

**Prof. dr. Jusuf Žiga**  
Faculty of Political Sciences  
University of Sarajevo

## **CHALLENGES OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA IN THE PROCESS OF EURO-ATLANTIC INTEGRATION**

*Text is published in periodical "Survey" 3-4, 2007*

### **Summary**

*The multilateral character of the society of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which has been sedimented for a millennium, should represent its comparative advantage in the process of association to the Euro-Atlantic structures.*

*On the other hand, it would be difficult to believe the trustworthiness of the proclaimed European principles for European integration, if Bosnia and Herzegovina is not offered help to transcend the legal, political and limitations of other kind, imposed by the Dayton Agreement, which prevent harmonization of the country with the EU principles.*

*The Dayton "solutions" are also not correspondent with the historical character of the society of Bosnia and Herzegovina, its ethnological diversity, which is a result of openness towards the other and the different, as well as of respect and incorporation of "otherness" into its ethnological substance.*

*How to accept the apartheid-like limits in the Electoral Law (in the process of electing the Presidency members and while constituting the House of Peoples), or unequal positioning in the decision-making processes of legislative and executive organs (the so-called entity voting) which has been instilled in the constitutional system, especially when one refers to the country's insufficiency in comparison to its entities, for which it has been stressed that they are not states?*

*The current Constitution of Bosnia and Herzegovina does not recognize a single positive experience in functioning of the world's states, not even the legal and political theory in general. That is why it is imperative to harmonize the Constitution with the European environment.*

## Introduction

We live in the time of globalization, which is an attempt to bring about a new world order which will, as it seems, impose all kinds of novelties to the mankind, starting with the information and communication systems and a general dynamism, uniformed clichés and highly demanding standards in all spheres of life, all the way to redefining of the past ethical and other conceptions about the human activities. One question is inevitably imposed: How to, paradigmatically speaking, be in sync with time, yet not dislocated in space and not pushed aside to the margins?

The Euro-Atlantic integrations, which Bosnia and Herzegovina is trying to become a part of, should be observed in the above-mentioned context.

What does globalization really represent? Is it the installment of a unilateral world order, after the collapse of the bipolar, or is it, as many say, an attempt of “westernization”, that is “Americanization” of the world? Is the European Union constituted on a similar “matrix”? Many questions arise and should be answered adequately.

Some authors claim that we have already stepped into the “inevitable conflict of civilizations” for the purpose of “mundialization of the planet”. Some also see globalization as “expansion, deepening and acceleration of the world interrelations, transformation of societies, cultures and economies of the developed capitalist world and the ones who are outside of that” (Tony Mc Grew). Others identify globalization with the “multi-national stage of the capitalism”, recognizable for “innovations in communication technologies”, which push back the local differences and result in “a fast assimilation of the previously- autonomous national markets”, which means “massification of all the peoples on the planet.” (Frederic Jameson).

It is also said that globalization is an intention of “widening of the social, political and economic activities beyond the borders of the national states”, that is, in the context of “trans-regional networking, with the possibility of acting at a distance”, and all “thanks to the modern communication transport systems”.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See more: Z. Golubovic, *Challenges of Democracy in the Contemporary World*, Požarevac, Centre for Culture, 2003, p. 42 – 65.

For Richard Falk, the main dimension of globalization is reflected in “the compression of time and space, which generally affects ideas, feelings and behavior, and fundamentally and rapidly changes the everyday life of man”.

According to Anthony Giddens, it is “intensification of the world social relations”, in which the “remote localities are connected and events are formed which take place miles away”; while K. Kilminster is of the opinion that “globalization changes the nature of human relations in the sense of the increase of inter-dependence between the peoples and the increased consciousness on the common human life”.

Samuel P. Huntington sees globalization as “imposing the Western system of values to the world”. After the end of the Cold War, “Islamic and Confucian (and especially Islamic) civilization will”, according to this author, inevitably “come into conflict with the west-Christian civilization”.

