Dear Readers,

Here, we are offering an analysis of impact of nationalism on the formulation of foreign policy. This theme has been subject to many debates and writing, yet, it seems that there is a lack of explanation of theoretical genesis of the perverted Bosnian-Herzegovinian nationalism that invents and establishes ethno-nationalist criteria for the purpose of explaining and preserving itself. Its practical realisation is what we live in our everyday life in all the visible and invisible crisis it generates.

What makes this analysis even more valuable is the fact that it fully reveals these paradoxes in the domain of foreign policy, where they are shrewdly disguised behind the alleged elitism, forged on the flames of the "Dayton status quo" and seasoned with its ethno-subjects' political correctness.

We can argue that the analysis offered is one of the pioneer attempts to define, at least theoretically, to which of modern national paradoxes the nationalism of BiH belongs. Here, the analysis not only offers specific answers to this very question, but, more importantly, clearly and systematically identifies the ways in which ethno-nationalism in BiH prevents - at a practical level - the formulation of foreign policy, and why it permanently reduces it to mere foreign affairs.

In a systematically structured paper that brings down the issue to its essential parameters, it would be easy for readers to find for themselves the answer to question: why BiH is incapable of adapting its foreign relations to global and regional changes, and why it is faced with the threat - if it continues along this path - with a permanent status quo which would annul totally its foreign-policy personality and subjectivity.

We would like to use this opportunity to thank the Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Sarajevo Office, for all the support and confidence.

Sincerely
FPI BH

Impact of Nationalism on Foreign Policy Formulation

CONTENTS

Three basic lines of thought can be identified in understanding the concept of 'nation': nationalist - characterising nations as timeless and primordial; perennialist - arguing that nations have existed for a long time, but take different forms over the time; and concepts that see nations as entirely modern and constructed. At the beginning, the nationalist concept was used to mobilise public support in the erosion of the socialist system of values, and to impose a different, primarily divisive, view of society, which found fertile ground in the ethnic diversity of BiH. However, it abused the vacuum thus created and imposed the concept of nation as a social axiom, which cannot be and should not be challenged. That way, nationalism has been decontextualised, stripped of its theoretical definition and scientific connotations, transformed into a pure political variable, a pragmatic political tool. It moulds into institutional shapes created by the claustrophobic Dayton arrangements, which take the concepts of nations and nationalism for granted, as given axioms, which represent constitutive elements of this society, without any questioning of their origins and future, or their impact on the society as a whole. This paper intends to place nations and nationalism in their wider theoretical framework, for the purpose of examining their relationship with theories of international relations, and effects on foreign policy formulation in BiH. We will thus examine and analyse the relationship and interaction between two seemingly distinct areas of political science, international relations and nationalism.

Both areas of study are fairly young, but went their separate ways due to an artificially strict delineation between the internal and external affairs of a state. As a result, more authors started to argue that, if nationalism continues to be studied autonomously, it will simply restrict International Relations to "foreign policy analysis, national security and strategic studies".[1] However, in the past century, nationalism proved to be "a powerful force for disorder both within states and in inter-state relations".[2] It thus undermined this strict delineation at both a theoretical and practical level and showed that it has a substantial, compelling and consequential impact on international affairs.

While examining different theoretical concepts of nations and nationalism, we will make a distinction between 'civic' and 'ethnic' nationalism, and focus on the latter, which is particular, but not exclusive, to the states of former Yugoslavia.[3] Our focus will be the reasons and origins of the delineation between the two academic disciplines. Commenting on the central treatment, which the nation-state received in the early theories of International Relations, realism and liberalism in particular, Michael Sullivan, for example, argues that "nationalism is both a threat to and justification of the division of humanity into separate sovereign states".[4] However, as international relations theories moved away

---

[1] Poole, Ross. Nation and identity.

[2] Pettman, Jan Jindy. "Nationalism and after".
http://staff.bath.ac.uk/ecsda/EU10616/Pettman%20on%20Nationalism.pdf

[3] The governance structures of Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) are unique in their complexity. As a result of the Dayton and Washington Peace Agreements, BiH has a State Government (referred to as BiH), two Entity Governments (Federation of BiH and Republika Srpska) and Brcko District. The Federation of BiH consists of 10 cantons and 80 municipalities, whereas Republika Srpska consists of 60 municipalities. As a result of the complexity of BiH governance structures and its constitutional arrangements, the state level is very weak and decentralized, whilst the entities, and cantons to a certain extent, are highly centralized. One of the main arguments of this study is that structures designed on equitable distribution of power between different 'nations/ethnicities' provide channels for nationalism to permeate and influence the state's policies.

[4] Sullivan, Michael. "Nationalism and International Relations Theory", in *The Australian Journal of Politics and*

from traditionalist theories and began to "deconstruct" the actors and processes that shape world affairs, non-state actors, "soft interests"[5], and the meta-politics, such as that of identity and nationalism, came to the fore. This instigated a question about the relationship between the two - can nationalism and international relations theories engage productively to explain world affairs, but also to explain each other?

