

AMERICAN MILITARY UNIVERSITY

INTERNAL CULTURE THE OBSTACLE IN NEGOTIATION IN BOSNIA:  
INTEGRATION AND DISINTEGRATION OF THE THREE MAJOR ETHNIC GROUPS

INTL504 ANALYTICS I

AMERICAN MILITARY UNIVERSITY

DR. JONATHAN S. LOCKWOOD

BY

DANIEL J. EVANS

APRIL 25, 2010

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The country of Bosnia has suffered instability and violence for decades. However, the history of the ethnic groups in Bosnia goes back for centuries. There have been times of only intermittent violence; yet it is still not stable. Much of this has to do with the three major ethnic groups: the Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats. These three main ethnic groups have their own languages and unique dialects. They are able to communicate with one another, and all versions of the languages are intelligible. The groups have separate religions, cultures, and educational institutions. They also have their own customs, courtesies, beliefs and values.

Inter-ethnic disparities during the time of World War II contributed to the escalation of hostilities and set the stage for current conflicts. Bosniaks are predominately Sunni Islam, speak Bosnian, and trace their roots to the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Serbs are predominately Christian (Serbian Orthodox Church), speak Serbian, and have extensive roots to the Slavs from as early as 527 BC. The Croats are primarily Catholic, speak Croatian, and have roots from as early as 852 BC. Though they all speak different languages, they only differ faintly; the Serbian or Croatian language is slightly different in writing and grammar, and all are equally understandable. It is in dialects where the differences lie.

The United States and NATO intervened in Bosnia because of genocide and “democratic states” have tried to stop dictators or uproot them from power (Mackrell 1997). The other goal was to stop the conflict and promote a peaceful Alternate. NATO is thought to have been successful in its operations in Bosnia with the continuation of stability that it helped foster in the region, preventing further conflict (Bennett, 243-244). The Dayton Accords attempted to establish peace with the hopes that the three ethnic groups could work together. They also

divided the country into federations, which were the Bosniak-Croat federation and the Republika Srpska (the Serbs).

However, while Bosnia has been split into federations (or regions) this has mainly resulted in controlled segregation of the groups. The groups have not integrated properly and have started going through disintegration. Systems theory and other measures can be applied to Bosnia to explain the probability as to whether or not the country can unite. Also the application of several other theories with regards to conflict, demonstrate that Bosnia meets the characteristics of an intractable conflict. Even though major fighting has ceased, the lack of integration between all of the ethnic groups shows that there is still a conflict.

The Dayton Accords have successfully stopped a lot of the mainstream conflict and fighting and have had some success at containing the disparities between the three major ethnic groups. While there are many successes from the Dayton Accords, there are many failures and aspects of the Accords that have not resulted in setting the stage for more catastrophic problems. The Dayton Accords were successful as a stop-gap, or emergency measure, but by no means did they re-integrate the three ethnic groups. The two federations that were established, the Bosniak-Croat federation and the Republika Srpska have not integrated well. Not only have they failed to integrate, they are going through disintegration as the Dayton Accords established a form of controlled segregation.

This paper will analyze the following questions: Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or have they caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? Also, will the pressure from wanting to join the EU bring about more disintegration within Bosnia or cause integration of the two federations? This paper will also show Bosnia meets the characteristics of an intractable conflict. It will also explore how meeting features of an intractable conflict may

contribute to the disintegration of the country. Throughout this paper the Lockwood Analytical Method of Prediction will be used to predict the possible futures of the Serbians (Serbs), Croats (Croats) and Bosniaks in Bosnia.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### *Dayton Accords*

The Dayton Accords established a framework for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The General Framework Accord was that Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia consented to completely respect the sovereign egalitarianism of each other and to settle differences by way of peaceful processes. The Dayton [peace] Accord was negotiated in Dayton, Ohio and consequently was named for that reason. In March, 1994 the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was created. This is when Croats and Muslims signed a peace accord. This established only two parties still at war. The disagreement continued until the end of 1995. On December 14, 1995, the accord was formally signed in Paris. This would be the end of the three year war in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The foundation of the accord was that the Bosnia would continue a single state within its existing borders; though it would consist of a Muslim-Croat federation and a Serb republic. An additional facet to the accord was that there would be the institution of a rotating tripartite presidency. The United States brokered the accords in Dayton to stop the war that had been waging from 1992-1995. Much of the military and diplomatic efforts to ensure that there would be an accord were led by the United States. The United States had also been in charge of numerous efforts behind NATO maintaining its command in Sarajevo. NATO is considered by to have been successful with the prolongation of stability in Bosnia that it helped foster in the region, as well as, averting additional disagreement. Millions of dollars in aid has been received

from the United States for rebuilding projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Department of State, 2009).

The backdrop of the three year war in Bosnia-Herzegovina had a lot to do with the rise to power of Slobodan Milosevic in 1986. The unraveling of Yugoslavia was accelerated by Milosevic's climb to power. Much of the ethnic disagreement occurring within the boundaries of Bosnia had to do with the welcoming of Serb nationalism by Milosevic (Amnesty International, 2006 & Department of State, 2009). June of 1991 marked the independence of Yugoslavia by Slovenia and Croatia. Then in September of that year Bosnian Serb Radovan Karadzic's SDS declared four self-proclaimed "Serb Autonomous Regions (SAO)" in Bosnia (Department of State, 2009). Bosnian Serbs, in October, proclaimed the creation of the "Serbian Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina" which would have its individual constitution and parliamentary assembly. Radovan Karadzic, in January of 1992, publicly proclaimed an independent "Republic of the Serbian People in Bosnia-Herzegovina," and then March 1, 1992, the Bosnian government conducted a referendum on independence.

The Parliament of Bosnia affirmed the independence of the republic on April 5, 1992. Though, this movement was opposed by the legislative body of the Serbs, who had voted in their own referendum in November 1991 in favor of continuing part of Yugoslavia. The Bosnian Serbs, with the support of Serbia, came with an armed force in an effort to divide the republic along the ethnic lines to create "greater Serbia." The total identification of the independence of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the United States and the majority of the European countries occurred on April 7 then on May 22, 1992 Bosnia and Herzegovina were allowed in the United Nations (Department of State, 2009).

There were numerous horrific war crimes that occurred throughout this disagreement and much genocide. The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia met in The Hague in July of 1995 to indict the Bosnian-Serb separatist, political and military leaders Radovan Karadzic and Ratko Mladic. The two former leaders faced charges ranging from crimes against humanity and genocide and much of this had to do with their involvement in the Srebrenica massacre (Department of State, 2009).

The Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (FBiH) and the Republika Srpska (RS) is what constitutes Bosnia and Herzegovina. FBiH is principally Croat and Bosniak while the RS is principally Serb. A decision was reached by the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina in July of 2000; the court rendered a decision by which they would recognize Bosniaks, the Croats, and the Serbs as constituent people throughout the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In March of 2002, this decision was recognized formally and settled by main the political parties for both bodies. National elections of the two entities occurred in October of 2006 allowing them to choose new members of the presidency of the state; governments of the two entities; and the cantonal parliaments (Department of State, 2009).

The nationalist parties that dominated throughout wartime--SDS, HDZ, and SDA—were defeated and lost many seats to SNSD, SBiH, and HDZ-1990; though these parties trusted messages of ethnic basis to heavily appeal to the voters. A coalition of the six-parties has formed a national government and the following national elections will be in October of 2010. In October of 2008, Bosnia and the Herzegovina celebrated the municipal elections where they directly chose the mayors and the members of municipal and cantonal assembly in all the municipalities with the exception of the district of Mostar and Brck. The Dayton Accords have the international community maintaining high levels of civilian and the military presence in

Bosnia and the Herzegovina BiH. A position that the Dayton accords created was the High Representative which was an international civil employee with the supervision of the putting in practice of the civil aspects in the accord.

NATO deployed a force to put into practice the peace accords consisting of 60,000 troops (IFOR) in December of 1995. They were to supervise the execution of the military aspects in the accord. A smaller force of the stabilization (SFOR) would take over for IFOR in 1996. SFOR mission would end in December of 2004 then the European Union (EU) assumed the primary responsibility of combat operations and stabilization. About 2,000 troops from the EU troops continue in Bosnia and NATO maintains a small operational headquarters with the responsibility to attend with defense reform efforts of against the people processed for the war crimes and counterterrorism against the populace (Daalder, 2004).

### *Facets of the Accords that worked*

NATO is considered to have been successful in its operations in Bosnia with the prolongation of stability that it has helped foster in the region, as well as, averting additional disagreement (Mackrell, 1997). The execution of the military aspects of the accords with regards to meeting the deadlines and without principal occurrences met part of the accord from the accord. The strong NATO force of 60,000 (IFOR) deployed in December 1995 that supervised with the cease-fire, stabilized the old lines of face along a zone of separation dividing the RS and the federation of Moslem-Croat, and them weapons of troop and doors contained in a corral in sectors indicated of quartering.

IFOR and its successor, SFOR, also created a blocked setting in which to put pursuant to the civil aspects accords and to revitalize the economy (Hayes, 2004). The refugee return policy and the partial political success of the Dayton Accords are revealed in the limited economic

development in Bosnia. It seems clear that additional development in creating a single market, unifying the tax codes, encouraging free movement of goods and labor and attracting foreign direct investment are all tied to the success of reforming Bosnia's political structure into that of a single state (Amnesty International, 2006).

### ***Facets of the Accords that didn't work***

There have been numerous failures from the Dayton Accords. While numerous factors of the military agenda have worked, the civilian side of the execution at Dayton has not been effective. There are numerous reasons for this failure, but Professor Daalder points out four major factors: (1) "The accords are essentially a cease-fire accord that legitimized the deployment of an international military force to monitor the cessation of hostilities and to stabilize the security setting;" (2) "Dayton's complex constitutional arrangement embraced this dilemma by incorporating the competing visions of Bosnia's future, along with the ethnic segregation that this disagreement violently produced;" (3) "the accords lack the ingredient most essential to success in peace operations;" and (4) "the accords suffer from an enforcement gap" (Daalder, 2004).

The first is the lack of the ententes' to solve the fundamental dilemma of rehabilitation of the partition of Bosnia. The accords are primarily an accord of cease-fire which legitimated the deployment of an international military force to supervise the suspension of the hostilities and to stabilize the setting of safety. There is the existence and buildup of 60,000 with the current number at 30,000 well-armed and trained foreign soldiers whose job is to insure that there is no leveling differences by unless they are through means of military intervention so while problems still existed and still do the civilians did not have a real diplomatic may to dispute their differences (Hays, 2004 & Daalder, 2004).