On the other hand, Noam Chomsky emphasized that “globalization is a deceit of the Western elite who wants to use it as means to rule the entire world”.

The way people understand the term “globalization”, that is, “standards of universalism” is of crucial importance. The same could be said for the European integration processes, for, it is not the same to speak in the context of “conflict of civilizations”, especially in multilateral societies like Bosnia and Herzegovina, or in the context of the above-mentioned “Westernization”, that is, “Americanization” of the world; or to measure all that by contemplating the new philosophy of life, dictated by the IT revolution, etc.

Does this, perhaps, conceal the wish of the developed Western countries, led by the USA, to impose the “economic imperialism”, to use the words of Ulrich Beck; or is it about the “ideology of neo-liberalism” which handicaps the powerless and underdeveloped and favors the powerful and developed; or is the issue, perhaps, the “neo-liberals’ ideology of market fundamentalism” (A. Giddens)?

If globalization, and in that context, the European integration, is to impose itself to the world in an imperial manner, that is, in the sense of exclusively preferring the cultural values of Western Europe, in order for that process to be “unified pursuant to the Anglo-American standards”, i.e. without respecting even those cultural and traditional elements of life which have lasted for millenniums, such as Chinese, Indian, African,

South-American, and the like, in which the emphasis has often been on *common* rather than on individual characteristics of people, that is, on the “spiritual-religious aspects of life”, not only on the material (in the sense of exclusive favoring of technical progress), then the issue is to what extent would it really be accepted at the global level, but also capable to “open new prospects for cultural or any other advancement of many peoples in the world”.

This is why many analysts of globalization emphasize that it cannot be a uniformly imposed process, “independent and ignorant of the different peoples’ traditions”.

To simplify the matter, we could narrow the controversies regarding globalization in three options:

- a) *Affirmative*, in the sense of establishing a new world order on “common mundial values, norms and patterns”, that is “formation of the world economy which will push aside the local economic relations...”, which will result in “the beginning of the end of the national states”. According to F. Fukuyama, “liberal democracy will succeed to meet all the needs and tendencies of the new age man, which will definitively mark the end of history”;
- b) *Skeptical*, which can be brought down to fear that the new world order will even more favor the developed and handicap the underdeveloped. In that sense, John Esposito is of the opinion that globalization is “an extremely dangerous threat, because Americanization of the world hides behind that name”. Anthony Giddens expressed similar fears of “westernization” of the world.
- c) *Transformational*, in the sense of “inevitable consequences of the technical revolution in the field of communications, which help decrease distances, which, in turn, cannot be without implications to the different aspects of human life”, but, at the same time, the above-mentioned opposite valorizations of globalization are rejected.<sup>2</sup>

One thing most analysts agree on is that globalization encompasses all the important areas of human activities, not only some: in the domain of economy, that is the “liberalization-oriented trend”, in political life, it is “preferring democracy and decentralization of power”, in culture it

---

<sup>2</sup> See more: B. Aminima, Signs of Time, No.17/2002

is “univerzalization of communications and transfer of cultural values”, not only the “globalization of symbols” and expansion of the so-called “mass culture” (M. Waters).

However, in relation to the above-mentioned, numerous dilemmas arise. Several authors, like Scott, have asked: “does the globalization process necessarily lead to a synthesis of particular and universal values”, that is, is it truly possible to harmonize the standardization imposed by the globalization processes with local diversities, or is the “tendency towards uniqueness of differences”, as Robertson sees it, more realistic?

What will really happen: the so-called “McDonaldization” of the world, the “global proliferation of the Anglo-American values and lifestyle”, advocated by Francis Fukuyama, in which equalization of the “Americanization of the world” with the “spread of democracy and free market” takes place; or will the “local cultural nooks” survive?

