

DEMILITARIZATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA IDEA, UTOPIA OR SOMETHING ELSE

Review article

DOI: 10.7251/DEFEN1401005N

UDK 323.1: 355.426(497.6)

Stamenko Novaković¹

Retired Brigadier General

Abstract:

The history of human society can be, unfortunately, best perceived through the history of warfare. At any given moment in the world there was a war waged, and many of them have been fought after they were banned, post World War II. The mere prohibition of the wars of aggression by the UN did not stop them from breaking out. Wars are closely related to the realization and protection of the interests of belligerents. It is not always necessary to initiate war to realize these interests.

The main forces in war are military forces and the appearance of militarism is not unusual. It is closely linked with a specific time and space. Strengthening the power of military circles is accompanied by strengthening the resistance to this, by all means, negative phenomenon, most often in the form of antimilitarism.

The war in BiH can be viewed, in many respects, in broader, theoretical aspects. Its main characteristics could not have been the instigating factor for the idea of demilitarization in BiH. The seriousness of circles and circumstances it is debated in points to its political significance. This requires a broad and quality consideration during the process of formation of critical attitudes.

After war comes peace, which is far more complex than war and which requires a lot of effort. In war “the main” idea is to defeat the enemy, whereas in peace the following springs up:

- *end the war,*
- *build up peaceful and prosperous social community and*
- *prevent new conflicts from breaking out, a new war.*

¹ Correspondence to: Stamenko Novaković, e-mail: nbjsnovakovic@yahoo.com

The BiH citizens still suffer the consequences of the past war, and for some it still has not finished, it has only changed in form. Instead of development, many processes are directed in the wrong way. Conflicts are still present, and the current state of peace cannot guarantee its stability. The reforms which were implemented and are still being implemented have the centralization of BiH as their priority, and not the improvement of the current situation. This kind of situation does not contribute to building peace and prosperity. There is still hope that the outcome will be positive.

The National Assembly of the Republic of Srpska (NARS) has adopted the Declaration on demilitarization (Declaration on strategic commitments of the RS in the defense system). Political entities of the RS, in the field of defense, are advocating demilitarization policy. Those in disagreement with this policy are silent or they do not have a significant role on the political scene.

Demilitarization policy is not correctly shaped and it can be disputed because of:

- basis for attitudes,*
- real goals,*
- superficiality,*
- collision of points of view.*

Thus its effects are diminished.

Keywords: *war, militarism, peace and demilitarization.*

INTRODUCTION

The defense system in the SFRY was one of the basic subsystems of society. It was developed from the partisan forces and experiences of the People's Liberation Movement (PLM). A lot was invested in the Movement and it was constantly being developed. The Yugoslav National Army (YNA), as its basic element, was a highly respectable military force. Majority of the current key political figures still remember those times. Many references have been made in favor of past times.

In the meantime, the SFRY broke down into smaller parts it was made up of. The YNA lasted longer than the country it defended and its capacities were used for the formation of the armies of the subsequent countries on its territory.

The SFRY broke apart in a brutal, military way. It was so brutal that no one ever believed it would be put together again. However, they were wrong. The decrees of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in BiH (Dayton Agreement) led to the creation of Yugoslavia in small. Destruction of one multinational community in order to be replaced with another is a political experiment which is, according to many, doomed to failure. One should bear in mind the fact that the Armed Forces of BiH (AF BiH), which were believed to be a positive example and a signpost to other subsystem societies, are nothing more than a poor image of the YNA. Building a perspective, united country is thus additionally hampered with significant, but negative, factors.

After the learned lessons on the SFRY example and its military breakdown, it was expected that the defense system would be looked at with special attention, thoughtfully and carefully. Very soon, ten years after the war, just the opposite happened. Thoughtlessly and carelessly, under the pressure of selfish interests and foreign powerful

people, the Armed Forces of BiH² were formed out of the confronted forces. Promised investments and envisioned system of development saw no light. A lacuna got in the way, in the crossfire of political turmoil, with continual burdening with legacies, affairs, mediocrities... On top of it all, there is political demilitarization which, as an apple of discord, just confirms the futility of community.

There was a gradual need for a detailed analysis of the newly created situation.

Many realized that “the defense system” required a more constructive approach and an exit strategy from an obviously failed and poorly supported project.

One of the suggestions, which has been present in the public for ten years, is the demilitarization of BiH. Is there any truth in this, sincerity and feasibility given the conditions in this country, is the question which requires a prudent and a well-thought-out answer. Avoiding serious discussion on the matter can be counterproductive. **The key aspects of this suggestion need to be reviewed in the light of modern trends and give thoughtful answers.**

One of the ways for seeking answers is considering the essential existence of the armed force. War and militarism, along with everything that accompanies them, give unilateral answers in favor of the army, while the peace situation is more complex. Only an entire insight is correct and can give correct and useful answers.

The wars in this region were fought many times. Only the periods of peace lasted longer or shorter. How long this peace will last should not be subjected to any prognosis. Some Serbian politicians stated that there would be no more wars in BiH and thus proposed the concept of demilitarization. The period behind us is not short and it favors those who are active in the process of building peace, and not those who regard it as a permanent state and a category which cannot be endangered.