Bosnia and Herzegovina's heterogeneous ethnic composition and the nature of governance structures put in place by the Dayton Peace Agreement have created a non-functional division of labour along ethnic lines. This institutional division represents a medium for channelling nationalist discontent, which has become a dominant feature of almost every aspect of state activity, including the formulation and implementation of foreign policy priorities. The weak and powerless state structures created by the Dayton Peace Agreement are often denied their statehood by politicians supposedly representing that very state. As such, BiH does not resemble the classic realist model of a nation-state. Its internal structures and political dynamics have become particularly influential on foreign policy-making and as a result, "political leaders are finding it more difficult to maintain a coherent set of priorities in foreign policy, and more difficult to articulate a single national interest".[6] Indeed, this reflects very negatively on the definition of a unified set of foreign policy priorities. It will, therefore, be argued that for those reasons, Bosnia and Herzegovina is deprived of a foreign policy, and instead, only "engages in foreign relations".[7]

Nation And Nationalism: Definitions And Concepts

We will begin with a theoretical characterisation of different aspects of nations and nationalism: nations' occurrence in time, their sociological and political basis, and theoretical coherence. Ernest Gellner, who was considered to be one of the most important scholars of nationalism, refrains from formal definitions of a nation, and rather opts for "looking at what culture does"[8], His study is rather focused on the process through which nations come to being, and their relationship with the state, neither of which are seen as "universal necessities". Moreover, Gellner clearly states that nations and states are not the same contingency, although nationalism holds that they were "destined for each other"; that either without the other is "incomplete",[9] and "constitutes a tragedy". He places nationalism at the point of the transition from the agro-literate to the industrial stage of human history and claims that "Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist".[10]

History, Vol. 43, No. 1, February 1997.

5 Nye, Joseph. "Redefining the National Interest", in *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1999, pp. 23 – 24.

6 Ibid. p. 25.

7 Fawn, Rick (ed). *Ideology and National Identity in Post-Communist Foreign Policies*. London: Franc Cass, 2004. p. 21.

8 Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983, pp. 6-7.

9 "The state has certainly emerged without the help of the nation. Some nations have certainly emerged without the blessings of their own state". Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983, pp. 6-7.

10 Ibid.

However, Benedict Anderson argues that the drawback of this formulation is that Gellner assimilates 'invention' to 'fabrication' and 'falsity', rather than to 'imagining' and 'creation'.[11] This "imagining" is explained in Anderson's definition of a nation as "an imagined political community", born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying "the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm".[12] He reveals three paradoxes in the way 'nations' are comprehended today:

♦ The objective modernity of nations to the historian's eye vs. their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists.

♦ The formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept (in the modern world everyone can, should, will 'have' a nationality, as he or she 'has' a gender) vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations.

♦ The 'political' power of nationalisms vs. their philosophical poverty and even incoherence.[13]

Anthony Smith identifies other perspectives that Gellner's approach fails to account for, namely "the passions generated by nationalism".[14] Smith argues that nationalism draws on the pre-existing history of the "group" and attempts to fashion this history into a sense of common identity and shared history. Smith asserts that many nationalisms are based on "historically flawed interpretations of past events and tend to overly mythologize small, inaccurate parts of their history".[15] Nationalism, according to Smith, does not require that members of a "nation" should all be alike, only that they should *feel* an intense bond of solidarity to the nation and other members of their nation. A sense of nationalism can inhabit and be produced from whatever dominant ideology exists in a given environment: it can build on pre-existing kinship, religious and belief systems.

Smith's definition of nation as a "named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths, and historical memories, a mass public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members"[16] is criticized by Tamir for mixing together "reasons for the emergence of a nation (a shared historic territory, a common economy, and a common legal system) with the results (sharing myths and historical memories)".[17] For Tamir, a nation is a "community whose members share feelings of fraternity, substantial distinctiveness, and exclusivity, as well as beliefs in a common ancestry and continuous genealogy".[18]

---

[11] Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Editions, 1983. p. 35.

[12] Benedict Anderson sees nations as imagined communities because of a "deep, horizontal comradeship" dependent on joint imagining of this belonging. Ibid. p.12.

[13] Anderson, Benedict. "The New World Disorder", in *New Left Review. No. 193, May/June 1992*.

[14] "Why should so many have "fought and died" for their nation, when nationalism was only a tool created by the elites for the sole purpose of economic gain and economic cohesion?". A. Smith. *Nationalism and Modernism*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998, p. 74

[15] Ibid.

[16] Ibid, p. 14.

[17] Quoted in Barrington, Lowell W. "'Nation' and 'nationalism': the misuse of key concepts in political science", in *Political Science & Politics*, 1 December 1997, p. 424.

[18] Ibid. 425.