Imperial conquests are also spread through language (80% of the Internet sites are in English!). The number of languages spoken in the world seriously decreases (“in the year 1500, there were 14.500 languages, while in the year 2000, the number came down to 7.000”). Some linguists predict that by the end of the 21st century, the “remaining 50 – 90% of today’s languages will disappear. Currently, there are about 6.800 languages spoken in the world; 357 languages are spoken by groups of not more than 50 people!<sup>3</sup>

Opposite the optimistic scenario of globalization that has been discussed previously, and which “begins with the concept of liberalization with multicultural values of the contemporary society within which it is possible to realize a social and legal equilibrium, with the help of standardization, information technology and mobile partnership”, in the way that the free flow of capital and international business is ensured, there is a pessimistic view in which globofobes recognize (in globalization) neocolonialism, that is, “imperialism realized by transnational speculative capital in the hands of the international capitalist organizations”. The flow of capital is seen in the way that it reaches the areas in which the labor force is cheap. On the other hand, the change of the labor character, from the point of view of greater technical demands, causes local unemployment and economic migrations (Lechner and Boli, 2000/2003), which, again,

---

<sup>3</sup> See: Dnevni avaz, 4. 9. 2003

in the “nationally secluded areas of the countries receivers bring either ghettoization or frustrations related to the cultural identity” (N.Ibrulj).

This is where a key dilemma is imposed: “should the global forms be accepted” and all the incompatible, proper social agenda rejected; or should such agenda be rearranged in accordance to the “international standards” and made mobile and comparative with the global surrounding?

There is another interesting phenomenon emphasized by analysts studying the integrational and transitional processes in the world: “syncretism of cultures and hybridization of peoples”. Economic migrations, migrations which result from ethnic conflicts and wars, as well as from huge natural calamities, escape of different dissidents and the like, bring about serious problems and lack of adaptation skills. This was shown in the studies performed by Peter Kivist (2002). The studies focused on Canada, Great Britain, Germany, but the situation is similar in many other countries. What can be observed is animosity of the domicile inhabitants towards the immigrants and vice versa. The former think that the immigrants bring something that is “foreign and dangerous” to their culture and tradition, while the latter become frustrated because of the lack of acceptance of their “lifestyle” in the new environment.

Many analysts agree that “two ways of thinking change and determine the social, political, cultural and religious relief of the contemporary world: globalism on the one hand and individualism and pluralism on the other. Globalism does that through a concept of transnational culture and religious paradigm, while pluralism and individualism do that through pluralization of individualized, that is, subjectivized universal cultural and religious values. These ways of thinking fundamentally produce the crisis of individual and collective identities”.<sup>4</sup>

That has been taking place dramatically in multilateral societies and regions. In that sense, A. Silajdžić, PhD, emphasized the problem of identity of Muslims in Europe. “Since the spiritual and cultural identity and fundamental crisis, it is quite natural that Muslims are also looking for an answer of how to preserve and affirm one’s own cultural specialty in the multilateral Europe.” This author is of the opinion that the “idea of multiculturalism, which the European peoples got acquainted with when

---

<sup>4</sup> A. Silajdžić, *Muslims in Search of an Identity*, FIN- IC El-Kalem, Sarajevo, 2006, p. 89

they had encountered Muslims from Sicily and Spain, was oppressed for centuries in the religious philosophy of the old Europe, through the ideology of Christo-centrism – the religious exclusivism, that is, in the social and political philosophy of the modern Europe which is the ideology of unilateralism, that has been, for centuries, expressed in the shape of Eurocentrism, colonialism; today as neocolonialism, neoliberalism, etc.”<sup>5</sup>

Keeping in mind the above stated, A. Silajdžić asks the following: “Is it possible to talk about cultural pluralism in the United Europe, outside of its ideological determination? Finally, in what way is it possible, if it is possible at all, to promote even further the idea of multiculturalism and multilateralism, that is to promote the idea of pluralism of the world, religions, cultures and civilizations, in the new European community, in which exist serious tendencies advocating militarization of Europe?”<sup>6</sup>

If culture is seen as a “universal good”, which, by its immanent nature, “does not bear any political and ideological, national and regional exclusivisms, for they are its two completely opposite polarities”<sup>7</sup>, the aforesaid will have an additional sense.