The peace in BiH is not stable enough to claim that its citizens live and work in a safe environment. When it comes to that, we should not forget how important it is, given the circumstances that rule in the Balkans. It requires a constant and careful monitoring of the state and timely and efficient measures necessary for dealing with problems. Is there, among these measures, any room for the weakening of military effectiveness and demilitarization? This deserves special consideration and scrutiny.

The aim of this paper is not to answer many questions in **the domain of defense**. Rather, the purpose of this paper is to **identify and define the key elements of the demilitarization issue in BiH**, regardless of the value use of suggested solutions proposed by the Declaration.

The paper should shed some light on the issue of war and peace and help **direct those in charge of defense** and its role in building the sense of protection of the citizens in BiH.

WAR AND MILITARIZATION

In the SFRY, the post-war generations have reached the state of spirit which looks upon war through the: magnifier of solemn speeches about nurturing tradition, embellished historical facts and partisan movies. For the 1980s generations this is ancient

² It is difficult to use the term “the defense system of BiH”, because it has not been officially adopted.

history. Formulated to look appealing and exciting was lightly and uncritically received. The economic as well as the crisis in the functioning of relationships in the state have shifted the focus from war and revolution and put it aside. Former wars were not used as a lesson, nor did they prompt a necessary caution.

The economic crisis, breakdown of the SFRY and the dreadful war destructions in the last two decades of the 20th century have demonstrated in their full destructive force the danger of superficial attitude towards crucial issues. The consequences are such that they will require a lot of time and even more energy to diminish their impact and for social processes to be directed in the positive way. This is why it is necessary for all the activities to be quality designed and implemented in a planned and organized way.

War destructions, the current state BiH is in and the fear of possible repetition of conflicts require a serious approach to this issue.

The essence of war

There are not enough strong reasons to use the term war in this paper in the way Clausewitz and others, classical theoreticians³, use it. With respect to historical facts and modern way of thinking, the more acceptable definition of war (Vojni leksikon, 1981) is the one which says that war is a “complex, intensive and massive conflict of states, military-political alliances or different social powers within one state, where massive and organized use of armed violence and conflict is conducted for the purpose of realizing specific political, economic and military goals of classes, states or people”.

This definition entails all the rudimentary elements of war:

- belligerents,
- armed conflict as a dominant, but not its only trait,
- organized and guided forces within unique social structure,
- given time and space
- more or less applied tactics and rules of warfare and
- clearly defined goal.

Conflict is broader in meaning than war. This means that every conflict is not war. Conflicts were present in the first community, but, essentially, lacked the characteristics of war. Low level of development, attitude towards nature, community needs and types of conflicts could not generate such a complex phenomenon as war. With the development of society, conflicts became complex too. The appearance of social classes led to the necessary prerequisites for conflict to take on the characteristic of war. Wars changed in complexity in the history of human society, and unfortunately more frequent. The progress of civilization did not improve the way of dealing with vexed questions. Disputes were resolved less in a “civilized”, and more in a military way. There was an increase in the number of wars, which were more complex and destructive, if not in the physical sense, then in the structural one. After the prohibition of wars and the idea of absence of wars, many more have broken out after World War II.

³ Classical theoreticians define war as an armed conflict. There are other interpretations of war that denote it as a continual state of conflict where forms of conflict are susceptible to change and by which war goals are achieved through armed forms of violence.

The history of human society can be fully viewed through the history of warfare. There is a widespread belief that **the history of society actually represents the history of warfare**.

In the meantime, a classical notion of war as a complex social phenomenon and not just an armed conflict became prevalent. An armed conflict is the essence of war and the outcome of war greatly rests upon it. Aside from an armed conflict, war includes political, economic, psychological and other forms of conflict. Politics⁴ lies at the heart of war and it determines the issue of war and peace. Politicians choose opponents and allies. Politics governs social community and military forces. It is political decisions that end war, and after war politics steers social community in a designated direction. Economics provides the necessary military potential and it is responsible for many important military issues. The term “economic warfare” is not uncommon and infrequent. The same applies to psychological-propaganda effects, special war, etc.

War is a planned, organized activity governed by defined goals. The planning and preparation is run by politics. Politics holds the key responsibility in warfare, and it directs its influence through a specially formed command part of military forces. The desired goal is the ultimate result of war. These are values that are aspired to and want to be preserved. They are particularly important to the holder. These are political, economic, territorial and military goals. They are determined by:

- self-defense,
- assume control of a part or the whole territory and the potentials of the opposing side,
- annihilation or destruction of the enemy,
- reorganization of social community and
- gaining a better position in social community.

In simpler words, the aim of war is to impose one’s will on the enemy. Such relation between the winner and the defeated makes possible for the winner to realize other military goals.

Aside from the classical interpretation of war, many theoreticians view it as continual conflict lacking arms. According to them, the main idea is achieving goals. Sometimes it is easier to get greater effects on the opposing side without the use of arms. This is possible for those whose political power exceeds the power of the opponent. History is full of examples which show that this is possible without the use of armed violence. The first who made reference this was Sun Tzu⁵ 2,500 years ago in his treatise “The Art of War” (Sun Tzu, 2009).