The importance of perpetuating the perceived historical lineage of a nation for the purpose of preserving its contemporary legacy is further explained by Ernest Renan, who holds that a nation is a soul, a spiritual principle. Two things constitute this soul or spiritual principle. One lies in the past, one in the present. One is the possession in common of a rich legacy of memories; the other is present - day consent to live together, the will to perpetuate the value of the heritage that one has received in an undivided form. Renan therefore argues that a nation is a large-scale solidarity, constituted by the feeling of the sacrifices that one has made in the past and of those that one is prepared to make in the future.[19]

However, Eric Hobsbawm reasserts Gellner's elements of "artefact, invention and social engineering which enters into the making of nations".[20] He also stresses another important dimension of a nation – its modernity. He does not regard the 'nation' as neither a primary nor an unchanging social entity, but as belonging exclusively to a particular, and historically recent, period. This argument therefore leads us to identifying the "smallest common denominator" of all the above theories, used for the purpose of our argument[21]: modernity of nations, absence of intrinsic and inherent sociological and political roots (which can be constructed, imagined, or fabricated through the perpetual revival of the idea of belonging to a nation), and theoretical incoherence in explaining the 'ethnic nationalism'.

Liah Greenfeld provides a definition for the distinction between 'ethnic nationalism' and its other fraternal forms, characterized by its view of nationality as "determined genetically, entirely independent of the individual volition, and thus inherent".[22] Elements of this kind of nationalism, which finds it hard to prove national distinctiveness in terms of the language, culture, tradition, or even statehood, and thus relies heavily on religious distinctiveness and 'ethnic origins' are evident in the contemporary nationalism that exist in BiH. The void created by the dissolution of the socialist system of values was filled by nationalist ideologies in an abrupt and violent manner, and the notion of a nation was given gradually the second and third dimension, until it became one of the predominant features, and eventually a constituent part of the BiH society, culture, and state. The process through which it was possible to turn a vague notion into a definitive reality is what is defined here as *nationalism*. This relationship between nation and nationalism was also recognized by Hobsbawm who states that "nations as a natural, God-given way of classifying men, as an inherent political destiny, are a myth, whereas nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures: that is a reality".[23]

---

[19] Renan, Ernest. "What is a Nation?" in Eley, Geoff and Suny, Ronald Grigor, ed. 1996. Becoming National: A Reader. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996: pp. 41 – 55.

[20] Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 65.

[21] Other definitions of a nation further strengthen some elements that can be distilled as common to all those outlined here. E. Renan does not regard the 'nation' as a "neither primary nor as an unchanging social entity" and believes that it belongs exclusively to a particular, and historically recent, period. Miroslav Hroch sees the nation not as an "eternal category", and as a "combination of several kinds of objective relationships and their subjective reflection in collective consciousness". Barrington, Lowell W. "'Nation' and 'nationalism': the misuse of key concepts in political science", in Political Science & Politics, 1 December 1997.

[22] Leah Greenfeld defines a nation as "a collective individual, endowed with a will and interest of its own, which are independent of and take priority over the wills and interests of human individuals within the nation". Ibid.

[23] Ibid.

Nationalism And International Relations Theory

That 'reality' needs to be placed in the context of international relations theories in order to examine which theories of international relations account for the influence of nationalism on a state's conduct in international affairs. Ross Poole argues that "realism and liberalism in International Relations have been challenged in recent years over their reluctance to transcend an inside/outside disciplinary divide which isolates them from a growing number of world order issues".[24] However, some attempts have been made by both realism and liberalism to capture nationalism's evident capacity to transcend to the "outside" world, but, as it will be demonstrated further below, because of their insistence on traditionalist actors of inter-national affairs, they still fail to integrate nationalism as a process that shapes states' international behaviour.

Michael Sullivan's description of the traditional realist attempt to recognize the problem of the impact of nationalism on world order, demonstrates this point: realism "seeks to contain nationalism within the existing distribution of territorial borders, so that it does not upset a stable balance of power among so called "Great Powers".[25] However, the absence of the Cold War and "great powers" leaves an academic vacuum in realist theories, in which emerging actors, namely intra-, inter-, and cross-state actors, have not been taken into account and identified as alternatives to the traditional ones. In that respect, Sullivan argues that "realism is unable, either to mount a persuasive critique of nationalism as an ideology, or to prescribe changes in the conduct of international relations that minimize the forces of imperialism, ancient or modern…".[26]

Liberal theories, which seek to promote a more orderly world, with an emphasis on human freedom, also fail to give an adequate explanation of nationalism's impact on international affairs. The liberalist solution to the problem of nationalism lies "in the spread of the conditions and processes which contribute to what Mueller calls the "obsolescence" of war".[27] However, as Gellner rightly contends, "tensions between liberalism and nationalism emerged and increased as one moved from West to East", and as the relevance of 'ethnic nationalism' increases. Ignatieff partly tries to moderate this tension by making a distinction between rational (civic) and irrational (ethnic) forms of nationalism. However, as Sullivan puts it, the former is "consistent with liberal discourse", whilst the latter "systematically undermines it"[28], Although, Ignatieff's distinction does not absolve liberalism from weakness to account for 'ethnic nationalism', his distinction is nonetheless considered credible and useful.

From a constructivist perspective, the central issue in the post-Cold War world is "how different groups conceive their identities and interests".[29] Although power is not irrelevant,

[24] R. Poole, op. cit.

