new priorities designed to respond to the need to continue the “building of the state of Bosnia”.\textsuperscript{18} As analysts of the European Stability Initiative (ESI) noted, this was the first time a state-building agenda was put on the table in a systematic manner.\textsuperscript{19} The establishment of state corporations and introduction of state legislation on civil service, state court and state treasury were the first major steps in the new state-building agenda. Two demands were also made with the particular goal of diminishing the power-base of nationalist parties. The first was a demand for abolition of payment bureaus and the second was a demand for legislation on party financing.\textsuperscript{20} The payment bureaus were a communist regime construction that was used to exercise a monopoly on all financial transfers. They were bank-like institutions directly controlled by the state, or in the Bosnian case where state was divided, by the leadership of the three ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{21} The dismantling of the payment bureaus as well as new legislation on party financing was expected to remove the possibility for nationalist parties to finance their regimes.

In a sense, the battle against corruption accompanied the new state-building agenda and the battle against obstruction and non-compliance of nationalist parties. It laid ground for a focused effort of the new OHR leadership to finally remove the ruling nationalists from power and install an intervention-friendly, civic and non-nationalist opposition government that would take ownership of the process and speed up the state-building reforms after the next general elections, to be held in fall of 2000. As Petritsch stated earlier, there was to be a zero-tolerance policy towards extremists and nationalists. The commitment by the OHR to aid the opposition parties was strengthened. In the Republika Srpska, the moderates, backed by international support, were already in power, although Dodik’s government failed to provide tangible results. Nevertheless, the support to Dodik continued while the focus moved to the Federation and pressure was increased towards the SDA and HDZ, the two dominant parties in the Croat-Bosniak areas.

\textsuperscript{17} OHR, "PIC Madrid Declaration" in \textit{PIC Documents} (Madrid: OHR Archives, 16 December 1998).
\textsuperscript{18} OHR, "PIC Declaration - Main Document" in \textit{PIC Documents} (Brussels: OHR Archives, 24 May 2000).
\textsuperscript{21} USAID, "Payment Bureaus in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Obstacles to development and a strategy of orderly transformations" (Sarajev: United State Agency for International Development, 15 February 1999).
2000 Elections

The next round of elections came in 2000. The municipal elections were held in April and the parliamentary elections in November. These elections were supposed to be the first post-war elections organized by the Bosnian election commission, and not by the OSCE and the international community. The election to the Bosnian joint presidency was not held in 2000, as 1998 elections were for a 4-year mandate of the presidency. During 2000, the nationalist parties lost power in neighbouring Croatia and Serbia, and the nationalist leaders that had signed the DPA on behalf of the Bosnian Croats and Serbs were no longer providing support to the Bosnian separatists. Franjo Tudjman had died in 1999 and Slobodan Milosevic was overthrown by the Serbian people in September 2000, only a month before the Bosnian general elections. Optimism was therefore growing that the 2000 Bosnian elections could become the turning point in the process as the opposition had a real chance to win power, even in the Bosniak-Croat Federation.

The April municipal elections demonstrated a trend towards increased support for the non-nationalist parties across Bosnia. In the Federation, the Social Democratic Party (SDP) gained votes from the SDA, probably due to corruption scandals, and the Sarajevo media coverage of such scandals. In Croat areas of the Federation, the HDZ was not threatened by any serious opposition challenge but the voter turnout dramatically decreased, which was perceived as a decrease of support for the HDZ. In the Republika Srpska, Mladen Ivanic’s Party for Democratic Change (PDP) gained votes and Dodik’s SLOGA Alliance surprisingly gained enough votes to secure the survival of the anti-SDS coalition. These results strengthened optimism within the international agencies in Bosnia that the November general elections represented a realistic possibility for a real change. However, the parliamentary situation in the Republika Srpska made Dodik’s government increasingly unviable and, in the summer of 2000, it lost a vote of confidence, causing the SLOGA Alliance to break apart. Dodik refused to step down, arguing that he still had the legitimacy to stay in office until the upcoming November elections and the OHR chose to allow him to do so. This was done reluctantly since even those that supported Dodik, and had enabled him to stay in power throughout earlier crisis, increasingly realized that

---

22 Permanent Election Law was supposed to be adopted early in the year 2000.
25 Ibid.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Dayton Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) p. 164
his government did not have the will to implement what was agreed upon, to carry out reforms, speed up refugee return process or change the RS attitude towards state institutions. Still, the alternatives were either to allow the SDS and the Radical party to form government, or to leave RS without government. As neither of these options was attractive to the OHR, Petritsch reluctantly supported Dodik, in line with the policy of his predecessor.\textsuperscript{29}

As the November elections approached, the results were unpredictable, possibly for the first time since the fall of the communist regime. There were serious contenders to the nationalist parties in all three ethnic groups. Given the damage to the SDA and HDZ resulting from the corruption allegations and corruption scandals, the non-nationalist parties had a solid platform to run on. Previously, non-nationalists were supported by the international community and they ran with poor results almost exclusively on a platform of being anti-nationalists. This time, they ran on a campaign of being honest and non-corrupt; and put forth themselves as being able to change the relationship between local institutions and representatives of the international community, as well being able to offer economic reforms – something nationalist parties rarely mentioned in their campaigns.\textsuperscript{30} Nationalist campaigns in all the post-war elections were about the past rather than the future, as they focused on the war and the claimed ability of the nationalist option to protect their own ethnic group against its enemies. For the first time, speech about economic reform and the future of the country dominated the debates instead of traditional partition-integration debate and hate-speech reminiscent of the wartime propaganda.\textsuperscript{31}

The nationalist parties had kept a firm grip on the electorate in the 1998 general elections despite the overoptimistic pre-election analysis and cognizant of that the OSCE and the OHR sought to increase the possibilities for the opposition to win the 2000 elections. Hence, a massive anti-corruption campaign was mounted with the slogan “Outvote Corruption”\textsuperscript{32} and a number of changes were made to the election procedures. In the previous 1997 and 1998 elections, changes in the electoral rules had also been made with the desire to weaken the power of the nationalist parties. However, those changes did not have a major effect on the election results.\textsuperscript{33} This time, the proposed election law was more substantial. Among other things, the OSCE lowered the threshold for entry into parliament, enabling a number of smaller parties to win seats. The OSCE also introduced a preferential voting system for the president of the Republika Srpska as a means of avoiding a constitutional crisis like one after the 1998 elections. In

\textsuperscript{29} Wolfgang Petritsch, \textit{Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Daytona Do Evrope} (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002) p. 164
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{32} OHR, “Statement of the Ambassador Robert Barry to the OBN News” in \textit{Media Monitoring} (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 15 September 2000).
\textsuperscript{33} See Chapter Seven, section on 1998 elections.
addition, it introduced an open list system in order to increase the accountability of the individual candidates. International agencies were mandated by the DPA to organize elections as they saw fit and the proposed new election law was intended to create the conditions for a change of government before the local institutions took over the control of the electoral process.

The new electoral procedures were perceived as most damaging to the HDZ, the largest Croatian nationalist party. Under the new election law, in the Bosniak Croat Federation entity both Croats and Bosniaks were supposed to vote for both Croat and Bosniak representatives to the Federation Parliament Upper House. Since no Bosniaks were likely to vote for Croatian nationalists and no Croats were likely to vote for Bosniak nationalists, results amounted to a decrease in support for both; but more so for HDZ than for the Bosniak nationalist party SDA, due to smaller size of the Croat electorate. Although the intentions of the new rule was to force the parties to have a less nationalistic profile in order to attract votes from the members of other ethnic groups, the change resulted in a theoretical possibility of Bosniaks electing Croat representatives who did not have the support of the Croat people. The HDZ protested and its leaders used the new legislation to portray the actions of the OSCE and the OHR as attempted ‘minorization’ of the Croats. They presented a hypothetical scenario claiming that even if all Bosnian Croats voted for the same party that party would not necessarily receive a majority of the seats allocated to Croat representatives. Therefore, requests for the dismantling of the Federation and creation of the ‘third entity’ reemerged as the HDZ successfully used the new election rules to increase fear among its constituency and raise its support. The effect of the reform was counter-productive to its intentions since it ultimately gave the Croat political parties an even more nationalistic profile. Instead of promoting tolerance and pluralism, this reform radicalized the HDZ to a point where there was a risk of renewed fighting.

Nevertheless, the Croat leadership was not the only side that criticized the proposed election law. The leading Bosniak parties SDA and SBiH argued against the proposed law because it allowed refugees and displaced persons to vote where they lived, rather than in their pre-war municipalities. This rule had already partially been applied in municipal elections earlier and was blamed for ‘cementing the results of ethnic cleansing’. Now, this rule was to be applied in

37 Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Dayton Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svetlost, 2002) p. 154
general elections as well. Furthermore, the largest opposition party in the
Federation, Zlatko Lagumdžija’s Social Democratic Party (SDP) found the new
proposed election law to be unconstitutional and in contrast to the European
Convention on Human Rights, since residents of the RS voted for Serb representa-
tives to the BH Joint Presidency and the BH Parliament, despite large minority
population in the RS. Furthermore, they noted that ‘others’, i.e., minorities such
as Jews, could not be voted into state institutions since the system presumed that
all representatives must be Serbs, Croats or Bosniaks.40 Early in 2000, the
parliament met on two occasions to discuss and debate the proposed new
election law and both times the members of parliament discussed procedural
issues – not the substance of the law. They proposed a number of changes and
amendments and there were even suggestions to postpone the elections.
Consequently, the OSCE announced that it was taking over the organization of
the elections and that the ‘temporary election law’ that included most of the
proposed changes would be used in the November 2000 elections.41 The transfer
of responsibility for the electoral process to local authorities failed and the
OSCE and the OHR once again found themselves in a situation where they had
to bypass the local institutions in a vital matter such as the new election law.

The election campaigns included a number of nationalist slogans such as the
SDA’s “Each has selected his own – What about you?”42, and HDZ’s dramatic
“Determination or Extermination” slogan43 while non-nationalist campaigns
focused on change and anti-corruption, assisted by the OSCE who had openly
campaigned against the nationalists on a “Outvote Corruption” slogan. Once
again, the ethno-nationalist ‘counting of heads’ took place as Croat and Bosniak
leaders tried to influence the electorate to vote ‘smart’, i.e., to vote for the
nationalists as representatives of their own group in order to balance the strength
of nationalists in other groups.44 All nationalist parties turned to fear-mongering
in order to scare members of their own group and gain support. The Bosniak and
Croat parties used the weakness of the Dodik’s government and the expected
success of the SDS in their propaganda. The change of power relations within
the Federation, perceived as damaging by the Croats, enabled the HDZ to
promote itself as the protector of Croats who they claimed were threatened both
by Bosniak dominance and by the representatives of the international commu-
nity who were ignoring their political rights, needs and desires.45

41 OHR, “The High Representative supports the Draft Election Law” in *OHR Press Releases*
(Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 14 December 1999).
42 ICG, "Bosnia's November Elections: Dayton Stumbles" in *ICG Europe Report* (Sarajevo:
International Crisis Group, 18 December 2000).
43 Ibid.
44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
These campaigns bore fruit. Throughout Bosnia the nationalist parties received far more votes than expected – despite the changes in the election law, the success of non-nationalists in municipal elections and the changes in Croatia and Serbia. The first polls indicated that most Croats voted for the HDZ, most Serbs voted for the SDS and most Bosniaks voted for the SDA. This result was disappointing to the representatives of the international community. Yet, it had also become obvious that none of the ethnic groups voted for the nationalist elites from the other two groups and, thus, the results still amounted to a dramatic increase in the non-nationalist vote. Most visibly, the multi-ethnic civil Social Democratic Party (SDP) of Zlatko Lagumdžija seemed to gain enough support to challenge the nationalist parties in the Federation. However, the extreme nationalist party SDS won the elections in the Republika Srpska (winning 38% of the vote) as the OHR-sponsored Dodik government failed to govern in a meaningful manner. In part, this result was expected before the elections; last minute calls by US diplomats were made to ban the SDS party from participation in elections on the basis that individuals accused of war-crimes were still on the SDS election lists. However, since the SDS denied these allegations and restated its commitment to the Dayton Agreement, the OSCE allowed it to participate in the elections. The result was a defeat for the moderates – despite the overt support of the OSCE and the OHR for the sitting government, despite the changed electoral rules enabling smaller parties to win seats in the parliament and despite threats that international support to the RS would be cut if the hardliners won. The economic conditionality principle once again proved inadequate in influencing the behaviour of the Serb authorities and the Serb electorate.

In the end, the complex Bosnian constitutional structure and complex election regulations produced no clear winners and no clear losers. A period of intense negotiations and coalition building followed. The OHR and other international actors focused on assisting the moderate parties to organize under the umbrella of the ‘Alliance for Change’. As the nationalist parties did not have enough seats to form government on their own, this process eventually succeeded at both the Federation and the state level. It is interesting to note that the OHR, the US embassy and other international actors participated in negotiations on the formation of government as if they were representatives of the political parties themselves. They made implicit political promises to Alliance members, and were instrumental in persuading Silajdžić and the SBiH to enter
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the Alliance for Change. In the case of Ivanic’s PDP party, they threatened sanctions if the PDP formed the government in alliance with the SDS. These international actors also extracted promises from local politicians to support the Dayton Agreement and to implement the OHR-introduced reforms. Although the rhetoric regarding the concept of ownership highlighted the need for local actors to take charge of the process, the post-election negotiations and creation of the Alliance government actually testified to exactly the opposite. The SDP party leader Lagumdzija did not lead the process of party negotiations – it was engineered from the outside.

Nevertheless, Bosnia suddenly had a new, anti-nationalist government in spring of 2001, consisting of ten parties and led by Zlatko Lagumdzija and the Social Democrats. On both entity and state level, the nationalist parties were outmanoeuvred by the opposition and the representatives of the international community. Even in Republika Srpska, where Dodik’s government lost power and nationalists received a majority of the vote, the representatives of the international community successfully brokered a deal between the Ivanic’s PDP party and the nationalist SDS and, thus, made Ivanic the leader of the RS government. The involvement of the OHR, OSCE, US and UK embassies had clear and far-reaching effects. Had they not intervened the PDP would not have led the Republika Srpska, the SBiH would not have entered the alliance, the SDP would not have been able to form the government and the whole idea of the Alliance for Change would not have been possible. Nevertheless, the future of the Alliance was uncertain from the start, as it was forced to cooperate with parties that incorporated both nationalist and reform agendas, such as the Ivanic’s PDP and Silajdzic’s SBiH. There were also a few smaller one-issue parties elected such as the two pensioner parties and parties with diametrically different ideological background, including the Liberals, Republicans and Social Democrats.


51 Ibid.

52 The member parties of the Alliance were the Social Democratic Party (SDP), Party for BiH (SBiH), New Croat Initiative (NHI), Bosnia-Herzegovina Patriotic Party (BPS), Republican Party, Civil Democratic Party (GDS), Croat Peasant Party (HSS), Liberal Democratic Party (LDS), Democratic Party of Pensioners of BiH, and Party of Pensioners of the Federation of BiH. The Herzegovina-based People’s Party of Work for Betterment and the RS-based Party of Independent Social Democrats (SNSD) later attended the Alliance’s co-ordination meetings, but without formally joining the coalition. The two pensioners’ parties subsequently merged. ICG, “Elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina” in ICG Europe Report (International Crisis Group, 22 September 1996).

Nationalists’ Response

After the Alliance was installed, a feeling of euphoria was evident in the communication coming from the OHR. Finally, after years of obstruction, there was a promising change in the local political scene. The concept of ownership was now becoming a real alternative, as moderate parties presumably had little incentive to obstruct the reform process. However, as had happened many times before, there was a setback. The HDZ, perhaps rightly so, reacted strongly to the new election procedures even before the elections themselves and it created the ‘Croat National Congress’, an alliance between HDZ and a few smaller Croat nationalist parties. They organized a referendum on Croat right to self-rule, which was held on the same day as the elections. While the OSCE declared this referendum illegal after it was conducted, the HDZ announced that over 70% of the Croats voted and 99% of them supported the creation of separate Croat institutions. Consequently, after the new government was installed, the HDZ left the institutions of the Federation and proclaimed the establishment of Croat self-governance through a so-called ‘inter-cantonal council’. This move represented an open challenge to the representatives of the international community. It was a provocation, since it meant that Croats no longer accepted co-existence with the Bosniaks in the Federation. They demanded self-rule through creation of a Croat-dominated third entity. As reaching this goal through elections and the normal political process was not a realistic possibility, the Croats decided to act unilaterally and proclaim the already existing parallel structures of Herzeg-Bosna as the Croat government.

The OHR reacted swiftly, dismissing Jelavic of the HDZ who was the Croat member of the presidency. This was in line with HR Petritsch’s earlier statement that there would be “no tolerance for those political forces that denounce the Dayton Agreement and use anti-Dayton propaganda”. Furthermore, the OHR announced that the ‘Hercegovacka Banka’, a local bank under the control of HDZ that was illegally financing the inter-cantonal council and parallel institutions of Herceg-Bosna, would be placed under international supervision. Fearing Croat response, HR Petritsch asked the SFOR commanders to conduct

---
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the takeover of the bank.\textsuperscript{60} In response, Croat nationalists organized and attempted to stop this takeover from taking place and tensions culminated into open violent confrontation between a couple of thousand Croat extremists and the SFOR troops.\textsuperscript{61} While the crisis was eventually averted, the HDZ had purposely succeeded in provoking the OHR and the OSCE into decisive action, thus portraying the representatives of the international community as the enemy of Croat national interests.\textsuperscript{62} In this manner, through manipulation of their own population and manoeuvring the OHR, the HDZ re-established itself as the only party representing the interests of the Croat people who were, it was claimed, endangered by the intrusive international involvement and the Bosniak dominance in the Federation, created by the imposed election law.\textsuperscript{63}

Some time later, in May 2001, the Serb extremists would test the patience of the international community. In what was called “a barbaric act of ethnic chauvinisms”, an organized mob physically attacked the returning refugees and international dignitaries at the ceremonial laying of the corner stones for reconstruction of two of the oldest Bosnian mosques, Ferhadija in Banja Luka and Osman Pasha Mosque in Trebinje.\textsuperscript{64} As refugees started returning to the Republika Srpska, many mosques were being repaired in both cities and villages across the country. However, these two mosques had great symbolic value and the Serb municipal authorities had repeatedly stopped any rebuilding attempts. After an intervention from the Human Rights Chamber and the OHR, local Serb authorities finally granted necessary permissions. Nevertheless, at the ceremonial start of the reconstruction, thousands of Serbs extremists gathered and stoned Muslim returnees and representatives of the international community in both Banja Luka and in Trebinje.\textsuperscript{65} This had resulted in strong condemnations by the HR who stated, "I am shocked that the RS still appears to be a place with no rule of law, no civilized behaviour and no religious freedom", where "small groups of extremists are allowed to spread ultra-nationalism, intolerance and violence. I hold the authorities responsible for this frightening state of affairs."\textsuperscript{66} In the week following, the Ivanic government dismissed a number of high-
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ranking officials, including the RS Minister of Interior, for their inability to stop the violent demonstrations.67

These were also some incidents occurring in Bosniak controlled areas. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the USA, Bosnia was asked to chase down Mujahedin fighters and foreign fundamentalists that had acted as mercenaries during the war and stayed in Bosnia thereafter.68 A group of six Algerians was of particular interest to the US government and the SDP government acted in response to the requests of the Americans.69 The government ordered the Bosnian special police forces to arrest the Algerians and hand them over to the US authorities. Eventually, they ended up in Guantanamo Bay as detainees.70

The problem was that the Federation Supreme Court earlier had ordered their release from detention due to the lack of evidence and the BiH Human Rights Chamber requested the BiH and Federation authorities to take all necessary steps to prevent four of them from being taken out of BiH by force.71 Even if the Alliance government had little choice but to obey the requests of the US government, this move provoked strong reactions and accusations that the government had acted against Islam. Similarly as Dodik and Plavsic were once accused of being traitors of the Serb national interests, Lagumdzija and the SDP were now being portrayed as traitors to the Bosniak cause.72 Furthermore, given the Supreme Court decision, supported by the Human Rights Chamber, not to hand the Algerians over to the US authorities, the Alliance lost credibility as the political option that was, in contrast to the nationalist, acting according to the rule of law and highest international standards of human rights.

Although in no way related, all three of these incidents, the attempt to create Croat self-government, the violence towards returnees in the Republika Srpska and the violent protests against the government’s decision to hand over the Algerians to the US, represented a show of strength for the nationalist elites. While the Alliance for Change and the OHR attempted to implement reforms and strengthen the Bosnian state, the nationalist parties acted in ways to undermine this work and any attempts to unify, democratize and reconcile the ethnically divided society. The HDZ party did this through isolation and creation of parallel institutions, the Serb extreme parties through spread of fear and hate within population of RS and the Bosniak elites through discrediting the Alliance. All three crises were averted, but the instalment of the Alliance and attempts to
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speed up the state-building reforms provoked a strong nationalist response that included, at least in two of these cases, violence against representatives of the international community.

**Failure of the Alliance**

The situations in both Croat, Serb and Bosniak areas eventually calmed, partly because of decisive international intervention but also because it became obvious that the change of parties in power did not push the process forward in big leaps as it had been expected. There were three different factors that prevented the Alliance from excelling and producing dramatic results. First, the nationalist elites continued to undermine the process, both politically in parliaments and at the local level of government, and practically, through disruptions such as those described above. Second, the Alliance for Change was an alliance of ten different political parties with rather different ideas about what should be done. Although all of them claimed to be non-nationalist parties, some of them like the SBoH had earlier cooperated with the nationalist SDA. Different parties in the Alliance were also ideologically different and these ideological conflicts made the Alliance utterly inefficient. Third, the Alliance was elected on a platform of anti-corruption and anti-nationalism. The SDP portrayed itself as the only truly multi-ethnic and non-corrupt option in Bosnian politics. However, after the elections, the focus of Alliance politics was in some regards similar to those of nationalist parties. Appointments of judges and state-owned company leaders were deemed more urgent than conducting reforms; and privatization and corruption scandals were once again attracting most of the media attention.73

The paralysis evidenced by the Alliance was overcome through the OHR continuing its practice of imposing decisions and pushing the reforms forward, although this was not its preferred solution. The newly elected Alliance perceived the OHR as the solution to the problems with obstructive nationalist parties and attempted to use the OHR as an implementation tool. As noted by one Bosnian journalist, HR Petritsch used to pressure the nationalists in order to push through reforms, but the tables had turned after the elections and the Alliance seemed to pressure the OHR to implement reforms – sweeping Bonn Powers were perceived as a much easier path to immediate implementation, without the necessity for compromises.74 At first, the OHR refused to use its powers in order to fulfil the Alliance’s election promises. The representatives of the international community attempted to remain passive and to allow the Alliance to assume ownership of the process. As this did not occur, the leaders of the Alliance started speaking of a partnership, rather than an ownership.
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Eventually, the lack of reforms forced the OHR to put ownership on hold, so to speak, and to accept the idea of partnership. As the HR stated before he left Bosnia:

> With the Alliance leaders I developed a different relationship — one based on partnership and mutual respect, as an interim stage on the way to full ownership.\(^5\)

An example of this practice was the imposition of a new law on pension and disability insurance. As the parties within the Alliance, as well as other parties in the parliament, could not agree on the politically sensitive issue of lowering pensions in order to balance the budget, the OHR intervened and imposed the necessary legislation.\(^6\) Yet another example of OHR intervention was the case of the payment bureaus, which were dismantled and its deposits moved to commercial banks. This legislation was also pushed through by the OHR, due to inability of the Alliance to gain enough parliamentary support for the reform.\(^7\)

The most important example of partnership occurred later, in 2001, when the OHR and the Alliance for Change cooperated in an attempt to implement the decision of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina from 2000, which reversed the ethnic division embedded in the Dayton constitution. The DPA defined the Republika Srpska as a Serb entity and the Federation as a Bosniak and Croat entity. This connection between ethnicity and territory was, in a sense, a ratification of the wartime partition of the country. Five years later, the Constitutional Court decided that this provision was unconstitutional, as the Dayton constitution also states, “Bosniaks, Croats and Serbs are constituent peoples … citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina.” Thus, the argument was that there could not be any ‘Serb’ entity, or ‘Bosniak’ or ‘Croat’ entity. All peoples are constituent and equal in rights, throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. A territorial regionalization or decentralization in administrative units is possible, but it cannot be directly connected to ethnicity. The effect of this reform was expected to weaken the power of the entities. For example, as Croats and Bosniaks became ‘constituent peoples’ in the Republika Srpska, it meant that they were guaranteed representation in government bodies, and that certain decisions 'of vital national interests' required consensus, thus effectively awarding all three groups the right of veto throughout Bosnia. As the Dayton consti-
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tution was based on the principles of ethnic division, this reform was, in a sense, the first attempt to rewrite Dayton. This was perceived as a major blow to the separatist nationalist parties. Especially in the Republika Srpska, there were loud protests and the leadership ignored the decision of the court because it was not sanctioned by the Serb judges. Earlier, the OHR added three international judges to the court, in addition to the two Bosniak, two Serb and two Croat judges, in an attempt to make the Constitutional Court functional. The three international judges were supposed to prevent any one national group from stalemating the decision-making process, yet this time, the international judges acted to impose the will of one national group over the expressed wishes of the other two national groups, as the Serb and the Croat judges voted against the decision. In addition, although recognized as important in principle by the Bosniaks and the Croats, the decision was not implemented in the Federation either. Finally, with the help of the OHR, the Alliance for Change initiated a process of implementation of the decision through interpreting of its meaning and incorporating the decision into amendments to the entity constitutions.