War is a destructive social phenomenon characterized by devastation and destruction. It destroys the values of man which are the basis of ethical quality of society and most often social order. It destroys human, cultural and material potentials by manipulating the destructiveness of the phenomenon.

Special social relations are established in war in which specific roles, and influence as well, are given to the authorities that get by easily in war conditions. Upon the end

⁴ Carl von Clausewitz in his work “On War” states that: “War is a continuation of politics which deploys other means.”

⁵ Sun Tzu, The Art of War: “Supreme excellence in winning a battle is defeating the enemy without going into one.”

of war, new social relations emerge. This gives room to people of questionable morality to establish their influence in social community. Adjusting war authority to peaceful conditions poses a complex problem.

War is full of negative occurrences, individuals and groups. Aside from devastation and destruction, war favors controversial individuals and groups which cause different problems.

Most often these are war crimes and different forms of crime, damaging of reputation and moral power of the army and people, profiteering, smuggling... Many members of these groups become suspiciously rich and take advantage of this situation after war. The appearance of militarism, no matter how much it is present, ultimately has a negative impact on the efforts of society to deal with numerous problems.

The horrors of World War II and former unsuccessful attempts resulted in the Charter of the United Nations which legally bans a war of aggression, and permits a victim of aggression to defend itself. All new conventions on war law have replaced the term war with the term armed conflict.

The power of the Charter is great, but not great enough to resolve disputes in international relations within complex social communities. Many wars which were waged after the adoption of the Charter testify to this fact. Therefore, **wars, although prohibited, still continue to exist.**

Militarism

It is safe to say that soldiers dominate in war and this is viewed, given the circumstances, by society with understanding and support. The degree of militarism gets high. This, ultimately, becomes a problem which generates other problems. It leads to a state of confusion in which negative phenomena surface. This is an inevitable manifestation. It is destructive and it requires a broader elaboration.

Militarism⁶ is often manifested through disproportional empowering of the army and fleet for the purpose of showing aggression to other countries and **antidemocratic pressure in one's own country** (Vojna enciklopedija, Vol. 5, pp. 587, 1962). One of the manifestations of militarism is the tendency of transferring military notion and relations onto civilians and, in general, onto the entire social relations at the expense of democratic rights and freedoms of citizens.

Essentially, this is an aggressive and reactionary phenomenon deployed by the ruling circles in some countries, especially in Prussia. Like any phenomenon, based on historical facts on crises and wars, militarism had its ups and downs.

Militarism always generates **antimilitarism** which is most often expressed in the fight against the army in favor of militia and against excessive strengthening of military power. This was construed as disproportional influence of the military factor on the political life of the country and aggressiveness in foreign policy. The fight for peace and the development of democracy in the world, combined with other factors, weakens the

⁶ The term militarism (French militarisme, German Militarismus and Russian Милитаризм) appears in the 1960s of the 19th century in order to mark superiority of military circles and army in state and social life of some countries.

influence of militarism. Its final descend from the historical scene is linked to the absence of wars as a means of solving domestic and foreign issues.

The war in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The way of formation of the SFRY can be regarded as a surprise, but the war in BiH surprised only those who “had overslept” the previous events. Unfortunately, some of these included people in high positions.

The war in BiH started as a logical continuation of international conflicts and fights for independence of republics-states on the territory of the former SFRY. The crisis that engulfed this part of the Balkans was already internationalized, so the influence of big powers on the events in BiH was more and more present from day to day.

What was exactly happening in this region at the end of the last century? By generalizing some elements of the war in BiH, one can notice its conventional characteristics and clear traits of interior conflicts. Observed through the prism of the UN Charter, it was a tragic domestic armed conflict with a high degree of involvement of foreign factors. We were the witnesses of that, in a cruel way and by paying a high price, what is forbidden or called by another name did not automatically cease to exist. Putting the events into the classical framework of conflict, we had a war waged with conventional arms. Some regarded it as a fight for survival, others saw it as an aggression, still others construed it as a domestic armed conflict. In any case, it was a war. Viewed from the formal-legal aspect, three **sides were involved in the conflict** – the Serbs, the Croats and the Bosniaks in the form of the Republic of Srpska, “Republic BiH”⁷ and Herzeg Bosnia. In effect, the situation was far more complex than that. The YNA, as an armed force of the then “truncated SFRY” (since April 27, 1992) in the form of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, had abandoned BiH until May 19, 1992. Up until then, it had been executing its constitutional obligations by leading an armed fight for the protection of people and state territory and its own forces, means and capacities. Although they were the allies in the fight against the Republic of Srpska, from 1993 to 1994, in central Bosnia and in the valley of Neretva, the Croats and the Bosniaks fought each other. During that period the Serbs protected the Croats. The alliance, however, did not change in the other parts of BiH. During 1994–1995, on the majority of the area of Velika Kladuša, there was Autonomous Province of Western Bosnia whose forces were the allies of Republic of Srpska. The units of the Croatian Army were active the whole time of war on the territory of BiH, which means that this can be regarded as aggression. The UNPROFOR forces were not unbiased according to their mission and they, on some occasions, deployed arms in the fight against the ARS and on the infrastructure of the RS. NATO forces conducted their own operations with and without the mandate of the Security Council against the ARS and the RS. This issue deserves special multi-disciplinary elaboration, but for the purpose of this paper this is enough.