The second of the failure with the Dayton accords is the constitutional arrangement complexes of Dayton embraced this dilemma by incorporating the revelations of competition of the future of Bosnia with the ethnic segregation that this disagreement brutally created although it did not predict institutions or methods able to negotiate the inevitable disagreements. So, despite the fact that it conceived to maintain Bosnia like a simple and multi-ethnic state and the allowance of Dayton for a tremendous amount of decentralization what ends up happening is actually a more divided country than a more united one (Daalder, 2004).

The federation of Muslim-Croat and the RS received substantial powers such as more defense and several fiscal policies. The federation of Muslim-Croat and the RS also has unique bonds with bordering states; this allows them to ignore the central government and work on building alliances (Daalder, 2004). By taking out the power of the central government what happens is that the federation of Muslim-Croat and the RS are leaving the domination of aggression with them instead of the government. This in turn creates a system where the central government has disadvantaged the chief characteristics of sovereignty: “the right to prepare for self-defense” (Daalder, 2004). Bosnia-Herzegovina, by the structure that the government has taken, and the other variables, now does not have the capability to support or defend itself from threats and the mutations that it has taken leave it defenseless (Daalder, 2004).

The way the accords are set up for peace operations there will be very little success and they miss the elements that will make them effective. There need to be involved in the negotiations of disputing the negotiations of the accord. Both sides believe the accord was imposed on them. The Bosnian Muslims signed the accord very late, almost at the last minute while feeling a lot of pressure from the United States to do so. The Bosnian Serbs and the Bosnians Croats were successfully left out of the deliberations at Dayton, and rejected signing

the accord once it was finalized. There were proxy negotiations over the political and territorial powers. According to the accord, the execution of the requirements from Dayton is the responsibility of the parties in Bosnia (Daalder, 2004).

The civilian execution of Dayton is at a standstill. The United States and others nations are urging SFOR to fill a gap by becoming more authoritative. Serb and Bosnian control needs to be severed and the question addressed as to what will happen when there is no longer a foreign force in place (Daalder, 2004).

With regards to Implementation and Structure the Dayton Peace Accords there have been several violations such as:

A. Failure of National Will including (1) Refusal to Cooperate with Proceedings; (2) Failure to Enforce Judgments; and (3) Failure to Transfer Indictees (President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1999).

B. Failure of International Will including (1) Failure to Enforce Compliance; (2) Failure of Police Reforms; and a (3) Failure to Arrest Indictees (President and Fellows of Harvard College, 1999).

### ***Major Powers in Peace Settlements***

While there were numerous failures in the accords after they were established, the United States played a significant role in establishing the peace process and continually putting its time and effort into the situation. It was the United States that brokered the accords in Dayton to stop the war that had been waging from 1992-1995. Still to this day much of the military and diplomatic efforts are led by the United States, and the United States has also been in charge of numerous of the effort behind NATO maintaining its command in Sarajevo. The United States has spent millions of dollars in aid for rebuilding projects in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Bureau of

European and Eurasian Affairs, 2009). While not necessarily considered as being as significant, the training of US troops in peace keeping operations was put to the test and several different lessons were learned on how to conduct stability operations. There was also an emergence of learning new techniques in geopolitical and cultural analysis by the US military operations in Bosnia (Olsen, 1999).

### ***Principles Pertinent to Peace in Bosnia-Herzegovina***

Integration and disintegration are becoming key components in the study of international affairs and can be applied to conflict. What is happening or has occurred are the attributes of disintegration within Bosnia. Integration can be looked at to figure out what may have caused the disintegration and several pertinent theorists have written about it. Talcott Parsons, a major contributor to systems theory, wrote about integration. Parsons explicated action between an individual and actor; action in a “societal context” called “action systems.” His systems place people in the role of subjects and objects. He also explains that at any given time people are members of several other action systems such as family, employer and nation-state. Parsons states that the three subsystems are 1) the personality system 2) the social system 3) the cultural system. They are interconnected through the action system. If there is a change in one of the subsystems it will affect another in turn affecting the entire action system.

Systems theory “assumes the interdependence of parts in determinate relationships, which impose order on the components of the system.” “Social systems are characterized by a multiple-equilibrium process since social systems have numerous subsystems, each of which must continue in equilibrium in the larger system is to maintain equilibrium” (Dougherty, 2001 pp 115-116).

Causes of disintegration, from Parsons point of view, explain how the systems deal with stress. Parson's four functional conditions are prerequisite: (1) Pattern Maintenance; (2) adaptation (to the setting); (3) goal attainment; (4) Integration (of the different functions and the subsystems into a cohesive, coordinated whole; while what is happening inside of Bosnia is the inverse this can still be applied. "The integrative function is fulfilled by the cultural subsystems the serve the function of pattern maintenance." According to Parsons, the formulation of common values that cut across national boundaries is essential to international order. If you look at the EU this is in place and happening very clearly but looking at the framework for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina it can be seen that several of these factors are not taking place and only a handful are fairly being used (Dougherty, 2001 pp 115-116).

The conditions of integration that Joseph S. Nye explains, which are slightly different than that of Parsons, are what the EU follows: (1) Politicization; (2) Redistribution; (3) Reduction of Alternates; and (4) Externalization. In short the EU for example has a common interest to have a closer knit Europe, a single currency to allow for less exchange rate processes, the states involved have a parliament that is able to discuss sovereign Alternates, and they seek to not bring in external forces to control the general foundation of the EU. This can be very attractive to numerous countries and membership into the EU could perpetuate them more in the global market where they once had trouble competing (Nye, 1988 & Dougherty 2001).

Another method of looking at the internal strife in Bosnia would be with Neo-realist theory using an approach known as "constellation analysis" which is a "multi-method system of inquiry." This consists of (1) system design (2) perception and reality (3) interest and power (4) norm and advantage (5) structure of independence and (6) cooperation and disagreement. Neo-realist theory uses the bases of realism but adds factors such as "cross cultural comparative

analysis”; this would be very beneficial in analyzing the internal instabilities of Bosnia. Neo-realism tries to broaden and deepen realism. A major contributor of Neo-realism was Kenneth Waltz who spoke of “structural realism”, and “power continues a key variable”. Others such as Gottfried-Karl Kindermann stated power is not always the primary factor in politics; so using that perspective an analysis can be tentatively conducted (Dougherty 2001).

While Neo-realism can still be used in conjunction the incorporation of Neo-classical realism builds a link between international and domestic politics; it suggests that leaders seek to control resources to advance international and domestic agendas and seek economic and technological wealth. It speaks of external extraction: actors will access resources beyond their borders to achieve domestic and international status or power. External validation: leaders seek authoritative status in the international community so they can enhance their domestic image; while more importantly is dealing with the internal setting of Bosnia this can still be attended to particularly by looking at external state relationships. Charles Glaser, an influence on neo-classical realism came up with contingent realism: when states enter into escalations, such as arms races, they may enter into a self-help system, since they have seen the benefit versus the cost of making such an accord; or they have weighed out the consequences (Dougherty, 2001 pp 88-89).

### ***Disagreement and Negotiation***

There are numerous different ways in which a disagreement can be negotiated and there are several different components of the negotiation process. Prior to coming to that negotiation process what should have occurred was the factors leading into the disagreement should have been attended to before the accords starting with: (1) latent disagreement; (2) disagreement emergence; (3) disagreement escalation; (4) stalemate; (5) de-escalation/negotiation; (6) dispute

settlement; and (7) post disagreement building. The use a method called “ripeness” when negotiations are ready to be negotiated should have been used. A “ripe” moment also refers to when a group is ready to negotiate and only when a group is actually ready to negotiate will anything happen. Crocker also notes that a “mediator makes these judgment calls and calculations to determine how to best intervene to help ripen the disagreement” (Crocker, 2004).

Principled negotiation is a way negotiators can plan their negotiation strategy and the framework for this is: (1) Separate the people from the problem; (2) negotiate about interests, not positions; (3) invent options for mutual gain; (4) insist on objective decision criteria, and; (5) know you’re best Alternate to a negotiated accord (Fisher, Ury, and Patton). Other negotiation strategies are centered around: (1) orientation and fact finding; (2) resistance; (3) reformulation of strategies; (4) hard bargaining and decision making; (5) accord and; (6) follow-up (Acuff, 1997).

### III. ACTORS & PERCEPTIONS

To look at the actors and perceptions in the Bosnian case study the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP) step on through three will be used. Step (1) “determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future”, step (2) “specify the ‘actors’ involved”, and step (3) “perform an in-depth study of how each actor perceives the issue in question.”

#### **Step 1: Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future**

Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or has it caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? Also, will the pressure from wanting to join the EU bring about more disintegration within Bosnia or cause integration of the two federations?

There are a few possibilities for Bosnia. Part of it has to do with the Republika Srpska but all of the ethnic groups have something at stake. However, the internal frustrations and lack of cooperation is not allowing for an integration of the ethnic groups and is causing disintegration. Another aspect that supports the idea that there will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia is the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

Characteristics of an Intractable Conflict:

- (1) They are typically long standing
  - (2) They remain unresolved
  - (3) There is a continuation of violence
  - (4) There are vested interests of the parties involved in the conflict
- (Crocker 2004).

These characteristics describe in greater detail how the ethnic groups are not integrating and how it contributes to the disintegration of the three ethnic groups and the country.

If Republika Srpska can cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy then there will not be disintegration. However, thus far, none of that has happened and the likelihood it will is very small. If the Republika Srpska decides to cooperate there will be integration.

Another possible future is if leaders of Croats and Bosniaks collaborate against the Serbs and accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would contribute to the future of the Republika Srpska and probably push it farther into disintegration. This would cause the Serbs and RS to continue the fight and push for independence and ruin any potential membership into the EU.

However, another future would be if the RS decided to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. This scenario would rely simply on the idea

that the Serbs did not want to work with the other groups and whether or not they collaborated or not. This would frustrate any efforts of the EU and cause a progressive disintegration. This scenario fits with systems theory and the direction in which the RS is heading unless they feel there is an incentive to not push for their own independence.

While at present the Serbs have been pushing for independence, this is a scenario that is not only reserved for them. Any or all of the ethnic groups could decide to push for their own autonomy and decide against working with the other groups. The Bosniaks could decide that they wish to have their own complete independence. The Croats alike could also decide that in favor of their own autonomy.