[25] Sullivan, Michael. "Nationalism and International Relations Theory", in *The Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol. 43, No. 1, February 1997.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Walt, Stephen M. "International relations" One World, Many Theories", in Foreign Policy, 22 March 1998.

constructivism emphasises how ideas and identities are created, how they evolve, and how they inform interests.[30] Constructivists contend that "agents and structures are mutually constituted"[31], and that understanding how actors develop their interests is crucial to explaining various international phenomena. Constructivism is therefore considered to be an analytical framework best suited to explain the impact of nationalism in international affairs. This is primarily true in the case of the "unit-level constructivism", which concentrates on the relationship between "domestic social and legal norms, and the identities and interests of states".[32] However, as Anderson points out, even constructivist explanations of nationalism leave us with a question 'why should so many be prepared to kill or die for a nation their grandparents had never heard of?[33]

We can see that as International Relations theories move to "deconstruct" the actors and process that shape world affairs, the politics of identity and nationalism come to the fore. As the alleged delineation of the two disciplines is undermined, it becomes more evident that the two disciplines can productively attempt to explain world affairs and each other. However, such an effort requires considerable distancing from the traditionalist approaches to international relations, realism and liberalism in particular.

Nationalism And Foreign Policy Formulation

Taking the approach prescribed by constructivism, we bring the nexus between nationalism and international relations, identified at the theoretical level, into the realm of practical foreign policy-making. Kenneth Thompson and Roy Macridis deem ideology to be the dominant form of study of foreign policy[34], and define national identity as one of the determinants of 'post-communist foreign policies'. Therefore, expressions of nationalism could be considered ideological. However, our argument is that nationalism is neither a full substitute for political ideology nor synonymous with it. Even though it is difficult to consider ethnic nationalism as a substitute for ideology, this chapter argues that it has nevertheless abused the vacuum created by the absence of an adequate foreign policy ideology, to deeply penetrate governance structures in BiH and influence its foreign policy formulation. Political ideologies must be more broadly based than nationalism and be able to answer more questions and provide wider guidance, particularly in countries which are vulnerable to weak internal structures and struggle to form unified policies. The implication is that their foreign policy is driven not solely by its institutional structures (as would be explained by realism) but also by the domestic political patterns, which in the case of BiH, work against the formulation of a consolidated foreign policy. According to Deborah Gerner, the impact of domestic politics on foreign policy-making includes the "values, national character, political culture, and historical traditions of a society, its structural attributes, etc".[35]

---

[30] Walt, Stephen. "International Relations: one world, many theories." in *Foreign Policy*, 22 Match 1998.

[31] Burchill, Scott; Linklater, Andrew. *Theories of International Relations*. London: Palgrave, 2001, p. 197.

[32] Ibid, p. 200.

[33] Anderson, Benedict. "The New World Disorder", in *New Left Review. No. 193, May/June 1992.*

[34] R. Fawn, op. cit. p. 6.

[35] Deborah Gerner, in Neack, Laura; Hay, Jeanne A. K.; J. Haney, Patrick. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in its*

Therefore, we can see that different theories have made a case that nationalist '*identities*' of political actors have influence on the definition of their political *interests*, and interests have an impact on the formation of state *policies*. Here we shall merely outline some of the policies which resulted from such channelling of the identities and interests of foreign policy actors, specifically of BiH foreign ministers since its independence.

To the outside world, Silajdžić represented an acceptable personification of a new state. Probably the most charismatic of all ministers of former republics of SFRY at the time, he understood international politics and was known for his sharp style. Silajdžić did not waste time on international acclaim, and openly showed sympathy towards American politics in the Balkans. Foreign policy thus reflected the Minister's personality and style. As a result, what was left behind him was a strong charisma, but also a complete disorder in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Ljubijankić sought international protection for the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He successfully drew American attention and interest to BiH, but also to other countries such as Iran. He took a number of steps to bring some order into the Ministry and create a more serious institution, to move it away from randomness and ad hoc reactions to international politics, primarily by giving a central role as well as support to the Department for analysis and planning.

With American citizenship and direct accountability to President Izetbegović, Šaćirbegović did not feel responsible for or accountable to BiH institutions. He created a deliberate gap between himself and the Ministry, did not feel the need to use it nor had he any interest in making it work, and thus created space for foreign policy-making to be the complete prerogative of the President.

Prlić was the first minister after Dayton. After his political adventure with Herceg-Bosna, he made an attempt to represent BiH in a proper way, supporting European principles unreservedly. It was during his mandate that the tri-partite parallelism was created, with the creation of positions of two deputies, who ensured ethnic equality, but also replicated the vision of the Presidency as created in Dayton. This principle was almost immediately applied to all BiH embassies abroad, where deputy ambassadors were appointed with the same purpose, which was, in essence, the channelling of the so-called 'national protection' at all levels of foreign affairs: protocolar, diplomatic, contractual or consular. The parallel channels imposed a system of communication in which everyone informed 'their own'. This was considered politically correct, justified, and the only thing possible. The Ministry was thus entangled by nationalism at all levels; it was disabled by deliberate procedural and formal issues it created, often characterized by hyper-regulation in the most basic and simple affairs. It was during this mandate that a large number of people were brought into the Ministry without any of the professional criteria or qualities required by the diplomatic service.