The armed conflict was a dominant, but not the defining factor of the war. Other features were also very important:

- political fight,

⁷ The Bosniaks wanted to keep the continuity of republic-state and thus try to realize their war goals.

- media war,
- economic war,
- psychological-propaganda influence,
- military help and
- information support.

Some things had its continuity, while others would sometimes take place. Their intensity and influence on the development of situation fluctuated during the war. Due to special significance of the armed forms of conflict, they need to be dealt with in more academic papers. But in this paper, it is enough to point out that the things which had an immense impact on the course of the war and the balance of powers are:

- negotiation processes and different forms of political pressures,
- media satanization of the Serbs
- economic sanctions and blockades,
- different forms of unsubstantiated accusations,
- delivery of arms and military equipment,
- creation of protected zones and introduction of different types of limitation and
- help and support in planning and carrying out operations.

When it comes to the leadership of forces, things tend to get complicated here. International law recognizes command responsibility and accepts factual state in the field. Each of the abovementioned confronted sides had its governing and command structure. Some additional things consisted of tutorship and mentoring, which played an important part in military decision-making. The USA had a prominent role by hiring private companies for military consultation and support. Besides this, they also directly deployed their own capacities as a backup for planning and carrying out operations. The area on which some of these operations and activities were carried out extended the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was determined by:

- areas used for target actions in BiH,
- centers in which decisions were made,
- areas used for armed actions.

It is very difficult to determine the length of war due to different interpretations of its essence. Special attention needs to be paid to the attitudes of the belligerents about the commencement of military operations and the period of implementation of the military part of the Dayton Agreement. One anecdote says that “war begins when in all the news report on numbers of victims instead of individual cases”.

When it comes to warfare tactics the following springs up:

- lack of storms,
- line-trench defense,
- firearms and intelligence support,
- positioning and protection of civilians and
- importance of former military knowledge and experiences in operations.

The law was not sufficiently applied in the armed conflict. Everything was based on the conscience of the individual, and less on the defined political relation. One may question the importance of warfare rules of the authorities and institutions.

No side achieved the war goals in full. The Serbs fought for the survival on their ancestral home, but lost a lot of their territory. The Croats fought for Croatia which would span to the Drina and Zemun, but failed. The Bosniaks feel that the Serbs have Serbia, the Croats have Croatia, and that Bosnia belongs to them. They do not speak of Herzegovina to them know reasons. Some western countries have managed to create a polygon for political experiments and get a good basis for further actions, which means they are the only ones who can be satisfied with accomplished results. Only the situation in BiH is an eyesore which prevents them from receiving worldwide admiration. All this leads to the conclusion that the war on the territory of BiH is not over yet. It is not a classical war, an armed conflict, for there is no armed fight, but there are fierce, other forms of dominant political fight for accomplishing previously set goals. This can be seen in the division of territory, collapse of vital interests and transfer of authority. It is reasonable to say that vital interests, in principle, are the values fought for and about. Whether it is an armed or not an armed conflict is less important. What are the defense measures and the scope of “the defender”, is a question which is not easy to answer. It is not something impossible and difficult, since the consequences require defense in an adequate way. Militarism was not present enough to pose a threat to the social governing system, not even during the war. This is why different forms of animosity towards the ARS, and later towards the AF BiH, seem strange. Viewed in the framework of present time, this phenomenon is isolated and it is attributed solely to the politics of some Serbian parties. Unfortunately, the most influential political parties. When it comes to the opposing sides, and this region, the issue does not have the same magnitude. The militarism in RS manifested itself in the following way:

- society was oriented toward military forces and values,
- civil values lost its significance,
- some military authority figures rose to abnormal prominence,
- military decision-making strongly influenced civil decision-making.

The results were unexpected and disproportional. It is worth pointing out that:

- civil-military antagonisms were created,
- preserving such state was of importance,
- political countermeasures were deployed which, ultimately, very soon resulted in abolition of its own military force and the basis for the creation of a new one.

Since there is a **strong reaction to nothing**, it is necessary to think about its true background and goals. In doing so, the following deserves attention:

- Who is the initiator and what are his reasons?
- Who benefits from it and why?
- What are the gains and losses?
- Does such relation have any perspective?
- Are there any exists and what are they like?

The answers to these and similar questions would enable a useful and acceptable defense policy than the one applied now.

PEACE AND DEMILITARIZATION

The “Wright-Patterson” Air Force Base in Dayton, Federal State of Ohio (USA), was the place where the negotiations about the end of war in BiH from 1–21 November 1995 took place. The Agreement was reached on 21 November and signed the following day. The General Framework Agreement for Peace in BiH or the Dayton Agreement was officially signed in the Elysée Palace on 14 December 1995. The Agreement marked the end of war and defined the postwar situation in BiH. With the implementation of the Agreement a painstaking process of building peace on the territory of BiH started.