### **Multilateralism of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a Comparative Advantage or a Handicap in the Integration Processes in Europe and in the World?**

We live in the time of a general identity crisis, which can be analytically observed from within, in deep, in the sense of recognizing the dislocation towards one’s own cultural and traditional roots; as well as from the outside, through diagnosing the evident state of renegade within the human kind in general. It seems that we care less and less about the human complexity, about the charm of living in diversities, especially in the time of clichés globalism brings.

The genius that shaped us, in all the senses this term could mean, had a good reason to make, for example, even the siamese twins different. Let us only imagine what we would feel like if we were all the same, that is, if we all had our duplicates...

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid, p. 92

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, p. 95

<sup>7</sup> Ibid, p. 101

Precious varieties within the human kind (those of race, culture, religion, ideology...) cannot be fruitful without tolerance and mutual respect. Instead, the attacks of one man against another, especially if the other is different, are becoming increasingly brutal.

Although motivation for conflicts between people has existed since the beginning of time (religions talk even about the conflicts in the first generation of Adam and Eve's offspring), it seems that the modern man has surpassed all that, not only in the quantitative sense, which could be understood to a point, if one keeps in mind the current demographic explosion, but also in the sense of character of the crime over members of the same kind, as well as in the absence of consciousness on where such conflicts take us. We are witnessing the mass killing, abuse and all kinds of humiliation of people, only because they differ in skin color, race, religious affiliation, cultural and traditional manners, ideology...

In this context, multilateralism of Bosnia and Herzegovina is of the planetary importance. With respect to the spacial limitation of the essay, I will hereby mention only a few arguments that go in favor to the aforementioned view.

Firstly, while Europe and the world in general are trying, even today, and with evident frustrations and paranoia, to get used to the other and the different; in Bosnia, religious, cultural, traditional and all other kinds of multilateralism have been cherished and protected for centuries, and that, civilization-wise, deserves attention. That is why the sluggishness of primarily European countries in response to the recent aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina is very concerning.

Secondly, one should keep in mind the value of numerous spiritual and cultural points of origin of the Bosnian multilateralism. We will only mention some of them and from the relatively new history of this society:

- Presence of neo-Manichaeism in the area;
- Specific characteristics of the Bosnian Church, which had been considered heretic by both the Catholic and Orthodox tradition;
- Several centuries' long influence of Catholicism on the multilateral character of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is through that spirituality that the vibrations from the West reached the area and some of its cultural and traditional characteristics came to life;
- On the other hand, spirituality and culture of Byzantium, that is, the Orthodox Christianity, had also reached the area and left a visible trace in the physiognomy of Bosnia and Herzegovina;



- Also, Islamic civilization came to life here with the Ottoman conquest, in its fullness, which lasts up to this day in a recognizable manner;
- Sometime later, Jews exiled from Spain also came here, bringing additional spiritual and cultural treasures to the area;
- Then, in the late 19th and early 20th century, Bosnia and Herzegovina came under the power of Austro-Hungary, which also accepted the local multilateralism;
- After that, this country survived all the regimes of Yugoslavia, that is, its integrations and desintegrations.

In short, *Bosnia and Herzegovina is not a piece of the planet in which different civilizations, religions and cultures met and “came into a conflict”*. Even the recent aggression against this country cannot be observed in such a way, contrary to suggestions made by certain analysts like S.P. Huntington. The issue here is, in fact, that we have a case of a “planetary intersection”, in which the East and the West, the North and the South, that is, different civilizational sides, have fruitfully joined together, like colors of rainbow, and in which the individual and the common have been differed quite clearly. For over a millennium, this has been a place where different civilizational substantialities and lifestyles meet, intertwine and influence one another. The result of that “meeting” is that all those substantialities have sedimented, in an “organic manner”, into the Bosnian “unity of differences”.