While some of this ultimately depends on the fundamental conflict in the RS, there could at some point be Nationalism, but much of the disparities point to the direction of disintegration. At last the three groups could grow tired of conflict and simply want to be part of Europe, having the economic advantages that other Europeans have. They may decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation that has fought for decades may become tired and the new generation may want to live a better life.

## **Step 2: Specify the Actors Involved**

There are several smaller actors involved in the intricacies of the situation in Bosnia however, this paper will examine only the major actors involved. The major actors are the Bosniaks, Croats, and Serbs, which are the three major ethnic groups. The other major actors are the European Union (EU), the Bosniak-Croat Federation, and the Republika Srpska. The breakdown is Bosniak 48%, Serb 37.1%, and Croat 14.3% and the religions are Muslim 40%, Orthodox 31%, and Roman Catholic 15% (CIA World Factbook 2010). Languages spoken are



Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian (CIA World Factbook 2010). The Dayton Accords established the Bosniak-Croat Federation, and the Republika Srpska controlled by the Serbs.

The Bosniaks are Bosnian Muslims and were the largest ethnic group in Bosnia and Herzegovina before the war in 1992-1995. Throughout the war Muslims were expelled from territories controlled by the Serb or Croat armies or killed. Some escaped from cities. Prior to the war Muslims filled the cities even the capital Sarajevo. A result of the past war has caused populations of Bosniaks to be displaced all over Europe; there is a significant amount in Germany. However, there are Bosniaks outside of Europe in other nations such as the United States, Canada, and Australia but other places including the Middle East to name a few.

The number of Bosniaks has been reduced in Bosnia and it is complicated to conclude the accurate post-war populace since the displacement was greatly because of military action, mandatory expulsion and ethnic cleansing. Some of this was also because of political manipulation.

The Croats or Bosnian Croats make up around 17 percent of the population. They have been on a campaign to start their own republic. They insist that changes should be made to the constitution and that what was put in place by the Dayton peace agreement was not fair to them.

The Bosnian Serbs have been supported by Serbia and Montenegro. They attempted with armed resistance to partition the republic along ethnic lines and would like the areas dominated by Serbs to either one day create a "Greater Serbia or their independence from Bosnia. They meet the criteria for disintegration based off systems theory and from Joseph Nye (Dougherty 2000). During the war the Serbs battled both the Croats and the Bosniaks. Throughout the war the Serbs received reinforcements from the Republic of the Serb Frontier, Federal Republic of

Yugoslavia and other allies. The Republika Srpska would like its eventual independence and/or incorporation into Serbia

The EU's stake in Bosnia and Herzegovina has to do with its potential membership into the EU. Bosnia and Herzegovina has made a considerable amount of money from EU autonomous trade measures. The nickname of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is the Muslim-Croat Federation. The Federation is the larger of the two and it is mainly populated by Bosniaks and Croats. Though, there are Serbs that also live in the Federation but there are also Bosniaks and Croats in the Republika Srpska.

### **Step 3: Perform an In-depth Study of how each Actor Perceives the Issue in Question**

Though there has been some cooperation with the three ethnic groups, there is not only a desire for autonomy; all the groups seem to believe they are entitled. The perceptions from the Croats and leadership in the Croat community support the idea that it is more likely that there will be disintegration instead of integration of the three ethnic groups.

Ivo Miro Jovic, a Croat who currently chairs Bosnia's three-man rotating state presidency, has said that Muslim-Croat federation was a "jail for the Croatian people", adding that all three Bosnian nationalities should have equal rights. "We have nothing against Bosnian Serbs having their own Republika Srpska, but Croatian and Bosniac (Muslim) republics have to be created equally", Jovic told AFP on Thursday. He said the Dayton agreement was forged to "control, not to solve the crisis" and that time was ripe for a change. "We are going through a sick period which has to be overcome", he added (Croatian American Association, 2007).

The spiritual leader of Bosnian Croats, Archbishop Vinko Puljic, told the Catholic Synod meeting in Vatican this week that the position of Bosnian Croats could be compared with "extermination". Catholics in Bosnia are, in his words, "deprived of the right to return to their homes and to use their own language". Puljic accused the international community, which safeguards peace in Bosnia, of "favoring Muslim arrogance" and of tolerating obstructive behavior of Serbs, who are Orthodox Christians, while ignoring the problems of the Catholic Croats (Croatian American Association, 2007).

Croats were pleased with the end of the war, but Miso Roleta of the Croatian Democratic Union said "There is no future for Bosnia-Herzegovina without solving the question of equality for the Croats in Bosnia". Croats, like the Serbs would like their own autonomy. This supports the idea that there will not be an integration of Bosnia as a country, and that it will not integrate into the EU. Croats feel as though they were forced to live with the Bosniaks.

The Serbs in Bosnia's perception is that the Dayton Accords have not brought about re-integration and has caused disintegration. This also supports the idea of the intractable conflict from Crocker's (2004) framework, which sets the stage for further disintegration. While it is no longer a full scale violent conflict there is definitely still a less violent conflict and resistance to integration.

The Serbs believe "they should get something from all this." A significant segment of the Bosnian Serb population wants at least independence, if not union with Serbia. It is for sure that at least until now, many feel no real loyalty to the concept of Bosnia and fear the consequences if left "unprotected" at the mercies of the Croats and Bosniaks. While one can debate the facts of the conflict, including who was responsible and so on, it is an interesting phenomenon that of the three ethnic groups, it is the Serbs who are by far the most outspoken and most concerned about the prospects of being somehow "ruled" by the other ethnic groups (Montgomery 2010)

Since the Dayton Accord agreement has been implemented, there is more disintegration then integration in the country. The EU was thought to have gained significant strength at this point but it has not. Thought there have been attempts to join, none of them have come into fruition. The EU has failed for a number of reasons but it is not necessarily the fault of the EU. The Balkan Monitor, which is a poll conducted by the Gallup organization to gauge perceptions about entering the EU investigated the following question: "*When, in which year do you think Bosnia will be a part of the European Union?*" Respondents answered:

People's (average) assessment of their countries' accession date reflects the respective countries' integration progress.

Respondents in Bosnia and Herzegovina were most pessimistic and did not expect their country to enter the Union until 2020. It is also noteworthy that roughly one in six (16%) of people in Bosnia feared that their country would never join the EU — by far the highest percentage in the region (Gallup Balkan Monitor 2009).

This reflects public attitudes regarding Bosnia's long road towards integration. The Gallup Balkan Monitor (2009) asked a series of questions and much of them supported the notion that there was a significant drop of EU support. On the question of "*Generally speaking, do you think that Bosnia and Herzegovina's membership of the European Union would be a good thing, a bad thing, or neither good or bad?*"

Two-thirds of the population considered EU membership to be positive; this number has decreased to 48% two years later. A third of respondents were undecided about the EU's benefits in 2008 — twice as many as in 2006.

The ethnic and political diversity of Bosnia and Herzegovina is strongly reflected in the population's attitude towards the EU: while 65% of Bosniak respondents and 50% of Bosnian Croats interviewed were convinced that EU accession would be a good thing, only 34% of Bosnian Serbs were of the same opinion. The latter group had a rather neutral view with a relative majority (43%) considering the EU to be neither good nor bad.

Bosnian respondents were also divided in their assessment of the International Community's involvement in national affairs: asked whether they considered a position such as the Office of the High Representative (OHR) necessary for the country to function, 60% of people in the Federation agreed, while only 16% in Republika Srpska held that view. The difference between the entities was less pronounced in the expectations towards the change from OHR to EU Special Representative (EUSR) — scheduled for June 2008, but currently postponed without a new date having been set —: in both entities, the relative majorities did not expect significant changes emanating from the EUSR, but while 31% of people in the Federation expected a change for the better, this opinion was only shared by 9% of respondents in Republika Srpska (Gallup Balkan Monitor 2009).

The environment in Bosnia reflects the idea that all three groups would like their own autonomous region. Even though Bosnia and Herzegovina has profited from EU autonomous trade measures, it does not look as if there will be a complete integration but more disintegration. Just on the simple question of “*How strongly do you identify with Europe?*” Bosniaks responded at 21%, though it was higher than Bosnian Serbs that responded at 10%, both were very low.

#### IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

##### ***Research Questions and Hypothesis***

This paper will employ the Lockwood Analytical Method of Prediction (LAMP) to determine the likely future of Integration of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia, disintegration or of violent conflict (Lockwood 2008). LAMP is a predictive analytical method that will forecast and attempt to analyze the following questions: Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or have they caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? Also, will the pressure from wanting to join the EU bring about more disintegration within Bosnia or cause integration of the two federations? This paper will also show Bosnia meets the characteristics of an intractable conflict. It will also explore how meeting features of an intractable conflict may contribute to the disintegration of the country. LAMP will used to predict the possible futures of the Serbians (Serbs), Croatians (Croats) and Bosniaks in Bosnia.

The LAMP method is an objective and inductive way to examine and evaluate possible potential Alternate futures. The method bases this on the relative likelihood of possible courses of actions for each actor (Lockwood 2008).

However, LAMP does not give probabilities. LAMP presumes that the actions of each actor are of a rational actor. The actor has freewill to choose and decide on what they feel is their best interest for their country (Lockwood 2008). The LAMP method is a 12 step process and it is as followed:

- 1) Determine the Predictive Issue
- 2) Specify the Actors Bearing on the Problem
- 3) Conduct in-depth study of perceptions and intentions of each actor
- 4) Specify courses of action for each actor
- 5) Determine the major scenarios
- 6) Calculate the number of alternate futures
- 7) Do pair wise comparison of alternate futures
- 8) Rank order the alternate futures
- 9) Analyze consequences of alternate futures

### ***Justification and Goal***

It is important to know what forces are impacting integration, disintegration, or the worse outcome of violent conflict; because understanding the relationship could help better understand how to prevent the unwanted outcomes from happening. Integration within the EU would show a middle range theoretical proposition explaining that governments in times of prosperous growth find it easy to pursue policies of regional and economic integration until a recession really begins to affect them; then they will try to focus once again on nationalism. However, in the case of Bosnia, this does not look like it will follow traditional methodology.