The main problems of peace

Peace is a state defined by the absence of war. It is a period of time between two wars. Peace is an antithesis to war. It is the desired state of society in which it can prosper. According to the international law, it is a state where all disputes are resolved without the use of armed violence. Further elaboration on countless definitions of the term is a matter of special sciences, and the abovementioned definition will serve the purpose for this paper.

Building peace is a very complex process. Primarily because of the importance and level of numerous goals which need to be achieved. For BiH, additional complication poses the fact that **the opposing sides** should achieve these goals with **joint efforts** in a united social community. All in all, successfully completed periods are behind us: end of aggression, stabilization of peace and implementation of most of decrees in the Dayton Agreement. Unfortunately, taking into consideration all the terms, it is difficult to choose the one which entirely summarizes the current situation in BiH. It is difficult to say whether this is a state of frozen conflict, incomplete peace, peace, something else or a little bit of everything. The best thing is to use the official term “period of building peace”. Hence, the peace in BiH is still being built and it is not complete.

Other things which are debatable are:

- Neither side is satisfied. Dissatisfaction can lead to new conflicts.
- Neither side accomplished their war goals. It is reasonable to say that all sides will try to accomplish them in peace. This puts strain on peace.
- The quality of peace lies in satisfying life quality of the citizens and development typical of more developed part of social community. This is still not visible, while other very important processes are directed in the wrong way.
- Everyone wants peace, satisfaction, prosperity. After the initial euphoria and serious analysis we are left with those who think that peace is priceless and those who rely upon limits.

Why is this still a burning question is something that science has not been able to explain yet, but the outlines of answers can be found in the following:

- It was very important to end war and give chance to peace. The price of that was less important at the time. Dilemmas appeared only later.
- The energy put into the war was used for its completion or its external support. The latter brought with itself hidden dangers that surfaced only later.
- Foreign factor became the key element with its own interests which could not be achieved in correct peace but by maintaining potential crisis until more favorable solutions appeared as a final solution, a dominant one, working in its own interest.

The chance given to peace in this region can be used positively. A lot of energy of another kind is needed to do this, an energy which recognizes tolerance, wisdom, patience, consensus... The times behind us are full of arguments which lead to the conclusion that this chance was not used in its full potential, but that there is always hope.

Reforms of the defense system in BiH

The word *reform* comes from Latin which means “transformation” (Mala enciklopedija 3, 1978, p. 58). This is reorganization for the purpose of improvement and mending. The biggest transformation that BiH has gone through is in the field of social organization. Socialist way of governing was replaced by capitalist one. The volume of transition and a low quality of coping with new social relations generated a wide specter of problems which particularly reflected themselves in basic areas, the foundations of every society. All the other reforms conducted in BiH directly depend on or serve the above-mentioned ones. They were all supposed to be based on the Dayton Agreement. Many of them are, but some of them were imposed forcefully. This generated another set of problems and additionally burdened the process of building peace. Imposed reforms were not primarily aimed at improving the current situation, but strengthening the central government. This further empowered the advocates of decentralization and forced the other side to openly protest.

Reforms in the defense system were executed in a rather complex situation. Some of them were necessary, while others were extorted. It is important to point out that this social system plays an important part in states of emergency and war, while it has more or less marginalized role in peace. It is also worth mentioning that the peace in BiH, narrow and broader surroundings, **is far from being considered guaranteed peace.**

Postwar demobilization was done in order to transit from the state of war to the state of peace and the state of diminished mobility of some parts of the armed forces. This is a normal and necessary step typical of the end of war and is not construed as a reform in classical sense.

Developments regarding the defense system of the Republic of Srpska during 1997 are untypical, but have significance in the consideration of reforms and compared to the demilitarization policy in BiH. From the aspect of reforms, radical personnel changes were carried out, the process of abandoning the YNA and war legacy was initiated and specific improvements were planned. From the aspect of demilitarization planners, entropy of military professionalism was initiated at the expense of politically suitable per-

sonnel, experimental engagement of police⁸ was executed in military assignments and “a virus of destruction” was planted in the ARS. These actions were perceived as a political impact on the Army and they deserve special attention.

“Locker’s Reform”⁹ of the BiH defense system was designed to generate solutions which would enable BiH to join the Partnership for Peace. The Commission proposed a solution in 2004 which all three sides found relatively satisfactory. The implementation of the solution, essentially, implies abolishment of entities and cantonal ministries of defense and formation of joint Ministry of Defense BiH. At the end of the painstaking work of the Commission and its teams and partial implementation of the reached agreement, the reform was declared unsuccessful. As it was explained, it had a systematic error. It was obvious that, in the meantime, a more profitable agreement was “reached” in some political circles and that the way to centralized defense system and formation of joint Armed Forces was open. The Serbian government yield to Ashdown’s pressure.

In December 2004, the High Representative of the international community for BiH, Paddy Ashdown¹⁰, formed a new Defense Reform Commission. The cochairmen of the Commission were Dr. Raffi Gregorian¹¹ and the Minister of Defense BiH, Nikola Radovanović. It took only six months for the Commission to coordinate solutions of unified defense system of BiH governed by the Law on Defense of BiH and the Law on Service in the AF BiH. With the implementation of these solutions, dated 1 January 2006, the entity armies were shut down.