In other words, multilateralism of the society of Bosnia and Herzegovina is authentic. It is not a mere collection of the spiritual, cultural, civilizational, that is, ethnic gists, which (co)exist one next to another because of the historical circumstances.

Indeed, Ivo Banac was right when he emphasized that “Bosnia and Herzegovina is a particular society – a particular cultural space. The three Bosnian communities have never been completely isolated and the separate customs and mentalities intertwined (and I think they still do) in a society which is different from that in Croatia and Serbia. It is exactly because this Bosnia was an integrated cultural space, with a separate historical identity, it cannot be compared to Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia was a state, not a society. Bosnia, on the other hand, regardless of how weak a state it is, represents a true society”.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Banac I., *The Price of Bosnia*, Europa danas, Zagreb, 1994, p. 108

The truth is, Bosnia and Herzegovina had gone through certain physiognomic discontinuities, but, historically, it never disappeared as an entity. On the contrary, it was respected by the Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and Yugoslav regimes. However, we will discuss that issue on another occasion.

One should also keep in mind the existence of written documents on the longstanding relationship between the Bosnian state and other countries. Although, in that sense, the Kulin Ban Decree, which dates back to 1189, is not the oldest written document in the state of Bosnia (there is also the Plate of Hum, which dates back to the late 10th and early 11th century; Bosnia is also mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenetos in his work entitled *De administrando imperio*), it can surely be taken as the “birth certificate of Bosnian statehood, in which borders of Bosnia are mentioned. In that document, the Bosnian Ban (ruler) Kulin guarantees the merchants of Dubrovnik safety of life, property and honour.”<sup>9</sup>

Several centuries later, or, in precise terms, in 1463, Sultan Mehmet II Fatih, conqueror of the Medieval Bosnian state, presented a decree to the then-leader of Bosnian Franciscans, Firar Anđelo Zvizdović, guaranteeing them safety and freedom of faith. Authentic facsimile of this document, which bears testimony of longstanding co-existence and mutual respect between the followers of different religions in the area, is preserved today in a Franciscan monastery in Fojnica.

Academician Muhamed Filipović emphasized that “those are the authentic documents of our entire independent and original state and cultural identity. The very proof of the homogenous and unified spiritual and linguistic development of Bosnia lies in the fact that the wonderful language, in which our first historical charters and documents were written, including the famous *Kulin Ban Charter*, written to the State of Dubrovnik 800 years ago (we celebrated the anniversary recently, in 1989) is completely comprehensible today to every Bosniak (and to every Bosnian – we would add – note J.Ž.). Of all the Slavic countries in this area, Bosnia is special because of the homogenous character of language in time and in space.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Dr. M. Maglajlić, See Dnevni avaz 2.9.2005

<sup>10</sup> Filipović M. “Bosnia and Herzegovina – the Most Important Geographical, Demographical, Historical, Cultural and Political Facts”, Compact, Sarajevo, 1997, p. 62

Multilateralism of the society of Bosnia and Herzegovina can be seen with bare eyes in almost every corner of the country, from Trebinje and Stolac in the south, to Gradačac and Brčko in the north, from Srebrenica, Višegrad and Zvornik in the east to Bihać in the west of the country. For centuries, the Bosnian people have lived together in towns and villages, and in apartment buildings lately as well. That was not found unusual, but rather accepted as lifestyle. Not only Sarajevo, but other cities of Bosnia as well, as rare examples in the world, have been centuries' old, prototypical witnesses of the possible spiritual and cultural multilateralism of life.