Second Generation. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1995, p. 21.

Lagumdžija's mandate was characterized by a strong and influential connection between the Presidency and himself in the role of Minister of Foreign Affairs and also Chairman of the Council of Ministers. Thus encouraged by this institutionalized closer cooperation, he made an attempt to subdue the 'national' in the diplomatic service by 'professionalizing' it, and developing more dynamic relations with neighbouring and other European countries, while keeping close connections with the US. This professionalisation of service, coupled with insistence on policies of substance that replaced the insistence on Dayton forms, produced a perceptible decrease in national tensions within the Ministry, and a more positive competitiveness and professional atmosphere at all levels. However, this effort remained constrained by a short mandate and could only expand as far as the internal state structure allowed. There was thus not enough time or space for this reform to take root and to result in a unified diplomatic service and an equally unified foreign policy.

Without a similar pressure and insistence on professionalisation and unified foreign policy from inside or outside, Ivanić paralysed even further the bureaucratic structure, which resulted in a faint and disoriented diplomatic service. In order not to create any turmoil and satisfy all 'sides', the Ministry entrenched the national division, which re-produced three inert, passive and reactionary foreign policies.

Such analysis of the actors' influence on foreign policy might constitute one segment of Roy Macridis' classical definition of foreign policy evaluation, which involves the assessment of the "goals of a given country; analysis of various predicaments that seem to endanger these goals; an examination of the instrumentalities (policies) pursued to alleviate the predicaments; a careful examination of the manner in which such policies were formulated, with regard to both the predicament involved and the manner in which the policy was to be implemented; an account of the major governmental organs responsible for the implementation of a policy; a careful examination of the availability of alternate means and instrumentalities; and finally, an assessment – that is, did the policy as formulated and implemented bring about the desired goals"?[36]

However, an assessment of the influence of internal nationalisms on foreign policy formulation calls for a distinctive methodology of foreign policy analysis, which explores aspects outside the classical methods prescribed by Macridis. Although goals, predicaments, instruments, actors, structures, and processes of foreign policy formulation will be dealt with in this paper, we will argue that because Bosnia and Herzegovina does not resemble the classic realist model of a nation-state[37], its structural weakness and insecurity make internal nationalisms particularly influential on its foreign policy. BiH foreign policy structures mirror its constitutional tri-partite arrangement[38], and thus

---

[36] Macridis, Roy C (ed.). *Foreign Policy in World Politics*. New Jersey: Prantice Hall, 1992, p. 6.

[37] One of the results of the Dayton Peace Agreement are weak and powerless state structures, whose statehood is often denied by politicians supposedly representing that very state.

[38] A study by the Foreign Policy Initiative of BiH describes this arrangement as: "the total triple parallelism which came into existence not only in the organisation of diplomatic network but in the manner in which it functioned as well (diplomatic missions were opened according to completely simple and sometimes caricature - like archaically conceived "historical affiliation" to certain countries, regions and civilizations.". Dizdarevic, Zlatko. "BiH Diplomacy: Reality and Needs", in *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Sarajevo: Foreign Policy Initiative, 2006.

constitute channels that allow nationalist policies of individual ethnic groups to permeate, influence and determine the state's foreign policy.

Joe Hagan[39] asserts that this relationship is complex because leaders pursue dual domestic political games and, then, respond with alternative strategies with divergent foreign policy effects.[40] As a result, foreign policy must be adjusted, so that it imposes fewer domestic political costs.[41]

This tension between the external gains and perceived internal losses is particularly evident in the case of a key foreign policy priority – the integration of BiH into European structures. A survey conducted by the 'PULS' agency in 2004, showed that 88% of BiH citizens were in favour of BiH accession to the EU, and so claim the majority of its politicians. For BiH citizens, accession to EU has a symbolic meaning, representing a stable economic, secure and democratic framework. The EU framework represents as a set of values to which BiH should subscribe, to which it should strive. In essence, it is a framework of ideological values, qualitative aspirations of the society. Since EU standards and values are 'integrationist' in nature, their ideological basis collides with the 'exclusivist' nature of ethnic nationalism. This 'ideological' collision is most evident in cases when politicians act contrary to the aspirations of the society and subdue foreign policy priorities to some narrower 'domestic' interests. For example, throughout his election campaign, the Prime Minister of Republika Srpska (RS) Milorad Dodik, opposed police reform, which is one of the six EU "key conditions". His argument was that the police reform went against Serb interests, which would not be adequately protected if the RS police structures were dismantled. He has been quoted to as saying: "If the road to Europe means an end to Republika Srpska, we shall then say: Goodbye, Europe"![42]

We can see that even if European integration is a foreign policy priority around which there is the largest degree of public consensus, it is only acceptable as long as it does not collide with the 'national' interests of individual groups, or if it does not generate unwanted domestic political losses. It also indicates that even though there may be consensus about European integration, there is still no consensus about the state of BiH itself. Because of that, EU integrations as an 'ideological' foreign policy framework are not potent enough to take precedence over nationalism as a predominant foreign policy ideology.