Only ten years after the war, the ARS, as a respectable military force which played an important part in the creation and defense of the Republic of Srpska, was not able to impose itself on the Serbian political establishment. The significant immovable property it owned was at disposal to others, it was tarnished by framed scandals and shut down, which is not stipulated by the Dayton Agreement unless a specific agreement is reached. The explanation of this act lies in the fact that there will be no more wars in this region. This form of attitude is still advocated by some Serbian politicians, which calls for evaluation of political reality in the light of current events.

An enormous step taken in the last defense reform poses a risk which still has not met expectations. It did not launch the euphoric centralization of BiH, so the defense system remained in the crossfire, exposed to constant impacts of political storms.

Demilitarization

Demilitarization (Vojni leksikon, 1981) in narrow, military, sense represents an obligation of a state not to station military forces in certain parts of its territory and main-

⁸ There are police units (the Carabinieri in Italy and the Gendarmerie in Serbia) which are trained to carry out the tasks of civilian and military police, but not complex military operations.

⁹ James R. Locher, an American military expert who the High Representative of the international community for BiH, Paddy Ashdown, appointed the Chairman of the Defense Reform Commission for BiH.

¹⁰ Jeremy John Durham Ashdown (Paddy Ashdown) is a British politician, the Chair of the Liberal Democrats 1988–1999, and as of 2000 a lifetime knight at the House of Lords UK. On May 27, 2002 he became the High Representative of the IC in BiH.

¹¹ Dr. Raffi Gregorian, until his appointment in the Commission, was a civil servant at the NATO Headquarters in Sarajevo. After that, he was appointed a Supervisor for the District Brčko and a Deputy of the High Representative.

tain military machines. The obligation has an international-legal character and it is most often regulated by agreement on truce or peace. In this way the situation on mainland is controlled, while special rules are applied for air space and coast belt.

In broader, political sense, demilitarization (Mala enciklopedija, 1978),¹² in principle, represents the process of diminishment and elimination of military influence on civilian governing of society. There are no known examples of successfully implemented demilitarization by either of the opposing sides or single parts of territory in a conflict. The war in BiH was an attempt to demilitarize some zones. On 16 April 1993 an UNPROFOR commander, French general Philippe Morillon, declared Srebrenica a UN protected zone (UN Security Council Resolution 819). As of 6 May 1993 the Resolution declared the areas of Sarajevo, Tuzla, Žepa, Goražde, Bihać and Srebrenica demilitarized zones under the UN protection. It is generally known that they were never demilitarized, and the military forces in these areas did not decrease their military actions. Unfortunately, the other side took advantage of its position at the international level and the concurrence of goals with those of the USA, Germany, Great Britain and other NATO state members, to deploy military provocations and force the ARS to respond adequately, further escalating the situation. The outcome was the NATO military intervention against the RS.

DECLARATION ON STRATEGIC COMMITMENTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF SRPSKA IN THE DEFENSE SYSTEM

On 18 March 2005 the National Assembly of the Republic of Srpska (NARS), on the initiative of the Caucus to the Alliance of Independent Social Democrats (AISD), adopted the Declaration¹³ on Strategic Commitments of the RS in the defense system. This took place at the time when the Defense Reform Commission was in force to which the same convocation of the NARS gave a unanimous approval for transferring defense authority from entity to state level. The outcome of the Commission's efforts was abolition of entity and formation of united AF BiH. It is clear that the primary goal of the proposers was to influence the electorate, and the secondary goal was an attempt to control the Commission. Given the decision-making process at the BiH level, which the Declaration proposers and the MPs to NARS were aware of, it seems that this initiative, aside from being an opinion and a proposal, serves at the same time for distancing from previous efforts.

The subsequent declaration and politics which came out of it did not shut down military capacities until 2007, but the initiative still serves as a guiding idea in the BiH

¹² Demilitarization implies "measures aimed at decreasing or ending military tradition, caste-corporative status of the officer corps, higher appreciation for military than civilian government, indoctrination of the young in the military spirit, etc."

¹³ A declaration (Vojni leksikon, 1981) represents "an act that defines a political program or principle opinion on important political and other issues. A declaration is a form of statement of the international law in order to establish, confirm or increase the influence of a given law. Declaration in itself is a written act containing such statement. A declaration is a unilateral act that a state uses to express its attitude towards a given international issue." A declaration in general (Mala enciklopedija, 1978) means: "a statement, an explanation, an announcement and a notification. It represent a statement of the government on its politics with the first encounter with the parliament or in other important cases a parliamentary statement, a statement of some parliamentary party and alike."

defense system. The President of the Republic of Srpska (RS), Milorad Dodik, launched an initiative on 8 October 2012 for demilitarization of BiH seconded by the RS Government and the NARS. The initiative was coordinated with the Declaration. For the first time, since the formation of the AF BiH, the President Dodik publically admitted that the reform was not in accordance with the Dayton Agreement but was a fruit of the pressure of the international community, i.e. the High Representative at the time, Ashdown. After this reaction, and later on frequent statements of the RS officials, it is clear that demilitarization policy is here to stay and that is governed by the Declaration decrees.