Talcott Parsons perspective of systems theory will be applied for his belief that the action between an individual and actor; action in a “societal context,” as he calls them “action systems”

Systems theory is also the lens that frames the question of this inquiry. His systems theory places people in the role of subjects and objects. The integration and what may be causing disintegration will be addressed from Parsons' point of view on how the systems deal with stress with his four functional conditions as a prerequisite (1) "pattern Maintenance" (2) "adaptation," to the environment (3) "goal attainment" (4) "integration," of the different functions and the subsystems into a cohesive, coordinated whole. "The integrative function is fulfilled by the cultural subsystems that serve the function of pattern maintenance." "According to Parsons, the formulation of common values that cut across national boundaries is essential to international order." If you look at the three ethnic groups these factors are not taking place and only a handful are fairly being used (Dougherty 2001, 15-116). What seems to be happening is the opposite of Parson's theory.

The goal of this research is to see the effects of integration and disintegration of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia. This has become a major aspect of study in international affairs. The economic integration of the European Union or the disintegration of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia is what the LAMP method will analyze. Integration is not a new concept. Talcott Parsons, using systems theory, wrote about integration (Dougherty 2001). The disintegration of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia could happen several different ways. The ethnic groups have the choice of trying to fix the internal problems and allow Bosnia to join an organization such as the European Union or to try and function as independent states (Dougherty 2001). However, disintegration of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia would ultimately be the worst possible outcome. Disintegration would be a splitting of the country and promote the ethnic disputes, ideological conflicts, and several other factors (Dougherty 2001).

Not acclimatizing to the new systems may cause extinction of a country because of lack of flexibility and this may cause conflict. While evaluating Bosnia with the LAMP method the Structural-Functional approach will be used. This will help with the view of political and economic systems individually as well as compare different systems to each other. This can be done because (1) “In different countries, the same structure may perform different functions” (2) “institutions often do not have a monopoly on any given function”. This tells us that there are factors that work as a cause and effect model and this will incorporate systems theory (Almond 2008, 33). By using this framework in conjunction with LAMP it will allow is an easier way of categorizing the groups.

The forces of disintegration and economic integration have changed the way we view international systems and countries. While normally, it would be thought that globalization and the potential membership of the EU would have minimized Bosnia’s nationalism and economic collectivism that does not seem to be as much of a factor. Usually, the loss of group identity in is a causal factor for the rise of nationalist movements redefining the borders of nation-states while this is somewhat happening in Bosnia, it seems to fit the framework of an intractable conflict instead of globalization (Bhagwati, 2004).

### ***Methodology***

#### ***Operationalized Definitions of Variables***

To observe the phenomena of disintegration/integration more specifically in a measureable, observable way, the focus will be alternate futures of the three ethnic groups in Bosnia. Will there be integration, disintegration, or armed conflict. More specifically the following questions will be answered using the LAMP method: Will the Bosniaks, Croats and/or



Serbs (1) push for their own country (2) try to join the EU or (3) decide that armed conflict is the best possible future to attain their goals.

### ***Limitation of LAMP***

However, like most methodologies LAMP does have its limitations: such as an “exponential explosion problem with alternate futures,” “analyst can identify “most likely” future, but cannot assign a quantifiable probability of occurrence for each future” and there is “little allowance for ambiguity” (LAMP Presentation).

### ***Applications of LAMP***

Though, there are some limitations of LAMP it is very useful for: “Indications and Warning;” “Estimative Intelligence;” “Common analytical method for intelligence;” “Computerized analytic tool kit;” “Training;” “Interface between intelligence, academia and public policy communities;” and “Tactical intelligence” (LAMP Presentation).

## **V. CASE STUDY/ANALYSIS/FINDINGS** (Presents predictive analysis)

### **Step 4: Specify courses of action for each actor**

There are three main courses of action for the three ethnic groups, the Bosniaks, Croats and the Serbs. The three courses of actions are the will push or establish their own country, the will join the EU, or they will have armed conflict. The legend below illustrated this in a graph and gives a key that can be used for the rest of the study:

Legend	
OC	Own Country
EU	Join EU
AC	Armed Conflict

### Step 5: Determine the major scenarios

1) Disintegration: this where all or some of the groups decide to push for their own country.

2) Integration: this is if any or all of the three ethnic groups join the EU. However, there could be integration if some or one of the groups joined the EU. It is possible for integration into the EU and disintegration of one of the other ethnic groups but not likely.

3) Continued Armed Conflict: This is based off of the fact that the situation in Bosnia meets all of the basic characteristics of an intractable conflict and has a past history of armed conflict.

The matrix below illustrates the alternated futures, and the actors (Croats, Bosniaks, and Serbs).

The graphically shows each actor and the alternate future:

ALTERNATE FUTURES			
ACTORS:	DISINTEGRATION	INTEGRATION	CONTINUED VIOLENT CONFLICT
<b>Croats</b>	1) Push for own country	1) Join EU	1) Armed Conflict
<b>Bosniaks</b>	1) Push for own country	1) Join EU	1) Armed Conflict
<b>Serbs</b>	1) Push for own country	1) Join EU	1) Armed Conflict

**Step 6: Calculate the number of alternate futures**

X= Number of courses open to each actor

Y= Number of national actors

Z= Total number of alternate futures to be compared

Since there are three possible courses of action (X) for each of the three ethnic groups and (Y) that are present in Bosnia-Herzegovina than (Z) shows there are 27 possible alternate futures. The below chart is shows the formula and its calculations:

$$X^Y=Z \quad 3^3=27$$

$$X = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \quad 27(27-1)/2=136$$

### Step 7: Do pair wise comparison of alternate futures

The "pair wise comparison" will analyze the alternate futures two at a time compared to the scenario in question. It assumes the two futures being compared at the moment are the only ones that exist.

The below diagrams illustrate each scenario. For example, scenario 1 is disintegration. In this scenario the Croats push for their own country. The diagram shows the three actors (Croats, Bosniaks, and the Serbs) and the alternate futures. By looking at the diagram, in alternate future 1, all of the ethnic groups have chosen their own country (OC). However, in alternate future 2, all but one of the ethnic groups has chosen their OC. The remaining ethnic group (the Serbs), have pushed for joining the EU. As with the first two examples, the diagrams go onto to show different scenarios and different alternate futures.

<b>Scenario 1: Disintegration - Croats Push for their Own Country</b>			
<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	OC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	OC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	OC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	OC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	OC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	OC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	OC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	OC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	OC	AC	AC

---

**Scenario 1: Disintegration - Bosniaks Push for their Own Country**

---

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	OC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	OC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	OC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	OC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	OC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	OC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	OC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	OC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	OC	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 1: Disintegration - Serbs Push for their Own Country**

---

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Serbs</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>
<b>1</b>	OC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	OC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	OC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	OC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	OC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	OC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	OC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	OC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	OC	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 2: Integration - Croats Join the EU**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	EU	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	EU	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	EU	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	EU	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	EU	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	EU	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	EU	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	EU	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	EU	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 2: Integration - Bosniaks Join the EU**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	EU	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	EU	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	EU	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	EU	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	EU	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	EU	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	EU	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	EU	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	EU	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 2: Integration - Serbs Join the EU**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Serbs</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>
<b>1</b>	EU	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	EU	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	EU	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	EU	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	EU	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	EU	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	EU	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	EU	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	EU	AC	AC

---

**Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	AC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	AC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	AC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	AC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	AC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	AC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	AC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	AC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	AC	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Serbs</b>
<b>1</b>	AC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	AC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	AC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	AC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	AC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	AC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	AC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	AC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	AC	AC	AC

---

---

**Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict**

<b>Alternate Future #</b>	<b>Serbs</b>	<b>Croats</b>	<b>Bosniaks</b>
<b>1</b>	AC	OC	OC
<b>2</b>	AC	OC	EU
<b>3</b>	AC	OC	AC
<b>4</b>	AC	EU	OC
<b>5</b>	AC	EU	EU
<b>6</b>	AC	EU	AC
<b>7</b>	AC	AC	OC
<b>8</b>	AC	AC	EU
<b>9</b>	AC	AC	AC

---



### Step 8: Rank order the alternate futures

Pair wise comparison complete, the series of futures are voted on based on the relative probability to each other. The matrixes below show the total number of votes for each Alternate future in the far right column. Here the Alternate futures were voted upon, then highlighted according to those that received the highest values for votes. A scale of 1-9 was used. The Alternate futures that have a vote of 1 – 3 are the most likely Alternate future.

In the matrices below for instance alternated future 1 received a vote of 2, Alternate future 4 received a vote of 1, and Alternate future 6 received a vote of 3. So for scenario 1 which is disintegration – Croats push for their own country, Alternate future 4 is the number 1 choice:

Scenario 1: Disintegration - Croats Push for their Own Country				
Alternate Future #	Croats	Bosniaks	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	OC	OC	OC	2
2	OC	OC	EU	9
3	OC	OC	AC	8
4	OC	EU	OC	1
5	OC	EU	EU	7
6	OC	EU	AC	3
7	OC	AC	OC	4
8	OC	AC	EU	6
9	OC	AC	AC	5

Scenario 1: Disintegration - Bosniaks Push for their Own Country				
Alternate Future #	Bosniaks	Croats	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	OC	OC	OC	2
2	OC	OC	EU	8
3	OC	OC	AC	6
4	OC	EU	OC	1
5	OC	EU	EU	7
6	OC	EU	AC	3
7	OC	AC	OC	4
8	OC	AC	EU	9
9	OC	AC	AC	5

Scenario 1: Disintegration - Serbs Push for their Own Country				
Alternate Future #	Serbs	Croats	Bosniaks	Total # of Votes
1	OC	OC	OC	2
2	OC	OC	EU	5
3	OC	OC	AC	6
4	OC	EU	OC	3
5	OC	EU	EU	1
6	OC	EU	AC	4
7	OC	AC	OC	8
8	OC	AC	EU	9
9	OC	AC	AC	7

Scenario 2: Integration - Croats Join the EU				
Alternate Future #	Croats	Bosniaks	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	EU	OC	OC	2
2	EU	OC	EU	8
3	EU	OC	AC	4
4	EU	EU	OC	1
5	EU	EU	EU	9
6	EU	EU	AC	3
7	EU	AC	OC	5
8	EU	AC	EU	9
9	EU	AC	AC	7

Scenario 2: Integration - Bosniaks Join the EU				
Alternate Future #	Bosniaks	Croats	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	EU	OC	OC	3
2	EU	OC	EU	5
3	EU	OC	AC	4
4	EU	EU	OC	1
5	EU	EU	EU	9
6	EU	EU	AC	2
7	EU	AC	OC	6
8	EU	AC	EU	8
9	EU	AC	AC	7