Throughout 2001 and the first part of 2002, the implementation of this Constitutional Court decision was the main issue in Bosnian politics. The decision was welcomed by the non-nationalists and by the representatives of the international community, as it promised a reversal of some of the negative aspects of the Dayton constitution and was perceived as imperative to implementation of the Annex VII of the DPA, concerned with refugee return. The refugee return process was still moving very slowly and unsatisfactorily and it was presumed that the court decision would speed up the process since there would be no ‘minority’ ethnic groups, thus ensuring the rights of returnees. Nevertheless, the resistance by the Serb and Croat nationalist parties was extremely strong as this decision effectively made their separatist agendas impossible. As mentioned above, the chances of these agendas being enacted were made highly unlikely earlier, for example, by the decision on Brcko, but this current decision, if implemented properly, meant that the independence agenda was ultimately unreachable. The Serb parliament could not even initiate a process that would lead to a referendum for independence, since such a decision would be blocked by either Bosniak or Croat members of the Republika Srpska House of Peoples, which was supposed to be created following the Court’s decision. Not surprisingly, the idea of the House of Peoples was rejected by all Serb parties, even the moderate PDP. Mladen Ivanic, the RS Prime Minister, stated in an interview with Zagreb’s Vecernji List that the international community did not have a mandate to impose constitutional solutions:

This would be no more than a protectorate…If seven years after the Dayton peace Agreement, the High Representative tries to impose such a decision – to introduce a House of Peoples in the RS – a very negative message would be sent which would even question the very existence of BIH.80

The solution was found in the OHR-sponsored negotiations between all parties, the members of the Alliance for Change as well as the three nationalist parties in opposition, in which a compromise was reached and enforced. The issues were the definition of vital national interests, the mechanisms to protect them and the representation of the constituent peoples in the institutions in both entities. Before the negotiations started, The PIC demanded a solution and it made the acceptance of Bosnia into the Council of Europe conditional on the ability of the parties to compromise. In a statement on February 28, the Steering Board of the PIC stated:

However, time to achieve a solution that will permit the elections to proceed as scheduled is fast running out. The Steering Board therefore strongly urges the political leadership in the country to focus on achievable solutions and to reach a final agreement on this matter, and welcomes the recognition by the BiH political leaders that this must be done by mid-March 2002. Failure to demonstrate 'ownership' on this issue would have serious negative consequences and would retard BiH's integration into European structures. On the other hand a domestic resolution would not only allow for the proper conduct of the October 2002 General Elections but would also serve as proof that BiH is indeed ready for forthcoming admittance to the Council of Europe.81

In the following two rounds of negotiations, the 'Mrakovica–Sarajevo Agreement' was reached and signed by most involved parties on March 28 2002. The international community wholeheartedly welcomed the agreement, saying that it turned a page in the history of modern Bosnia. HR Petritsch commended the BiH leaders for their “far-sightedness and courage”, noting that this agreement would turn Bosnia into a truly multiethnic country.82 The agreement was also praised by the Peace Implementation Council’s Steering Board, the OSCE, the EU General Affairs Council, the US and French Embassies, and the Croatian and Yugoslav governments, all judging it to be a decisive step forward in the Bosnian post-war process.83 Yet, the representatives of the Republika Srpska signed it with reservations, the HDZ did not sign the agreement at all and the SDA party refused to
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participate in the negotiations. The objections of the Federation parties rested on the argument that the negotiated compromise was filled with asymmetric solutions for the Federation and the Republika Srpska. The Serb refusal to create a House of Peoples had been accepted in the agreement, due to the fierce refusal of the Serb negotiators. This meant that the Serbs had representation in the Federation House of Peoples, the Bosniaks and the Croats were only given representation in the Council of Peoples of the Republika Srpska, giving them far less powers than had they been represented in a separate house in the parliament.

Similarly as in the case of House of Peoples, the President of the RS kept his powers while the President of the Federation had to share power with a deputy president, coming from a different ethnic group, and so forth. The asymmetry of the agreement, which offered concessions to the Republika Srpska in order to ensure implementation of the Court’s decision, was heavily criticized both from within and from the outside of the Alliance for Change. Effectively, the Mrakovica-Sarajevo agreement caused the Alliance to split up as well, since it lost popular support throughout Bosnia. As neither side obtained what it wanted, the OHR was accused of imposing the solution. Although the parties had accepted the agreement and the OHR had not directly imposed it by resorting to the Bonn Powers, all of those who signed the agreement argued that they had no choice but to accept it, given that membership in the Council of Europe was at stake. Indeed, after the agreement was reached, the Council of Europe’s Committee of Ministers decided to invite BiH to join the organization as the 44th member-state in April 2002.

Nevertheless, the Alliance for Change came under heavy criticism in the local media in the aftermath of the Mrakovica-Sarajevo agreement. On one hand, a corruption scandal involving the wife of Alliance leader Zlatko Lagumdzija came to light, damaging the credibility of the Alliance’s anti-corruption image. On the other hand, the Mrakovica-Sarajevo agreement was portrayed as a missed opportunity, as it awarded the Republika Srpska concessions for implementing the Constitutional Court decision. This decision was expected to remove the raison d'être of the Republika Srpska and to create a truly multi-ethnic state with two equally multi-ethnic entities. As implementation was asymmetrical, this was not the case. Further erosion to Lagumdzija’s popularity continued as his anti-nationalist speech increasingly irritated the Bosniak voters, as he repeatedly argued that SDA was in coalition with SDS and HDZ – meaning that the support of the SDA was actually support for the SDS.

---
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and HDZ. Although there was a certain logic to those statements, they were interpreted as being disrespectful to the SDA’s past defence of the Bosniak people during the war; hence, Lagumdzija was accused of disrespecting the memory of victims of war since he treated these three parties equally. The SDA party used such statements to alienate the Alliance from Bosniak voters by portraying Lagumdzija as a politician that was damaging the image of Bosniak fight for freedom against aggressors.

Furthermore, the scandals surrounding the Algerians added to this anti-Bosniak image of Lagumdzija because he had used the special police to arrest and expedite them to the US. The SDP leader had motivated and justified this decision by blaming the nationalist SDA for allowing the Algerians to be in Bosnia in the first place, thus making Bosnia a terrorist-harbouring state. Bosnian Muslims were deeply offended by the result of these statements, as the Serb nationalist leaders cited these statements to claim that Bosniak war crimes were as bad, if not worse, than those committed by the Serbs. Lagumdzija was, in a sense, providing arguments to Bosniak wartime enemies, thus deeply alienating his own supporters.

In conclusion, the Alliance for Change was expected to fight corruption, to permanently weaken the nationalist grip on power, to introduce and implement reforms, to prepare Bosnia for the Euro-Atlantic integration process, including Partnership for Peace, membership in Council of Europe and negotiations about future membership in the EU. Moreover, it was anticipated that Alliance would change the relation between local authorities and representatives of the international community, inasmuch as it was supposed to take ownership of the process and make international intervention obsolete.

Instead, embroiled in scandals of its own, the Alliance strengthened the appeal of the nationalist parties. This was exacerbated by its poorly designed and arrogant approach to key questions in Bosnian politics such as the heritage of war, importance of religion and ethnicity. Eventually, Bosnia did become a full member of the Council of Europe, but though portrayed as immensely important, it was perceived as a small victory of little immediate relevance for the lives of the Bosnian people. The Alliance for Change did not take ownership of the process as it was anticipated and encouraged by the OHR and other representatives of the international community. Rather, the Alliance perceived the relationship between itself and the OHR in a completely different way – as a partnership in which the OHR would implement what the Alliance had agreed upon, thus enabling it to govern effectively. As the OHR was uncomfortable with this role, the result was a conflict between the Alliance and the OHR, with

89 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
high-ranking officials of the SDP accusing the OHR of working against the interests of the Bosnian people.

Reform of the Judiciary

As ownership was failing due to the inability of the Alliance to push the reform process further, the OHR continued to undermine the power base of the nationalist parties and it continued doing so from above, through the imposition of both the agenda for reform and the solutions to problems – without input from the local authorities. The clearest example of this turning away from the concept of ownership was the comprehensive reform of the Bosnian judiciary. Even before the anti-corruption and anti-obstruction policies came together, it was obvious that something needed to be done in the field of the judiciary in order to improve the rule of law. Bosnian prosecutors and judges were politically appointed as the judiciary still functioned as it did in the communist system before the war and it was thus difficult for any ‘rule of law’ policies to create desired effects. The courts were unable to prosecute and punish politicians and criminals with connections to the nationalist parties. Consequently, the situation in regard to the rule of law remained extremely poor despite numerous international policies in this field.

The first steps towards improving the rule of law were conducted through the UNMBiH that had the mandate to oversee the judiciary through the Judicial System Assessment Program (JSAP). The main contribution of the JSAP was its review of the problems in the judiciary. It found that Bosnian judges and prosecutors were politically controlled; neither politicians nor the public nor judges themselves perceived that the judiciary was independent. The JSAP also found bureaucratic and administrative cases were mounting in the courts that were ill-equipped to handle the workload. In addition, the Central Eastern European Law Initiative of the American Bar Association (CEELI) conducted its own studies and analyses of the judicial system with similar, disappointing results. In 1998, based on the recommendations of the JSAP and CEELI, the PIC and the OHR started legislating for an improved rule of law. The first step was to introduce a new law for the appointment of judges and prosecutors, through independent commissions rather than directly by the government. Furthermore, salaries were dramatically increased in order to prevent corruption. Yet, these efforts did not bear fruit. The Sarajevo media continued reporting high-level corruption scandals in which neither police nor judiciary system could do anything to bring the perpetrators to justice. In response and given that the JSAP mandate was coming to an end, the OHR decided in November 2000 to create the Independent Judiciary Commission (IJC) to continue the work of the JSAP.

---
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with a broader mandate. After the start of its activities, the IJC investigated the
problems in the judiciary and it pointed to a number of structural problems. As it
became operational, the IJC also started investigating complaints by citizens. It
soon became clear that this policy was not providing results, as complaints were
few and the burden of proof, i.e., determining that a judge of a prosecutor is
corrupt or incompetent, proved to be practically impossible. In close to two
years, only 70 cases were investigated and only six judges were removed from
their duties. The OHR consequently decided to award the IJC a comprehensive
mandate to reform the entire judiciary system, through an across-the-board
review of judges and prosecutors, in order to move the burden of proof from the
IJC to individual judges and prosecutors.\footnote{IJC, "An Alternative Strategy to Verify the Competency of the Judiciary: A Re-appointment Process" (Sarajevo: Independent Judicial Commission, 18 December 2001) p. 6.}

The work of the IJC resulted in drastic measures. Apart from drafting a new
legal framework for the judicial system, the IJC took over the work of the
commissions’ appointment of judges and prosecutors. Eventually, this process
resulted in firing of all judges and prosecutors in Bosnia in order to re-employ
them, after a comprehensive review. Some 1,000 judges and prosecutors were
fired, reviewed and re-employed under the auspice of the IJC. This procedure
cause serious criticism from many observers, including the Council of Europe,
whose analysts argued that to “remove from office judges already enjoying life
tenure although no professional misconduct of the individual judge can be
established” is in “breach of democratic practices”, “illegal” and “unconstitutio-
nal”.\footnote{As quoted in Gerald Knaus and Felix Martin, "Lessons from Bosnia and Herzegovina: Travails of the European Raj" in \textit{Journal of Democracy} 14, no. 3 (2003).} Nevertheless, the OHR and the IJC continued the review process and in
order to silence expected criticism, the HR first removed ten judges and prose-
cutors from office, in May of 2002, before all other judges were fired as well.
This intimidation worked and all legal professionals under review, although
employed for life and protected by the constitution, obeyed the new procedures
and reapplied for their jobs.\footnote{Ibid.} Once again, the Bonn Powers were being used to bypass both local laws and regulations, as well as to bypass established
democratic practices. Although the judicial reform was welcomed by the
Alliance for Change and although it eventually produced positive results for the
development of democracy in Bosnia, the way it was introduced and the way it
was carried out was interpreted as an extreme expression of the OHR
protectorate type intervention, the opposite of the promoted principle of owner-
ship.
Towards the End of Wolfgang Petritsch’s Mandate

As the practice of command and control from above remained the main engine in the process, despite the concept of ownership, the OHR continued introducing new legislation packages aiming to limit the competencies of entities and strengthen the central Bosnian government. In addition, Wolfgang Petritsch opted to propose a further strengthening of the OHR and further structuring of relations between different international agencies. Despite the fact that Petritsch relaxed the relationship between the OHR and the local elites, both in government and outside, this attempt to restructure the international machinery in Bosnia testifies of a belief in command and control governance mechanisms.96 In 2001, he proposed to the PIC a so-called ‘table model’, where the OHR would chair a cabinet-style organization.97 The HR would preside and participants would be the heads of the OSCE mission to Bosnia, the UNMBiH, the IPTF and the UNHCR, who would all be appointed as deputies to the HR, with the responsibility to lead their own organizations, yet answering to the HR who could replace them in case of poor performance.98 This was an attempt to continue restructuring of the international presence in Bosnia, in search for effectiveness and efficiency. However, the proposal was met with harsh criticism from the local media.99 More importantly, the international agencies that were supposed to subject to the OHR cabinet were protesting and referring to the proposed restructuring as ‘Camelot’ and ‘King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table’.100 The heads of missions also pointed out that they are responsible to far more impressive bodies than the OHR, such as the UN Security Council, the World Bank Board of Trustees and the Permanent Council of the OSCE in Vienna.101 Wolfgang Petritsch revised his plan and proposed that the HR should be the head of UNMBiH,102 but even this weaker structure was rejected by the PIC steering board.103 Instead, it was agreed that the streamlining process should continue and during the next year, it became clear that there would be no major re-organization of different international agencies, but rather a transfer or authority to the EU.

96 Earlier, Petritsch initiated two civil society organizations, the Civic Forum and a Consultative Partnership Forum, two local think-thanks that provided a direct local input in the policy formation process. Carlos L. Yordán, "Society Building in Bosnia: A Critique of Post-Dayton Peacebuilding Efforts", in Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations (Summer/Fall 2003).
98 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
The state-building agenda was increasingly motivated as being a part of the Euro-Atlantic integration, and as former Yugoslav republic of Slovenia came closer to the EU membership, the link between reforms and the prospect of EU membership was accepted by the Bosnian people. Furthermore, this ‘turn to Brussels’ was being directly endorsed by the EU, inasmuch as the EU started taking over responsibly for different parts of the Bosnian political process. For example, it was decided that the next HR would have two functions, the High Representative of the International Community (HR) and the European Union Special Representative (EUSR). It was also envisioned that the EU would in the near future take over the tasks of the UN-led IPTF and even the NATO-led SFOR. The Bosnian membership in the Council of Europe was also contributing to the increased credibility of the idea of European integration. Bosnia was finally being recognized as a member of the European family of nations. The merits of the partnership between the Alliance for Change and HR Petritsch resulted primarily in 1) the success of the turn towards Europe, 2) the Mrakovica agreement, and 3) the reform of the judiciary. As Petritsch left the office, he looked back at the last two and a half years and noted the main improvements in Bosnia. Remaining faithful to his partners despite their inability to fulfil pre-election promises, he stated:

I am convinced that the nationalist frenzy of the last decade belongs to the past and that officials as well as citizens in this part of the world are becoming politically mature, aware of the responsibility they carry…

…at the end of the year 2000, the Alliance for Change arrived: a reform-minded government that, in the beginning of 2001, took over and expressed commitment to statehood, to the idea and concept of a state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This, I think, was the most decisive moment – a watershed situation in Bosnia’s recent history. I am much more confident now that these reform-minded forces will continue to be in place, that they will succeed and that you, the citizens of this country, will succeed together with them.104

On the other hand, he used the opportunity to respond to nationalist criticisms of his (and the Alliance’s) reform packages, primarily the compromises made at Mrakovica:

The top political leaders in this country are not always up to the challenges of the 21st century. The responses sometimes sort of date back to the 19th century … With the constitutional reforms105 you actually established a fair and level playing ground for all the citizens throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this way, the two Entities have become less relevant and more administrative units.106

104 Wolfgang Petritsch, "BH Future is – Europe", in Oslobodjenje, 20 May 2002.
105 Note that the HR refers to Sarajevo-Mrakovica agreement as ‘constitutional reform’ here. Not to be confused with the comprehensive constitutional reform proposed in the connection to the tenth anniversary of the Dayton Peace Agreement. See Chapter Nine.
106 Wolfgang Petritsch, "BH Future is – Europe", in Oslobodjenje, 20 May 2002.
Nevertheless, despite the conclusions drawn by the outgoing HR, Bosnian journalists and commentators welcomed the change in the leadership of the OHR. As much as Wolfgang Petritsch was praised during the first years of his tenure in Bosnia, he was criticized towards the end of his time in Bosnia. Despite orchestrating the defeat of the nationalist parties and the change of government, it was the failure of the concept of ownership to take hold for which he was heavily criticized. In the aftermath of the Mrakovica agreement, the Alliance started breaking up and its focus moved away from reform to settling of internal battles and gaining control over the corrupt economy and the corrupt state apparatus. Once again, the OHR had to start acting in a protectorate-like manner in order to push the process further. At the end, Petritsch imposed much more decisions than any other High Representative, totalling 215 decisions imposing legislation and 63 removals from office. Although there were improvements caused by the implemented reforms, there were also great disappointments, as the promised ownership resulted in solutions no one was pleased with and with a government that was seemingly corrupt and incapable to govern, as the nationalist parties were earlier. In the end, the OHR under Wolfgang Petritsch ended up firing all Bosnian judges and prosecutors and asking for more sweeping and administrative powers, in addition to unprecedented authority to legislate as it sees fit and remove elected officials.

With the Alliance losing popularity and Wolfgang Petritsch departure welcomed, the new High Representative, Lord Paddy Ashdown from the UK, came to Bosnia with a renewed commitment to the concept of ownership.

**Wolfgang Petritsch and the Concept of Ownership: Cultural Theory Analysis**

The following section of this chapter will consist of an analysis of the above described crisis and events that have defined the relationship between local and international actors in Bosnia, based on the framework for analysis presented in Chapter Four. The focus will once again be on the position of local and international authorities focused more on change, as the social map at the start of the Petritsch’s mandate is given in the analysis of the previous chapter. There, it was concluded that the position of the OHR changed dramatically in connection to the introduction of the Bonn Powers, from the lower left corner of the map towards the higher right corner of the hierarchical social solidarity. Furthermore, it was concluded that this change, in combination with a number of policies that were implemented by the OHR and OSCE, which made local nationalist elite’s goals less plausible; had caused a change in the local society, a change on the social map. The local nationalist elites, in light of the failures of their policies,
shifted to the left of the social map from the hierarchical towards the fatalist social solidarity, where they adapted to the new powers vested in the OHR – given that they fiercely argued against OHR’s policies, only to accept them without much resistance after the OHR made its decision. However, the socio-cultural viability space was shifting downwards, as policies imposed by the OHR improved the general security situation and to some extent, event the political situation in Bosnia.

**Interactions and Change**

Upon taking up his post in Bosnia, Petritsch immediately introduced the concept of ownership, a new paradigm guiding the civilian international intervention in Bosnia. The idea was to change the role of the OHR in the process, as the previous period of excessive use of the Bonn Powers produced a dependency syndrome. This resulted in the OHR actively engaging in politics and policy, while the local political actors became passive and reacted with a combination of obstruction and indifferent obedience after the decisions were imposed by the OHR.

As the process started, the concept of ownership was promoted in the rhetoric of the OHR, testifying to its commitment to low-grid social solidarities of individualism and egalitarianism. The role of the OHR was once again defined as being *assistants*, rather than *guardians*, as it was defined a couple of years earlier, at the very start of the process. Creation of local think-thanks testifies to attempts to change the social relations between the OHR and the local elites. The statements regarding slow decrease in use of the Bonn Powers were aiming to prepare for a change of strategic behaviour as well. However, there was no possibility to change the social relations and/or strategic behaviour of the OHR immediately, due to the socio-cultural context at the time. The Bonn Powers were still employed, increasingly so, as there was a necessity to implement the new state-building agenda in order to build institutions that would enable Bosnia to become a self-sustaining state. Furthermore, the obstructive local authorities were increasingly perceived as the main problem in the Bosnian process and the corruption scandals motivated the OHR and other powerful international actors to remove them from power by means of electoral engineering, as well as directly, through the use of Bonn Powers and removals from office. This was supposed to be the last major intrusive behaviour, as the coming non-nationalist government was expected to be cooperative and willing to take ownership of the process, pushing for reforms without external pressures and, consequently, making the OHR obsolete. Therefore, it can be concluded that the introduction of the concept of ownership was a change in rhetoric of the OHR, while social relations and strategic behaviours remained hierarchical, in anticipation of changes in the local socio-cultural context (this attempted, but not completed change is illustrated by the stretched line in Figure 17 below).
The result of the 2000 election, including the coalition-building and electoral engineering that followed, although successful in changing the government and installing the reform-friendly Alliance for Change, produced only a temporary change in the relationship between the local elites and the international representatives. At first, there was an expectation that there would be dramatic changes, improvements in Bosnian economy and politics. Indeed, the Alliance for Change opted to fully implement reforms that were put on the table by the PIC and the OHR. Yet, after an initial euphoria, the Alliance started failing to deliver these reforms and the leaders of the parties within the Alliance started behaving as their predecessors had, i.e., they spent most of their time attempting to take the control of the state apparatus, the media, the police, the intelligence services and the state companies. Instead of pushing for reforms, they continued consolidating their power, which can be interpreted as movement towards the top right corner of the map, towards the attraction of the hierarchical social solidarity, as illustrated in Figure 17 below. Simultaneously, the OHR attempted to stop using the Bonn Powers to impose reforms, waiting for the Alliance to push through reforms by itself. This was as an attempt to complete the change in rhetoric with a change in strategic behaviour and social relations.

This attempt to change the role of the OHR in Bosnian politics failed. As reform packages again became stuck in parliaments and the Alliance failed to push them through, the OHR went back to the role of a guardian. Once again, the OHR started creating and introducing policy. It also started removing politicians and officials that were taking a stand against the proposed reform packages. Put as simply as possible, the OHR returned to governing in a command and control manner.
mode, through ‘boss-ism’ top-down policy process. This is best exemplified by the intrusion in connection to the judicial reform and by the Constitutional Court decision on continuativeness of peoples, both being cases where the representatives of the international community disregarded accepted democratic practices and even local laws and the Bosnian constitution. In addition, the OHR attempted to further the structuring of social relations among the representatives of the international community, as it proposed changing the structure of the international presence into a cabinet-like structure, where the HR would act almost as a prime minister, presiding over and controlling a number of large organizations involved in the process.

The interpretation of these events leads to a conclusion that the position of the OHR on the social map did not change. Seen over the three-year long period, the movement of the OHR resembles a failed attempt to move downwards as its final position resembled the position it had at the start of the period. Once again, change was not possible due to the socio-cultural context. The attempt to leave the socio-cultural viability space resulted in the failure of short-term policies and the OHR was forced to return to practices of a semi-protectorate. The change was permanent only in the speech of the OHR, as Wolfgang Petritsch insisted on talking about local ownership as the most important long-term goal. The interpretation of the way the OHR acted and spoke in this period leads to a conclusion that the OHR during Petritsch’s tenure became socio-culturally incoherent. The underlying bias was not corresponding with the preferred social relations and strategic behaviours. The end position of the OHR on the Bosnian social map can therefore be described as a position between viability and non-viability, close to the border of the socio-cultural viability space, attempting (and failing) to move downwards, as illustrated in Figure 18 below.
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*Figure 18 – Movement of Actors in the Aftermath of 2000 Elections*
On the other hand, the local nationalist elites initially moved even closer to the fatalist social solidarity, as they had lost the support of the electorate and the 2000 elections. Later, they bounced back as opposition parties and re-positioned themselves as the protectors of the national interests, which they portrayed as being threatened by a combination of secular, civic government, intrusive involvement of the OHR and of course, untrustworthy elites of other ethnic groups, as illustrated in Figure 18 above. The non-nationalist opposition initially moved towards the hierarchical social solidarity, as it formed the government, took over the state apparatus and attempted to force through reforms. Yet, as the reforms failed and failures became the rule rather than the exception, the Alliance moved towards the fatalistic social solidarity, attempting to survive in power, rather than to produce meaningful governance. In addition, although the alliance tried to remain a multi-ethnic, non-nationalist option, it found itself in conflict between its own cultural bias and the political system designed on the basis of ethnicity. Thus, the position of the Alliance for Change, during the latter part of their time in power, resembles an uncomfortable position bordering between viability and non-viability, between fatalism and hierarchy, between its low-grid history and its high-grid present.