The essence of the Declaration

The Declaration itself offers a concept of the BiH defense system. It is not defined in detail, which is not necessary for this kind of act. The basis for the idea of shutting down its own military capacities in BiH or reducing them to minimum was defined swiftly and superficially. This diminished the quality of upgrading it at the start. This particularly relates to the idea that “**democratic states do not fight each other**”.

The essence of the Declaration comes down to:

- shutting down its own military capacities,
- redirecting released funds and
- footing in the defense against: NATO guarantees and the Signatories to the Dayton Agreement and police forces.

As an idea¹⁴, the stances in the Declaration possess a potential for further thinking and elaboration, but they are partly burdened with unrealistic stands, and some of them are directly collided. It is particularly difficult to find historical basis for these kinds of reflection. When it comes to one of the most essential needs of the people and social community to feel protected, **this kind of risk** is maybe acceptable for the individual, **but not** for the people.

This “idea” has been present in the public almost 10 years so the reflections about it were thoroughly and clearly formulated and argued. Since the defense system is centralized, the reflections coming from the RS are less important. It is important what foreign and military-political analysts and politicians from the BiH Federation think. They, for the most part, claim that is not possible to join the NATO and the EU without the AF. They believe that it is not the right time for one such reform and that the BiH demilitarization policy is populist, frivolous and unrealistic. This undoubtedly shows that the Declaration suggestions will not be taken into consideration, let alone accepted in the

¹⁴ An idea (Mala enciklopedija, 1978) is a figure, a form; the term with an indefinite number of meanings comprises everything what is not directly given in reality, but is created in the human spirit and is a product of the human spirit: 1. a thought, a notion about something, a concept of something which is between a live presentation and an abstract notion and is used to express or reflect something; any cognitive experience, regardless whether it is direct or indirect; 2. an invention, that what is created in the human spirit as a creation of imagination, and it is realized in different ways in different areas of human creativity (art, science, philosophy, industry, technology and everyday life), as well as a process creation which has a symbolic and representative function; 3. a project, blueprint, vision of something that does not exist, but can (an idea for the reform of society, education, etc.); 4. an attitude in the sense of given opinion, a view in the sense of specific spiritual orientations and understanding.

near future. All the efforts of turning this idea into a concrete project and starting with its realization were in vain. Lack of operationalization has, primarily, turned this well-intentioned idea into Utopia¹⁵. One must admit that decentralized BiH free of conflicts and wars sounds good. Advocating something like this is not out of malice. However, putting aside the real, political function of the Declaration, its contents is interpreted as it is. It is not difficult to see the unreality and the impossibility of suggested solutions. This Utopian vision of the transformation of BiH is not in accordance with previous experiences, but it could be realized in new, changed conditions and circumstances. Thus, working on their changes comes in the foreground.

Given the fact that there have not been any attempts about the consideration of suggested solutions, a number of Serbian politicians **turned** the notion and “vision” of transformation of BiH **into sort of guidelines for political demilitarization**. Viewed from this time reference, it is clear that demilitarization policy is favored by the people, especially the people in the RS. Especially the viewpoint about redirecting funds. It is not unlikely that BiH will go through this transformation but its realistic planning is still nowhere in sight. It is in the interest of all relevant factors in and related to BiH (or should be) to create such social community in which military capacities would not exist. The interest is not different, but the ideas about getting one such community definitely are. Thus this “idea” is construed as Utopian. However, by putting aside the physical part of demilitarization, the question remains what to do with the militarized people’s awareness in this region. **How to demilitarize the minds** of soldiers, policemen, sports riflemen, hunters, or worse, criminals, Vehabias, terrorists...?

Problems that hinder demilitarization

If we were to conduct a serious evaluation of the situation in the functioning of BiH demilitarization policy, we would reach the following, general, conclusions:

- The entire world is, hypothetically speaking, militarized, both in physical and psychological sense. There are no global considerations about general demilitarization. The world has for a long time been a public scene where general state has influence on specific areas and vice versa. This applies to BiH too. Any attempt for changes without general approval does not guarantee success.
- The situation in the narrower and wider surroundings is burdened with a lot of disputes. The Euro-Atlantic integrations are ongoing processes, which have a positive effect on building peace and good neighborly relations. Supporting these processes would have a direct, favorable impact on the process itself and demilitarization as an ultimate state.

¹⁵ Utopia (Mala enciklopedija, 1978) means: “a place which does not exist, the name of Thomas More’s work (About the best state constitution or a new island Utopia); in general, a name for any work, doctrine, concept, project which is ideally designed, but unrealistic and unrealizable; however, Utopia is a vision of the existing social relations, although not in accordance with former experiences, can still be realized in new, changed circumstances; in that regard it confronts real things as criticism of the existing and a spiritual guidance for the transformation of the existing. Finally, every project is Utopian which is not based on real, but ideal assumptions generated by the mind.”