Scenario 2: Integration - Serbs Join the EU				
Alternate Future #	Serbs	Croats	Bosniaks	Total # of Votes
1	EU	OC	OC	3
2	EU	OC	EU	4
3	EU	OC	AC	9
4	EU	EU	OC	2
5	EU	EU	EU	1
6	EU	EU	AC	5
7	EU	AC	OC	7
8	EU	AC	EU	6
9	EU	AC	AC	8

Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict				
Alternate Future #	Croats	Bosniaks	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	AC	OC	OC	6
2	AC	OC	EU	7
3	AC	OC	AC	5
4	AC	EU	OC	4
5	AC	EU	EU	9
6	AC	EU	AC	3
7	AC	AC	OC	2
8	AC	AC	EU	8
9	AC	AC	AC	1

Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict

Alternate Future #	Bosniaks	Croats	Serbs	Total # of Votes
1	AC	OC	OC	4
2	AC	OC	EU	9
3	AC	OC	AC	3
4	AC	EU	OC	5
5	AC	EU	EU	8
6	AC	EU	AC	6
7	AC	AC	OC	2
8	AC	AC	EU	7
9	AC	AC	AC	1

Alternate Future #	Serbs	Croats	Bosniaks	Total # of Votes
1	AC	OC	OC	3
2	AC	OC	EU	8
3	AC	OC	AC	4
4	AC	EU	OC	6
5	AC	EU	EU	9
6	AC	EU	AC	7
7	AC	AC	OC	2
8	AC	AC	EU	5
9	AC	AC	AC	1

## **Step 9: Analyze consequences of alternate futures**

### ***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Croats Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. The Croats would like their own country, the Bosniaks push to try and join the EU and the Serbs decide they will also push for their own country. This will ultimately cause disintegration as the Serbs and Croats push for their own country and Bosniaks try to join the EU. The EU will not just let an ethnic group join, and the lack of cooperation causes the country to tear down and prevents integration.

### ***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Bosniaks Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. The Bosniaks push for their own country, while the Croats decide to try and join the EU, the Serbs also decide they would like their own country. This will cause disintegration and the country will break down. One ethnic group cannot join the EU. Similar to the previous alternate future, as one of the members of the Federation tries and pursues their own country, it is thought the other group will try and join the EU. The Serbs are consistent with pushing for their own country.

### ***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Serbs Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 5 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. The Serbs push for their own country and the Croats and Bosniaks try and join the EU. In the previous scenarios the Serbs have continued to push for their own country. However, it is possible that the Croats and Bosniaks would collaborate for sake of economic advantages. The Serbs already have the RS and have been pushing for autonomy. It is not likely the EU will allow just the Federation into the organization.

### ***Scenario 2: Integration - Croats Join the EU***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. The Croats join the EU and it is likely that the Bosniaks would decide to collaborate and try and join the EU. This would be because of the economic advantages of being integrated into the organization. The Serbs are consistent with once again trying to establish their own country. However, it is very unlikely that the EU would change their rules and regulations and allow the Federation to join without the RS.

### ***Scenario 2: Integration - Bosniaks Join the EU***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. This has the same outcome as the previous scenario. The Bosniaks join the EU and it is likely that the Croats would decide to collaborate and try and join the EU. This would be because of the economic advantages of being integrated into the organization. The Serbs are consistent with once again trying to establish their own country. However, it is very unlikely that the EU would change their rules and regulations and allow the Federation to join without the RS.

### ***Scenario 2: Integration - Serbs Join the EU***

Alternate future # 5 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. While based on the evidence it is unlikely that the Serbs would join the EU. If this scenario were to happen the other groups would likely decide to join the EU. This would allow for economic advantages and allow Bosnia to be integrated into Europe. From the evidence it is likely that if the Serbs comply that the country would be able to meet the requirements of the EU and Bosnia would finally be a member of the EU. However, this scenario is at the discretion of the Serbs. In previous scenarios the Bosniaks and Croats tried to pursue membership into the EU.

***Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

***Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

***Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

*Summary for the above scenarios:*

In all three scenarios: Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict; Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict; and Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict; it is the same outcome. If one group takes up armed conflict the other groups will take up armed conflict. Based off of all of the tensions, the past war, and that Bosnia meets all of the characteristics of an intractable conflict, it is likely that if one group picked up arms the others would not simply be victims. In all three of the top Alternate futures of scenario 3 the outcome was the same. This would be the “straw that broke the camel’s back” scenario. This be the cause of all out war between the three ethnic groups and require intervention from the EU, NATO, and the United States. If the conflict was contained it would require a completely new accord, making the Dayton Agreement null and void.

**Step 10: Determine focal events for alternate futures**

***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Croats Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.



Focal Point: For this future to occur, the Croats would need to decide that they cannot cooperate any longer with the Bosniaks. Since the Serbs have the RS they may decide they would like their own Federation without the Bosniaks.

Focal Point: The government of the Federation breaks down and the Croats feel that the Bosniaks have more power.

***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Bosniaks Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.

Focal Point: Bosniaks decide that they cannot cooperate any longer with the Croats.

Focal Points: The government of the Federation breaks down and the Bosniaks feel that the Croats have more power.

***Scenario 1: Disintegration - Serbs Push for their Own Country***

Alternate future # 5 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.

Focal Point: The Serbs decide that the autonomy they have now is not enough and want to pursue their own national independent of Bosnia.

Focal Point: Serbia provides the RS with enough supplies and other pertinent resources to push completely out of Bosnia.

Focal Point: The notion of “Greater Serbia” is more attractive than the current state of affairs.

***Scenario 2: Integration - Croats Join the EU***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.

Focal Point: The EU would have to recognize the Croats in Bosnia as their own country.

Focal Point: The EU would have to change their rules allowing entrance of ethnic groups, as well as, countries.

***Scenario 2: Integration - Bosniaks Join the EU***

Alternate future # 4 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.

Focal Point: The EU would have to recognize the Bosniaks in Bosnia as their own country.

Focal Point: The EU would have to change their rules allowing entrance of ethnic groups, as well as, countries.

***Scenario 2: Integration - Serbs Join the EU***

Alternate future # 5 received the highest score and is ranked number 1.

Focal Point: If the Serbs/RS decided to cooperate then the rest of the ethnic groups would fall in line and the entire country would prepare and meet the criteria to join the EU.

***Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

***Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

***Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict***

Alternate future # 9 received the highest score and is ranked number 1. SEE BELOW SUMMARY.

*Summary for the above scenarios:*

In all three scenarios: Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict; Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict; and Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict; it would be the same focal point.

Focal Point: Accidental shooting by one group by another would cause riots.

Focal Point: Riots against one ethnic group would eventually cause conflict to break out.

Focal Point: If two ethnic groups are in the conflict, eventually the other one that is not in the conflict would either accidentally get attacked bringing them into the conflict, or it happens to cross in to a district that, that ethnic groups is in, resulting in conflict.

Focal Point: Ethnic groups may pair with one side, or it may be an all out conflict between the three groups.

### **Step 11: Develop indicators for each focal event**

*Focal Point:* What would need to happen could be as simple as the Croats deciding that they cannot cooperate any longer with the Bosniaks. Since the Serbs have the RS they may decide they would like their own Federation without the Bosniaks.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* The government of the Federation breaks down and the Croats feel that the Bosniaks have more power.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* Bosniaks decide that they cannot cooperate any longer with the Croats.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Points:* The government of the Federation breaks down and the Bosniaks feel that the Croats have more power.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* The Serbs decide that the autonomy they have now is not enough and want to pursue their own national independent of Bosnia.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* Serbia provides the RS with enough supplies and other pertinent resources to push completely out of Bosnia.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* The notion of “Greater Serbia” is more attractive than the current state of affairs.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* The EU would have to recognize the Croats in Bosnia as their own country.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability of the other groups.

*Key Indicator:* This could cause disintegration of other ethnic groups in Europe because they decide to pursue the EU.

*Focal Point:* The EU would have to change their rules allowing entrance of ethnic groups, as well as, countries.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability of the other groups.

*Key Indicator:* This could cause disintegration of other ethnic groups in Europe because they decide to pursue the EU.

*Focal Point:* The EU would have to recognize the Bosniaks in Bosnia as their own country.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability of the other groups.

*Key Indicator:* This could cause disintegration of other ethnic groups in Europe because they decide to pursue the EU.

*Focal Point:* The EU would have to change their rules allowing entrance of ethnic groups, as well as, countries.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability of the other groups.

*Key Indicator:* This could cause disintegration of other ethnic groups in Europe because they decide to pursue the EU.

*Focal Point:* If the Serbs/RS decided to cooperate then the rest of the ethnic groups would fall in line and the entire country would prepare and meet the criteria to join the EU.

*Key Indicator:* There would be peace in Bosnia and in the region.

*Key Indicator:* The EU would prosper because of the addition.

*Key Indicator:* No more violent conflict in Bosnia.

*Focal Point:* Accidental shooting by one group by another would cause riots.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* Riots against one ethnic group would eventually cause conflict to break out.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* If two ethnic groups are in the conflict, eventually the other one that is not in the conflict would either accidentally get attacked bringing them into the conflict, or it happens to cross in to a district that, that ethnic groups is in, resulting in conflict.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

*Focal Point:* Ethnic groups may pair with one side, or it may be an all out conflict between the three groups.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention a world power for a new settlement, negotiation, or some type of mediation.

*Key Indicator:* Intervention by NATO and EU forces for stability operations.

*Key Indicator:* This would cause disintegration and instability.

## **Step 12: Assess the potential for transposition between alternate futures**

After the analysis of the focal events and key indicators the hypothesis may be changed based off the alternate futures. In the following scenarios: Scenario 3: Violent Conflict: Croats take up Armed Conflict; Scenario 3: Violent Conflict - Bosniaks take up Armed Conflict; and Scenario 3: Armed Conflict - Serbs take up Armed Conflict it is likely that any number of things could cause a different outcome. For instance, any or all of the ethnic groups may decide that they do not wish to fight anymore and may seek outside intervention or aid immediately upon the threat of violence or immediately successive to violence. This would keep the entire country from going to war and may actually by default come to a way to better mediate the potential conflict. Most of the alternate futures could be transposed and there could be completely different outcomes. The scenarios relating to violent conflict seem to have the greatest likelihood of having several different futures within the same future. Ideally, not everyone associated with a particular group will want violent conflict and it has already been shown that many members of the populace would like to join the EU, do not want further conflict, or simply want a better way of life.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has analyzed the following questions: Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or have they caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? It has also shown that the pressure from wanting to join the EU may bring about more integration of the two federations. This analysis has also demonstrated that Bosnia meets the characteristics of an intractable conflict but if mediated and negotiated correctly than there could be lasting peace. It has explored how aspects of an intractable conflict contribute to the disintegration of the country. Throughout this paper the Lockwood Analytical Method of Prediction was applied to predict the possible futures of the Serbians (Serbs), Croatians (Croats) and Bosniaks in Bosnia.