**Effects on the Social Map**

The initial effect of the concept of ownership was positive and it produced a belief in possibilities for a dramatic change. As corruption became a major issue in Bosnian politics, the nationalist parties lost much of their support, while low-grid non-nationalist discourses gained popularity. The results of the elections testify to a change of the size of socio-cultural viability space. The SDP and the smaller parties that were members of the Alliance for Change did not alter their position on the social map in the run-up to the elections. Their position, meaning their discourses, values and beliefs, became socio-culturally viable while the three nationalist parties were stuck in the extremely high-grid positions. This change of the socio-cultural viability space was caused by successful implementation of international policies earlier, by Carlos Westendorp and by a successful new rhetoric of Wolfgang Petritsch. As new legislation was imposed, new institutions created and the policies of nationalist elites were failing, as well as the OHR communicated the necessity for change of government, the Bosnian socio-cultural context allowed the emergence of stronger local low-grid voices. In fact, this development is best described as a broadening of the socio-cultural viability space to include the pluralist middle of the map. The nationalist discourses based on the fatalist and hierarchical cultural biases were still the most viable, while the more extreme versions of individualistic and egalitarian speech were still non-viable. However, pluralist discourses that were based on all four cultural biases were increasingly being accepted in the public debate. This was indeed a promising development, as analyzed by the Cultural Theory framework.
Nevertheless, this positive change did not last long. As in all previous drastic improvements in balances of strengths of social solidarities, there was a counter-reaction, caused by disappointments that followed the initial positive developments. This time, the failure of local ownership resulted in deep disappointment by the Bosnian people in politics, non-nationalist discourses and, ultimately, in the ability of the OHR and its allies in Bosnian politics to keep their promises. The change of government and the promise of ownership had stretched the socio-cultural viability space to become more pluralistic, to allow the individualistic and egalitarian views and values into the middle of the public debate. Yet, the disappointments brought about by the failure of the Alliance to deliver on its promises and the return of the OHR to high-grid position on the social map had caused a setback, a return to the fatalist-hierarchy alliance as the only viable way position on the social map. In summary, the concept of ownership and the victory of the Alliance of Change represented a powerful ‘jolt to the system’, so to speak, where the ending positions resembled the positions at the start of the period, as illustrated in Figure 19 above.

The end result of the introduction of concept of ownership and the change of government was not a dramatic change in the Bosnian socio-cultural context. At the end of the Petritsch period in Bosnia, the local socio-cultural alliance of hierarchy and fatalism was still as dominant as before. The seemingly dramatic changes following the 2000 elections, although positive at first, actually reinforced the strength of the two high-grid social solidarities in the end, as they proved the adherents of the fatalist social solidarity right, their mantra being ‘no matter who you vote for, they always win’. Moreover, the attempt to implement constitutional reforms in connection to the decision regarding constitutiveness of peoples, although successful in bringing Bosnia into the Council of Europe,
ended up in compromises and it did not achieve its full potential; a change of the constitutional framework that would presumably enabled major socio-cultural changes, as it would change the rules of how the game of politics was played in Bosnia.

*In conclusion, a Cultural Theory analysis of the third period of international post-conflict intervention to Bosnia shows that: 1) the concept of ownership constituted an attempt to change the socio-cultural adherence of the OHR, from hierarchical to individualist and egalitarian social solidarities, 2) the proposed change failed, as it was not socio-culturally viable, i.e. the local socio-cultural context needed the OHR to remain a hierarchically biased actor forcefully implementing reforms, and 3) the effects on the socio-cultural viability space were dual, as the OHR successfully removed nationalist from power at first, thus improving the situation, yet the consequent failures to speed up and fully implement reforms reinforced the dominant high-grid social solidarities once again.*
Chapter Nine: Lord Paddy Ashdown and the Euro-Atlantic Integration

This empirical chapter covers the three and a half year period between the summer of 2002 and the spring of 2006, the time when Lord Paddy Ashdown of the United Kingdom was the High Representative of the International Community, as well as the European Union Special Representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina. This period is also studied and analyzed with the help of the Cultural Theory theoretical framework. Once again, the focus is on the events and crises that formed and defined the social relations and strategic behaviours of local and international actors involved in the process.

The first section of the chapter consists of a description of the main events and crises. There were four such events. The first event was the introduction of new priorities by the arriving HR. The second event was the re-election of the nationalist parties to power. The third event was the re-introduction of the new (and improved) EU conditionality principle, through expert commissions. The fourth event was the introduction of comprehensive reform packages, such as the police reform and the constitutional reform, in connection to the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement.

As was the pattern in earlier chapters, the last section of this chapter will consist of a Cultural Theory analysis of these principal events and crisis.

The Arrival of the Fourth High Representative

British Liberal politician Lord Paddy Ashdown, the fourth High Representative in Bosnia, arrived in Sarajevo in June 2001. He received a dual mandate from the PIC and from the EU. Thus, in contrast to the mandates of the previous High Representatives, Ashdown inherited an OHR that represented both the international community (answering to the PIC), and the EU (answering directly to the European Commission). This was a continuation of the change ‘from Dayton to Brussels’, introduced by Petritsch in connection with the acceptance of Bosnia into the Council of Europe. The turn towards Brussels was being pushed further by the planned exit of both the UN mission to Bosnia and by the withdrawal of US troops from Bosnia. The tasks of SFOR and IPTF were being taken over by a European Force (EUFOR) and a European Police Mission.

---

1 OHR, “PIC Steering Board Communiqué” in PIC Documents (Brussels: OHR Archives, 28 February 2002).
2 Wolfgang Petritsch, Bosna i Hercegovina: Od Daytona Do Evrope (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 2002).
Since the EU was taking over the leadership in the process in Bosnia, the character of the process changed once again, from a state-building agenda towards Euro-Atlantic Integration – in other words, towards preparing Bosnia for future negotiations with EU and NATO, regarding full membership in these two organizations. The path to Europe, as defined by the new HR, was through administrative and economic reform.

In his address to the Bosnian parliaments, and as well to the Bosnian people and in his first meetings with the PIC, HR Paddy Ashdown committed himself and the OHR to the goal of pushing Bosnia towards Europe and he outlined the priorities for the process in Bosnia. His definition of the main Bosnian problem was summarized in the following, rather revealing, facts about institutional inefficiency:

You have 1,200 judges and prosecutors, 760 legislators, 180 Ministers, four separate levels of government and three armies – for a country of less than four million people! You have 13 Prime Ministers! That’s a Prime Minister for every 300,000 citizens!

Ashdown stressed also the importance of the rule of law and economic reform, announcing his two major priorities, ‘jobs and justice’. Concerning the democratization process, Ashdown noted that people seem to be fed up with elections and expressed worries about upcoming elections. He urged people to register to vote and to vote ‘for Europe’. Recognizing the failures of the Alliance and questionable practices of his predecessors regarding their involvement in the electoral process, the new HR avoided offering full and unreserved support for the non-nationalist parties. In his televised address to the people of Bosnia, he proclaimed:

it is not my job to interfere with elections, but it is my job to promote democracy
… Please vote … vote for hope - not for fear, vote for the future - not for the past.

Regarding the role of the OHR in the process, Ashdown expressed a commitment to the concept of ownership in wording that was reminiscent of the original mandate of the OHR:

---

3 Anna E. Juncos, "The EU’s post-Conflict Intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina: (re)Integrating the Balkans and/or (re)Inventing the EU?" in Southeast European Politics 6, no. 2 (2005).
4 OHR, "Declaration of the Political Directors of the Peace Implementation Council Steering Board" in PIC Documents (Brussels: OHR Archives, 30 January 2003).
5 OHR, "Inaugural Speech by Paddy Ashdown, the new High Representative for Bosnia & Herzegovina" in HR Speeches (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 27 May 2002).
6 Ibid.
7 OHR, "The High Representative Paddy Ashdown Television Address to the Citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina" in HR Speeches (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 May 2002).
It is not a question of the Office of the High Representative stepping the pace up, it is question of the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina having to step the pace of reform up and we act as facilitators. (Emphasis added)\(^8\)

Yet, he also recognized the power vested in his office and warned the local authorities about his intention to use them:

> I shall also have to use the High Representative’ powers from time to time. But I regard these powers as acceptable only if they are used on behalf of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a whole…

> …I have concluded that there are two ways I can make my decisions. One is with a tape measure, measuring the precise equidistant position between three sides. The other is by doing what I think is right for the country as a whole. I prefer the second of these.\(^9\)

Finally, he outlined some new ideas about the future of international involvement in Bosnia. First and foremost, the OHR’s goal was to make itself obsolete. Statements of this kind were made by all three earlier High Representatives, but this was the first time some visible steps were made towards this goal. As HR Ashdown explained, he intended to decrease dramatically the international staff of the OHR and replace them as much as possible with local staff. He also announced a decrease in overall size of the OHR as soon as possible. Finally, he talked about a change of attitude within the OHR, in regard to its relation with the Bosnian society and its people, which was to become more open and direct:

> And when I have to travel abroad I shall wish to do so as a representative, not just of the international community, but of Bosnia and Herzegovina, under the BiH flag. I want the Office of the High Representative to be open and accessible to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. So, starting today, I will be spending more time out of Sarajevo, meeting people from across the country, and listening to their views. And I have given instructions today, that the iron gates at the front of OHR Sarajevo will be opened and left open, except when a specific security threat requires otherwise.\(^10\)

Overall, the first communication coming out of the OHR after Ashdown’s arrival can be summarized as a continuation of commitment to the idea of local ownership of the process. While Wolfgang Petritsch introduced the concept but continued acting intrusively, Paddy Ashdown seemed determined to lead by example, employing young Bosnians and making the OHR more open and transparent. In this way, the gap was between the representatives of the international community and the Bosnian elites (and the Bosnian people in

---

\(^8\) OHR, "Transcript of the press conference given by the High Representative, Paddy Ashdown at CPIC, Tito Barracks" in *HR Press Conferences* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 May 2002).

\(^9\) OHR, "Inaugural Speech by Paddy Ashdown, the new High Representative for Bosnia & Herzegovina" in *HR Speeches* (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 27 May 2002).

\(^10\) Ibid.
general) decreased. Once again, there was a promise of a changed role for the OHR in the Bosnian political system.

Ashdown’s first mission implementation plan, published in December 2002, envisioned almost all Bosnian problems as necessitating administrative, economic and judicial reforms. Significantly, Ashdown’s appointment as the new HR marked the start of a new trend towards separating the democratization and state-building processes from politics and the local political process. Previously, obstructive local political parties were blamed for the failures and slow rate of progress. As experiments to install non-nationalist governments in both the Republika Srpska and in the Federation produced less than dramatic increases in the pace of the reforms, the OHR started constructing reform programs that were politically neutral, so to speak, in the tradition of the institutions of IMC and IJC. ‘Jobs and justice’ were in the interests of the people and the reforms were deemed necessary in order to bring Bosnia into Europe, regardless of the will of the elected politicians. Whereas Wolfgang Petritsch had attempted to combine the concept of ownership with the intrusive practices of the OHR, the Ashdown’s OHR announced that it would change the relations with the local society, inasmuch as the new HR intended to create an alliance directly with the people of Bosnia.

2002 elections

The first test for this new approach arrived in October 2002 with the fourth round of post-war elections. For the first time, Bosnia had its own electoral legislation and own electoral commission. The OSCE participated as observers, not as organizers. The OHR limited its involvement to attempts to increase the voter turnout and advised voters to cast their votes based on rational calculation and to consider the future, rather than simply voting based on past habits and history. This was, of course, an attempt to promote non-nationalist parties, since the people presumably voted for the nationalists out of habit, and the nationalists were those campaigning on issues regarding the past, their role in protection of vital national interests of the people, before, during and after the war that had occurred eight years earlier. However, the promotion of non-nationalists was conducted in a much less intrusive manner than in earlier elections. There were no attempts by the OHR to limit the reach of nationalist campaigns, no attempts to interfere in specific political battles between the

11 EUSR OHR, Report to the European Parliament by the OHR and EU Special Representative for BiH, January - June 2003, HR Reports (Sarajevo: EUSR, 2003).
12 Robert M. Beecroft, "Pobjeda nacionalistickih stranaka nije zabrinjavajuca", in Speech to the OSCE Permanent Council (31 October 2002).
13 Statements such as those made in OHR, "The High Representative Paddy Ashdown Television Address to the Citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina" in HR Speeches (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 May 2002).
parties and no attempts to influence the result through electoral engineering. In comparison with earlier elections, the OHR was rather passive.

The result of the elections was a strong nationalist comeback. The three nationalist parties won the elections on all sides; while voter turnout went down to 55 percent, (voter turnout was around 85 percent in the first rounds of post-war elections and since then constantly on decline). The Alliance for Change suffered a bitter defeat and it actually blamed the OHR for its failures. The High Representative simply noted that he considered the nationalist comeback as a protest vote by “a people sick and tired of slow reforms, constant elections and corruption”, not as a vote for nationalism. In addition, he noted that the elections were free and fair and Bosnians should be proud of the job the electoral commission had done:

Consider for a moment the Election Commission as a model for what Bosnia and Herzegovina could be. Foreigners taking a back seat, content to leave things to a highly talented body of Bosnian citizens, of all ethnicities, armed with commitment, professionalism and modern ideas, operating an organization extending into every village and community, delivering a service to every citizen, doing one of the most difficult jobs any state has to do, doing it to international standards, and doing it superbly.

After the three nationalist parties formed governments, HR Ashdown stated that he intended to form a new ‘partnership’ with the nationalist parties, in a similar manner as his predecessor had formed partnerships with non-nationalist parties. Yet, he reiterated that his true partners were the people of Bosnia and that he would always act in their interests, regardless of how well nationalist parties behaved in the new partnership relationship.

The manner in which HR Ashdown handled the return of nationalist parties to power was remarkable in a couple of respects. First, years and years of obstruction in which the three nationalist parties had been the main problem in the implementation of the Dayton Agreement, peacebuilding, state-building and democratization processes were seemingly forgotten. In the past, the lack of progress was routinely attributed to these three parties and previous High Representatives had always done their utmost to weaken their grip on Bosnian politics, either through attempts to bypass them in the process of reform or through direct criticism, referring to them as “a thing of the past”, “incompetent”
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and “corrupt”. Now, without great hesitation, they were accepted as major actors of relevance for the future of Bosnia, acknowledged as legitimate representatives of the people and welcomed to be included in the process. This had not occurred previously, especially not in the case of Serb and Croat nationalist parties with whom the OHR had its harshest battles throughout the years. The relationship between the OHR and local nationalist elites appeared to be changing into a relationship of equals among equals.

This was justified by a combination of four new facts in Bosnian politics. First, the failure of the Alliance to implement reforms and its clashes with earlier HR made it clear that a Bosnia with non-nationalist opposition in power was not the panacea to all its problems. Lagumdzija, Dodik, Ivanic and others, although much more cooperative and willing to implement reform, proved to be unable to govern in a meaningful manner. Second, in the run-up to 2002 elections, the nationalist parties had committed to the Dayton Peace Agreement and its full implementation. Most interestingly, the Serb SDS party had finally accepted the Dayton Agreement in full, but ironically, not because they accepted legitimacy of the Bosnian state, but because the pace of reforms aimed at strengthening the state-institutions threatened the Serb autonomy – suddenly the text of the Dayton Agreement became the cornerstone of arguments against reforms. The agreement guaranteed the existence and autonomy of the Republika Srpska. Third, the HDZ, SDA and SDS had modernized their agendas to include reforms. Realizing the people’s dissatisfaction that led to their failure in the last elections, the nationalist parties started focusing on economic reforms and related issues, instead of their traditional exclusive focus on national interests, i.e., discourses about the war, their war record and the usual hate-speech and fear spreading discourses. Fourth, they had elected moderates to power. In the SDA, Sulejman Tihic was elected president and his first statements indicated a distancing from the connection between the party and its religious origins. In the HDZ, the new leadership abandoned the idea of the third entity as it had led to disastrous effects earlier, and focused their agenda on the constitutional reform that would somehow remove entities all together – the Federation was perceived as dysfunctional and damaging to the Croats. The Serbs, as mentioned, focused on the defence of the Dayton Peace Agreement and the constitution it provided, since it guaranteed the existence of Republika Srpska and the Serb autonomy. They elected Dragan Cavic as the SDS party president, a much less radical leader than past leaders, such as Karadzic, Plavsic or

18 See Chapters Six, Seven and Eight.
21 ESI, "Waiting For A Miracle? The Politics Of Constitutional Change In Bosnia And Herzegovina" (Sarajevo: European Stability Initiative 2004).
Krajisnik, all of whom were indicted by the ICTY. As HR Paddy Ashdown wrote at the time, critics who argued that OHR support to the three nationalist parties would result in a disaster for the Bosnian post-war process were wrong. Instead, Ashdown asserted, the election results would lead to progress in the process.

I do not believe Saturday's vote was a vote for nationalism. It was instead a vote for faster reform, for real change, for more progress …

… Ask any Bosnian the question: was the last [non-nationalist] government punished for changing too much, or for changing too little? - and the answer you get could not be clearer.22

In practical terms however, all of these changes proved to be less dramatic than they seemed at first. The nationalist parties, although their agendas were reformed and modernized, still held on to their primary goals, their definition of national interests of their ethnic groups.23 The OHR, although accepting the newly elected nationalists as legitimate leaders of their peoples and promulgated partnership, still acted as a guardian and controller, justifying the guardianship and control of the political process through a discourse of protection of ‘the interests of the Bosnian people’.24

**Reform Packages and the New Conditionality**

Ashdown opted for six key goals for the OHR under his leadership: entrenching the rule of law, ensuring that the extremists and organized criminals could not reverse peace implementation, reforming the economy, strengthening the capacity of BH state-level governing institutions, establishing state-level civilian command and reforming the security sector, and promoting the sustainable return of refugees and displaced persons.25 This strategy focused on technical and administrative reforms; therefore, party politics were becoming less relevant. The conflicts between nationalist and non-nationalist local political actors returned to being outside the OHR mandate. As seen in the aftermath of the 2002 elections, whatever party won faced the same demands for reform and ended up with the same consequences if the reforms were obstructed.26 Given this awareness, the nationalist win was not perceived as negative for the international efforts, as it had usually been in earlier elections.

---

22 Paddy Ashdown, "Bosnia wants change not nationalism", in *Financial Times*, 11 October 2002
24 Summarized in the phrase: "Paddy Rules, Ok?" in ibid.
Furthermore, while his predecessors found justification for the creation of reform packages and the arbitrary deadlines for their implementation in the PIC documents, and ultimately, in the text of the Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA) itself, the new HR turned away from the DPA, labelling it as a “floor, not the ceiling” of the process. Instead, he turned to Euro-Atlantic integration processes as the main source of justification for intervention, as every larger reform was being conditioned by, and connected to, the EU integration processes. The road ‘from Dayton to Brussels’ had been mapped out by Petritsch, but it was not until the appointment of Ashdown and the position was changed from ‘High Representative of the International Community’ to the ‘European Union Special Representative’ that the prospect of Euro-Atlantic integration was more seriously used to push the process further ahead. This was a return to the conditionality principle of the past, only this time it was not humanitarian aid that was offered in exchange for compliance, but rather the promise of inclusion in EU and NATO, the presumed desire of the Bosnian people and the common denominator between all political parties of Bosnia, regardless of the ethnic group they represented.

A good example of this new praxis was the reform of the armed forces and security services. The DPA granted all three ethnic groups the right to its own army and its own police. In cooperation with NATO, the OHR and the PIC announced that Bosnia could enter the ‘Partnership for Peace’ (PFP) program if the three armies could cooperate. The next step, full membership in NATO, was conditional upon the integration of the three armies in one, single command and same uniform army. In contrast to earlier reform packages, the OHR did not create a schema for what the reform must include. Instead, conditions of the modernization and centralization process were set up directly by NATO leadership in Brussels. The OHR created a Defence Reform Commission, consisting of representatives of all three parties, the ministers of defence and a number of international experts. The commission was chaired by an American general, Gen. James R. Locher III, and it started its work in 2003, with the goal of reaching a consensus solution that would be accepted by all three parties. By September 2003, after meeting on no less than ten occasions, the commission submitted a comprehensive report that called for the creation of a single army under a single civilian command, but it had also recommended an administrative reform that followed the entity borders and it did not include the creation of

---

27 As stated in OHR, "Inaugural Speech by Paddy Ashdown, the new High Representative for Bosnia & Herzegovina" in HR Speeches (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 27 May 2002).
29 Valery Perry, "Defence Reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Will Partnership Solidify Peace?" in Perihelion Articles (ICAR, September 2003).
30 OHR, "Decision Establishing the Defence Reform Commission" in OHR Decisions (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 09 May 2003).
ethnically mixed units. In the following months, the proposal was debated in the state and entity parliaments and all three sides accepted it, as the OHR and NATO had demanded acceptance without amendments or changes.

This kind of conditionality was first used in respect to the Council of Europe membership a year earlier, but this time it became evident that, if he could form a ‘partnership’ with the people of Bosnia first, Ashdown could force through reforms despite the strong protests of the nationalists in control of the government and the parliaments. Given that NATO and EU memberships were seen as the panacea to all problems by all three peoples of Bosnia, this manner of introducing reforms seemed to bear fruit, even in cases when the reforms were contrary to the letter of the Dayton Agreement, and even though they were extremely controversial in the Bosnian post-war context. The reform creating a unified military force was most certainly contentious considering that these three armies were doing their utmost to kill each other as late as eight or nine years ago.

The new way of connecting reforms to the ‘wishes of the people’ resulted also in some more practical changes in the way policy was created and the reforms were implemented. Instead of allowing months and years of parliamentary debates before finally imposing legislation the local parliaments could not agree upon, the OHR formed internationally-chaired commissions where representatives of all three sides sat down with the representatives of the international community and negotiated reforms. This was a return to negotiations with a goal of consensus, as the main tool for implementation of reforms. This can be seen as a typically egalitarian way of creating relations and conducting policy, something the Joint Civilian Commissions (JCC) were once supposed to do. Remarkably, this time, it seemed to have worked. As HR Ashdown described:

And to get these laws enacted, we need consensus. In the first half of this year I established a Commission on Defence Reform, a Commission on Intelligence Reform and an Indirect Tax Policy Commission …

The commissions have worked better than many people imagined. They have produced legislation that puts party-political interest in the back seat and focuses instead on advancing the interests of all the citizens of this country. They have put people first. The result is three legal solutions that are modern, practical and fair.

31 Valery Perry, "Defence Reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Will Partnership Solidify Peace?", in Perihelion Articles (ICAR, September 2003).
32 Ibid.
33 See Chapter Six
34 OHR, "A Culture of Consensus" in HR Articles (Sarajevo OHR Archives, 16 September 2003).
Yet another, even better example of the new and improved OHR involvement was the creation of the ‘Bulldozer Committee’, consisting of representatives of the business sector from both entities. As the political parties more often than not obstructed the reform process, the OHR under the leadership of Ashdown opted for a different approach to promote economic reforms. In late 2002, the OHR called upon 500 local businessmen to define specific administrative improvements. This initiative was well accepted in the local business community, which was tired of the obsolete administrative rules and regulations and red tape that had plagued the Bosnian economy for years. Consequently, proposals from businesspersons were gathered and analyzed and the Bulldozer commission was formed, recommending 50 specific proposals for the change of existing legislation designed to simplify the registration of firms, patent procedures, taxation and foreign investment regulations. Accompanied by a 45-day deadline, the proposal was sent to entity parliaments. All 50 improvements were accepted by the Bosnian parliaments and the parties in power met and agreed to continue on the path of economic reform. The project was probably one of the OHR’s largest successes in its new policy of creating alliances directly with the people of Bosnia, as promised by HR Ashdown at the start of his mandate. With a piece of legislation passing the parliamentary procedures every four days, the work of the committee was praised by the HR for creating an unparalleled pace of reforms. Consequently, this unprecedented success was followed up by more Bulldozer-type reforms. First, the original Bulldozer Committee continued its activities after the first 50 laws were accepted. In addition, ‘Bulldozer II’ was created to introduce 50 more proposals. Moreover,

35 The Bulldozer Commission was formed under the Economic Transition unit of the OHR. For more, see ‘economic transition unit’ on www.ohr.int, last accessed in September 2006.
37 As an example of rules and regulations that made business unnecessary difficult, consider the fee for building and maintenance of nuclear-war shelters. In Bosnia, there was a fee of 2% of the value of property for building of commercial real-estate, despite the fact that there were no nuclear-war shelters being built or maintained. This regulation was a relic from the Cold War. The OHR Economic Transition Unit, "Buldozer Commission Brochure: 50 reforms in 150 days" (Sarajevo: OHR Archives 2002) Reform No.7.
38 OHR, "Buldozer Committee Completes List of 50 Bureaucratic Roadblocks to Doing Business in BiH" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo OHR Archives, 25 February 2003).
39 "OHR welcomes adoption of Bulldozer Committee reforms: Buldozer Recommendations to be turned to laws", in Dnevni List, 17 April 2004.
40 "Bjelasnica Statement of BiH Authorities: Commitment to Implement Reforms Confirmed", in Dnevni Avaz, 26 April 2003.
41 “Paddy Ashdown Congratulates Bulldozer Committee: “Unparalleled” Speed in Reform Adoption”, in Oslobodjenje, 18 May 2003.
42 This success story was presented by the OHR as foreign officials showed interest in copying the Bulldozer committee system. See "Interest in Bulldozer Committee Abroad as Well", in Dnevni List, 31 May 2003.
it was also proposed to create specific Bulldozer packages for areas of agriculture, natural resources and small enterprises.\textsuperscript{44} Throughout 2003 and 2004, the Bulldozer initiative successfully reformed a number of economic laws and regulations, and created a much better climate for business and foreign investment. Significantly, the Bulldozer Committee symbolized a change in the approach of the representatives of the international community. Although coordinated by the OHR, the reform proposals came directly from the Bosnian economy, i.e., the reforms came from below, rather than being imposed from the above. For the first time since the very start of the process, a comprehensive reformist legislation package was produced by the actors within the local society, not by representatives of the international community. Also for the first time, the politicians did not obstruct the reforms for political purposes. As Paddy Ashdown stated:

\textit{The Bulldozer strategy has been fundamentally different from similar reform efforts, in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in other countries. For the first time, economic reform in BiH has been led by businesspeople, not politicians or bureaucrats. They [bulldozer reforms] have generated a new type of partnership between political leaders and the private sector.}\textsuperscript{45}

Towards the end of 2003, the approach of HR Ashdown was showing considerable results, presumably because the nationalist parties were recognized as legitimate representatives of the people and were not opposed by the representatives of the international community as was the case in the earlier periods under the three previous High Representatives. Reforms that had had been unthinkable before, such as the reforms of defence and security services, were now agreed upon by the three parties. The Bulldozer Committee produced economic reforms at an unprecedented pace, and more importantly, these reforms came from below and were not imposed by the OHR through use of the Bonn Powers. In addition, an important reform package regarding taxation practices was put on the table in 2003, in order to ensure the financial means for the functioning of the Bosnian state, through an indirect taxation reform.\textsuperscript{46} This reform was meant to enable the central government to function on its own, without being dependent on financing by the entities or the internationally sponsored ‘financial lifeboats’ of the past.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{quotation}

\textsuperscript{45} "Paddy Ashdown Congratulates Bulldozer Committee: “Unparalleled” Speed in Reform Adoption", in \textit{Oslobodjenje}, 18 May 2003.