- The situation in BiH is no such to take serious considerations about demilitarization. It is a situation of an unfinished conflict where there are still forces that contemplate about the chances for the realization of previously set war goals. In this kind of situation caution is an essential need.
- There is no honest and serious attitude toward the issues of jeopardizing security, on the one hand, and the defense issues, on the other. There is no lack in wisdom, but the focus and honesty can be challenged. It is necessary and possible to change this.
- The state of the defense system is below required level and it continues to collapse. At the same time, there is no clear political stand and idea of what wants to be accomplished with this system. Authorized institutions and individuals have to be clearly defined for the purpose of further development of this very important, useful, efficient and necessary part of society. Suggested alternatives are not the solution.
- The BiH territory poses an auspicious starting point for the emergence of crisis and endangering the safety of citizens. The stronger the awareness about this fact, the greater the chance of timely and efficient countermeasures.

When it comes to the Declaration and the solutions in it, the following is disputable:

- Who and how deals with the issues that can be influenced? In this case, the effects are counterproductive. It is not fair, due to insufficient opportunities for dealing with basic human issues, to redirect attention from them to “the scapegoat” – the defense system.
- Superficial attitude toward serious issues. A sober and responsible thinking and approach is expected of authorized institutions and individuals. The given in relation to demilitarization policy points to a similar approach to more important, life, issues.
- Every social community has a need for specific forces, special means and high level of willingness to respond to specific situations. The role of the army is irreplaceable here. Police forces can faintly compete with the level of knowledge, skills and operational skills for executing extra, very complex tasks in the field of territorial defense.
- Pacifism is not much of a solution. Making a state dependent on the will of the opposing side or a situation where somebody else has to defend it is irresponsible.
- There have been cases of redistribution of approved funds, but there is no economic and social logics like the one in the Declaration. It is not to be expected that any of this will significantly change in the near future.

CONCLUSION

Although wars are prohibited by the UN Charter, they continue to break out. They are waged because of interests and values, which can be obtained without an armed conflict. Thus, the courage and readiness of soldiers who defend these values in an armed

conflict compared to soldiers who defend them in peace are viewed equally. Due to difference in type of sacrifice, politicians are obliged to braver defense against attacks and a more responsible governing of social community. The war in BiH (the armed part) was ended with the Dayton Agreement. The outcome is a state which does not suit any of the constitutional people. Neither of the opposing sides realized their previously set war goals, hence the fight for them in peace changed only in form. It was continued, admittedly, with a lower intensity and well camouflaged and efficient forms of armed conflict for the centralization of BiH, abolishment of entities and Bosniak dominance. The state of peace does not guarantee the protection of its citizens in full sense. The reforms being implemented are aimed at the centralization of BiH, not the improvement of the situation. The defense system reform has put the maturity and courage of the RS politicians on test. They are not strong enough to contribute to and defend the RS. They yielded to pressure and they renounced their own military force, the ARS. Since they failed to defend the ARS, it was not to be expected that they would defend the united AF BiH. "The exit" lies in demilitarization policy. The Serbs did portray militarism to that extent so it would generate antimilitarism, which would lead to strategic commitment against military capacities. It is a consequence of lack of political courage, the state of internal (civilian-military) relations and reckless attitudes. **BiH demilitarization is an idea since it represents a vision of something that does not exist.** The vision of highly positioned persons in the main social institutions should not be disputed lightly, and just the opposite is true. Seven years given for the deadline of realization of this idea is long enough to abandon or revise it. None of the aforementioned took place, which **has made it susceptible to dispute. A Utopian idea is not good enough to be put into operation.** The envisioned state of peace and prosperity of society in which everybody is protected and satisfied seems nice and attractive, but it is far away and blurred. Undefined or general ways of realization of suggestions are removing it from reality and bringing it closer to Utopia. An extra problem poses the opposition and degradation of the Croats and Bosniaks. However, there are also hidden dangers here, and they should be avoided. The fact is that the BiH citizens are gradually becoming accustomed to fictitious solutions and ideas. One more or less does not pose a problem, but it becomes one when it turns into a critical mass and society "hits a dead end", without the possibility for prosperity.

The solutions in the Declaration (putting people and society in a state of defense dependant on guarantees, foreign military forces and own faulty organization of the defense forces) **are not good.** The suggestion is typical of radical changes. In order to be accepted in the amount required for decision-making, it is necessary to get an acceptable explanation and conduct a quality campaign. Both these parts are left out which means, in principle, **that the current situation in BiH is not disputed.** It is clear that the stances in the Declaration have become the guidelines in some political options in the RS for governing demilitarization policy and a form of **a daily-political combination** used as distraction from more important, but intractable, existential problems of the citizens.

REFERENCES

- *Vojna enciklopedija* (1962). Beograd: Redakcija vojne enciklopedije.
- *Vojni leksikon* (1981). Beograd: Vojnoizdavački zavod.

- *Deklaracija o strateškim opredeljenjima RS u oblasti odbrane*, NSRS, 2005.
- Klauzevic, K. (1951). *O ratu*. Beograd: Buk Karadžić.
- *Mala enciklopedija* (1978). Beograd: Prosveta.
- Mor T. (2012). *Utopija*. Beograd: Delfi knjižare.
- *Opšti okvirni sporazum za mir u BiH*, Dejton, Pariz, 1995.
- Sun Cu (2009). *Umeće ratovanja*. Zagreb Mozaik knjiga.
- *Zakon o odbrani BiH*, PS BiH, 2005.

Paper submitted: 9.10.2013.

Paper approved: 17.2.2014.