This also imposes significant difficulties in the implementation of BiH foreign policy, primarily because of the structural/organizational particularisation along ethnic lines of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Even though one of the principles of statehood accepted in Dayton was that state organized on the basis of the new Constitution inherits all the statehood attributes of the independent Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the implementation of the Dayton Agreement reversed this process and fragmented BiH statehood at a practical level. The 'ethnic principle', which was introduced by the Dayton

---

[39] Hagan, Joe: "Basic approaches for gauging the magnitude and direction of the effects of domestic politics on foreign policy: characteristics of opposition, political system structure, characteristics of the decision setting". L. Neack, J. Hay, J.H. Patrick, op. cit.

[40] Hagan, Joe, p. 118

[41] Ibid. 124.

[42] Milorad Dodik, Prime Minister of Republika Srpska, *DANI Magazine*, 9 June 2006, p. 11.

Agreement, but was not prescribed by it as an axiom of state organization, took its root through some almost banal practices. The BiH Ministry of Foreign Affairs was one of those institutions, which initially failed to preserve and protect the statehood attributes it had inherited. In order to pursue the unwritten rule on national equity introduced after Dayton, and for the sake of 'higher' goals of 'national political correctness', the 'ethnic principle' was accepted as the primary criteria on the selection of diplomatic (and ALL OTHER) staff. A number of staff who were hired mainly during the war, and were to a large degree, but still not exclusively, Bosniak, had to be made redundant in order to level the 'national quotas' which were abruptly introduced. On the other hand, a number of Serbs, sufficient to cover the 'S' quota, were literally brought from Pale every morning on a bus, and in a similar manner a number of 'H' cadres suddenly appeared in the Ministry. Needless to say, none of the three 'quotas' were filled through any merit based on a publicly open selection process. From that moment, diplomatic positions were chosen and allocated on the principle of the so-called 'national key' rather than based on any professional qualities. Since then, the Ministry has always had an organizational chart with 'B' 'S' and 'C' positions across all rankings, which are filled by using first and foremost the national criteria. This ethno-cratic inertia established a reverse principle of 'political correctness' in the sense that if one post is allocated to a representative of a certain nationality, the other two nationalities do not interfere or show any interest in the selection of staff for that post. Such a structure is subject to the national identities of individual diplomats and excludes any possibility of the development of a unified professional structure.

This non-functional division of labour along ethnic lines represents a medium for transcending and channelling the nationalist interests and discontent of individual staff into the conduct of foreign affairs. From the point of view of the constructivist theory, ideas, beliefs and values exert an influence and shape political actions, and in that way they acquire structural characteristics and eventually shape those structures. Political actors and structures thus become 'mutually constitutive'[43] – nationalist ideas and ideology create ethnocratic structures, which then serve to sustain the 'ethnic principle' and nationalist ideas, and project them on to policies. Bosnia and Herzegovina's heterogeneous ethnic composition was thus institutionalised after the Dayton Agreement through practices which sought to undermine its inherited statehood. The projection of the 'ethnic principle' on the state structures made them weak and powerless, based on the tri-partite ethnic parallelism, which was replicated in designing the diplomatic network as well - the diplomatic hierarchy is not built in accordance with the functional principle, but with a purely national one; heads of diplomatic missions are first of all selected for posts allocated to their nationality, the principle is then applied to all other embassy staff until sufficient equity is reached, which in most cases includes the technical staff as well; in return, the loyalty of the heads of diplomatic missions continues to rest with their 'ethnic' or party bosses, to whom they often report, based on 'ethnic' rather than functional lines, opening parallel channels, relying on one-sided sources, creating structures in which the minister, his deputy and general secretary operate as "parallel" ministers. Diplomatic missions are left to operate independently from the functional lines of the Ministry, and the quality of the work of individual missions depends on the agility of individual heads

[43] Christian Reus Smit. Theories of International Relations. Palgrave Macmillan. Basingstoke: 2005.

of missions, their ambitions, or the lack thereof. Therefore, in order to maintain and justify the structures created through this process, actors pursue practices which follow the same principles of division and exclusivity, which allows nationalism to monopolise the ideological sphere of foreign policy making.