\textsuperscript{46} Vesna Bojicic-Dzelilovic et al., \textit{Bosnia and Herzegovina – Understanding Reform, Global Development Network Southeast Europe} (The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, 2004)

\textsuperscript{47} See Chapter Seven.
\end{quotation}
Failure of the Partnership

Nevertheless, after an initial period of successful negotiations on reforms, the nationalist parties started stalling the implementation of the agreed reform packages, and they became increasingly reluctant to compromise on any new reforms. By mid-2004, Ashdown found himself in the uncomfortable situation of having to respond to heavy criticism for the slowing down of the reform process and for not delivering on his promises of a smaller, less intrusive OHR.

Four different factors can be isolated as leading to the OHR policy of partnership with the three nationalist parties not making any further gains. First, the agenda for the reform process was set by the EU and the OHR. Even though the nationalist parties had negotiated the reforms on the basis of proposals of the representatives of the international community, these negotiations concerned questions regarding the details in connection to the implementation of reforms, rather than the design of the reforms or the necessity for the reforms themselves. Their input was limited to the choice of accepting or refusing the reform packages. If one of the parties chose to reject a proposed solution, the party became the target of OHR criticism, which was expressed in rather harsh terms. As every reform was accompanied with a discourse of its necessity, extreme urgency and its historical importance for the future of Bosnia, every failure to comply was deemed as disastrous for the future of Bosnia, and the politicians that were non-cooperative risked being removed by the OHR. For example, in the matter of the defence reform, Sulejman Tihic, the Bosniak member of the presidency, initially refused to accept the OHR-brokered solution, as it was “a half-measure”, as he referred to it at the time, since it did not fully integrate the three armies into ethnically mixed units. As he stated,

The International Community, eight years after Dayton, wants me to accept three armies, thus open up for the creation of the third entity and the final division of the country. My predecessor Alija Izetbegovic had to accept such painful compromises in 1995, I do not.\(^48\)

The OHR responded immediately with a statement by the OHR spokesperson Julian Braithwaite on the same day stating, “Sulejman Tihic is the largest obstacle standing in the way of Bosnia’s membership in the NATO and the PfP.” Moreover, for the refusal to accept the proposed State Defence Law, “he might face severe consequences.”\(^49\)

In time, Tihic was forced to change his stance and to sign the agreement, as he would otherwise be labelled as obstructionist and as damaging for the process of Euro-Atlantic integration, and possibly would even be removed from office. Similar arm-twisting occurred throughout the reform process. The OHR was

---

\(^48\) “Tihic odbija novi zakon o obrani BiH, OHR prijeti sankcijama”, in Dnevni Avaz, 19 September 2003.

\(^49\) Ibid.
proposing solutions and forcing through agreements through discourses of ‘extreme urgency’ and ‘historical importance’ and threats to obstructive leaders, even though sometimes the claims and demands of those opposing the reforms had merit. After the first, successfully-imposed agreements on defence and intelligence services reforms, the three nationalist parties started voicing dissatisfaction with the OHR, the ownership principle and the partnership relations. Perhaps rightly so, they pointed to the arrogance of the OHR and its insensitivity to local political realities.50

The second factor leading to the partnership policy being stalemated was that the OHR-brokered solutions in the first three large reform packages were compromises similar to the compromises made in Dayton. In order not to alienate one of the ethnic groups, the OHR attempted to find a middle way, thus sending a mixed signal of reforming in order to create a functional state, yet accepting the ethnic division and the results of the war. The results were reforms that were disliked by all three sides. For example, the defence reform did create a state-level joint command, yet it allowed the entity command system to remain in place. The reform of intelligence services did create a state-level ministry of security, yet it allowed the entity security services a continued existence, as two institutions under the newly created ministry. The necessity for reforms was justified by institutional inefficiency of the Dayton division, yet as critics pointed out, the solutions were creating even more bureaucracy.51 Instead of alienating one of the three parties in power, the OHR alienated all three, resulting in all three sides becoming obstructionist, i.e., started avoiding and slowing down the reform process.

The third factor was that, even directly after the 2002 elections, the liberal press, the non-nationalist civic opposition and international as well as local NGOs found naïve and counter-productive the OHR’s acceptance of the nationalist parties as being reformed, modern, and righteous representatives of the people. When the reform process stalled after the initial successful period of the Bulldozer Committees and the security services reform, the local media and the opposition parties blamed the OHR for being naïve, attempting to label the local nationalist parties as a ‘modern’ and ‘European’ political option, ignoring their past deeds and their ideological, nationalistic background. In its desire to establish good working relationships with the nationalists, the OHR legitimized their agendas and reversed the path of integration of the country that had begun with Wolfgang Petritsch and the decision of the Constitutional Court two years earlier.52 It has been argued that the OHR policy towards the nationalists had destroyed any possibility for the true, civic opposition to grow and it had

50 Sead Jusufovic, "Aritmetika Neodgovornosti: Kako i kada napraviti funkcionalnu tranziciju ovlasti sa medjunarodne zajednice na lokalne vlasti" (Sarajevo: Foreign Policy Initiative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Juni 2005) p. 9.
51 Ibid. p. 3.
52 See Chapter Eight.
weakened the civil society all together as Bosnian politics became a game played between the OHR on one hand and SDS, SDA and HDZ on the other.\(^5\)

The fourth and last factor is that the changes that the OHR announced concerning the manner in which the international community worked in Bosnia were largely symbolic. This resulted in HR Ashdown gaining an image of being ‘a politician’, a negative term in the Bosnian political culture. Upon arrival at his post, Ashdown announced that more Bosnian citizens would be employed by the OHR, that the Bosnian flag would be posted outside the OHR building, that the door of the OHR would be open for all, that he will consult the Ministry of Foreign Affairs when he travelled abroad, and so forth. These symbolic steps were meant to promote an image of a new OHR that was more open in its contacts with the local authorities and the Bosnian society in general, an image of new relations based on equality rather than power. Nevertheless, it soon became clear that the announced new approach was abandoned. To the contrary, the doors that were open were closed again and the ‘nationalization’ of the OHR through employment of local staff failed.\(^5\) Furthermore, the promised transparency and use of local structures was replaced with the exact opposite development, as the HR stopped consulting and informing the local authorities of his travels and important bilateral visits.\(^5\) Eventually, the model of cooperation and consultation with local authorities that was promised and welcomed at the start of Ashdown’s mandate was replaced with a tough and threatening, almost arrogant stance of the OHR. The disappointment was huge and as one local observer noticed, it soon became clear that “a technocrat [Petritsch] was replaced by a politician [Ashdown].”\(^5\)

In conclusion, after a positive initial period, the OHR under Paddy Ashdown experienced heavy criticism from all sides, both the nationalist parties in power and the opposition. As Bosnian journalists commented in 2004, Lord Paddy Ashdown celebrated his two years as head of the OHR in isolation, having alienated both his nationalistic partners and non-nationalist civic opposition, and


\(^{54}\) Sead Jusufovic, “Aritmetika Neodgovornosti: Kako i kada napraviti funkcionalnu tranziciju ovlasti sa medjunarodne zajednice na lokalne vlasti” (Sarajevo: Foreign Policy Initiative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Juni 2005) p. 9.

\(^{55}\) For example, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Bosnia had to intervene and ask the OHR to follow protocol, as it is the Bosnian Presidency that welcomes foreign dignitaries in official visits to Bosnia. ESI, "Post-Industrial Society and the Authoritarian Temptation" in Governance Assessment of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Sarajevo: European Stability Initiative 2004).

\(^{56}\) Sead Jusufovic, “Aritmetika Neodgovornosti: Kako i kada napraviti funkcionalnu tranziciju ovlasti sa medjunarodne zajednice na lokalne vlasti” (Sarajevo: Foreign Policy Initiative of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Juni 2005) p. 8.
with his ‘alliance with the Bosnian people’ failing. With the pace of reforms slowing down and the local nationalist parties increasingly obstructing the process, the next large reform package looming on the horizon was the crucial reform of the police forces.

Reform of the Police Forces

As in the case of the defence and security services reforms, the police reform was proposed with certain conditions set by the EU, connected directly to the EU feasibility study and the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) talks, which were conditional upon the result of the police reform. Like it was the case with the defence and security services reform, the project of reforming the police forces started with a joint commission, consisting of ministers of interior and other high-ranking officials from all three Bosnian ethnic groups, chaired by a representative of the international community. The failure of the OHR to implement the concept of ownership was demonstrated in the political process surrounding this reform.

The necessity for a reform of the police forces can be explained through three main problems. First, each entity had its own police and the Bosniak-Croat Federation police was further divided in cantonal police forces, with little or no cooperation between them. These different police forces were not only poorly coordinated, they had no jurisdiction on the territory of other police forces. Not surprisingly, this had been exploited by criminals who could simply flee across the inter-entity border in order to avoid capturing. Second, the war criminals still-at-large were not pursued by the police, especially in the Republika Srpska. The Federation police had demonstrated a degree of willingness to arrest individuals indicted by ICTY even when they belonged to the majority ethnic group. In the Republika Srpska, the police had not arrested a single war criminal and it had even protected high-ranking Serbs who had been indicted, such as Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic. Third, a number of earlier police reform projects, implemented primarily by the IPTF and mostly focused on education and training of the police and certification of police officers, had produced modest result. Granted that the police force had become more professional and the practices of arbitrary arrests and discrimination of members of the minority groups (such acts were common after the end of the war) had ceased, the police


58 The Commission was chaired by former Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens and former UK Inspector of Police David Blakey. It consisted of local politicians and officials, among other the two entity Ministers of Interior, two cantonal Ministers of Interior, three mayors, BH Chief Prosecutors, Director of State Border Service, the director of Police of RS, the director of Federal Administration of Police and so forth. See OHR, "Decision Establishing the Police Restructuring Commission (PRC)" in OHR Decisions (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 5 July 2004).
was still under a firm control of the nationalist elites, i.e., the three largest nationalist parties.

In order to remedy this problem, the OHR created a Police Reform Commission, which had the task to reform the policy accordingly to three criteria: 1) exclusive competence for all police matters at the state level, 2) no political interference in policing and 3) local police areas designed on the basis of technical policing considerations, rather than political. The decision to reform the police was justified by the EU feasibility study, as earlier failures of the local authorities to abide by PIC recommendations regarding policing had failed, and by the publication of the overall assessments of the police forces that were published with a finding that the police were incapable of fighting crime and unwilling to arrest the indicted war criminals.

As the Police Reform Commission started working, it became clear that the reform of police according to the criteria set by the EU would not be an easy task. As usual, the representatives of the Republika Srpska opposed the strengthening of state competence on behalf of the competence of the entities. However, this usual protest was the least of problems. The last criteria, demanding that the territorial organization of the police forces must follow technical and practical borders, rather than political borders, caused the most problems. The Serb side, perhaps rightly so, perceived this as the first step in the abolition of entities. It was expected that any administrative regions that did not follow entity borders would become a model for future regionalization of a new Bosnian state without the entities. If there were five police regions, this could possibly mean that future reforms would lead to a five canton Bosnia, without the Republika Srpska. Clearly, this was deemed unacceptable by the RS representatives, who proposed a reform that included a weak umbrella organization on state-level, and police regions following an inter-entity boundary line. When the OHR rejected this proposal and accompanied the rejection with more pressure to accept a compromise proposal based on ten regions, Banja Luka responded fiercely. First, most high-ranking RS politicians resigned from office, including the RS government and four Serb ministers in the CoM. Second, virtually all political parties in the RS condemned the proposed reform design and some

---

59 Decision was announced at a press conference of the high Representative in June of 2004. See OHR, "High Representative Announces Measures Against ICTY Obstructionists" in HR Press Conferences (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 30 June 2004)
60 These three criteria were defined in correspondence between Bosnian authorities and EU, represented by Javier Solana and European Commissioners Patten and Rehn. See ICG, “Bosnia’s Stalled Police Reform: No Progress, No EU” in Europe Report (International Crisis Group 2005)
62 Two Serb members of CoM resigned, other two threatened to resign but they had not followed up on their announcement. James Lyon, "Overcoming Ethnic Politics in Bosnia? Achievements and Obstacles to European Integration" in Peacebuilding and Civil Society in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Ten Years after Dayton, ed. Martina Fischer (Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2006).
politicians, including the RS President Dragan Cavic, threatened to organize a referendum for secession from Bosnia.63 Third, Serbian President Kostunica and other Serbian high-ranking politicians offered full support to the Bosnian Serbs on this matter, adding to the political crisis in Bosnia.64

The representatives of the international community again suffered great disappointment. In the preparation for police reform, the progress of EU integration was heavily conditional upon the success of the project. As the commission failed to reach an agreement within the OHR deadline, there was no option other than to stop the SAA talks and thereby stall the progress of EU integration.65

The OHR and the PIC eventually averted the crisis through political arm-twisting, repeated promises that police restructuring would not lead to the abolition of the RS and through concessions concerning the role of entities in the new police system, since the bureaucratic level of entity police was kept, defined as having a consultative role in the structure of police leadership. This solution was a compromise, not really meeting the EU demand for territorial police organization on technical and professional criteria rather than on political criteria. Even the fact that the final proposition included ten regions, rather than five or six, is perceived as a political, rather than optimal, technical solution. However, these concessions were enough to make the resigned RS officials withdraw their resignations and come back to the negotiating table.

Consequently, the agreement was accepted and although it did not fulfil the demands of the EU, it was deemed as sufficient by the HR, who could speak on behalf of the EU as well. The Serb parliament ratified the police-restructuring proposal at the last minute, on October 5, 2005, and what was accepted was actually a timeline rather than an immediate comprehensive reform. The timeline called for the establishment of a Directorate for Police Restructuring Implementation by December 31, 2005. The implementation itself was postponed further, with deadlines such as September 30, 2006 for a completion of an implementation plan; entity and state government approval of the plan by December 31, 2006; and entity and state parliamentary adoption of the scheme by the end of February 2007.66 It remains to be seen how much reform the process will eventually result in.

63 "Cavic: Attempts to abolish RS will lead to referendum", in FENA, 19 December 2004.
65 OHR, "Remarks by the High Representative, Paddy Ashdown, at the Press Conference on Police Restructuring" in OHR Press Conferences (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 18 May 2005).
Towards the End of Ashdown’s Mandate

After the adoption of the agreement on police reform, the OHR started preparations for the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Dayton Agreement. In November 2005, the representatives of all three Bosnian ethnic groups were scheduled to meet in Dayton once again and this conference was intended to mark the definitive transfer of authority from the US to the EU. The plan was to broker a deal on a constitutional reform which was supposed to strengthen the central government and create possibilities for a functional self-sustainable state, to announce the closing of the OHR and a full transfer of authority to the European Union Special Representative (EUSR) and to initiate the SAA talks with the EU. By spring 2005, the HR’s American deputy Donald Hayes returned to the US and started working on a plan for a comprehensive constitutional change.67

In Bosnia, the talks at the time of the anniversary were anticipated as possibly leading to the removal of entities altogether, through the creation of a Dayton II agreement. The European Stability Initiative (ESI) published a study in 2004 that argued for a dismantling of the Federation and the Republika Srpska and a ‘cantonization’ of the country, i.e., decentralization, unburdened by heavy bureaucracy, which would still guarantee proper representation of the three ethnic groups. In response, the Serb side had begun to argue for the sanctity of the Dayton agreement and the Dayton constitution. The president of the Republika Srpska, Kalinic of the SDS party, announced,

We cannot allow the Republika Srpska to become collateral damage of the alleged non-functionality of the Bosnian state.68

Milorad Dodik, once supported by the OHR, increased the stakes in the debate with his own proposition,

My proposition is that Bosnia and Herzegovina should be organized as a confederation of three ethnic Republics, all three of which have the right for self-determination, including secession.69

The reactions to the ESI proposal in Sarajevo and Mostar were overwhelmingly positive. The Bosniak leadership had argued for a rewriting of Dayton for years and the HDZ party had realized that the idea of a third entity could not become reality, especially in the aftermath of the earlier attempts to promote the idea of a Croat entity, such as the attempt in connection with the 2000 elections and the

---
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69 Ibid.
The HDZ was now arguing for a dismantling of the Federation and a proper representation in the state-level institutions. Nevertheless, as the Serb side rejected any proposals for rewriting the Dayton constitution, the OHR and other international agencies rejected the idea at the time. As the time for the tenth anniversary of Dayton approached, this idea was revived by the US state department, especially by Richard Holbrooke, who had expressed a desire to ‘set the record straight’ and correct the failures of Dayton before the US left Bosnia and handed over all responsibilities to the EU.

In preparation of the conference in Dayton, Holbrooke had put pressure on the Serb side inasmuch as he announced that the Republika Srpska was ‘a mistake’ made in Dayton and inasmuch as he, once again, argued for a ban against the SDS party, since it was obstructive and had protected the ICTY indicted war-criminal. Paddy Ashdown and the OHR reiterated the usual narratives of the historical importance and extreme urgency of reforms. The local authorities, on their part, anticipated the conference through radicalization of their standpoint – the Bosniaks argued that reforms must be comprehensive (that is, true reforms creating a strong state, not compromises), while the Serbs argued that the RS must be maintained. As the tenth anniversary approached, no agreement was reached and despite last minute negotiations, the parties agreed merely to put the constitutional reform on the table, i.e., to create a commission, similar to the earlier commissions on defence, security services and police reforms. In the following months, the commission met without success, due to the diametrically different standpoints of Bosniak and Serb delegations.

In the remaining months of the Paddy Ashdown’s tenure in Bosnia, the work of the commission on constitutional reform was in focus. Once again, a number of concessions were announced, resulting in lowered expectations and commentaries in the newspapers that described the whole process as yet another promise of reform that would lead to increased complexity of the Bosnian political system, rather than the opposite. As HR Paddy Ashdown left Bosnia in the spring of 2006, his approval rate was standing on a low 46 percent, lower than any measurement of support for any previous HR. Bosnians of all three ethnic
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groups welcomed his departure. Nevertheless, the OHR under the Ashdown mandate had successfully put Bosnia on the path to the EU membership and NATO. In addition, reform packages that were forced through were improving the situation on the ground, as did the imposed reforms of the earlier High Representatives. Most notably, the economic reforms and the introduction of indirect taxation were providing results in terms of improvements in the economy, despite the fact that the practice of expert-led commissions and the ‘depoliticization of politics’ were in effect contrary to Ashdown’s main goal of promotion of local ownership of the process.

Paddy Ashdown and the Euro-Atlantic Integration: Cultural Theory Analysis

The following section of this last empirical chapter consists of an analysis of the above described crisis and events that have defined the relationship between local and international actors in Bosnia, based on the framework for analysis presented in Chapter Four. The focus is once again on the position of local and international authorities and their changes on the social map from their position at the start of the Ashdown’s mandate, as depicted in the analysis of the previous chapter. There, it was concluded that the position of the OHR did not change as dramatically as had been announced in connection to the introduction of the concept of ownership and that the local socio-cultural context, although improved, did not dramatically change. Bosnia was still a society with high attraction for the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities, a society with a traditionalistic political culture, although improvements caused by numerous state-building policies that professionalized the administrative machinery, as well as change of government, somewhat widened the socio-cultural viability space.

Interactions and Change

As Paddy Ashdown arrived in Bosnia, he committed to the concept of ownership and he even translated the abstract concept to practical policies, for example, the decision to employ more Bosnian citizens in the OHR, to increase the transparency of the institution and to create new partnership relations with the local authorities. Once more, the HR restated that dependency syndrome must be reversed and that the Bosnian people and the local authorities must step up to the task and take control of their own country. This time, the intentions of
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the OHR were underscored by a clear message that the OHR would try to minimize the use of the Bonn Powers since they would cease to exist in just a couple of years. This represented a renewed attempt to move the OHR downwards on the social map, away from its position of guardian and protector. In initial interactions with the local authorities in connection to the elections of 2002, the new approach was put to the test. The OHR was remarkably passive: first choosing not to support the Alliance for Change and then, after the nationalist parties won the elections, the OHR under Ashdown started implementing ideas about local ownership through the new partnership relationship with the legitimate winners, the nationalist parties. It should be noted that there were no attempts to interfere with the electoral process through electoral engineering and political manoeuvring in the following coalition-building process, as it often occurred after the elections in the past. In difference to his predecessor, Ashdown opted to change the rhetoric, social relations and strategic behaviours, decisively and without delay. He thus avoided incoherencies in the approach of the OHR.

Directly after the elections, the reform process was pushed further by the OHR. This time all aspects of the process were connected to the future prospect of EU and NATO integration processes. In this way, the proposed reforms gained credibility and they forced the newly-elected nationalist parties to cooperate and embrace the reform process. The so-called ‘partnership with the people of Bosnia’ seemed to be working and the new approach of the OHR provided immediate positive results.

In terms of Cultural Theory, both the OHR and the local authorities changed their position on the social map, as illustrated in Figure 20 below. The OHR was leaving the hierarchical approach of the past and the local nationalist authorities were increasingly getting involved in the process. As they gained legitimacy, both through the overwhelming victory in the elections and through the fact that the OHR and other international agencies accepted them as legitimate representatives of the people, the nationalist parties were modernizing their agendas. The SDS, SDA and HDZ attempted to live up to the task and deliver what was asked from them and what they had promised in the election campaigns – comprehensive reforms and faster EU integration process. The OHR used the Bonn Powers more economically and changed the way it interfered in the process, from command and control from above, to facilitation of the process in joint commissions, i.e., in networks of actors that were based on inclusion of all parties as equals. In other words, the approach changed from a hierarchical, to a combined individualist-egalitarian approach, as illustrated in Figure 20 below.
The change was apparently positive as all involved actors realigned themselves according to the new rules of the game, that is, the ‘EU conditionality’ reform process combined with nationalist parties in power. There was a collective rise in self-esteem of the local elites, as the Bosnian political process started appearing as a more ‘normal’ political process, resembling more ‘normal’ European democracies. The earlier dominant nationalist discourses and metanarratives were weakened and the Bosnian state was regarded as being on the way to self-sustainability. The only negative development of this time was the break-up of the Alliance for Change and the general weakening of the non-nationalist opposition, which was shattered on all three sides in the 2002 elections. These parties, mainly the Socialist SDP, were breaking apart due to internal conflicts and their post-election position was one of isolation. Not only did the SDP lose the elections, it ceased to act as the strong voice of multi-ethnic opposition.

Nevertheless, this positive period of the lower position of the OHR on the social map lasted only a year or so. After the success of the Bulldozer commissions, presumably the greatest success of the Ashdown’s new approach, the nationalist parties found that the reform process was not leading down the path they desired. The Bosniak and Croat side believed that the OHR was offering too many concessions to the Serb side, while the Serbs found the reforms to be against their national interests, against the Republika Srpska. Furthermore, as every reform was deemed ‘crucial’, of a ‘historic importance’ and ‘extreme urgency’, all three sides started questioning the OHR’s role in the process, as the partnership increasingly seemed a partnership between a powerful OHR and obedient local authorities. In addition, the promised transparent, soft and equality-based approach of the OHR did not seem to become a
reality. Rather, the speeches of the OHR promising increased ownership and decreased importance of the OHR were seeming as a case of ‘stolen rhetoric’, i.e., merely a rhetoric tool used for strategic purposes, not a real change of approach.