The question was partially answered: Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or have they caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? The Accords have done both, while there is no longer a violent conflict, the groups did not all receive a proportionate amount of aid from the Accords. Some of the groups would still like their autonomy, which shows that not everything was addressed fully in the Accords. The question of: It has also shown that the pressure from wanting to join the EU may bring about more integration of the two federations? It is likely that if Bosnia was able to join the EU that it would cause integration but in order of that to happen the two federations must first integrate. This brings back the point that once again, there needs to be negotiations that address all of the concerns and desires of the groups and that all ethnic groups participate proportionately.

There must be further observations of the three ethnic groups and observations of the progress or lack of progress from the Dayton Accords. There has been some polls and surveys conducted by outside organizations, there needs to be in-depth interviews and ethnography's to better understand the internal climate. There must be a greater analysis of the Dayton Accords

for a deeper understanding of its implementation in a post-conflict era, so there is not future conflict.



## References

- A cuff, Frank L. (1997). *How to Negotiate Anything with Anyone Anywhere Around the World*. New York: American Management Association.
- Almond, G., Powell Jr., G. Dalton, R., & Strom, K. (2008). *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. 9th Edition. United States: Pearson-Longman
- Amnesty International (2006). Bosnia and Herzegovina: Widespread discrimination blocking refugee return. Amnesty international. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/EUR63/002/2006/en/ff70a962-d46d-11dd-8743-d305bea2b2c7/eur630022006en.pdf>
- Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In Defense of Globalization*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press
- Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. (2009). Background Note: Bosnia and Herzegovina. US department of state: bureau of European and Eurasian affairs. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2868.htm#history>
- CIA World Factbook. 2009. Bosnia and Herzegovina. Central Intelligence Agency. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/bk.html> (accessed April 20, 2010).
- Croatian American Association. "CROATS STEP UP DRIVE FOR OWN REPUBLIC." Croatian American Association. Available from <http://www.causa.org/articles/octnov2005/CROATS%20STEP%20UP%20DRIVE%20FOR%20OWN%20REPUBLIC.html>. Internet; accessed 23 April 2010.
- Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (2004). *Taming Intractable Conflicts: Mediation in the Hardest Cases*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Daalder, I. (2004). Bosnia after SFOR: Options for Continued US Engagement. School of public affairs and director of research, center for international and security studies, University of Maryland. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.publicpolicy.umd.edu/faculty/daalder/daalder.pdf>
- Department of State (2009). Background Note: Bosnia and Herzegovina. US Department of State: Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. Retrieved April 25, 2010 from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2868.htm#history>
- Dougherty, J. E., & Pfaltzgraff, R. L. (2001). *Contending theories of international relations: comprehensive survey* (5th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

- Kukeli, A. (2007). Foreign Direct Investment in Transition Economies: an Institutional Approach. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 6(12), Retrieved April 20, 2010 from <http://www.cluteinstitute-onlinejournals.com/PDFs/2007224.pdf>
- Hays, D. (2004). Lessons Learned from the Balkans Conflict: Keynote Address. The Dayton peace accords project. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.daytonproject.org/publications/publication.php?id=29>
- Heuer, Richards J. 1999. Psychology of Intelligence Analysis. Washington, DC: CIA Center for the Study of Intelligence.
- Lockwood, Jonathan. 2008. Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction. <http://www.lamp-method.org/> (accessed April 16, 2009).
- Lockwood, Jonathan S. and Kathleen O'Brien Lockwood. 1994. The Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction (LAMP), Washington DC: Joint Military Intelligence College.
- Mackrell, E.; NATO Website (1997). "Combined forces support: The evolution in military (intelligence) affairs" <http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1997/9706-06.htm> Retrieved August 16, 2009
- Montgomery, William. "The Future of the Republika Srpska." B92. Available from <http://www.b92.net/feedback/misljenja/press/william.php>. Internet; accessed 23 April 2010.
- Nye, J.S. (1988). Integration and Conflict in Regional Organization *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, 4, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1961822> retrieved July 19, 2009.
- Olsen, H. (1999). Training U.S. Army Officers for Peace Operations: Lessons from Bosnia. United states institute for peace. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.usip.org/resources/training-us-army-officers-peace-operations-lessons-bosnia>
- President and Fellows of Harvard College. (1999). The Best-Laid Plans: Implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords in the Courtroom and on the Ground. *Harvard Human Rights Journal*. Retrieved (2009, October 24) from <http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/orgs/hrj/iss12/palmer.shtm>
- Thorne, M., & Giesen, M. (2002) *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. McGraw Hill. NY.

## VIII. APPENDIX A

In order to predict the possible futures of Bosnia and whether or not it will disintegrate or integrate, the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH) will be used to determine a predictive analysis. The ACH method is an 8 step method can weight hypotheses against one another and attempt to determine which hypotheses will work the best. The method is a way to break down a complex problem and come up with a possible outcome (Heuer 1999).

The 8 steps of the Analysis of Competing Hypotheses (ACH)

1. Identify the possible hypotheses to be considered. Use a group of analysts with different perspectives to brainstorm the possibilities.
2. Make a list of significant evidence and arguments for and against each hypothesis.
3. Prepare a matrix with hypotheses across the top and evidence down the side. Analyze the "diagnosticity" of the evidence and arguments--that is, identify which items are most helpful in judging the relative likelihood of the hypotheses.
4. Refine the matrix. Reconsider the hypotheses and delete evidence and arguments that have no diagnostic value.
5. Draw tentative conclusions about the relative likelihood of each hypothesis. Proceed by trying to disprove the hypotheses rather than prove them.
6. Analyze how sensitive your conclusion is to a few critical items of evidence. Consider the consequences for your analysis if that evidence were wrong, misleading, or subject to a different interpretation.
7. Report conclusions. Discuss the relative likelihood of all the hypotheses, not just the most likely one.
8. Identify milestones for future observation that may indicate events are taking a different course than expected.

The first step will be completed by the author of this research paper and not collaborated with other analysts. In an applied setting there would be a group of analysts that would conduct a brainstorming activity; however, the author will provide the possible hypotheses. In an applied

setting, in step one there is not a limit to the amount of hypotheses that can be formulated. As a general rule seven hypotheses is thought to be a little unmanageable but there is not restriction (Heuer 1999).

***Step 1: Identify the possible hypotheses to be considered. Use a group of analysts with different perspectives to brainstorm the possibilities.***

Have the Dayton Accords helped to bring about re-integration or has it caused irreversible disintegration of Bosnia? Will the pressure from wanting to join the EU bring about more disintegration within Bosnia or cause integration of the two federations? This paper will also show Bosnia meets the characteristic of an intractable conflict and how it contributes to the disintegration of the country? The ACH method will be used to attempt to predict the possible futures of the Serbians (Serbs), Croatians (Croats) and Bosniaks in Bosnia.

(1) The internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will disintegrate.

(2) There will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

Characteristics of an Intractable Conflict:

- (1) They are typically long standing
- (2) They remain unresolved
- (3) There is a continuation of violence
- (4) There are vested interests of the parties involved in the conflict

(3) The Republika Srpska will cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this will cause integration.

(4) The leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks will collaborate against the Serbs and decide to accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would cause only

the Republika Srpska to disintegrate, continue the fight, push for independence and ruin any potential membership into the EU.

(5) The RS decides to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will not work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will frustrate efforts by the EU and cause disintegration.

(6) The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration.

(7) All three groups get tired of the conflict and decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. They decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation is tired and the new generation wants to live in peace.

***Step 2: Make a list of significant evidence and arguments for and against each hypothesis.***

(1) The internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will disintegrate.

*For:*

A decision was reached by the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina in July of 2000, the court rendered a decision by which they would recognize Bosniaks, the Croats, and to the Serbs as constituent people throughout the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In March of 2002, this decision was recognized formally and settled by main the political parties for both bodies (Department of State, 2009).

*Against:*

The Bosnians Serbs have the RS and would like to become part of “Greater Serbia” or have their independence. The Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their

own autonomy. The Croats say they having nothing against the Bosniaks but would like their own autonomy.

(2) There will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

Characteristics of an Intractable Conflict:

- (1) They are typically long standing
- (2) They remain unresolved
- (3) There is a continuation of violence
- (4) There are vested interests of the parties involved in the conflict

*For:*

Based off similar cases (Israeli's & Palestinians) where ethnic groups do not get along they continue in conflict and though there may not be major fighting they never integrate. All of the ethnic groups have the vested interest to gain something out of the continuation of the conflict.

*Against:*

Based off all of the research – this hypothesis is valid.

(3) The Republika Srpska will cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this will cause integration.

*For:*

Based off the research this hypothesis is not likely.

*Against:*

The Serbs believe "they should get something from all this." A significant segment of the Bosnian Serb population wants at least independence, if not union with Serbia (Montgomery 2010).

(4) The leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks will collaborate against the Serbs and decide to accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would cause only the Republika Srpska to disintegrate, continue the fight, push for independence and ruin any potential membership into the EU.

*For:*

The Dayton divided the country into federations the Bosniak-Croat federation and the Republika Srpska; the Croats and Bosniaks are already forced to collaborate.

*Against:*

Some Croats believe the federation is a "jail for the Croatian people", and think all three Bosnian ethnicities should have equal rights (Croatian American Association, 2007).

(5) The RS decides to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will not work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will frustrate efforts by the EU and cause disintegration.

*For:*

The RS wishes to gain as much as they can and wish to have their own autonomy and independence.

*Against:*

If there is a lot of violence then NATO forces or the EU will intervene and possibly the US to ensure that there is no more ethnic cleansing.

(6) The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration.

*For:*

None of the sides are completely happy and though the Bosniaks and Croats are primarily in the same area the Bosniaks feel cheated and would like autonomy. The Serbs have already been pushing towards autonomy.