Working in that spirit, it is often the case that during visits of the BiH official delegations, Bosniak politicians are accompanied only by Bosniak staff of BiH diplomatic mission in the host country, regardless of whether they are usually responsible for that subject area or whether it falls into their portfolio (Croats by Croat staff, Serb politicians by Serb diplomatic staff). There are also cases in which certain heads of missions give diplomatic staff of their own nationality a more privileged status in terms of some benefits (use of leave, health insurance, travel compensations, etc.), which further antagonizes representatives of other nationalities and deepens the already existing 'national' divisions inside the diplomatic service. In reaction to this under-privileged status, the other staff turn to representatives of their own nationality in the Ministry, report to them on a formal and informal basis, usually bypassing the head of the mission, and further strengthening the parallel structures. In such an atmosphere of distrust, information sharing inside a diplomatic mission is limited to a minimum, all of which reflects very negatively on the operability, functionality, efficiency and quality of work of the diplomatic network as a whole. Diplomatic staff are often used purely as 'tourist guides' or even just 'drivers' of the visiting delegations, without providing any advice, background or briefing on the substance of the visits. Communication between the Ministry and missions is very limited and apart from advance notices of different visits, there is little joint preparation and coordination in terms of the organization of those visits, or their follow-up. The only exemptions to the rule are cases where individual staff feel responsible and accountable, which is then reflected in their more substantial involvement in the organization of certain meetings or events. However, these are only individual and arbitrary exemptions, which cannot rely on the system for support nor are they in any way embedded in the system.

Another important element, which needs to be taken into account is the place which the international community in BiH has had in shaping state policies. If we look at the state-building process from Dayton to date, it is a notorious fact that the international community has invested billions of dollars and a vast amount of effort and time in building the capacity of state institutions. In the majority of cases, this effort was not limited to technical or material assistance, but, in fact, went as far as determining the outlook of those institutions, their roles and responsibilities, choice of staff and even management structures, and ultimately, had considerable impact on the policy making. As a result, different laws and policies were drafted in international institutions, primarily international financial institutions and OHR, and in some cases, were imposed by the High Representatives as well. The only exception to this rule has been the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Apart from some technical assistance, which mainly assisted (more or less successfully) in building the civil service capacity, the international community has had little insight into the matters of foreign policy making. This was probably a deliberate intention, a need to draw a line where the influence of international community had to be constrained. It can be assumed that it was based on an internationally accepted principle that a complete proof that one country is a protectorate is its inability to formulate and

project an independent and autonomous foreign policy. This may have informed OHR's policy not to interfere into the matters of foreign policy making.

The Ministry and policies it produced, thus became a prerogative of domestic political dynamics and processes, which could be another reason why there has been a status quo for over a decade. The Ministry has not conducted any transformations of its internal structure or the diplomatic network since 1996, while at the same time the world has witnessed tectonic changes, a decline of the international system based on nation-states and an erosion of inter-national, inter-state and other relations. New state and non-state actors have appeared on the stage, the meaning of power and powerful countries has acquired completely new dimensions, as has the multilateral nature of the international system. The centers of power are hard to identify, they are outside formal structures and their actors cannot be negotiated with. They are informed by interests and driven by ideologies, which are not necessarily rational and do not refrain from the use of force to achieve their goals. The world academia and literature has not spared words and pages to try and describe this system, to de-construct it, to explain it, help their governments and institutions to better understand in which system they operate and how to respond to it. However, driven by their narrow, exclusivist interests, which primarily seek to maintain the structural, institutional, and substantial status quo, the policy actors in BiH managed to ignore the world outside their horizon. As a result, the structures responsible for the conduct and formulation of BiH foreign policy have not been able to respond to new environments with adequate policies. The rigid structure of the MFA, its diplomatic network and actors, the policies they produce, all have continued to operate in an 'international' vacuum, which they created themselves.

For the past ten years at least, the Ministry has more or less preserved its archaic structure with a classical division of responsibilities based on bilateral, multilateral and general affairs. Concepts such as public diplomacy or political and strategic analysis have found no place in that structure or system of policy formulation. Neither are there separate departments, which would serve only the highest foreign policy priorities, such as EU and NATO integrations, which should be built and professionally developed in order to represent a knowledgeable core and pool of professionals, who could circulate between the Ministry and relevant missions, and provide support and substantive liaison with other institutions which deal with those issues. The existing Department for Analysis is also not adequately integrated into the overall structure of the Ministry, neither is it consulted at any stage of policy-formulation. It is inadequately equipped in terms of resources and generally left to its own devices, isolated from the formal decision-making process and policy formulation. The Ministry coordinates poorly with the Presidency at the stage of foreign policy design, the determination of priorities and the means of achieving them. The Presidency itself has parallel structures, in which every one of the three members have their own foreign policy advisor, and they operate in isolation from each other, with a high degree of distrust. There is no team or department in the Presidency, which would closely observe the activities of the Ministry, ensure coordination in terms of the design of joint goals and priorities, adequate strategy and the means of their implementation.