Although the use of the Bonn Powers had decreased, the new EU conditionality and the way the joint commissions were constructed and functioned were as equally an intrusive and imposing intervention in the process as had been the Bonn Powers before. After the internationally-led commission made its proposal, the input of the local authorities was limited to accepting or rejecting it. In case of rejection, they were facing severe consequences, removals from office and bans on political activities. Once again, the local nationalist parties became the protectors of national interests, interpreting every proposed reform package into the ever-present questions of national identity, and partition versus integration of the state of Bosnia. After problems in the process grew and revealed themselves in the public debate, the OHR was forced to return to the Bonn Powers and to act as a controller of the process, while the nationalist parties seemed to have moved back to the realm of the fatalist social solidarity. This is best exemplified by a new strategy of the nationalist parties. Faced with ‘necessary’, ‘urgent’ and ‘historical’ reforms, the nationalist parties started stalling the process, avoiding the issues, rejecting the propositions of the commissions until the OHR involved itself and brokered a compromise, with the help of Bonn Powers.
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Thus, the next change of positions was a return to the original positions. Slowly, the local authorities, i.e., the three nationalist parties, once again returned to their original goals of protection of national interest, threatened by the imposed
reform process. Similarly, the OHR was once again pushed back to the socio-culturally viable high-grid high-group position of a guardian and controller. Once again, the OHR was operating in a command and control mode, in a ‘bossist’ manner, through top-down policies and without much regard for local input into the process. The announced change was merely cosmetic, a case of ‘stolen rhetoric’. All actors reacted to the new situation produced by the announced new approach of the OHR, but all actors eventually returned to their original positions, as illustrated in Figure 21 above. The second attempt to implement local ownership, although accompanied with concrete policies, failed.

**Effects on the Social Map**

At the time of Ashdown’s arrival, the Bosnian socio-cultural context was dominated by the high-grid social solidarities of fatalism and hierarchy in a strong alliance. Previous High Representatives have done much to improve the situation in Bosnia and they were successful in a number of cases, such as in the case of security, the media, the economy, and refugee return. The improvements were great, especially if compared with the uncertain and capricious context of the first couple post-war years, or the pacifying years of the frequently used Bonn Powers. Yet the local political culture was still functioning as it always had – through an alliance between nationalistic elites promoting the hierarchical social solidarity and a population that was mainly attracted to the fatalist social solidarity, although all the improvements on the ground made more socio-culturally pluralistic values and beliefs increasingly viable.
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The early interactions between the representatives of the international community and the newly elected local authorities produced a positive change of position of both local and international authorities. Similarly, the first successful reforms that were produced by the new relationship affected the local socio-cultural context in a positive way. The security services reform and the defence reform increased the beliefs in the viability of the Bosnian state. The Bulldozer Committees and their fast economic reforms strengthened the belief that the civil society (the people) can influence the big-picture, politics and general developments in the society. However, the consequent return of both local authorities and the representatives of the international community to the high-grid positions on the social map constituted yet another negative surprise – one more failure, most likely resulting in a reinforcement of the existent, dominant fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities. The Bosnian political culture, where the elites rule as they see fit while the population reacts with indifference, obedience and isolation from the public sphere had once again proven to be correct and viable, i.e., corresponding to the socio-cultural realities. In addition, the socio-cultural viability space was pushed downwards even more as the prospect of NATO and EU membership became reality in this period. Presumably, the low-grid voices promoting and defending the individualist and egalitarian meta-narratives were strengthened by these developments, as there was a realistic promise of a positive future, economic development and political stability. Yet even in this case, there was a disappointment towards the end of the Ashdown time in Bosnia, as the EU membership showed to be much further in the future, due to failure of the Bosnian elites to continue the path of reforms. Even when reforms were agreed upon and implemented, they consisted of compromises and thus failed to achieve their full potential, the changing of ineffective and complex DPA structures, thus failing to enable major socio-cultural changes in Bosnian politics. As Ashdown left Bosnia, the socio-cultural viability space was improved, but only slightly, as the positive start of his tenure was annulled by the continued practice of ‘boss-ism’ and control from above, thus reinforcing the attractions of the dominant high-grid solidarities, as illustrated in Figure 22 above.

Despite the fact that Bosnia can still be described as a society ruled from outside and incapable of taking charge of its own destiny, and although the basic question of national identity and the Bosnian state, i.e., the partition versus integration debate, still affects close every political decision in Bosnia whole six years after the introduction of the Bonn Powers - it must also be noted that the risk for renewed fighting in Bosnia seemed extremely small as the international community celebrated ten years since the Dayton Peace Agreement was signed and the post-conflict process had started. At that time, the fifth High Representative, German diplomat Christian Schwartz-Shilling, arrived to Bosnia after the Dayton anniversary, determined to become known as the last High Representative to Bosnia and Herzegovina.
In conclusion, a Cultural Theory analysis of the fourth period of international post-conflict intervention to Bosnia shows that: 1) the role of the OHR in process seemingly changed back to adhering to low-grid social solidarities at the start of the period, yet the OHR showed continued adherence to the hierarchical social solidarity in the continuation of the reform process, 2) the local nationalist elites seemed to have modernized at the start of the period, yet they went back to high-grid positions in the continuation of the reform process, and 3) the effect of these changes on the socio-cultural viability space was once again dual, as initial successes in the reform process resulted in improvements on the ground, while continued intrusive policies eventually reinforced the dominant socio-cultural alliance between the hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities.
Chapter Ten: Empirical Findings and Prospects for Future

This final empirical chapter consists of a concluding empirical analysis, where the findings of the case study are summarized. However, the first section of the chapter consists of a brief look at the current situation in Bosnia and possible future scenarios. Although not a major part of the final analysis, the unfolding events in Bosnia are indeed interesting and they too can be analyzed through the theoretical lens of the Cultural Theory framework.

At the time of HR Ashdown’s departure in 2006, the main issue in Bosnian politics was the process of constitutional reform. The German diplomat Christian Schwarz-Schilling arrived in Bosnia determined to become the last High Representative. It had been decided earlier, at the time of the tenth anniversary of the signing of the DPA, that the OHR would cease to exist and would replaced as soon as possible by the Office of the European Union Special Representative (EUSR) which would not have the sweeping Bonn Powers at its disposal. More than ten years earlier, Carl Bildt anticipated that he would be merely the first HR, even though the US government argued for a short and narrow involvement in post-war Bosnia. His successor, HR Carlos Westendorp, defined the goal of the OHR as ‘making itself obsolete’. HR Wolfgang Petritsch introduced the concept of ownership tied to the goal of making Bosnia self-sustainable, and he hoped that he might be the last HR. Paddy Ashdown openly talked about dismantling the OHR, but even he could not reach this goal. Now, ten years after the process, Schwarz-Schilling went much further and promised that he would be the last HR, as the OHR would cease to exist and the Bonn Powers would cease to function, in a near future.

In his first televised address, as the new HR, Schwarz-Schilling announced:

> You are aware that I may be the last High Representative. This function and this office will disappear in the near future. This should not be a cause of concern. We should all embrace this change as a reflection of the fact that a new chapter has opened in this country’s relationship with the wider world and in particular with the rest of Europe.¹

Nevertheless, the new HR continued to lobby the Bosnian parties to agree on constitutional reform. As had often occurred in the past, the parties met under the auspices of the OHR and the representatives of the US diplomatic presence

¹ OHR, "High Representative's TV Address to Citizens of BiH" in OHR Press Releases (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 31 January 2006).
in Bosnia and, once again, a compromise solution was forced through against the will of all parties. In May 2006, the agreement between the largest parties was sent to parliament for approval and it was rejected by a margin of two votes. All opposition parties voted against it and even one SDA Member of Parliament voted against the proposal and against his party, in order to stop the agreement.

Even under these circumstances, Schwarz-Schilling did not use his powers to impose the reform, nor did he punish the politicians that voted against it. He limited his actions to lobbying and advising the parties. One hundred days after the start of his mandate, in May of 2006, HR Schwarz-Schilling held a speech at the Bosnian parliament in which he reiterated the importance of ownership:

I made it clear on day one when I addressed the citizens of Bosnia and Herze- govina that I have come to assist, advise and advocate. I have kept that promise … I will not take decisions for those who do not have the courage to take them – this is a democracy, and Parliament must make up its own mind; I will not intervene every time the authorities fail to take up their responsibilities; In short, I will not do the jobs that the institutions and elected leaders of this country must do.

Clearly, HR Schwarz-Schilling did not intend to rely on the Bonn Powers, despite the inability of local authorities to agree on constitutional reform and despite the possible damage this might cause to Bosnian attempts to advance in the EU membership negotiations process. Since then, the fifth round of elections has been held in Bosnia and the three nationalist parties that agreed on the compromise regarding the constitutional reform have lost the elections. Having been continuously forced to compromise with each other throughout the time Lord Paddy Ashdown was the High Representative and during the crucial negotiations on constitutional reforms, these parties failed to project the image of ‘protectors of national interests’ to the members of their ethnic groups. As the SDP and the multi-ethnic non-nationalist opposition were marginalized after the elections in 2002, the people chose a third option, the option of smaller nationalist parties. Earlier considered as moderates, Dodik in the Republika Srpska and Silajdzic in the Federation both ran on platforms that resembled the old platforms of the SDA and the SDS. For example, Dodik argued that constitutional reform could not take place until there was a referendum regarding the status of Republika Srpska; Silajdzic argued that constitutional reforms must include a reorganization of the country according to civic, rather than ethnic principles, meaning a reintegration of Republika Srpska. Some observers have
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noted that the Bosnian political process is where it was years ago, as nationalist tensions came back to the surface in the 2006 elections, with the difference that the OHR increasingly avoids getting involved in the political process.

Thus, it remains to be seen if this last attempt to foster ownership and to transfer control to local authorities will be a success or a failure. More importantly, it remains to be seen how the OHR reacts in case of a failure. Will the new HR give up his strategy and once again start acting as a guardian and protector? So far, there are indications that Schwarz-Schilling does indeed intend to make the OHR and its Bonn Powers obsolete. Furthermore, he has repeatedly stated that this fear is exaggerated and that Bosnia has gone a long way towards self-sustainability. As he assessed the situation in his weekly column,

In the late 1990s, the international community held the purse strings. Bosnia and Herzegovina survived by international subsidy and the domestic authorities were financially and politically dependent on the international community. This is no longer the case. Today, the bulk of government revenue comes from conventional sources, principally the value added tax. Bosnia and Herzegovina is no longer financially dependent on foreigners. Nor is it politically dependent. The PIC, through my office, makes fewer and fewer political interventions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. More and more important decisions are taken exclusively by domestic leaders and institutions.

Clearly, Bosnia is on the way towards self-reliance and self-sustainability, not the least due to the OHR imposed reform packages. Yet, there are also indications that local authorities cannot take ownership of the process and that Bosnian political system still needs intervention from the outside in order to function, since the nationalist elites still rule the country and politics still function as they did in the early days of the post-conflict process, focusing almost exclusively on the issues of national identity. Although not as horrible as post-war fear-mongering and hate-speech, the nationalistic discourses are still ever present in the Bosnian public debate and the hierarchy-fatalism alliance still constitutes the Bosnian political culture. Even after the OHR with its Bonn Powers is closed for good, the question remains if the future office of the EUSR can sit back and allow Bosnian elected politicians to rule as they wish, or if it will have to resort to intrusive involvement, either through Bonn Powers, expert commissions or some other command and control governance tool.

8 OHR, "Replacing the Push of Dayton with the Pull of Brussels" in HR Articles (Sarajevo: OHR Archives, 20 October 2006).
Summary of Empirical Findings

The starting point of the concluding analysis of the Bosnian case are the four sections found at the end of each empirical chapter. There are found the four different periods of the process analysed in more detail, resulting in graphic descriptions of the movements of different actors on the social map and the changes of the socio-cultural context. Here, the focus is on the entire process. The findings of the empirical chapters are summarized in general trends, which are sorted thematically, starting with the changing role of the international presence in Bosnia, continuing with the changing Bosnian socio-cultural context and finishing with an analysis of dynamics in the relationship between the representatives of the international community and the local socio-cultural context, in an unveiling of a ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’.

Changing Role of the OHR

The role of the international community in Bosnian politics, as embodied in the Office of the High Representative, has changed a number of times in the ten years that are included in this study, starting from the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement until 2006.

The OHR started its activities as a coordinating body, with the mandate to organize the collective international effort in the early stages of the post-conflict process. At that time, the process was defined as the ‘implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement’. The first High Representative Carl Bildt tried to influence the local socio-cultural context through negotiations, where he attempted to fill the vacant position of a promoter of low-grid social solidarities of individualism and egalitarianism, arguing for rationality, necessity of economic transition and development, integration, cooperation, and even reconciliation. After only a couple of months, the OHR became much more involved in the process than it had been envisioned by the architects of the DPA. The OHR started influencing the behaviour of the local political actors through the ‘conditionality principle’, where aid was offered to those who complied with the requests of the international actors and those who did not were excluded from the internationally sponsored reconstruction projects. This first major change of the preferred approach occurred due to the failure of the joint commissions and consensus-based negotiations, the strategic behaviour consistent with the egalitarian social solidarity. The solution was sought in the introduction of the individualistically-biased policy implementation tool of financial carrots-and-sticks, typical market mechanisms of pricing and ‘choice-ism’ type policy process. After initial successes of the conditionality principle, this strategic behaviour became the primary tool used to influence the local socio-cultural context. Furthermore, an analysis of other aspects of the process in this first period shows that it was not only the preferred strategic behaviour that changed, but also there was a change in the preferred social relations and the cultural bias.
The egalitarian-defined goals of the process were not voiced as strongly as they were at the start of the process, while the individualist-biased perceptions became the guiding paradigm of the OHR. The focus was increasingly being put on elections, election procedures, market mechanisms, freedom of information and freedom of movement; while reconciliation between the ethnic groups, based on justice and achieved through dialogue, became a secondary goal of the process. Analyzed with the help of the Cultural Theory framework, this change is interpreted as a shift from a combined individualist-egalitarian approach to an individualist approach. The economic conditionality period of the process was characterized by economic incentives, the egocentric network type of social relations and the beliefs that economic development, election procedures and market mechanisms could provide results. In other words, biases, relations and behaviours were consistent first and foremost with the individualist social solidarity.

The second major change of the OHR’s role occurred two years into the process, with the introduction of the Bonn Powers in late 1997. The OHR was granted executive and legislative powers, in order to push the process further when local actors were unable to do so. In addition, the OHR had the power to remove individuals from office if they were ‘anti-Dayton’, i.e., if they worked or spoke against the policies of the representatives of the international community. Although initially successful, the earlier individualistic approach failed in the long run and ceased to provide results. Consequently, the entire process came into question and the OHR increasingly acted in an 
\textit{ad-hoc} crisis management mode, without the ability to control the capricious Bosnian politics. The change of approach was necessary in order to push the process further and to avoid being drawn to the attractions of the fatalist social solidarity. This shift was the most dramatic change in the character of international involvement in Bosnia. An analysis based on the Cultural Theory analytical framework interprets this change as a change from an individualist biased to a hierarchical biased approach, which can be explained as a case of socio-cultural change provoked by first and foremost repeated failures, and also, through ‘stolen strategic behaviour’. Carlos Westendorp initially attempted to use the Bonn Powers economically, but most of his attempts to abstain from using them failed and the OHR reluctantly increased the use of its newly gained authority. At first, only strategic behaviour changed and, thereafter, the preferred social relations and the cultural bias changed as well. The reorganization of the OHR testifies to the attempts to organize in hierarchically structured pyramids, with a clear division of competencies and powerful command and control mechanisms. In addition, policy process was a top-down ‘boss-ism’ endeavour, where the PIC and the OHR decided on policy without input from the local society. Regarding the goals of the process, the early ideas about reconciliation through dialogue, which were replaced with the ideas about integration through the economic interdependence a couple of months into the process, were now being replaced with the idea of integration through ‘institution-building’, which emerged
around the time of the introduction of the Bonn Powers. This new catch phrase in the process was a part of broadening the OHR’s scope beyond the implementation of the particular provisions of the Dayton. The entire process was being redefined from a ‘Dayton implementation process’, to a ‘peace implementation process’.

The third identifiable change in the role of the OHR occurred with the introduction of the ‘concept of ownership’ in 1999, when the OHR attempted to influence the local political scene in a manner that would promote accountability, reversing the unwanted side effects of the Bonn Powers, namely the widespread dependency syndrome. In addition, the protectorate-like arrangement created by Carlos Westendorp was not coherent with the underlying cultural bias of the representatives of the international community. Thus, the new HR Wolfgang Petritsch committed himself to principles of democracy and democratization immediately upon arrival in Bosnia, and he expressed his doubts that the current role of the OHR in the process was productive in the long run. However, the introduction of the concept of ownership did not produce the expected result. Although it was meant to reduce the importance of the OHR in the local political system, it soon became clear that the following period was the period of the most intrusive international intervention, as the OHR and the OSCE attempted to remove the nationalist parties from power. There were some efforts to abstain from using the Bonn Powers in order for the local authorities to assume the ownership of the process, but this policy was not successful due to the inability of local elites to do so. Thus, the OHR increasingly imposed decisions and removed officials from office, despite constant rhetoric of local empowerment. Even after the Alliance for Change came to power in the 2000 elections, the OHR continued to act in a protectorate-like manner as a guardian of the democratic process, controlling the behaviour of local authorities. Once again, the HR perceived the Bonn Powers as a temporary necessary evil, which was not consistent with the underlying values and beliefs of the representatives of the international community, used only in order to achieve short-term policy effectiveness. However, even under the Petritsch’s tenure, in which the OHR had introduced the concept of ownership, it ended up increasing the usage of Bonn Powers, attempting to restructure the international machinery in even more pyramid-like social relations and placing an even stronger focus on institution-building and institutional control of the local authorities through yet another broadening of the OHR mandate. In other words, the change of rhetoric was followed by a failed change of strategic behaviours and social relations – resulting in a prolonged period of socio-cultural inconsistency, which ended with a return to socio-culturally viable position of a guardian. In that, the process was broadened once again and the ‘implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement’ that had become ‘peace implementation’, was now redefined in terms of a ‘state-building’ agenda.

The fourth identifiable change was the reintroduction of the ownership principle as the main concept for definition of the role of OHR in Bosnian politics,
after the arrival of Paddy Ashdown, the third High Representative. This time, ownership included a comprehensive and coherent change, as both relations, biases and behaviours seemed to have changed. This is exemplified by three different changes in the OHR’s approach. First, there was a full recognition of the election results, signalling a turn away from protectorate-like involvement to a full respect for the democratic process. Thus, the nationalist elites were accepted as rightful representatives of the people in connection to their win in the 2002 elections and this was the first time in the post-war period that the representatives of the international community did not try to limit their power and/or remove them from power. Second, there was a renewed and strengthened commitment of the OHR to make itself obsolete inasmuch as Ashdown announced a rescaling of the OHR into a smaller organization that would employ an increased number of Bosnian citizens, rather than international staff. Third, the conditionality principle was re-introduced, this time in the much broader process of the ‘Euro-Atlantic integration’. The prospect of EU and NATO membership was offered in return for acceptance of internationally introduced reform packages. Once again, the local ownership was promoted as imperative for the future of the process and once again, the new High Representative found the role of the OHR in the Bosnian political system uncomfortable, as it was not coherent with his underlying values and beliefs. But similarly as in the case of the OHR under the leadership of Wolfgang Petritsch, the incoherency between the cultural bias of the new High Representative and the learned strategic behaviour of the OHR (Bonn Powers) was not easily eradicated. The socio-cultural context dictated that a return to individualistic and/or egalitarian approach was still socio-culturally unviable, as the local elites failed to take ownership of the process, and there was thus a return to the hierarchical approach. Towards the end of his mandate, even Ashdown increasingly started to act and speak as a protector, guardian and a controller, achieving socio-cultural coherency, but not in a low-grid position, as had been announced at the start of this period, but rather in high-grid high-group position of the protector. This is exemplified by the practice of ‘de-politization of politics’, through strict EU conditionality, where local authorities had virtually no ability to influence the political process. Although defined in the words of the conditionality principle, this approach was still based on command and control management, top-down ‘boss-ist’ policy style controlled by the representatives of the international community, i.e., still corresponding with the hierarchical social solidarity. At the end, many observers noted that Lord Paddy Ashdown ruled Bosnia through command and control, from above, as much or more than any other High Representative before him, although he did not use Bonn Powers as much as his predecessors.

The fifth, possibly last change in the character of the process started occurring towards the end of period under investigation, around the tenth anniversary of the Dayton Peace Agreement, with the arrival of the present, and presumably the last HR to Bosnia, Christian Schwarz-Schilling. As indicated at
the beginning of his mandate, the fifth HR openly promoted the idea of closing
down the OHR. Until the conditions for this are achieved, the new High
Representative promised a non-intrusive international presence, limited only to
intervention if the peace and stability are directly threatened. Similarly as had
his predecessors, the present High Representative finds the hierarchical
approach uncomfortable and contrary to the underlying values and beliefs of
most representatives of the international community. However, it remains to be
seen how successful this approach is going to be, as there are indications that
closing of the OHR is possible, yet there are also indications that this policy will
fail, as important issues such as the constitutional reform are still being debated
in Bosnian parliaments. The proposed dismantling of the OHR could result in
the self-sustainability of the Bosnian state, but it could also lead to a new
disappointment, where the EUSR once again resorts to using direct regulation,
or internationally chaired expert commissions where solutions are forced upon
local authorities, and, therefore, once again reinforces the strength of the alliance
between the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities in the local society.
Again, the question is whether the OHR can achieve a coherent move down the
grid dimension, towards individualistic and/or egalitarian approach, or whether
the local socio-cultural context will force the OHR to remain in the position of
the protector and guardian.

The different approaches used by the different High Representatives, out-
lined in Figure 23 below, correspond to the ideal types of international inter-
vention outlined in the Chapter Three and specified in the operationalization in
Figure 7, Chapter Four. In Bosnia, the individualist approach was used by Carl
Bildt, through the economic conditionality approach. The hierarchical approach
was expressed by the Bonn Powers that were introduced and used by Carlos
Westendorp. Thereafter, both Wolfgang Petritsch and Paddy Ashdown unsuc-
cessfully attempted to introduce the concept of ownership and, thereby, change
the role of the OHR in the process. Petritsch continued using the Bonn Powers
in an intrusive manner in order to remove the nationalist from power, and then
continued using the Bonn Powers as a result of the failure of the Alliance for
Change to take ownership of the process. Yet another variation of the
hierarchical approach was the strict EU-conditionality utilized by Ashdown, as it
did not allow meaningful local input in the policy process. Although not directly
through the Bonn Powers, solutions to political and social problems were still
being imposed from the above. The egalitarian social solidarity was expressed
through the joint civilian commissions at the start of the process, but also
through proposed ideas of ownership, unsuccessfully promoted by both Petritsch
and Ashdown at the start of their mandates. Finally, the fatalist social solidarity
is exemplified by short periods of time when the instruments used by the
representatives of the international community did not produce result and the
OHR was forced to manage day-to-day crises in an ad-hoc manner. This
approach, or lack of approach, was visible in the later periods of Bildt’s time in
office before the OHR received the authority of the Bonn Powers, but also to a degree in the latter periods of tenures of all three High Representatives.

The analysis of position of the OHR on the Bosnian social map, simplified and summarized in general trends, shows a movement from a low position in between the individualistic and egalitarian singularities at the very start of the process, to individualism and, after that, to hierarchy through a short period of fatalism. Thereafter, the movement towards low-grid positions has been announced and attempted through the concept of ownership, but this policy has not provided dramatic results yet. Rather, the position of the OHR was stabilized close to the border between socio-culturally viable and socio-culturally unviable position. In most aspects, following most variables outlined in the theoretical operationalization, the development of the international intervention to Bosnia seems to have followed this path. The representatives of the international community started organizing in networks, changed to hierarchical pyramids and since the later period of Westendorp’s tenure in Bosnia, they are unsuccessfully trying to step down from the top of the pyramid and empower the local authorities. The preferred strategic behaviour was consensus-based negotiations within the joint commissions at the start of the process, only to change to a strict economic conditionality of ‘aid for compliance’ and to thereafter change to regulation from above, through the Bonn Powers. In the era of the mantra of ownership, the preferred strategic behaviour went back to conditionality and it was accompanied with the attempts to restrain the use of direct regulation and direct correction of the behaviour of the local political elites. However, this resulted in temporary success, as each attempt to promote ownership resulted in failure and a reinforced hierarchical approach of protectorate-like involvement. The perception of the international peacebuilders’ role in the process was
initially as assistants or teachers, than it changed to guardians and controllers and, ever since, there have been failed attempts to reinstate the initial perception of being assistants and teachers, rather than guardians. The goal of the process was first defined as integration and increased freedoms, then as an institutional order and stability and, more recently; it has been re-defined as integration through state-building and constitutional reforms. All the changes followed each other, in a way roughly illustrated in Figure 24 below.

![Figure 24 – Movement of the OHR on the Social Map](image)

The changing role of the OHR and the other representatives of the international community can be understood and explained in two different stages, which explain two general trends in the process. They can be understood as results of the search for viability and as result of an inherited strive for coherency. In both cases, the changes can be understood as induced by the socio-cultural context.