*Against:*

Though none of the groups are fond of each other, there is much to gain from the EU and integration into Europe. The country could generate a lot more wealth and profit off of integration much more than disintegration.

(7) All three groups get tired of the conflict and decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. They decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation is tired and the new generation wants to live in peace.

*For:*

The fight has been going on for a long time and though it is not great, the war is over and if it flares up again NATO, the EU and the US will stop the war. There is a lot of revenue to be generated from cooperation from the EU and other forces.

*Against:*

The groups are stubborn and do not like each other. There are vested interests for some of the higher politicians to continue a conflict. Just because there is peacekeepers in the area does not mean they will obey.

***Step 3: Prepare a matrix with hypotheses across the top and evidence down the side. Analyze the "diagnosticity" of the evidence and arguments--that is, identify which items are most helpful in judging the relative likelihood of the hypotheses.***

Legend:

NA is for Not Applicable.

C = Consistent



CC = Very Consistent  
I = Inconsistent  
II = Very Inconsistent  
N = Neutral

If this hypothesis is true, the answer is "Yes," this means there is consistency in the evidence. This will result in C for consistent or CC for very inconsistent. If the hypothesis is false, the answer is I for inconsistent or II for very inconsistent. If the hypothesis is neutral it receives N for neutral, and if it is not applicable it receives NA for not applicable. This matrix shows the weighted inconsistency score, which is the weighted sum of the I scores. The software PARC ACH 2.0.5 was used to build the matrices.

This matrix represents the Weighted Inconsistency (I) score which is the sum of I scores. In this matrix the I scores are not weighted. According to the matrix and the evidence against the hypotheses, the following hypotheses are considered very inconsistent.

H:3 or (3) the Republika Srpska will cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this will cause integration. This hypothesis has a weighted I score of -22.828.

H: 7 or (7) all three groups get tired of the conflict and decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. They decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation is tired and the new generation wants to live in peace. This hypothesis has a weighted I score of -21.828.

H:4 or (4) the leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks will collaborate against the Serbs and decide to accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would cause only the Republika Srpska to disintegrate, continue the fight, push for independence and ruin any

potential membership into the EU. This hypothesis has a weighted I score of -6.414; while not as high as the other two it is still much higher than the others and is inconsistent.

H:6 or (6) The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration. This hypothesis has a weighted I score of -4.035; while not as high as the other two it is high enough compared to the others and is inconsistent.

H:3, H:4, H:6 and H:7 will be removed as they are inconsistent, as well as, evident that is not as relevant.

⑩	Type	Credibility	Relevance	H: 1	H: 2	H: 3	H: 4	H: 5	H: 6	H: 7
				Internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups; the country will disintegrate.	There is disintegration of Bosnia because it meets characteristic of an intractable conflict	The RS will cooperate with the other ethnic groups, surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this causes integration.	The leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks collaborate against the Serbs. The RS disintegrates, pushes for independence ruins EU membership.	RS fights for autonomy suggested by Dayton Agreement. This frustrates efforts by the EU; disintegration.	The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration.	All groups tired of conflict, decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. Decide want peace and a better life.
				-1.914	-1.914	-22.828	-6.414	-3.121	-4.035	-21.828
E14		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E13	The Croats say they having nothing against the Bosniaks but would like their own autonomy.	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	C	CC	II	II	N	C	II
E12	The Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their own autonomy.	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	CC	C	I	II	I	CC	II
E11	The Bosnians Serbs have the RS and would like to become part of "Greater Serbia" or have their independence	HIGH	HIGH	CC	C	II	CC	CC	CC	II

E10	Based off similar cases (Israel's & Palestinians) where ethnic groups do not get along they continue in conflict and though there may not be major fighting they never integrate.		HIGH	HIGH	CC	CC	II	CC	CC	CC	II
E9	All of the ethnic groups have the vested interest to gain something out of the continuation of the conflict.		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	C	CC	II	C	C	CC	II
E8	The Dayton divided the country into federations the Bosniak-Croat federation and the Republika Srpska; the Croats and Bosniaks are already forced to collaborate.		LOW	LOW	I	I	C	C	C	I	C
E7	Some Croats believe the federation is a "jail for the Croatian people", and think all three Bosnian ethnicities should have equal rights		LOW	LOW	CC	C	II	C	NA	C	II
E6	The Serbs have already been pushing towards independence		HIGH	HIGH	C	C	II	C	CC	C	I

E5	There is a lot of revenue to be generated from cooperation from the EU and other forces.		HIGH	MEDIUM	I	I	CC	I	I	II	CC
E4	The fight has been going on for a long time and though it is not great, the war is over and if it flares up again NATO, the EU and the US will stop the war.		LOW	MEDIUM	C	C	N	N	I	I	CC
E3	Just because there is peacekeepers in the area does not mean they will obey.		LOW	LOW	CC	C	II	C	CC	C	II
E2	There are vested interests for some of the higher politicians to continue a conflict.		HIGH	MEDIUM	CC	CC	II	C	C	C	II
E1	The groups are stubborn and do not like each other		LOW	LOW	CC	C	II	II	CC	CC	II

This matrix represents the Inconsistency (I) score which is the sum of I scores. In this matrix the I scores are not weighted. According to the matrix and the evidence against the hypotheses, the following hypotheses are considered very inconsistent.

H:3 or (3) the Republika Srpska will cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this will cause integration. This hypothesis has an I score of -19.

H: 7 or (7) all three groups get tired of the conflict and decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. They decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation is tired and the new generation wants to live in peace. This hypothesis has an I score of -19.

H:4 or (4) the leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks will collaborate against the Serbs and decide to accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would cause only the Republika Srpska to disintegrate, continue the fight, push for independence and ruin any potential membership into the EU. This hypothesis has an I score of -7; while not as high as the other two it is still much higher than the others and is inconsistent.

H:6 or (6) The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration. This hypothesis has an I score of -4; while not as high as the other two it is high enough compared to the others and is inconsistent.

H:3, H:4, H:6 and H:7 will be removed as they are inconsistent, as well as, evidence that is not as relevant.

Integration or Disintegration of Bosnia - Main

	@	Type	H: 1	H: 2	H: 3	H: 4	H: 5	H: 6	H: 7
			Internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups; the country will disintegrate.	There is disintegration of Bosnia because it meets characteristic of an intractable conflict	The RS will cooperate with the other ethnic groups, surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this causes integration.	The leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks collaborate against the Serbs. The RS disintegrates, pushes for independence ruins EU membership.	RS fights for autonomy suggested by Dayton Agreement. This frustrates efforts by the EU; disintegration.	The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration.	All groups tired of conflict, decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. Decide want peace and a better life.
		Inconsistency Score +<->	-2	-2	-19	-7	-3	-4	-19
E14			NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E13		The Croats say they having nothing against the Bosniaks but would like their own autonomy.	C	CC	II	II	N	C	II
E12		The Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their own autonomy.	CC	C	I	II	I	CC	II
E11		The Bosnians Serbs have the RS and would like to become part of "Greater Serbia" or have their independence	CC	C	II	CC	CC	CC	II
		Based off similar cases (Israeli's & Palestinians) where ethnic groups do not get along they continue in conflict and though there may not be major fighting they never integrate.	CC	CC	II	CC	CC	CC	II
E10		All of the ethnic groups have the vested interest to gain something out of the continuation of the conflict.	C	CC	II	C	C	CC	II
E9		The Dayton divided the country into federations the Bosniak-Croat federation and the Republika Srpska; the Croats and Bosniaks are already forced to collaborate.	I	I	C	C	C	I	C
E8		Some Croats believe the federation is a "jail for the Croatian people", and think all three Bosnian ethnicities should have equal rights	CC	C	II	C	NA	C	II
E7		The Serbs have already been pushing towards autonomy.	C	C	II	C	CC	C	I
E6									

E5	There is a lot of revenue to be generated from cooperation from the EU and other forces.		I	I	CC	I	I	II	CC
E4	The fight has been going on for a long time and though it is not great, the war is over and if it flares up again NATO, the EU and the US will stop the war.		C	C	N	N	I	I	CC
E3	Just because there is peacekeepers in the area does not mean they will obey.		CC	C	II	C	CC	C	II
E2	There are vested interests for some of the higher politicians to continue a conflict.		CC	CC	II	C	C	C	II
E1	The groups are stubborn and do not like each other		CC	C	II	II	CC	CC	II

**Step 4: Refine the matrix. Reconsider the hypotheses and delete evidence and arguments that have no diagnostic value.**

The following hypotheses are consistent with the evidence and all the evidence that is inconsistent or very inconsistent has been removed. The matrix has been refined and the values have changed slightly only one of the hypotheses has a slight inconsistency of 1, which is H: 5

In this matrix only the weighted inconsistency score was used. While the analyst is free to use both weighted and un-weighted inconsistency scoring, in this particular matrix on the weighted inconsistency was used.

H: 1 or (1) the internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will disintegrate.

H: 2 or (2) there will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

Characteristics of an Intractable Conflict:

- (1) They are typically long standing
- (2) They remain unresolved
- (3) There is a continuation of violence
- (4) There are vested interests of the parties involved in the conflict

H: 5 or (5) The RS decides to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will not work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will frustrate efforts by the EU and cause disintegration. Notice there is only a slight inconsistency of 1. The inconsistency has to do with E6 which states the Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their own economy. The inconsistency is because while both H: 5 and E6 indicate disintegration the two do not applicable but could also indicate an inconsistency; this would have to do with the judgment of the analyst.

The below matrix is refined to show the adjustments with the evidence:

Integration or Disintegration of Bosnia - Main

	ID	Type	Credibility	Relevance	H: 1	H: 2	H: 3
					Internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups; the country will disintegrate.	There is disintegration of Bosnia because it meets characteristic of an intractable conflict	RS fights for autonomy suggested by Dayton Agreement. This frustrates efforts by the EU; disintegration.
					-0.0	-0.0	-1.0
E8			MEDIUM	MEDIUM	NA	NA	NA
E7	The Croats say they having nothing against the Bosniaks but would like their own autonomy.		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	C	CC	N
E6	The Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their own autonomy.		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	CC	C	I
E5	The Bosnians Serbs have the RS and would like to become part of "Greater Serbia" or have their independence		HIGH	HIGH	CC	C	CC



E4	Based off similar cases (Israeli's & Palestinians) where ethnic groups do not get along they continue in conflict and though there may not be major fighting they never integrate.		HIGH	HIGH	CC	CC	CC
E3	All of the ethnic groups have the vested interest to gain something out of the continuation of the conflict.		MEDIUM	MEDIUM	C	CC	C
E2	The Serbs have already been pushing towards autonomy.		HIGH	HIGH	C	C	CC
E1	There are vested interests for some of the higher politicians to continue a conflict.		HIGH	MEDIUM	CC	CC	C

***Step 5: Draw tentative conclusions about the relative likelihood of each hypothesis. Proceed by trying to disprove the hypotheses rather than prove them.***

For the following hypotheses  $H_0$ : represents the null hypotheses which are the opposite of the hypothesis.