Destroyers of the Bosnian society and “persecutors of Bosnia” from Bosnia and Herzegovina, are trying to “convince” all around them that multilateralism has neither existed nor functioned in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Certain number of countries, including the most influential, have been persuaded into a wrong and certainly devastating attitude about what happened in this country, through prejudice and through favoring the attitude that the relations between the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bosniaks, Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats) are “determined by hatred”. All that has happened in spite of the fact that the conflicts between the local Catholics, Orthodox and Muslims were never initiated from within, and that has been confirmed by many, scientifically verified evidence<sup>11</sup> we would like to assert on this occasion.

“Although the three religions existed in Bosnia in the Middle Ages”, J. Fine and R. Donia emphasized, “all the believers tolerated one another”.<sup>12</sup> Good neighborly relations and tolerance have always been traditionally cultivated. “Armed conflict, ethnic cleansing, bombardment of cities and crimes against civilians have never been treated in Bosnia as consequences of ethno-national divisions in the Bosnian society; they developed after the transformation of JNA (Yugoslav National Army) into an instrument of Serb nationalists, annexionistic ambitions of Serbian and Croatian governments, and eagerness of the national extremists to realize the ethnic cleansing campaign, with support and help of the organized army in the region.”<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> See more in A. Đozić's book *The Bosniak Nation* BKC, Sarajevo, 2003

<sup>12</sup> J. Fine and R. Donia, *Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Tradition Betrayed*, FAMA, Sarajevo, 1995, p. 9

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid*, p. 187

What happens when people “alienate” and dislocate themselves from their own domiciliary status, when they destroy the threshold of coexistence towards those they belong to – the human kind? In short, that is when the people’s temptations inevitably appear; that is when all kinds of confusion and suffering multiply. This is witnessed by the contemporary man, of an evidently emptied spirit and confused, obsessed with, to use the words of H. Jones “ruling over things”, as well as over the others, even over “himself”. In that, the “growing power of one side of his nature” results in “the deterioration of the notion of self and one’s own being.”

Only when toppled such a way, we are able to imagine to “be somebody” as opposed to the others, who are of “lesser value”, or even “completely worthless”, who, then, have their right to equality within the human kind suspended, as well as the right to being human beings. Let us recall Hitler’s obsession with “superiority of the Arian race” over others, the exclusivistic proclamation of the people “heavenly”, as if all people were not “heavenly”. However, Hitler was not the only one and will probably not be the last one attacking the unity of human diversities. Indeed, any fascist ideology tries to “legitimize” discrimination, whether race, cultural, national, religious, or of any other kind.

The above mentioned monstrous thesis on “inevitable conflict of civilizations” at the planetary level is possible to launch only within the fascist matrix. Discussions on the thesis have been led worldwide for fifteen years now. Advocates of the conflict within the human kind are, as a matter of fact, “*the dehumanized two-legged creatures*”, that is, persons who are not ready to see the important all-human substance in the other and the different. That destroys the basic principles of human kind.

True dialogue between cultures and civilizations means not only tolerating the other and the different, acknowledging the right of coexistence to the other and the different in multilateral ambiance of life, but also knowing the other and the different and learning from the other and the different, all of which are universally valuable accomplishments of the human kind. Without that, that is, without the “world which he divides and without the other in it”, the man cannot “know anything about himself, regardless of how deep he may go into his tradition, into his inner freedom, into his substance and symbolical forms which he uses to represent himself. Identity which is created in isolation, in cultural, linguistic or ontological isolation, is the identity of closed eyes, an internal reaction which does not

reveal itself before the other and the different to be compared, estimated and evaluated.” (N.Ibrulj).

In relation to the aforementioned, experience of Bosnia and Herzegovina, both the previous and the latest, could be, in the deepest sense, valuable. Indeed, the ones emphasizing the paradigmatic character of this country are right. This country, regardless of how small it may be, is extremely important for the new globalization of relations in the world. If this country is revoked the right of multilateral substance of life, in spite of the positive experience it has nurtured, how can then such a pattern of relations and cooperation be advocated at the European, that is, planetary level? Sadly, that is being done by the current centers of power in the world. The above mentioned Dayton Agreement is still experimented on and even auctioned off in the process of reconstruction of this country’s multiethnic character.