The initial position of the OHR, as adherents of the individualist and egalitarian social solidarity, was not a socio-culturally viable position at that time. Thus, the introduced policies failed to achieve their goals. The representatives of the international community had to move to a position within the socio-cultural viability space in order to function, influence events and produce desired outcomes. Therefore, the early failures led to learning and the OHR changed its preferred behaviours, relations and then it changed its underlying values and beliefs. The support for this understanding of the role of the OHR is found in the early periods of the process, under the OHR leadership of Carl Bildt and Carlos Westendorp. Consider the crises surrounding the transfer of Sarajevo suburbs, the removal of Radovan Karadzic from the scene, introduction of common state symbols, restructuring the media and most of the other major events in Bosnian politics in 1996, 1997 and even in 1998. In most of those instances, the
egalitarian and individualistic approaches failed to produce desired results and the OHR was increasingly drawn towards the effectiveness of the viable, hierarchical approach of ‘boss-ist’ command from above. Thus, it can be said that the socio-cultural context forced a change of the approach of the OHR. Though the protectorate role was not desired, it was necessary in order to tackle the challenges presented by the local socio-cultural context, which could not be managed by the earlier, nonviable low-grid approaches.

In the second case, the changes can be understood as a constant strive for coherency, towards the low-grid position of egalitarian and/or individualistic social solidarity. The protectorate-like arrangements and the Bonn Powers are inconsistent with the cultural biases underpinning the practice of peacebuilding. It is for that reason that Westendorp attempted to use Bonn Powers economically and Petritsch, Ashdown and most recently Schwarz-Schilling attempted to promote the concept of ownership, i.e., to move the OHR away from the hierarchical position of the protector and guardian. The support for this understanding of the role of the OHR is found in the fact that ever since the Bonn Powers were introduced, the High Representatives repeatedly attempted to limit their own role in the process, admittedly finding the position in the top right corner of the map uncomfortable. Nevertheless, they failed to move downwards, as this position continues to be the most socio-culturally viable, enabling productive and efficient policies. In other words, the local socio-cultural context makes a change of the approach impossible and it forces every arriving High Representative to adapt his cultural bias and his preferred way of creating social relations to the effective strategic behaviour, rather than allowing him to change the behaviour accordingly to his own cultural bias. Continued protectorate is actively resisted, yet it remains the only effective way of managing the local society as local ownership still has not taken hold. In other words:

*Both in the case when change of the position of the OHR on the Bosnian social map occurred, as well as in the case change was attempted without success, the position of the OHR can be explained as directly dependent on the local socio-cultural context.*

The next step in the concluding analysis of the Bosnian case is to take a closer look at the Bosnian socio-cultural context and the impact the representatives of the international community had on it in the ten years of the post-conflict process. The question here is whether the local socio-cultural context changed due to the international policies and the attempts of the OHR to provoke and promote a broad social and political transformation.

**Stable Socio-Cultural Context**

Throughout the ten years of the Bosnian post-war process, the local political elites were rarely proactive, changing purposely from within. For the most part,
they have been reactive to the actions of the representatives of the international community. Following the changing position of the international agencies, the local nationalist elites changed their position on the map along the group dimension, without changing down on the grid dimension, as illustrated in the Figure 25 below. Only in the case of the 2002 elections was there a temporary exception, when the nationalist parties tried to modernize their agendas.

![Figure 25 – Movement of the Local Elites on the Social Map](image)

At the start of the process, the local nationalist elites positioned themselves as adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity. They accepted this position as their natural role, as they perceived themselves as protectors of their own ethnic groups, as guardians of the perceived national interests and as undisputed rulers by virtue of their war-time merits. At first, they responded to the international involvement through a reinforcement of their adherence to the hierarchical social solidarity, positioning themselves against the competing social solidarities of individualism and egalitarianism, represented by the arriving international agencies. At this point, the strategy was providing results, an increased support of the electorate and an increased ability to pursue the national interests in a credible manner. Later, when the OHR received the Bonn Powers and moved to the upper right corner of the social map, this position became crowded, so to speak. With the newly won powers, the representatives of the international community successfully diminished the possibilities for nationalistic agendas to become realities, as the election legislation, dismantling of the Herzeg-Bosna project and the Brcko arbitration decision made both the Bosniak, the Croat and the Serb national interests unreachable. As a result, the local nationalist elites moved to the fatalist corner of the social map, attempting to remain in power without producing policy and governance. This is exemplified by their inability
and unwillingness to produce reforms, and by their obstruction of the OHR introduced and imposed policies. In connection to every crisis and every major event in Bosnian politics, they disagreed at first in order to be perceived as the protectors of the people, and thereafter, they accepted whatever decision was imposed and enforced by the OHR, in order to remain in power, i.e., not be accused of being ‘anti-Dayton’ and thus risk being removed from office. This practice of subordination and a withdrawal from the debate is typical for the adherents of the fatalist social solidarity.

The second movement of the local nationalist elites occurred in connection to the 2000 elections. The OHR and OSCE intervention in the electoral process created the possibilities for an Alliance for Change to win in the 2000 elections. In addition, there were significant improvements regarding the freedom of speech, freedom of movement and so forth, which were the result of the policies implemented with the help of the Bonn Powers. The combined result of the electoral engineering and the frequent use of the Bonn Powers weakened the nationalist parties, who increasingly adhered to the fatalist social solidarity and were thus becoming less legitimate protectors of national interests. In the 2000 elections, the support for the non-nationalist alternative increased and although the opposition did not win an overwhelming majority of the vote, the new government was installed with the help of the OHR and OSCE. Thus, there was a promise of local ownership of the process. However, the alliance failed to reach this goal in the following two year period and the OHR had to resort to the Bonn Powers on a number of occasions in order to push the process further. In addition, the Alliance for Change continuously rejected responsibility and asked for the support of the OHR, as the OHR had the power to impose reforms and avoid the parliamentary process. Due to the refusal of the OHR to comply with such requests, the Alliance for Change and the OHR ended up in conflict. Towards the end of the Petritsch mandate, it became clear that ownership was not working and the end result of the first attempt to introduce this concept was an increase in the strength of the fatalist social solidarity. The fatalist prophecy regarding irrelevance of democracy had once again proven superior to the image of democracy represented by other social solidarities, as there were little or no positive changes resulting from the change of government.

At the same time, the nationalist elites recognized the change of the socio-cultural context, increased freedom of movement, freedom of information, improved security and improved economic situation. The context was no longer extremely high-grid hierarchical and fatalist alliance and the three nationalist parties regrouped and reorganized accordingly, modernizing their agendas and changing their leaderships. As the 2002 elections approached, their speech was not based exclusively on the fatalist and hierarchical cultural biases, such as hate speech, spread of fear and the narratives of protection of the people. Although still mostly consistent with the high-grid social solidarities, the language of the nationalist elites also included some elements of the individualist and even the egalitarian cultural bias, as they (for the first time since their founding) started
campaigning on ideas for reforms and economic development agendas, as well as they opened up for the possibility of cooperation with the nationalist elites of other ethnic groups. Thus, the approach of the nationalist elites changed towards a slightly more culturally pluralistic approach and their position seemingly moved towards the centre of the social map, as illustrated in Figure 25. Thereafter, in 2002, the three nationalist parties won an overwhelming support of the electorate and they formed a partnership relation with the OHR under the leadership of Paddy Ashdown, promising to work on the coming comprehensive reforms. Nevertheless, after they successfully negotiated a few major reform packages introduced by the OHR as a condition for Euro-Atlantic integration, these elites returned to the practice of acting as the protectors of their own groups, through obstruction of the interests of other groups to gain ground and through obstruction of the international community’s policies if they were not in line with the agenda of their own ethnic group. Strict Euro-Atlantic integration conditionality was working, but only to a degree. When the OHR proposed major state-building reforms, nationalist interests revealed themselves and the reform process stalled once again.

As the positions of the representatives of the international community and the Bosnian nationalist elites changed on the Bosnian social map, the strengths and weaknesses of different social solidarities in the Bosnian society changed as well. At the start of the process, when Bosnia was a capricious, insecure and dangerous place, the Bosnian socio-cultural context was an extremely narrow alliance between the hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities, with little or no input from the low-grid social solidarities. Throughout the first couple of years of the process, the changes of the socio-cultural viability space were rather limited. There was no significant strengthening of the low-grid social solidarities. Over time, as the international policies started weakening the grip of the nationalist parties and as there were practical, tangible improvements in the Bosnian society (for example the improved situation in the economy, media, local administration and judiciary), the socio-cultural viability space started stretching downwards. Although incrementally, the lower positions on the map were becoming more viable and more adherents of the low-grid solidarities found that their input was valued. For example, the non-nationalist opposition gained support for their narratives in connection to the elections in 2000, and even the local intellectual elites and the local civil society started developing a voice that was influencing the public sphere and acting as an opposition to the ethno-nationalist narratives of the dominant political parties. In addition, the nationalist parties attempted to change from within, to move towards the pluralist centre of the map. Throughout the process, the stretching of the socio-cultural viability space has been gradual and difficult. For the most part, the reforms, public awareness campaigns, intervention in electoral process and other attempts to alter the local political environment mostly produced poor results and unwanted side effects. There were only a few dramatic improvements, all of which were results of the most intrusive instances of use of the Bonn Powers,
namely, the reform packages that effectively removed the power of nationalist structures from different areas of public life, such as the reform of the media, and the judiciary; and the reforms that changed the rules of the political game, such as the Brcko decision, the election legislation or the dismantling of Herzeg-Bosna parallel structures. Other than in those cases, the reforms either failed, or succeeded after prolonged debates that ended up in OHR imposed compromise solutions, thus producing negative side-effect of strengthened dominant social solidarities.

![Figure 26 – Changes of the Socio-Cultural Viability Space](image)

In retrospect, it can be said that ten years after the process started, the socio-cultural viability space in the Bosnian society is much wider. It stretches from the fatalist to the hierarchical social solidarity, but it also includes the more pluralistic middle of the map. The strength of the fatalist and the hierarchical singularities is somewhat weakened, while the strength of the individualist and egalitarian social solidarities is somewhat strengthened. Still, it must also be concluded that, even though the socio-cultural viability space has been stretched and the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities have been weakened towards the end of the studied period, Bosnia is still a society dominated by a fatalism-hierarchy alliance. Politics still function in a similar manner as before and the basic traditionalist Bosnian political culture has not been radically changed yet. As outlined in the brief historical overview in Chapter Five, this political culture originates from the times of the Turkish rule, through the Austrian occupation, the first and the second Yugoslavia, throughout the post-communist democratization, the war and the post-war Dayton context. It seems to have prevailed despite the changes of the political system, the new Dayton constitution, the post-war economic growth and the prospect of the membership
in the EU and NATO. Bosnian politics are still based on the same premise of a population that is not politically active through the civil society, an electorate that supports the strong hierarchical structures, which promise the protection of the national interests. Moreover, the elites still use the discourses of national interests in order to gain support, and the public debate is still essentially revolving around the centuries old identity issues and the decades old issues of constitutional status of the state of Bosnia and its three ethnic groups. Thus,

The analysis of changes in the local socio-cultural context leads to the conclusion that the changes were merely changes in degree (of the strengths of different social solidarities), not in character (of the political culture).

The above analysis of the changing position of the OHR and the representatives of the international community, combined with the analysis of the changes of the local socio-cultural context and its socio-cultural viability space, leads to the unveiling of the socio-cultural viability dilemma of international intervention to Bosnia and the first major conclusion of this thesis. It is concerned with the influence of the international intervention on the local social context and, vice-versa, the influences of the local socio-cultural context on the agencies leading the international intervention.

Unveiling the Socio-Cultural Viability Dilemma

The analysis of the case of Bosnia shows that the interactions between the representatives of the international community and the local socio-cultural context actually resulted in a dynamic that was contrary to what was expected at the start of the process. The role of the international agencies in the process was meant to assist and catalyze the transition from a war-torn, non-democratic, authoritarian and nationalist ruled society towards a more pluralistic, developed, democratic, tolerant and peaceful society. Translated into the terminology of the Cultural Theory and its social map model, the international intervention was supposed to transform the dominant authoritarian and traditionalistic alliance of the fatalist and hierarchist social solidarities into a pluralistic alliance of the individualist, egalitarian and hierarchical social solidarities, with as limited input of the fatalist social solidarity as possible. This transition has not yet occurred. Although there are significant improvements in the Bosnian socio-cultural context (notably, it is no longer immersed in the horrendous conditions of war), the degree of social change has not arrived at the point that the international presence has been made obsolete, due to the fact that contemporary Bosnian politics are, in many regards, similar to the Bosnian politics of the wartime and the immediate post-war context. Indeed, most international policies led to changes that have been positive for Bosnia, but they were slow and painful. Moreover, they produced a number of negative side effects such as the emergence of the dependency syndrome and the reinforcement of the traditional
Bosnian political culture, primarily through repeated confirmation of the fatalist prophecies regarding the irrelevance of democracy and repeated confirmation of the hierarchical argument based on image of endangered national interests. In addition, the actions of the representatives of the international community have repeatedly demonstrated that the hierarchical approach produces policy outcome, as their command and control, top-down ‘boss-ist’ approach repeatedly proved to be the only way the society could be meaningfully governed.

Among the changes that have happened over these last ten years, the most notable has been the socio-cultural change within the agencies representing the international community. The international agencies shifted from adhering to the individualistic and egalitarian social solidarities towards adhering to the hierarchically social solidarity. Each of the three attempts to go back towards the low-grid biased role of assistants, teachers, facilitators and coordinators; rather than guardians and controllers, has failed (the results of the last attempt is not evident yet). The question is thus ‘Who is changing whom?’ A Cultural Theory analysis points to a fact that instead of a change in the local socio-cultural context promoted by the international intervention, the local socio-cultural context has provoked a change in the approach of the international agencies. Their cultural bias, preferred social relations and preferred strategic behaviour changed in a much more dramatic way. Moreover, the attempts of Petritsch and Ashdown to move back towards the low-grid approaches have failed, due to the fact that the local socio-cultural context has not changed to a sufficient degree, making the low-grid positions nonviable. Thus, despite the expressed low-grid values and beliefs of each of the High Representatives upon their arrival in Bosnia, the socio-cultural viability of the hierarchical strategic behaviours (protectorate-like intervention and the Bonn Powers) has led each of the High Representatives to learn and change accordingly, and there is still a risk that the last High Representative will learn and change as his predecessors did.

In other words, the OHR seems to be stuck in an unresolved socio-cultural viability dilemma, which causes problems in the understanding of its own identity and its own role in the process. Once again, the socio-cultural viability dilemma is caused by the discrepancy between the dominant solidarities in the local socio-cultural context and the social solidarities adhered to by those intervening and attempting to promote a change in the local socio-cultural context. In the case of Bosnia, the dominant high-grid social solidarities in the Bosnian society and in Bosnian politics make the presence of individualistic and/or egalitarian international agencies unviable, resulting in complete failures of their policies. On the other hand, when international agencies adapt and change, their policies become viable and produce outcome, but the main effect of a viable approach is a reinforcement of the social solidarities already dominating the society, thus making the goal of a long-term socio-cultural change less probable. As expressed by one of the international officials in Bosnia, the
representatives of the international community “... went there to teach, they stayed to learn, they are learning still.”

The fact that the change of the OHR and other international agencies from adhering to the low-grid social solidarities to top-right corner of the hierarchical social solidarity, as well as the failure of the attempts to move back to low-grid position, combined with the lack of comprehensive socio-cultural change in the local socio-cultural context leads to the conclusion that:

There was indeed a socio-cultural viability dilemma facing the representatives of the international community, throughout the ten years of the post-conflict process in Bosnia Herzegovina.

This understanding of the socio-cultural viability dilemma of the international presence in Bosnia can be used to explain a number of problems in the Bosnian post-conflict process, and it can be used to evaluate the broader goals of the entire post-conflict process. Moreover, it can be used for the purpose of analytic generalization, as a tool for understanding of international peacebuilding as such.

---

Chapter Eleven: Final Analysis and Summary of Conclusions

This thesis used the Cultural Theory framework as a theoretical springboard, applying it to the Bosnian post-conflict process in order to answer the three research questions stated in Chapter One. In particular, the thesis has examined the role of the Office of the High Representative in the ten-year long period following the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement. In so doing, the context of the Bosnian post-conflict process has been sketched. This final chapter consists of the study’s final analysis and conclusions, including a discussion regarding the possible generalizations of the findings of the case study and a discussion regarding the performance of the theoretical approach. Its objective is to address the research questions and, consequently, fulfil the purpose of the study, as defined in Chapter One.

At this junction, it is worthwhile to bear in mind that the purpose of this thesis was to ‘unveil the socio-cultural viability dilemma facing international civilian intervention in war-torn societies’. This was realized through the theoretical lens of the Cultural Theory framework, which was applied to the theory and practice of international intervention in war-torn societies. Thereafter, the explanatory value of this approach was tested in the case study of post-conflict process in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The research questions derived from the statement of purpose were defined as:

1. Is there a ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ in the post-conflict intervention in Bosnia? Can Cultural Theory and its grid-group model be used to assess the impact of international presence in this process?

2. Can an understanding of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ enhance the understanding of international post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies? What is the essence of modern international peacebuilding?

3. Can a study of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ of international intervention in post-war societies contribute to the Cultural Theory framework itself? Can socio-cultural change be imposed?

The first of the above three research questions is concerned with the interpretations of the findings of the case study. In other words, the question asks: How can this particular theoretical approach contribute to the understanding of
the role of the international community during the ten years of Bosnian post-conflict process? Can it be used to evaluate the project – if so, in which way? Considering the current state of affairs in post-war Bosnia, especially considering the views regarding the role of the OHR, it is the contention of this study that the Cultural Theory analysis of the international experiences in Bosnia can serve as an answer to the question of success or failure.

The second research question is concerned with the analytical generalization of the findings of the case study. In other words, the question asks: What can this particular theoretical approach contribute to the understanding of the studied phenomena, international intervention in war-torn societies? Can it say something about the essence of post-conflict peacebuilding?

The third research question is concerned with the exploration and refinement of the theory based on the case study. In other words, the question asks: How well does the theory perform its tasks? Can this case study in some way improve the validity of the theory, its logic regarding the mechanisms of socio-cultural change? The answers to these three research questions are combined in order to conclude the study, to address the meaning and importance of socio-cultural viability in peacebuilding and, thereby, to fulfil the general purpose of this thesis.

**Cultural Theory Analysis – Evaluating the Process in Bosnia Herzegovina**

Descriptions of the Bosnian post-conflict problems are usually focused on the fact that the society remains divided along ethnic lines and that the same (or similar) political parties that had once led their people to war against their neighbours are still in power, pursuing the same (or similar) agendas. It has been argued that the same ethnic conflict continues, only with political means. Furthermore, the political system created in Dayton barely functions, as local power structures still remain unwilling to cooperate with each other. The state is unable to provide the public goods to a degree that would enable a description of the Bosnian state as a strong state. Rather, Bosnia still represents a failed or a weak state. Many observers point to the fact that the political stability is not at a satisfactory level and Bosnia’s political system is often described as being inherently unstable, probably unsustainable without intrusive involvement from the outside. Furthermore, observers of the political developments in Bosnia usually point to the character of the international involvement as a cause of concern, in some cases as a direct cause of the problems in the process. Clearly, while military intervention steadily decreased during the ten years of the process, civilian peacebuilding operation grew and changed character. Throughout the period after the introduction of the Bonn Powers in 1997, the OHR has been considered to be the most important institution in Bosnian politics, due to its powers to bypass the local political system whenever it is deemed necessary.
and to dismiss and ban any public official or elected politician from office, if they are deemed to be acting or speaking contrary to the Dayton Peace Agreement. These intrusive powers have led to the conclusion that international involvement in Bosnia represents a *de facto* international protectorate. Therefore, the role of international agencies in Bosnia, mainly the OHR, has been seriously questioned. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, the practices of dismissals of elected politicians and intervention in electoral process have led some observers to conclude that democracy is being ‘imposed with undemocratic means’.

In the previous chapter, a Cultural Theory analysis of the role of the representatives of the international community in Bosnian politics pointed to a continuous ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’. The remaining question is concerned with the interpretation of the meaning of this concept in order to evaluate the role of the international representatives in the Bosnian post-conflict process.

There are three different ways Cultural Theory analysis can be used to evaluate the Bosnian post-conflict process. First, Cultural Theory analysis can be used critically, to evaluate the failures in the process, provided the evaluation is conducted according to the broad goals of the process. Second, Cultural Theory can be used to highlight the difficulties facing peacebuilders in Bosnia and thus can explain the nature of progress in the process. In other words, Cultural Theory analysis can explain the successes. Third, Cultural Theory can be used to provide a balanced evaluation, one that points to the socio-cultural viability dilemma more directly, thus evaluating both the successes and failures in management of this dilemma, rather than evaluating the larger question of the success or failure of the entire process.

The first argument emerging from the Cultural Theory analysis of the Bosnian case is connected to the broadly defined goals of post-conflict peace-building and gives rise to a critical analysis of the failures in the process. In the analysis of the empirical findings in the previous chapter, it was concluded that the OHR changed its cultural bias, its preferred way of creating social relations and its preferred strategic behaviours, while the local socio-cultural context, although improved, still functions essentially as it had at the start of the process. There is still an alliance between the fatalist and the hierarchical social solidarity and the Bosnian political culture remains very much the same. If the intervention in Bosnia is evaluated against its primary, broadly defined goal of transforming Bosnia into a modern and democratic society, a strong state able to provide public goods to its citizens – the conclusion must be that the intervention in Bosnia is a failure – at least so far. Although it did end the war, intervention has failed to create a strong, self-sustainable state with a pluralist political culture where all four social solidarities co-exist and compete for adherents. Furthermore, it can be argued that the international involvement had a negative impact on the Bosnian politics. This is because the intervention unintentionally increased the existing perceptions of the irrelevance of the political process and of democracy itself, exemplified by the decreased trust in
political institutions, lowered voter turnout and, most damagingly, by isolationism and widespread apathy toward politics. These negative trends could be attributed to the intrusiveness of the international intervention, as it provoked a strengthening of the fatalist and hierarchical social solidarities throughout the process.

At first, the international agencies prevented the development of strong local voices that could have promoted and defended the low-grid social solidarities, inasmuch as they took those positions. The Cultural Theory framework prescribes that all four solidarities must be present in all societies and imbalances are corrected naturally, through different mechanisms for change, notably, through repeated failures and consequent learning. As the OHR, OSCE and other agencies initially positioned themselves low on the grid dimension, this natural balancing process did not occur. The local opposition could not take those positions on the social map, as it would mean that they would be promoting the same solutions to social and political problems as the international agencies, thus risking a label of ‘selling-out the national interests’, for which the members of different ethnic groups had ‘fought and died for’. Moreover, the parties in power did not have to modernize from within and become socio-culturally pluralistic at that time, as they had the representatives of the international intervention as a target against which they could position themselves. In a sense, the intervention had frozen the status quo and made the strengthening of low-grid solidarities from within less probable. After the position of the international agencies changed by moving towards the top right corner of the social map in connection to the introduction of the Bonn Powers, the low-grid positions were vacant. However, the use of the Bonn Powers, the consequent protectorate-like arrangements and the continuous fight against nationalist elites continued to reinforce the dominant socio-cultural alliance between fatalism and hierarchy. Through effectiveness of the control-and-command governance mode utilized by the representatives of the international community, and with the practice of obstruction and consequent compliance by the local nationalist authorities; both the typical fatalist and the typical hierarchical discourses were strengthened in Bosnia. In other words, each in its own way, the egalitarian-individualistic approach and the hierarchical approach to peacebuilding reinforced the dominant fatalism-hierarchy alliance and made a deeper socio-cultural change less likely. Thus, the Cultural Theory analysis explains both the failure of the initial socio-culturally nonviable approach and the subsequent socio-culturally viable approach. In both cases, the end result was a reinforcement of the dominant socio-cultural alliance between hierarchical and fatalist social solidarities.

According to this way of interpreting the results of the case study, the representatives of the international community are to be blamed for the shortcomings of the process and for the lack of change. It can be argued that the civilian international intervention achieved poor results, no results at all, or even negative results, as it reinforced the high-grid social solidarities. In a sense, the
intervention merely ensured security and allowed time to pass, enabling a slow process of normalization of inter-group relations, while it created a dependency syndrome that has plagued Bosnia for years, and probably will continue to do so in the future. In fact, a highly hypothetical argument could be made that if intervention in Bosnia had been purely non-political and non-intrusive, consisting only of a military and police operations that guaranteed security and the integrity of the Bosnian borders, combined with a grand reconstruction effort and massive development aid, the results might have been similar, or even better than they are now.

However, it must be noted that the periods of socio-cultural viability did produce policies that had positive and tangible results, notably, the security situation improved, the media professionalized and many of the refugees returned home – all due to the reform packages forced through by the OHR and PIC. In addition, state institutions started functioning in the latter stages of the process, if only barely. Still, ten years of international presence in Bosnia have merely taken the edge off the most extreme views and values within the ruling local nationalist elites, while the non-nationalist political parties remain an underdeveloped political option. Over time, the Bosnian society has become somewhat more pluralistic, but it has not yet transformed into a modern, self-sustainable, pluralistic, democratic state, i.e., a strong state. Thus:

A Cultural Theory analysis can lead to a conclusion that international policies in post-Dayton Bosnia Herzegovina failed to achieve the broad goal of the process, a change of the local political culture, and in addition, they were often counter-productive as they strengthened the existing socio-cultural alliance.