H: 1 or (1) the internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will disintegrate.

$H_0$ : The internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will integrate.

The null for H: 1 is improbable because internal frustration and lack of cooperation will not cause integration of the ethnic groups. Talcott Parsons suggested that integration had to do with action between an individual and actor; action in a “societal context” called “action systems.” He places people in the role of subjects and objects. Parsons states that the three subsystems are 1) the personality system 2) the social system 3) the cultural system. They are interconnected through the action system. If there is a change in one of the subsystems it will affect another in turn affecting the entire action system (Dougherty 2001). With regards to the null  $H_0$ : The internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will integrate; this goes against what is known about integration and therefore makes the null invalid.

H: 2 or (2) there will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker’s characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

$H_0$ : There will ultimately be integration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker’s characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).

Leading into the disagreement there was: (1) latent disagreement; (2) disagreement emergence; (3) disagreement escalation; (4) stalemate; (5) de-escalation/negotiation; (6) dispute settlement; and (7) post disagreement building. The use a method called “ripeness” when negotiations are ready to be negotiated should have been used. A “ripe” moment also refers to when a group is ready to negotiate and only when a group is actually ready to negotiate will anything happen. Crocker also notes that a “mediator makes these judgment calls and calculations to determine how to best intervene to help ripen the disagreement” (Crocker, 2004).

With regards to an intractable conflict steps 1-4 went accordingly. Step 5 did have a de-escalation but the negation of the Dayton Accords only allow some of the groups to get some of

things they wanted, while other groups felt as if they received nothing. Because of this step 6-7 did not properly function. Therefore H<sub>0</sub>: There will ultimately be integration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004), does not fit and is not probable.

H: 5 or (5) The RS decides to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will not work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will frustrate efforts by the EU and cause disintegration.

H<sub>0</sub>: The RS decides not to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will not frustrate efforts by the EU and will cause integration.

While the null is possible based on the evidence and the route the RS has taken thus far it does not fit the null. However, this hypothesis still could go either way because there is a chance that the Serbs will get tired of pushing for autonomy, they may see value in cooperation because the economic gains from that and the possibility of joining the EU could mean a better way of life. Based off the hypotheses this hypothesis would be the best route for Bosnia.

***Step 6: Analyze how sensitive your conclusion is to a few critical items of evidence. Consider the consequences for your analysis if that evidence were wrong, misleading, or subject to a different interpretation.***

The following evidence could be misleading or could have been interpreted the wrong way by either the analyst or the source that the analyst received the information.

*E7: The Croats say they having nothing against the Bosniaks but would like their own autonomy.*

The evidence could have been from only one source and by one person. Maybe this view is the view of a politician or a particular groups or person that feels the Croats deserve more or may have a stake in the situation meaning that they are a spoiler (Crocker 2004). Maybe most

Croats feel as if they already have received autonomy. While it is consistent with H: 1 and H: 2 are not applicable to H: 5.

*E6: The Bosniaks do not feel as if they got a fair deal and would like their own autonomy.*

As with the previous evidence this could have been from only one source and by one person. Maybe this view is the view of a politician or a particular groups or person that feels the Bosniaks deserve more or may have a stake in the situation meaning that they are a spoiler (Crocker 2004). Maybe most Bosniaks feel as if they already have received autonomy and got a fair deal. I was consistent with H: 1 and H: 2 but inconsistent with H: 5.

*E5: The Bosnians Serbs have the RS and would like to become part of “Greater Serbia” or have their independence*

While this was consistent with all of the hypotheses it might only be a small fraction of the Serbs would like to become part of “Greater Serbia.” This could also be generational, and the younger generation may feel as if the current situation was okay. The evidence could be from one source and the analyst could have considered the evidence to have more credibility and relevance than it had.

*E4: Based off similar cases (Israeli’s & Palestinians) where ethnic groups do not get along they continue in conflict and though there may not be major fighting they never integrate.*

While the evidence was based off of similar situations, no two situations are completely the same. There are other situations that have been intractable conflict that have been mediated. The evidence is only basing it off of one similar case and there could in fact be some form of integration.

*E3: All of the ethnic groups have the vested interest to gain something out of the continuation of the conflict.*

All of the ethnic groups have a vested interest in their ethnic group but a gain is relative to the individual and group. What may be a gain for some is integration and disintegration would cause them to gain nothing but in fact lose everything they wanted.

*E2: The Serbs have already been pushing towards autonomy.*

The Serbs have been pushing for autonomy but they already have the RS. Maybe the Serbs figured since they got the RS maybe they can get more but the problem could actually be politicians the need firmer boundaries. This could also simply be a ploy from politicians and not the actual desire of the people (the Serbs).

*E1: There are vested interests for some of the higher politicians to continue a conflict.*

The vested interest may only be from the politician. New administrations come and go in countries; Bosnia is not any different. What one administration wants may be completely different than another.

***Step 7: Report conclusions. Discuss the relative likelihood of all the hypotheses, not just the most likely one.***

*H: 1 the internal frustrations and lack of cooperation will not allow integration of the ethnic groups and the country will disintegrate.*

There is definitely internal frustration, whether or not they will actually cause the country to disintegrate is still not known. There has been some progress but there is a not to be done. However, if lack of cooperation continues there is a chance there will not be integration and there could be another violent conflict.

*H: 2 there will ultimately be a disintegration of Bosnia because the conflict meets all of the Chester Crocker's characteristics of an intractable conflict (2004).*

There are many cases around the world in the past and present that are what is considered intractable conflicts. While ultimately Bosnia may not disintegrate the fact that it meets all of these characteristics shows that there is a significant amount of problems. There is a definite need to have more negotiations and mediations because not all of the ethnic groups feel as they got what they needed out of the Dayton Accords.

*H:3 The Republika Srpska will cooperate with the other ethnic groups and allow major revisions of the Constitution, with the goal of establishing a stronger central government, and surrender a large amount of its autonomy; this will cause integration.*

This would be the best scenario, but unfortunately at this time the RS has been pushing for other things. All of the variables of this hypothesis would ensure that at least the three groups started to work together and hopefully find a way to negotiate something for everyone.

*H: 4 the leaders of the Croats and Bosniaks will collaborate against the Serbs and decide to accept all conditions of the Bosnian government and the Federation. This would cause only the Republika Srpska to disintegrate, continue the fight, push for independence and ruin any potential membership into the EU.*

This scenario seems to be the most unlikely, but would not impossible. While the Bosniaks and Croats share the Federation, it does not mean that they see eye to eye on everything, nor does it mean that the RS might not decide to try and work with the other two groups.

*H: 5 the RS decides to maintain a fight to ensure autonomy as suggested by the Dayton Agreement. The Serbs will not work with the other groups whether or not they collaborated against the RS. This will frustrate efforts by the EU and cause disintegration.*

This scenario according to the evidence could happen but the EU could find another way to work with the two cooperating groups.

*H: 6 The Serbs, Croats, and Bosniaks will all push for independence and their own autonomy. This will cause disintegration.*

This scenario is possible but not as likely because all three groups would have to want to disintegrate and not have anything to do with the EU. It is clear that at least some of the groups and members of the groups see the value of the EU because they have been trying to join it for a while but have not been able to meet all the criteria.

*H: 7 all three groups get tired of the conflict and decide to be part of Europe and share the economic advantages. They decide that a better economy and a better way of life are more important. The older generation is tired and the new generation wants to live in peace.*

This scenario would be the best possible scenario but at this point it is not as likely because the groups are still restless and some of the groups feel that the Dayton Accords failed to address all the concerns. However, a better economy and economic advantages would aid in building a stronger country and a better way of life in general.

***Step 8: Identify milestones for future observation that may indicate events are taking a different course than expected.***

There is a need for future observations of the three ethnic groups and the progress and lack of progress as a result of the Dayton Accords. While there has been some polls and surveys conducted by the Gallop organization, there needs to be in-depth interviews and possibly ethnography to better understand the climate. There also needs to be a greater analysis of the Dayton Accords so there may be a deeper understanding of its implementation in a post-conflict era. There also must be more analysis of the Bosnian negotiations and settlements.

## COMPARISON

After using both the ACH Method and the LAMP method there are several pros and cons for each. The ACH method is quicker to and has fewer steps than the LAMP method. It does a good job comparing hypotheses, both weighed and not weighted to figure out consistencies and inconsistencies'. There is open source software, which saves time in conducting analysis.

Although there was not current software for the LAMP method, calculations and tables were able to be done in Excel. The LAMP method was able to bring to the analyst's attention much more detail about alternate futures and demonstrate potential courses of action. Both methods were very useful when contrasted together, allowing the analyst to see the same situations through two platforms, thus giving the situation much critical detail and in-depth understanding.



## References

- Croatian American Association. "CROATS STEP UP DRIVE FOR OWN REPUBLIC." Croatian American Association. Available from <http://www.causa.org/articles/octnov2005/CROATS%20STEP%20UP%20DRIVE%20FOR%20OWN%20REPUBLIC.html>. Internet; accessed 23 April 2010.
- Crocker, Chester A., Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (2004). *Taming Intractable Conflicts: Mediation in the Hardest Cases*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Department of State (2009). *Background Note: Bosnia and Herzegovina*. US Department of State: Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs. Retrieved April 25, 2010 from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2868.htm#history>
- Dougherty, J. E., & Pfaltzgraff, R. L. (2001). *Contending theories of international relations: comprehensive survey* (5th ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.
- Heuer, R. (1999). *Psychology of Intelligence Analysis*, Washington DC: CIA Center for the Study of Intelligence. ISBN 1929667000 (paperback). Available online at <https://www.cia.gov/csi/books/19104/index.html>.
- PARC ACH 2.0.5 (2006). Palo Alto Research Center. ACH2.0.5 Download Page. Downloaded April 25, 2010 from <http://www2.parc.com/istl/projects/ach/ach.html>