One question inevitably arises: who and why within the International Community should be enabled, and even straightforwardly sponsored to destroy and deform the society of Bosnia and Herzegovina in all kinds of ways? Bosnia is the living document of the latest, open violation of the basic principles of humanity, including the basic rights to life, equality, property, and the like. This is where the incredible humiliation of the United Nations and its Security Council was allowed. It will suffice to only mention the terrible genocide in the UN-protected zone of Srebrenica, which was committed, in presence of military and civil officials of the UN, against the innocent Bosniak civilians. We should also recall the scandalous “legwork” performed by gentlemen like Carl Bildt and even Carlos Westendorp, and by the high representatives of the International Community to Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the line from Sarajevo to Pale, when they begged the former political and military establishment of the Bosnian Serbs, including the ones indicted by the ICTY for the most serious of crimes (Karadžić, Mladić...), for meaningless “favors”; especially if we have in mind that NATO assets were at their disposal all the time. It is well-known that that force disarmed all the armies and paramilitary units in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in a very short period of time and without any problems.

Instead of an energetic reconstruction and normalization of this society and state, which is imperative for its integration to the Euro-Atlantic structures, something the International Community has provided enormous

funds for and also installed a powerful military and civilian infrastructure, the torment of Bosnia and Herzegovina is still being allowed, and so is the political engagement of those people and forces who during the recent war destroyed this country and its people.

Secondly, if war crimes committed in this country are not adequately sanctioned, including the crime of genocide, how can we then expect this to be done somewhere else? Had stronger action in this regard been taken in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the perpetrators of crimes against Albanians in Kosovo would have thought twice before committing those crimes, as well as all other criminals anywhere in the world.

The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina can get us into thinking about some other issues as well. Is not Bosnia, perhaps, the “holy reminiscent of the past, somewhere in the margins of the modern history of the world, the very holy reminiscent (in the Biblical sense), by which God and people save the world from certain doom? Perhaps it is that bridge of salvation between the past and the future, preserved and made the sign of a new world, the world which has the model of political pluralism and unity of states? A sign of hope in the times of hopelessness”.<sup>14</sup>

Thirdly, considering the multiethnic character of this country, its geostrategic position, it could, undoubtedly, due to the presence of the Islamic component, it could find itself acting as a “bridge of cooperation” between the West-European and Middle Eastern countries, including even certain Far Eastern countries. Such regional, that is, continental “bridging” is necessary to the world, especially in the sense of meeting of different civilizations, cultures, religions, etc. That contributes the increase of general trust between the peoples and various forms of their cooperation. Actually, one key issue arises in the new globalization of relations in the world: How to adapt to the diversities and how to enable the continuous pulsing and development? That is also the basic question concerning democracy in general, for quality of the democratic order is seen in the level of protection of minorities by the majority, not in the level of achievements of the latter.

In short, positioning of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Euro-Atlantic integrations, that is, in the new globalization of relations in the world, must

---

<sup>14</sup> Markešić L., in *Essays: Political Pluralism in Democratic Transition of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, Sarajevo, 1998, p. 56

respect its historical character, which means, the country's multilateralism. In the legal and constitutional sense, it should be harmonized with the democratically-based countries of Europe and the world, which means rejection of the logic of "conflict of civilizations", "conflicts of religions", manners of discrimination and "exclusive rights" of ones over the others, both at the internal and the external level.

In that way, the multilateral being of Bosnia and Herzegovina could be presented as a comparative value, not as a handicap in relation towards other countries of Europe and the world.

### **Instead of Conclusion**

*Sisyphus deals with Bosnia  
And just when he thinks he has got it –  
He realizes it is a dream  
He is dreaming of an abyss –  
Bosnia wakes him up.  
They do not understand Bosnia!*