The second argument emerging from the Cultural Theory analysis of the Bosnian case illuminates the difficulties encountered in the process, and serves as an antidote to the previous, highly critical evaluation of the work of the OHR. This argument, in contrast to the previous argument, evaluates the successes judged against the problems encountered in the process. In this way, those problems are understood and explained, resulting in a conclusion that the OHR has done a rather good job, considering the socio-cultural context it operated in.

This argument is based on the normative aspects of the Cultural Theory, mentioned earlier in Chapter Two, which provide a blueprint of a ‘good society’, a ‘good democracy’ and a ‘good policy process’. In this conceptualization a ‘good society’ is pluralistic and all four social solidarities are existent and vocal; a ‘good democracy’ includes the elements of both guardian, participatory and protective democracy; and, finally, a ‘good policy’ is constructed so that it includes something for the adherents of all social solidarities, in order to be supported by all and implemented without problems.

Pluralism is seen as the key to socio-cultural success. This implies that the socio-cultural conflicts between the representatives of the international community and the local political elites are expected, natural and possibly even positive.
Conflicts and failures are the only way of achieving learning. Thus, the changing position of the representatives of the international community is also expected, natural and conceivably even constructive for the long-term development. Although a painful process with negative side-effects, learning and changing in itself should be considered as a positive outcome. Inevitably, the process of socio-cultural change is a complex process of ‘muddling through’, in which conflicts and misunderstandings occur between different actors who influence each other and learn from each other. It is this search for pluralism and for a socio-culturally viable position on the social map that slowly leads to long-term success. It is instructive that the process of change, whether in the changed positions of the representatives of the international community or in the process of change in the socio-cultural viability space, was usually gradual and incremental, with success achieved only after repeated attempts. In the Bosnian case this is evidenced, for example, by such events as the ongoing process of ownership transfer, or the prolonged process of internal moderation and modernization of the nationalist parties. Even though the Cultural Theory model is dynamic and assumes change rather than stability, dramatic socio-cultural change is not an easy process and short-term conflicts and failures can be expected to occur. Given that, fault and criticism should not be cast on the representatives of the international community in Bosnia, rather the opposite. Based on the inevitability of socio-cultural conflicts in complex processes of socio-cultural change, and based on the perseverance and ability to adapt and learn shown during the international intervention, the OHR could be commended for its exceptional ten-year long effort of ‘muddling through’, of adaptation and learning. The representatives of the international community learned to cope with a difficult socio-cultural context that repeatedly forced them to alter their values and beliefs in order to be able to influence the local socio-cultural context, a process that has taken enormous time and effort. Considering the destruction caused by war and considering the inadequacies of the Dayton Peace Agreement and the constitutional framework it created, the process must be regarded as a successful process, despite the dependency syndrome and the lack of a more dramatic change in the local political culture.

A Cultural Theory analysis can also lead to a conclusion that the international intervention in post-conflict process in Bosnia Herzegovina can be viewed as a success story, considering the successful learning and adaptation of the international agencies, who have slowly, incrementally and successfully tackled an unforgiving socio-cultural context, in the quest for socio-cultural change and socio-cultural pluralism.

Finally, in contrast to these two polar-opposites – one criticizing the OHR for the observed failures in the process and the other praising it for its perseverance in face of enormous difficulties – there is a more balanced way of using Cultural Theory as an evaluation tool, a way that recognizes the difficulties and allows
for a moderated criticism of the failures in the process. As mentioned in the
previous chapter, the intervention in the post-conflict process in Bosnia can be
divided in two different types according to the two different positions con-
cerning the socio-cultural viability space. The periods of socio-cultural viability
produced policies that had an influence on the local socio-cultural context, but
they also produced negative side effects, the strengthening of the two dominant
social solidarities. During the periods when the OHR was positioned outside the
socio-cultural viability space, the introduced policies failed and the local society
was prevented from developing its own promoters and defenders of the weak
social solidarities. This is the core problem of the socio-cultural viability
dilemma. It appears that both viable and unviable positions of third-party actors
who attempt to promote change inevitably create difficulties and actually make
long-term socio-cultural change less likely. Yet, there is a logical path of change –
from a viable position towards the desired end-position – through policies that
promote deeper structural changes in the socio-cultural context, i.e., policies that
alter the way the game of politics is played. Interpreted in this way, the changing
role of the OHR in the Bosnian process was neither excessively positive nor
completely negative; rather, the international intervention has been successful in
promoting socio-cultural change (Bosnia is far more pluralistic and democratic
now than ten years ago), although slowly, with great problems and difficulties.
Those problems should have been anticipated and planned for, since they
originate from the inevitable conflict between the successful implementation of
specific short-term policies and successful accomplishment of the broad long-
term goals of the process.

The evaluation of the international involvement in Bosnia based on the
Cultural Theory framework should, therefore, focus on the management of the
socio-cultural viability dilemma, rather than on the accomplishment of the goal
of socio-cultural change, or on the difficulties facing the representatives of the
international community. Accordingly, it can be argued that this dilemma and
the problems it presented were not properly managed, resulting in too many
unexpected effects and unnecessarily prolonging the process of socio-cultural
change. For example, the first years of the process were especially damaging for
the continuation of the process. In retrospect, it would have been much better if
the OHR had been granted the Bonn Powers sooner, rather than later. A number
of failures and consequent negative effects on the local socio-cultural context
could have been avoided. The consequent process of transfer of ownership
would undoubtedly have been easier and faster. Likewise, the introduction of
ownership and the attempt to move away from the socio-culturally viable
position at the top right corner of the map, which has resulted in repeated
failures, could have been postponed until the necessary conditions for the
transfer were met. The Alliance for Change was expected to take ownership of
the process almost immediately, a rather optimistic expectation considering the
way the Alliance came to power and considering its composition. Similarly, the
modernized nationalist parties were expected to take charge in the reform
process after they won the elections in 2002, despite their long history of obstruction of the reform process. Finally, the third attempt to transfer the ownership of the process to the local authorities, which is ongoing now, is also at risk of failure due to its timing. At the same time as Bosnian political parties are discussing the vital constitutional reform and that governments are being formed based on the results of the 2006 elections (which the nationalist option won again on the promise of protection of national interests), the OHR and the international community is attempting to step down from the top of the hierarchy once more. The result, so far, is a failure of the constitutional reform talks. It remains to be seen if the passive role of the OHR leads to complete failure and strengthening of the hierarchy-fatalism alliance, or if the conditions for a revival of local low-grid social solidarities are in place. In summary, and in contrast to the above outlined ways of interpreting the empirical findings:

Cultural Theory analysis of the process in post-Dayton Bosnia Herzegovina points to a conclusion that the representatives of the international managed the socio-cultural viability dilemma poorly. Although they have done their outmost to be effective and promote change, the move towards achieving socio-cultural viability and the attempted changes away from this position were not correctly timed.

The process could (should) have started with a comprehensive international authority at the hands of the OHR and it could (should) have ended with a swift transfer of ownership after a satisfying degree of socio-cultural change has been achieved, i.e. after the Bosnian constitution had been changed in a manner enabling proper functioning of the state, after the Euro-Atlantic integration processes were well on their way and after the large nationalist parties had completed modernization of their agendas.

This conclusion is supported by a number of instances where the process was successful from start to finish. For example, the first elections were organized by the OSCE with full authority over the entire election procedures. In 2002, the local election commission took over the organization of elections and conducted its tasks virtually without any major problems. Yet another example is the situation in the media. Although not immediately controlled by the international organizations, the regulation of the Bosnian media was put under a direct international rule through the Independent Media Commission (IMC) in 1998. This agency structured the broadcast media in Bosnia, created codes of conduct for journalists, professionalized the journalist core and finally, it transferred the authority to the locally-led Communications Regulatory Agency (CRA), which continues to perform its tasks in a professional manner. Today, the Bosnian media maintains a relatively good international standard, especially considering the media situation directly after the end of the war. Yet another example of international policies that successfully altered the way Bosnian political system functioned were the policies regarding the election legislation, the status of
Brcko and the dismantling of parallel institutions of Herceg-Bosna, described in Chapter Seven. In those cases, the OHR acted intrusively and it thus produced short-term reinforcements of the dominant social solidarities. Yet, those policies produced some dramatic improvements in the local socio-cultural context and they had thereby forced the major nationalist parties to modernize their agendas. In view of these success stories, the OHR and the PIC should not be criticized for learning and changing, even though that process was painful and contrary to shared values and beliefs that underpin the practice of peacebuilding. Instead, these institutions can be criticized for the poor timing of major decisions regarding the character of the process. First and foremost, they can be criticized for slow learning at the start of the process, the incoherency of their approach during the later stages of the process, and for their haste to transfer ownership of the process to the local actors before removing the obstacles for a real socio-cultural change, which would involve a change of the character of Bosnian political culture. This is underscored by many examples of the policies that were hampered by the socio-cultural incoherency and by the hasted attempts to transfer ownership to local authorities. Most notably, there were occasions when the OHR attempted to change the rules of the game through reforms of the constitutional framework; in connection to reforms of the police and security forces (described in Chapter Nine) and in connection to the implementation of the Constitutional Court decision on constitutiveness of the peoples of Bosnia (described in Chapter Eight). Repeatedly, policies aiming to change the constitutional framework and reverse some of the negative effects of the Dayton Peace Agreement were introduced, but they consequently failed, as they resulted in compromise solutions that had little effect on the way the political system functioned. The socio-culturally incoherent approach and the desire to transfer ownership drove the OHR and the PIC to include the input of nationalist parties in the process, thus failing to achieve the aims of reforms, dramatic changes in the local political system. Introduced comprehensive reforms that were supposed to change the structure of Bosnian politics were watered-down in the negotiation process. This lack of decisiveness in the reform process was presumably more damaging for the prospects of real socio-cultural change, than the practice of imposing decisions and reinforcing the discourses of incapability of the Bosnian authorities to take ownership of the process.

An analysis of the way socio-cultural viability dilemma was handled in post-Dayton Bosnia Herzegovina points to a conclusion that the imposed policies aiming to change the structural setting and alter the way the game of politics is played had a dramatic positive effect in the local socio-cultural context, despite the fact that they reinforced the dominant social solidarities. Policies that were not imposed resulted in prolonged negotiations and failure to achieve their goals.
Perhaps, the answer to the socio-cultural viability dilemma is a socio-culturally viable position at the start of the process, swift implementation of the policies aiming to change the local socio-cultural context in a decisive despite the negative effects of reinforcement of strong social solidarities, and a transfer of ownership after the process of socio-cultural change has been completed, or at least irreversibly set in motion.

Essence of Peacebuilding – Managing Socio-Cultural Viability Dilemma

The second research question defined in the introductory chapter was phrased in the following words: Can an understanding of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ enhance the understanding of international post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies? What is the essence of modern international peacebuilding? Considering the conclusions regarding the role of the OHR in Bosnia outlined above, and considering the need for a theoretical broadening of the studies of peacebuilding outlined in Chapter One, the Cultural Theory analysis and the socio-cultural viability dilemma can contribute to the understanding of the studied phenomena, namely, international peacebuilding intervention in war-torn societies.

As mentioned in Chapter Four dealing with the methodological approach used in this thesis, a single case study design does not allow generalizations because no single case can represent a population of cases. But on the other hand, single cases do allow for ‘analytical generalization’, in which findings of the study are generalized to a broader theory, rather than to a broader population of cases. Just as the Cultural Theory analysis of the role of the international representatives in Bosnian politics pointed to the problems caused by the socio-cultural viability dilemma, the following section of this chapter will elaborate on the possible generalizations regarding the theoretical understanding of peacebuilding, based on the conclusions regarding the process in Bosnia.

In the following discussion, four paths for analytical generalizations will be set out. First, a Cultural Theory analysis shows that peacebuilding is a culturally biased activity. Second, a Cultural Theory analysis highlights the problems regarding the basic dualistic understanding of the goals of peacebuilding. Third, possibilities for generalisation of the concept of socio-cultural viability dilemma are explored. Fourth, possible paths for management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma are briefly discussed.

The first contribution of the Cultural Theory framework to the understanding of peacebuilding is based on the analysis of the cultural biases guiding the intervention in Bosnia. As explained in the first part of this thesis, peacebuilding is a political process with the goal of transforming a society from war to peace. It is strongly influenced by culturally biased notions of how peace can (and should) be reached and those culturally biased notions guide the design of
peacebuilding interventions. In the case of Bosnia, the design was not primarily built upon the Bosnian political culture or on the specific Bosnian post-war socio-cultural context, but rather on the peacebuilding tradition that defines democratization, economic transition and active civil society as paths to achieving a lasting peace. In addition, as each of the last three High Representatives took up his post in Bosnia, each attempted to change the process accordingly to his own cultural bias, accepting that the local socio-cultural context is difficult to tackle, but not allowing it to guide the efforts of the international community, at least not at first. All of these efforts ended up causing problems, due to the fact that their designs originated from culturally biased notions, rather than from the socio-cultural setting in which they were supposed to exist. Moreover, the cultural biases behind international peacebuilding are deeply rooted in the western philosophy. They are based on notions of a ‘good man’ in need of access or opportunity. When confronted with a notion of an ‘evil man’, often existent in post-conflict environments following new wars, where war-lords and war-criminals become politicians directly after the fighting has stopped, peacebuilders have no available tools to manage such a confrontation. Similarly, when confronted with a seemingly ‘irrational’ population obeying seemingly ‘irrational’ leaders (choosing war rather than peace, choosing poverty rather than development, choosing corrupt autocracy rather than democracy), culturally biased peacebuilding approaches are incapable of understanding such behaviours, values and beliefs. Therefore, culturally biased approaches to peacebuilding result in misunderstandings and conflicts with the local population and, ultimately, lead to ineffectiveness. A representative of the international community sent to work with ‘evil men’ has little or no chance to reach the set goals, if all the available tools are based on a notion that all humans are inherently good. Apart from such an obvious and oversimplified example, there are more subtle blind-spots of culturally biased approaches that can be revealed and become damaging in the contacts with the local society. For example, the adherents of the hierarchical social solidarity view history as imperative for developments in the present and in the future. The adherents of the fatalist social solidarity view higher powers that they can not control as the main determinant of their destiny. When an individualistically biased authority, represented by an aid agency or a diplomat from a large international organization, confronts those values and beliefs, they are at most respected, but unlikely to be accepted as legitimate. Indeed, they are most likely to be dismissed and ignored in policy design. The result is a lack of credibility, legitimacy and decreased ability to achieve the policy goals. The first generalization drawn from the study of the Bosnian process is that peacebuilders, policymakers as well as practitioners working in the field, must learn, understand and accept the existence of values and beliefs that are diametrically different than their own. Clearly, this is a cry for cultural sensitivity training, which has already become a standard feature in training of outgoing personnel. There is another conclusion that can be drawn specifically from the Cultural Theory framework – the need
for an advanced cultural sensitivity, so to speak. Cultural Theory defines four diametrically different social solidarities, none of which is better or worse than any other. As propounded in the early writings of cultural theorists, each of the social solidarities constitute a negative force when it is unchecked – and even fatalism, when present in moderate doses, has a social function that makes it necessary and positive for the development of the whole system. Therefore, a way must be found to understand the local socio-cultural practices and to utilize the local political culture in the process of post-war recovery, at least in part, even when those practices and those beliefs seem to be contrary to the western values and beliefs. It should be possible to utilize the contribution of adherents of each of the social solidarities in the process of creation of a ‘good society’, rather than to dismiss them as negative for the societal development, as ‘undemocratic’ and/or ‘against peace’, as was often the case in Bosnia. Exactly how this can be done is another, rather difficult, question. At this point, only the conclusion regarding the mapping of cultural biases of international peacebuilding can be drawn, expressed as:

There is something inherently flawed in the practice of peacebuilding, as it is either individualistically or egalitarian biased. Neither of these approaches is viable in post-war environments in which some people organize into the hierarchical structures of strongly-bounded ethnic groups, while others chose to isolate themselves from the public sphere and focus on survival.

This is underscored by the fact that most peacebuilding theoreticians and peacebuilding practitioners largely reject the notion of hierarchically biased approach to peacebuilding consisting of guardianships, protectorates and international administration of territories, based on the power to rule through a command and control governance mode. As visible in the case of Bosnia, all High Representatives found their powerful position in the Bosnian political system to be uncomfortable at the start of their mandates. All, including Carlos Westendorp who introduced the Bonn Powers, stated that the Bonn Powers would be used ‘economically’, as a last resort. Over time, they learned and accepted their powers and their position as ruler, using the Bonn Powers to improve the situation on the ground as they saw fit, with little or no regard for the input from local authorities, even though they were elected in democratic elections. In that way, they achieved progress. When they abstained from using their powers, as well as when they allowed the input from the local nationalist parties, the reforms either failed or became watered-down to a degree that minimized their effect. In fact, this argument can be pushed even further, as it can be argued that the hierarchical, controlled and protected democracies (or protectorates) are logically better suited to tackle the hierarchically and/or fatalistically biased contexts, at least at the start of the post-conflict process, before the process of socio-cultural change and the balancing of the social map starts taking hold. What is needed in the understanding of peacebuilding is an
understanding of all four social solidarities, their biases, relations and behaviors, since there are no better or worse approaches to peacebuilding, only better and worse suited approaches for a specific socio-cultural context. Thus, a generalization based on the case of Bosnia and the Cultural Theory framework proposes a notion that peacebuilders – policymakers and practitioners alike – should be able to distance themselves from their own cultural biases and understand the necessity of having all the available tools at their disposal in order to be able to choose the best suited tool in a given socio-cultural situation. Stated in more practical terms:

The Cultural Theory analysis of the process in post-Dayton Bosnia Hercegovina shows that ‘democratization by undemocratic means’ is possible, and in some cases, even desirable. Protectorates and trusteeship arrangements might be the answer for socio-cultural contexts of collapsed states with prolonged conflicts that are damaged by warfare to a degree that they lack the necessary local capacity to balance the social map of their societies.

The second possible contribution of the Cultural Theory framework to the understanding of peacebuilding is based on the analysis of what is usually referred to as ‘negative side-effects’ of international policies in Bosnia, leading to what is usually referred to as a ‘dependency syndrome’. In Bosnia, the relationship between the OHR and the local Bosnian nationalist elites has been difficult since the start of the post-conflict process. During the first years of the post-conflict involvement, the OHR repeatedly blamed the three nationalist parties for everything that went wrong with Bosnia – probably rightly so. The fight against the nationalists, first through the media and later directly through the use of the Bonn Powers, has always been the perceived path to democratization of the country. These efforts culminated in 2000, when the OHR and the OSCE used all their available means, short of forbidding parties to run in the elections, in order to create conditions for a change of government. As Chapter Eight described, the result of this anti-nationalist policy has not been improved democracy, but rather an increased attraction of the fatalist social solidarity and a general low level of trust in the democratic process. This is symptomatic of the policies utilized by the policymakers in post-conflict peacebuilding interventions. Complex interdependent social phenomena are simplified and reduced to dualisms. Thus, local actors can be for peace or against peace, for or against democracy, for or against development, even for or against freedom – to take the most dramatic contemporary example. The dynamics of a post-conflict war-torn society are much more complex than that. Arguably, they are even more complex than pluralist western societies; given that they are unstable social systems where the socio-cultural equilibrium does not naturally balance itself. Therefore, the equilibrium of a war-torn society is unpredictable. As in any equilibrium system, every action causes an equal reaction but, in the case of the non-functioning equilibrium of a war-torn society, this reaction is not easily
predicted. As seen in Bosnia, some policies have caused violent reactions (the ‘antenna-wars’ dealt with in Chapter Seven, for example) while some others, perceived as equally or more controversial, surprisingly resulted in compliance and obedience (for example, the removal of the RS President from office, also described in Chapter Seven). The problem is an assumption that social equilibriums come in pairs, such as individualism-hierarchy, democracy-dictatorship or friend-foe dichotomies. Reality is often more complex than that, and even if Cultural Theory represents a reductionist theory that oversimplifies reality; it includes four categories rather than two, thereby allowing for a somewhat more nuanced understanding of social systems. Hence, the model is able to capture the unexpected reactions of the system to the intrusions from the outside. Such reactions are usually regarded as ‘negative side-effects’, a necessary by-product in the policy process. The second contribution of the Cultural Theory to the studies of post-conflict peacebuilding processes consists of the inclusion of these ‘negative side-effects’ in the analysis. As fatalism is a major by-product of intrusive international peacebuilding in Bosnia (and probably elsewhere), the Cultural Theory framework and its anti-dualist understanding of social systems captures this reoccurring problem and includes it in the broader understanding of difficulties of post-conflict intervention. Hence, there is a place for a Cultural Theory understanding of social equilibrium in the practice of policy design, policy implementation and evaluation, given that it can enable policymakers to avoid dichotomies, to take into account unanticipated responses when designing and implementing policies, and to evaluate their policies based not only on the achievement of goals, but also on unexpected effects on the equilibrium of the intervention-receiving society. In summary:

Socio-cultural contexts of war-torn societies constitute complex systems in which dualist explanations do not apply. The usual perceptions about peace, democratization and development are that they can be achieved through the removal of existing structures acting contrary to the values and beliefs associated with peace, democracy and development. As shown in the case of Bosnia, this is not necessarily correct.

For example, the goal to promote socio-cultural change, such as an increase in the strength of the individualist social solidarity, through a policy that reduces the strength of the hierarchical social solidarity, can possibly lead to the desired goal – but they can just as easily backfire and cause a strengthening of one of the other two social solidarities, whether it is fatalism or egalitarianism. Although individualism and hierarchy are often perceived as a dichotomy, less hierarchy does not automatically mean more individualism. This is indeed exemplified in Bosnia, where policies aiming to weaken the nationalist sentiment resulted not in democratization, but rather in increased apathy towards the political process.

The third contribution of the Cultural Theory framework to the understanding of peacebuilding is based on the analysis of the manifestations of the
socio-cultural viability dilemma. The question asked here is: Is this dilemma an inherent problem? Does it exist in all international interventions? Once again, the socio-cultural viability dilemma was described as a choice between a rock and a hard place. Presuming that the intervention-receiving society is a society where there is a total absence of one or two social solidarities and that the intervention aims to correct this problem as it attempts to create a pluralist and functioning society, there is a choice between replacing the voice of the adherents of the missing social solidarities, or adapting to the socio-cultural context, i.e. voicing the existent, strong and viable social solidarities. In the first case, socio-cultural change is promoted but there is a risk of misunderstandings, conflicts and failure, and in the other case, there is understanding, agreement and policy success, but there is a risk of missing out the long-term goal of socio-cultural change as dominant social solidarities are being reinforced through the very actions of the representatives of the international community. In short, whatever path is chosen, to attempt to change the local context or to allow the local context to change one self, there are possible failures, in either the short or the long run.

Is this problem an inherent problem of international peacebuilding? This question can not be answered empirically at this time (comparative studies are needed), but the tentative proposition is that this problem is universal, as it is a theoretically coherent and a logical problem. To a degree, it exists even within the societies, as different political and social actors purposely attempt to change the socio-cultural context in order to tackle new challenges, advancements in technology, the changing international system, globalisation and so forth. The obvious difference is, of course, that change promoted from within the system does not experience this dilemma as a major problem. Important social and political actors exist within the socio-cultural viability space and when promoting change, they do so from a position of an insider in the system. In the case of an international intervention where the interveners do not have the direct mandate of the people, often not even speaking the same language, the socio-cultural viability dilemma is a much more central problem. However, this does not mean that the dilemma exist in all cases of international peacebuilding. It is theoretically conceivable that there might be cases of international management of internal conflict in more pluralist societies, resulting in full understanding and acceptance of the cultural biases of the representatives of the international community. It is also conceivable that there are processes in which the international community has a mandate with very low ambitions, such as delivering humanitarian aid or assisting in road or bridge reparations and that it leaves the other, more complex tasks regarding the make-up of the society and state untouched. In those cases, there would be a smaller risk for misunderstandings and deep socio-cultural conflicts. However, in cases of a state collapse, where the international peacebuilders enter, create and implement policies and exercise governance, with the goal of transforming the society and correcting the imbalance of the social map so that it ceases being a failed state – the socio-
cultural viability dilemma would most probably reveal itself and hamper the process through both internal and external conflict. This would be manifested externally inasmuch as cultural biases underlying peacebuilding most probably do not correspond to the strong social solidarities in the intervention-receiving societies, and internally, inasmuch as changing to adapt to the socio-cultural context creates identity problems for the representatives of the international community, as well as incoherencies in their own approach, stolen rhetoric and/or stolen strategic behaviours. In sum:

As envisioned through the lens of Cultural Theory, the socio-cultural viability dilemma of international peacebuilding is an inevitable problem in the process of socio-cultural change promoted from the outside, by the representatives of the international community.

Assuming that the socio-cultural viability dilemma is a universal problem, or at least a likely problem in most complex post-conflict international interventions in failed states, collapsed states, war-torn and deeply divided societies – the next question is: What is a possible remedy to this problem? The fourth and final contribution of the Cultural Theory framework to the understanding of post-conflict peacebuilding consists of a tentative possible generalization regarding the more practical conclusions drawn from the study of Bosnia. As explained in the previous section of this chapter, the case of Bosnia leads to the conclusion that socio-cultural viability dilemma could have been managed better, thus reducing the negative effects of international intervention. The errors are attributable to a prolonged period of socio-cultural non-viability, inconsistency and incoherency. Most notably, there was a problem of inability to swiftly learn and adapt to the local socio-cultural context. Thereafter, there was a lack of will to decisively and boldly change the local socio-cultural context during the period when the Bonn Powers were viable and imposed changes were accepted by the local elites. Finally, there is the problem with the too-soon deactivation of the Bonn Powers, before the low-grid positions of ‘teachers’ and ‘assistants’ had become viable, i.e. before there are sufficient changes of the local socio-cultural context. This analysis translates into the following conclusions regarding a possible way of managing the socio-cultural viability dilemma. First and foremost, peacebuilders must have the full spectra of socio-cultural tools at their disposal. Sending peacebuilders into a difficult socio-cultural context armed with a culturally biased notion of their role in the process, supported by corresponding preferred social relations and behaviours, probably leads to conflicts and ultimately, to failure. Consider the early days of the OHR when it held individualistically biased ideas about economic aid as an adequate tool for influencing behaviour of hierarchical political elites. This led to failures and damage to the legitimacy of the international agencies. Policy-makers must have profound knowledge of the socio-cultural context they operate in, in order to be able to speak and act in a socio-culturally viable way. Second, this also implies
that the representatives of the international community must be adaptive, learn and change accordingly to the socio-cultural context in a timely manner. Consider the period before the introduction of the Bonn Powers, when most policies of the OHR failed and frustration was growing on both sides of the equation – in the local society and within the international community. If the Bonn Powers had been introduced earlier, it is plausible that a number of problems could have been avoided or solved earlier, eliminating the negative effect which repeated failures had on the socio-cultural context. Third, this also means that peacebuilders must be bold in their policymaking and policy implementation. Since the introduction of the Bonn Powers, the OHR and other international agencies have had a unique opportunity to change the local socio-cultural context. Consider the improvements in the field of media, security, refugee return and judiciary, all of which were made possible by bold and decisively-imposed policies of the OHR. If such boldness had been employed in other areas as well, such as the reform of the police, constitutional reform, implementation of the court’s decisions on constitutiveness, and so forth, Bosnia might have been ready for local ownership by now. Even though acting in a socio-culturally viable manner reinforces the local socio-cultural alliances and thus works against the overall goal of process which is socio-cultural change, it is reasonable to assume that shorter periods of time when policies aiming to change the rules of the game, and thus enable socio-cultural change, are explicitly and decisively imposed would have less of a negative effect than prolonged muddling through. Finally, this also means that peacebuilders can not leave the position of socio-cultural viability before there are conditions for such a move, before there is a socio-cultural change in the local society. Consider the concept of ownership. It has been repeatedly introduced in Bosnia, based on the discrepancy between the values and beliefs underpinning the theory and practice of peacebuilding – not based on the changes in the local socio-cultural context. For the most part, the argument was that the OHR cannot rule a country, rather than the argument than Bosnia is ready to rule itself. Simply put, in addition to boldness in policymaking and policy implementation designed to change the local socio-cultural context, there is also a need for patience before exit.

In summary, the experience from Bosnia (both positive and negative) implies that the socio-cultural viability dilemma could be managed better 1) if intervention is designed so that it enables socio-cultural pluralism, 2) if the interveners’ own cultural biases are not allowed to dominate and thus cloud their judgement, 3) if the socio-cultural context is understood in order to easily achieve socio-cultural viability, 4) if there is bold policy-making and finally, 5) if there is patience before exit.

Such a conclusion, it should be underscored, is based only on the case of Bosnia and the Cultural Theory understanding of the role of the OHR in that process; the experiences from Bosnia are generalizable only to the theoretical under-
standing of the socio-cultural viability dilemma. In Bosnia, a number of other factors influenced the way in which the OHR moved to and away from the socio-culturally viable position. Everything – from the contents of the Dayton agreement, to the frequent changes of the OHR personal and leadership, the relations between the military and the civilian presence in Bosnia and to the Bosnian political institutions and the decision-making process in the international organizations – has prevented, in one way or the other, the OHR from making the timely and correct decisions regarding its own role in the process. Most importantly, the Dayton Peace Agreement and its constitutional framework, which was an exercise in conflict management rather than conflict resolution, limited the possibilities for the representatives of the international community to act decisively in order to change the rules of the political game to a degree that would enable a more substantial socio-cultural change. Nevertheless, the post-conflict international authority could have achieved socio-cultural viability, and could have changed the rules of the game, through bold policy making. Only now, ten years after the process, constitutional matters are being debated. Earlier, a number of occasions to alter the constitutional framework and thus create the conditions for a deeper socio-cultural change were missed, mostly due to the socio-cultural incoherency and the too-soon attempts to transfer ownership. Presumably, the process of exit, through the concept of ownership, would have been easier if earlier reform packages were implemented in full.

Nevertheless, in other cases, factors such as peace agreements are likely to be quite different. In addition, every socio-cultural context has its own particularities. Thus, practical recommendations of the kind outlined above should only be understood as a starting point of future research project, one in which management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma is in focus and in which the empirical material consists of more than a single case.

In sum, the application of the Cultural Theory framework to the theory and practice of international intervention in war-torn societies successfully captures the essence of peacebuilding. Peacebuilding is a process of socio-cultural change, promoted from the outside. Problems experienced in these processes are largely dependant on a poor understanding and poor management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma, namely, the dilemma either to adapt to the local socio-cultural context or to stay true to one’s own values and beliefs and attempt to alter the local society and its political culture. Although not the only answer to all the problems peacebuilders face in their work, this concept makes possible a coherent, logical and credible explanation to a number of questions regarding the difficulties in contemporary peacebuilding practices.
Cultural Theory Revisited – Imposing Socio-Cultural Change

The third research question defined in the introductory chapter was phrased as: Can a study of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’ of international intervention in post-war societies contribute to the Cultural Theory framework itself? Can socio-cultural change be imposed? In addition to those questions, this last part of the analytical chapter is concerned with a general evaluation of the theory, i.e., how well has it performed in this empirical study.

Cultural Theory framework is a theoretical approach which is, among other things, ostensibly superior at explaining socio-cultural change. Cultural theorists have argued that the understanding of intentional change of the aspects of political cultures is one of the main tasks for the theory. As cultural theorists noted, preserving and changing different aspects of the cultural mix in developing societies is a challenge, because it requires that both practitioners and theorists (meaning cultural theorists) need to be able to grasp the complex culture-by-policy interactions in order to provide practical advice to those making policy choices. In part, this thesis has focused on this question through the socio-cultural viability dilemma of post-conflict peacebuilding. The question facing international peacebuilders is exactly the question implied by Klitgaard, (cited in Chapter One) – the dilemma of accepting the local culture or attempting to change it.

Following a brief evaluation of the performance of the Cultural Theory in this study, the theoretical implications of this study for the understanding of imposed socio-cultural change are discussed below. As mentioned in the discussion of the methodological approach used in this thesis, the purpose of this study was not to test the Cultural Theory framework in its entirety (such a test cannot be conducted in a single case study) but rather to assess the explanatory value of the theoretical approach. In other words, the theory could either perform well or perform poorly; the proof of the test being in the theory’s ability to capture cultural variance, the importance of the socio-cultural context and the ability to capture the interactions between the socio-cultural context and culturally biased approaches of those attempting to change the context.

First, there is a basic test of the Cultural Theory framework – the coherency of the link between social relations and cultural bias. As explained in Chapter Four, Cultural Theory could be refuted if there were no observed link between social relations, cultural biases and strategic behaviours. The study of the civilian international intervention in post-Dayton Bosnia and Herzegovina shows that there is such a link and, in addition, this link between behaviours, relations and biases is crucial for the understanding of the role of the international community in Bosnia as well for understanding the changes (or lack of changes) in the process. This leads to the finding that a Cultural Theory analysis of the process in Bosnia supports the basic claims of Cultural Theory.
and, consequently, this theory has relevant explanatory powers for studies of post-conflict processes.

In addition, there are five specific advantages of the framework that emerged during the work with the interpretation and understanding of the empirical material in this particular case study. The first of these advantages is that the Cultural Theory approach captures the socio-cultural context and includes it in the analysis. Grand political programs such as peacebuilding, democratization and state-building are all dependant on socio-culturally viability in order to succeed. By including the Bosnian political culture, the theory permitted the use of the relationships between the representatives of the international community and the local political elites to serve as an explanation for the successes and failures in the process. In this way, the theory provided a different tool for the evaluation of the process, not based on the usually perceived causes of problems, such as failure to reach specific policy goals due to insufficient resources or inadequate capabilities of the policymakers.

A second advantage is that the Cultural Theory framework captured the process of change through learning, surprises (failures) and ‘stolen rhetoric’ or ‘stolen behaviour’ mechanisms for socio-cultural change. Given that the objective of international intervention was to change certain aspects of the Bosnian political culture, explaining socio-cultural change is a necessary part of the analysis. The typological models enabled a systematic comparison of the socio-cultural context over time. Together with the social map model and the requisite variety condition that define a society as an equilibrium system, where every action has its reaction, the framework enabled an analysis of the socio-cultural changes and their effects.

A third specific advantage was that the Cultural Theory analysis included fatalism, often neglected in other approaches used to study the Bosnian process. Different social sciences usually acknowledge the individualism-hierarchy dichotomy but, as one of the main problems in the Bosnian post-war process is the passivity of the local political actors and the civil society, as well as a general apathy towards the political process, the fatalist social solidarity was central for the analysis of the dynamics in the process. Although Bosnia is both economically and politically in much better shape today than it was at the start of the process, the pessimism about politics, society, economic development and the future of the Bosnian state in general has been plaguing the process from the start, and it continues to plague Bosnia today as well. While often mentioned as one of the causes of the poor results in the process, fatalism and apathy are regularly excluded from analysis, and their origins, their existence, their perseverance and their effects on the process are not sufficiently researched. Thus, Cultural Theory adds to the analysis by highlighting the mechanisms that result in an increase of strength of the fatalist social solidarity, namely, the unwanted effects of the way the game of politics is played and the unwanted side effects of the intrusive international intervention. While fatalism causes poor results of the implemented policies, it is the way the policies are created...
and implemented that reproduces the strength of the fatalist cultural bias. The inclusion of fatalism in the analysis proved to be one of the main advantages of the Cultural Theory framework in contrast to the usual dualist approaches that expect an action to have a single, predictable reaction.

A fourth advantage is that Cultural Theory can explain the perseverance of the Bosnian nationalist elites. The Bosnian nationalist parties with their extremist and chauvinistic politics have repeatedly won the support of the electorate throughout the ten years of the process, despite great losses in terms of international aid, lack of economic progress and slow process of Euro-Atlantic integration. Political scientists studying Bosnia have never been able to sufficiently explain this seemingly ‘irrational’ voting pattern. After the first cycle of elections in 1996 and 1997, the support for the nationalist parties was explained as a result of the hate-speech and the spread of fear, of the poor situation in the media, inadequate legislation, cheating and intimidation. Yet after all of these specific problems were solved, the nationalist parties continued to win elections, with the exception of a couple of occasions when the opposition was installed, and even then, only due to internationally-imposed electoral engineering. There is a misunderstanding of the Bosnian political (and socio-cultural) system. Repeated ‘surprising’ result of continued support for the nationalist elites is the best example of cultural variance, the difference between the local political culture and the values and beliefs of international peace-builders.

The fifth and final advantage is that the Cultural Theory enables the analysis of the entire process and a construction of a single credible explanation. As mentioned in Chapter One, the specific problems in the policy implementation process and the effects of the specific implemented policies are often studied alone, with little or no connection to other policies and their effects. Each of the major changes that had occurred in the Bosnian process can be explained and understood based on the Cultural Theory understanding of social solidarities, the behaviours, relations and biases of their adherents, political cultures and socio-cultural contexts, and the interactions between adherents of different social solidarities and the socio-cultural context. The grid-group model that defines four social solidarities is encompassing enough to include credibly the main aspects of the process, yet simple enough to create a single, understandable and elegant explanation. Tentatively, the Cultural Theory framework and its models pass the Ockham’s razor test as they are general, simple, parsimonious, elegant and practically relevant. In conclusion:

The Cultural Theory framework proved to be a promising tool for the exploration and understanding of complex social processes of post-war recovery. As this study has demonstrated, Cultural Theory shows that it has merit, that it is relevant and that it can grasp a number of aspects otherwise not included in analysis of post-war transition. The theory performs well in empirical studies, it has a broad explanatory value and it provides credible explanations.
Nevertheless, there were also some problems that were experienced throughout the work on the interpretation of the empirical material. First, the Cultural Theory framework suffers from an unsolved, or rather inadequately explained, actor / structure problem. Throughout the work on this case study, the actor / structure problem was one of the more difficult theoretical and methodological problems to manage. As mentioned in Chapter Two, contemporary cultural theorists argue that social solidarities are the ‘prime-movers’, i.e., the very focus of the analysis. Actors and institutions are merely bearers of culture. As this thesis was concerned with socio-cultural change, which was intentionally promoted from the outside through an international intervention, the relationship between actors and their context was a central, unavoidable and a difficult issue. The agencies and organizations (the OHR, PIC, EU and others) have at times intentionally attempted to change the elements of the Bosnian socio-cultural context in order to influence the behaviours of local political actors. They have also intentionally attempted to influence the local political actors in order to produce changes in the socio-cultural context. Thus, in this thesis, the OHR and the local political elites were perceived as actors operating within a context – the Bosnian society. This was necessary in order to capture the culture-by-policy interactions. Despite the logic of social solidarities as the ‘prime-movers’, the experience from this study is that explaining culture-by-policy interactions requires a distinction between the political actors and the contexts they operate in. Second, there is a problem of outside influences on a socio-cultural context of a society, in part addressed in this study. Although the founders of the theory discussed the use of Cultural Theory in aid and development research, the specific particularities of socio-cultural change promoted from the outside have not been adequately discussed yet. It is assumed that all things being equal, a stronger individualistic voice in the debate produces a stronger attraction to the individualist social solidarity. As this study has shown, this is not always the case. If a strong individualist voice does not come from the right source, i.e. does not have the necessary legitimacy and credibility of a local socio-culturally viable actor, the effect might be the opposite, i.e. a weakening of the individualist social solidarity. This is a particularly interesting aspect of the interactions on the social map, considering the ‘new interventionism’ paradigm in international politics and the increased activities of the international community in conflicts around the world. Clearly, cultural theorists should deal with this issue in more detail.

The final section of this chapter will be concerned with the possible theoretical solutions to these two problems, the unresolved actor/structure problem and the specific nature of socio-cultural change that is imposed from the outside.

The root of both problems can be found in a conflicting logic embedded in the theoretical framework. On one hand, Cultural Theory prescribes equilibrium as a panacea, a solution to all social problems. On the other hand, Cultural
Theory prescribes a necessity of socio-cultural viability through its logic of policy process and governance. As it has been demonstrated in this thesis, there are situations when these two aspects are in conflict. In societies where the equilibrium is non-functioning, where one or two social solidarities fully dominate the society to such a degree that it constitutes a failed or collapsed state, the outside intervention should have a balancing effect. This implies that the representatives of the international community should take an opposite position from that of the local authorities who adhere to the strong social solidarities. In this way, it is presumed, the institution aiming to change the local socio-cultural context will substitute for missing adherents of weak solidarities, thus balance the social map in order to provide socio-cultural pluralism. However, this approach, as explained by Cultural Theory logic concerning policy process and governance, is not a socio-culturally viable approach, and results in policy failures. The problem has been defined in this thesis as a part of the socio-cultural viability dilemma. It is both a practical and a theoretical problem and the theoretical aspects certainly deserve more academic attention. Simply put, the theory prescribes that both approaches are correct. Both balancing the social map and adapting to the context are considered to be correct strategies. In a sense, the problem boils down to the actor/structure problem. Essentially, the problem is that actors influence structures in a rather different manner than structures influence actors. Structures, whether defined as the strengths of different social solidarities, as cultural regimes and alliances, as political cultures or as socio-cultural contexts; influence actors in a predictable manner. They force them to adapt in order to achieve viability. This ‘pull’ force is a logical, well-explained aspect of the Cultural Theory and its models. On the other hand, actors have a couple of options. Whether defined as individuals, groups of individuals, elites, organizations, agencies, political parties or international actors, they all have the choice either to promote and protect the weaker solidarity, adding to its ‘pull’ force, or to use ‘stolen rhetoric’ and ‘stolen behaviour’ in order to become viable and socio-culturally successful, while promoting the social solidarity to which they actually adhere. In the latter case, they could implement policies that would eventually result in a change of the socio-cultural context and, thus, they would act as a ‘push’ force, acting from within socio-cultural viability, aiming at changing the socio-cultural viability space. When cultural theorists argue that both actors and structures are bearers of culture and that the theory applies to both in the same way, they miss this important dimension of mechanisms behind socio-cultural change. It seems that the complexity of the process of socio-cultural change demands a distinction between actors and structures, between the agents of change and the structures that are supposed to be changed. In addition, the experience from this case study implies that socio-cultural viability is necessary in order to promote change in the short run, thus enabling socio-cultural change in the long run. Understood in an even broader sense, ‘stolen rhetoric’ and ‘stolen behaviours’ are necessary for successful ‘muddling through’ by the actors attempting to change a socio-
cultural context and thus create the conditions for a broader socio-cultural change.

Nevertheless, this problem is only touched upon here. It is a headache of interests for future research projects concerned with the Cultural Theory framework. What has been implied by this study is that the Cultural Theory might benefit from an inclusion of the actor/structure division in order to refine the subtle nuances of the theoretical tools for the understanding of socio-cultural change. The theory needs to be broadened in order to explain the particularities of imposed socio-cultural change, of culture-by-policy interactions. While change is expected to occur from a continuous conflict between the adherents of the four social solidarities, there are aspects of this process that can be captured only when the relationship between the agents of change (actors adhering to one of the four social solidarities) and the socio-cultural context (existent cultural mixture or political culture) are unveiled and explained.

In conclusion, the Cultural Theory framework and its models have proven to be well suited for the studies of post-conflict peacebuilding in war-torn societies. The explanatory value of the theory has been tested, inasmuch as the theory performed well in capturing some aspects of the post-conflict processes that are usually excluded in the studies of the role of the representatives of the international community in these processes. In addition, the framework successfully captures the socio-cultural viability dilemma, a phenomenon at the very heart of the essence of contemporary complex peacebuilding activities. Nevertheless, the theory has also revealed one of its blind-spots in this study – the inherent conflict between a normative notion prescribing pluralism and socio-cultural balance as a path to good society, while prescribing socio-cultural viability and adaptation to the socio-cultural context as a path to policy and governance success. The inability to resolve this theoretical problem is in part dependant on the avoidance of the actor/structure problem in explaining the mechanisms for socio-cultural change. This aspect, as it has been demonstrated in this thesis, has relevance for the success of the theory in explaining the problems encountered by peacebuilders in war-torn societies. In sum

The contribution of this study to the Cultural Theory framework is dual, inasmuch as it opens up a new path for empirical research in the field of peace and conflict studies, as well as it highlights a theoretical problem concerned with the explanation of imposed socio-cultural change.

Summary of Conclusions

A Cultural Theory analysis of post-conflict international intervention in war-torn societies, as exemplified in the case of the first ten years of the post-Dayton peace process in Bosnia Herzegovina, leads to a set of different conclusions regarding the case (Bosnia), the theory (grid-group Cultural Theory) and the studied phenomena (international peacebuilding in war-torn societies). Central
to all three conclusions is the concept of the ‘socio-cultural viability dilemma’, a choice that is facing policymakers involved in a process of third-party driven socio-cultural change. This choice means either 1) to learn, adapt to the socio-cultural context and achieve socio-cultural viability, or 2) not to learn, stay true to the own values and beliefs, acting as a voice for weak social solidarities and expecting the socio-cultural context to accept those voices and change accordingly, hence, achieving socio-cultural pluralism and socio-cultural equilibrium. The study of intervention in Bosnia and Herzegovina has demonstrated that neither of the two options guarantees success. Socio-cultural viable approach reinforces the existent socio-cultural mix and fails to achieve socio-cultural change although enabling policy implementation success. On the other hand, staying true to one’s own social solidarity enables coherency, but the attempts to balance for the voices of the weak social solidarities in this way make policy implementation rather difficult, if not impossible.

Cultural Theory framework and its models are able to capture the socio-cultural viability dilemma. With the help of this concept, this theoretical framework is also able to explain the successes, failures and the effects of intervention. Thus, the theory is evaluated as being useful for empirical studies in the field of peace and conflict research. In addition, it is deemed superior to rival approaches that are based on dualisms and dichotomies, given that it includes four social solidarities in the analysis, including fatalism. As fatalism is a problem experienced in international peacebuilding, this by-product of poor management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma can not be disregarded as a mere side-effect of international policies. Nevertheless, although considerable effort has been made to enable this framework to explain socio-cultural change, Cultural Theory still lacks an in-depth understanding of ‘culture-by-policy’ interactions – in this case, an understanding of imposed socio-cultural change. This study illuminates this theoretical problem and it is argued that the problem exists in part due to the incorrect handling of the actor/structure problem, that is, its exclusion from the theoretical framework. As it has been shown, there is a difference between the way context changes actors and the way actors can influence context through policies and governance. These mechanisms for change should be further studied.

Summarizing the conclusions regarding the case of Bosnia and the contribution Cultural Theory can offer to the knowledge about this process, it can be said that the socio-cultural viability dilemma has not been properly managed in this case, which has resulted in a number of problems. The main problem is the slow process of socio-cultural change and the reinforcement of the pre-existing dominant socio-cultural alliance between hierarchy and fatalism. The agencies representing the international community were socio-culturally unviable at the start of the process, failing to implement policies or to impact the local society. Later on, they learned and adapted, achieving socio-cultural viability but acting against their underlying values and beliefs. Consequently, this has caused incoherency in their approach that has manifested itself in repeated attempts to
change the nature of their involvement, to move back to the original position consistent with the individualist and egalitarian cultural biases. So far, these attempts have not been successful, resulting in a lack of substantial socio-cultural change in the Bosnian society and politics. Moreover, it has been argued here that the problems in management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma preserved the status quo, reinforcing the existing political culture and making the process of a broad socio-cultural change even more difficult. Nevertheless, intervention in Bosnia has not been a complete failure, but neither has it been a success. It has been a difficult process of ‘muddling through’, which is both natural and expected considering the inevitability of the socio-cultural viability dilemma. The criticism of the international approach to Bosnia is found in the way the dilemma has been handled, causing an unnecessarily prolonged period of muddling through due to poor timing of decisions regarding the role of the representatives of the international community in the process.

Finally, this thesis has indicated that the socio-cultural viability dilemma has bearing on post-conflict peacebuilding in general. In fact, it is argued that this dilemma captures the essence of various problems experienced in international peacebuilding. The question of how to change certain aspects of local political cultures, while preserving others, is one of the main questions facing policymakers and is especially relevant in contemporary complex post-conflict interventions. Cultural Theory sheds light on this by helping in the understanding of peacebuilding as a culturally biased activity, corresponding to the two low-grid social solidarities of individualism and egalitarianism, while war-torn societies, collapsed states and deeply divided societies, are socio-cultural contexts most likely consisting of traditionalistic and authoritarian political cultures, i.e., social solidarities of hierarchy and fatalism. Hence, Cultural Theory illuminates the socio-cultural conflicts and misunderstandings between the agencies involved in international peacebuilding and the local political and social actors. As well, Cultural Theory highlights the difficulties of culture-by-policy interactions. The tentative conclusions regarding the management of the socio-cultural viability dilemma point to a need for swift adaptive learning, viability of used approach, bold policymaking and patience in regard to exit strategies. Based on the experience in Bosnia, this approach is proposed as the least damaging, although it reinforces the existent socio-cultural alliance in the short run. Nevertheless, this single case study has merely opened the door for a deeper understanding of international interventions in war-torn societies, based on the often excluded socio-cultural aspects of such processes. If nothing else, this thesis has shown that there is a need for a systematic inclusion of culture, meaning political culture, in the studies of war-torn and deeply divided societies.

There are three different paths for future research that can be identified on the basis of this study. First, the socio-cultural viability dilemma could be theoretically developed further. Even though theories underlying post-conflict peacebuilding have been touched upon in this thesis, first and foremost in Chapter Three, there is a need for further work on the compatibility of the
concept with other theoretical approaches in both peace and conflict studies and in the field of international relations research. One of the questions that need to be answered is whether socio-cultural viability dilemma travels well to other theoretical approaches. Can it be useful and applicable without the underlying grid-group model and the Cultural Theory framework? Second, this thesis was based on a single case study and, although the case of Bosnia was a suitable first step, offering a lot in terms of possibilities for learning, there is a need for comparative studies. The understanding of the socio-cultural viability dilemma should be applied to other cases of post-conflict intervention as well in order to reveal how it manifests itself and how it is managed in different socio-cultural contexts and in different conflicts around the world – possibly even throughout history. Finally, there is a third natural path for future research, which would address the many questions regarding the practical implications of the socio-cultural viability dilemma. The last chapter of this thesis included a tentative attempt to answer a few of them, but it merely scratched the surface and it actually raised many more questions that deserve answers. There is a need for future research regarding the question of manageability of this dilemma. The most interesting questions concern policy design and the possibilities for prediction and avoidance of the negative side-effects of intrusive international policies.
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