The result is a complete absence of a foreign policy strategy, which would take into account the current affairs in the world and region, different theoretical perspectives

which offer more insight into the conduct of international affairs, which would accurately define BiH's place in that picture, create a political and pragmatic balance between the expectations of our international partners and the pursuit of our own interests, identify different actors and their roles in this process, provide clear advice and direct the conduct of BiH foreign policy. Instead, what we have had for the past ten years is a document which, in very scarce terms, defines principles and guidelines of foreign 'policy'. In 1996, such a document was produced in two places, Pale and Sarajevo, each having their own view of the world and BiH itself. The document produced on Pale, for example, emphasizes the role of entities in the conduct of external affairs, equalizing their status with that of the state[44]. Furthermore, it states that due to the fact that "BiH consists of three peoples, it will act in the direction of development of relations and cooperation of the Bosniak people with the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, and cooperation of the Serb and Croat people with multilateral, cultural and other activities of the Christian countries and peoples".[45] The document produced in Sarajevo, on the other hand, emphasizes the "state-building (državotvorna) role of the Ministry, aimed at reintegrating and preserving BiH within its internationally recognised borders"[46]. Both documents are excellent illustrations of the process through which identities (one nationalist, one unitary), inform the interests of their actors (one seeking to preserve the autonomous position of the entity, and the other attempting to reverse that process by integrating both entities into a state through the conduct of its foreign policy). Independent of each other, both inform the foreign policies of the political centers they represent, and as such, produce the resulting divergent foreign policies. However, we can also see from the 'Pale' example, to what extent the nationalist view of the world tries to limit the perspective of a state policy. Furthermore, the document produced on Pale, in the example quoted here, went as far as to attempt to project a reductionist perspective on the conduct of the international affairs of foreign states as well. Their ideological division along 'religious' lines is prescribed as a principle, and demands to be imposed on the foreign countries of the corresponding religious affiliations, which would presumably have to adapt to it and respond along the same lines- an effort so imprudent that it deserves no further analysis.

However, some progress was made in 1997 when a single document was produced[47], with a modest list of common/joint priorities, but with a strong reservation from 'the Serb side' bracketed next to one of the most important international obligations of BiH – cooperation with the Hague Tribunal. A draft of this document is also intertwined with references to 'Bosniak' or 'Serb' demands; for example, the preamble stating "committed to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of BiH, and determined to develop as a modern democratic state…" was marked as a 'Bosniak proposal'. On the other hand, reference to entities throughout the document is marked as the 'Serb proposal'.

---

[44] 'Osnovni pravci spoljno–političke aktivnosti', Pale, 1996.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Sastanak rukovodstva MVP-a sa šefovima DKP-a, Sarajevo, August 1996.

[47] Temeljni pravci vansjkopolitičkih aktivnosti BiH, prijedlog. Sarajevo, listopad 1997.

In 1998, a list of priorities, which could be described as the 'smallest common denominator' was produced and adopted by the Presidency[48], but it remained at that level of sophistication almost until 2001 when the government changed. The process of development of a new platform in 2001 was more 'democratic' involving wider layers of society, different parts of the country and resulted in a more comprehensive document, which unfortunately again was limited to 'priorities'.[49] However, the document did not produce the desired results in terms of drafting of any regulations, primarily the Law on Foreign Affairs, there was no necessary reorganisation within the foreign policy institutions based on this document, particularly in the BiH Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and no process of continuous policy design resulted from it.

This slow and ineffective evolution of the main policy document, which had barely progressed since the immediate aftermath of Dayton, illustrates how in the absence of alternative ideological grounds, the entrenched nationalist ideas and values, which have been institutionalized and are channelled through Dayton structures, in effect shape political (in)action. We can thus see how values are projected onto a discourse, which conditions their outcome – a deficient and inarticulate policy document.

Another way of locating where different interest and values rest is through the views of the public. A public opinion survey conducted by the 'PULS' agency, regarding positions on NATO membership, showed that more than half of respondents are in favour of NATO membership, but this ranges from over 70% support in the Federation of BiH to just 30% support in the RS. The same pattern can be seen in the breakdown by political party affiliations, which correspond quite closely to the ethnic affiliation of respondents - security related effects offered by NATO are most important for Bosniaks, while Serbs present the strongest resistance to BiH accession to NATO, due to 'historical-emotional' factors, arising from still fresh memories of the military campaign and air strikes against Bosnian Serb positions in 1995, and the NATO force intervention in Kosovo and bombardment of towns in Serbia in 1999".[50]

Besides the general positions, there are also specific examples of 'policy' clashes between different actors/institutions, which illustrate the institutional voids and lack of consistent policy, which again allow the 'nationalist' interests to inform the discourse. According to Nezavisne Novine, on January 15th 2007, the Minister of Civil Affairs Mr. Safet Halilović sent a letter to the FBiH Minster of the Interior informing him that the bilateral Agreement on dual citizenship with Serbia has not been in effect since Montenegro proclaimed independence from the State Community with Serbia. This position was confronted by a different interpretation of the Agreement by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, headed by the then Minister, Mladen Ivanić. Again, without examining the evidence, and without investigating this within the institutional structures of the state government, Dr. Silajdžić a member of BiH Presidency, decided to step in and voice his support for Minister Halilović through the media. Since then, the newly appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs followed

---

[48] The Basic Foreign Policy Principles and Activities of BiH, Adopted by the Presidency of BiH at its session on 17 February 1998.

[49] Opći pravci i prioriteti za provođenje vanjske politike Bosne i Hercegovine, Predsjedništvo BiH, 2001.

[50] Sarajlic-Maglic, Denisa; Vuletic, Davor. "Readiness for Stabilisation and Capacity for EU Association", in *Foreign Policy Analysis*. Sarajevo: Foreign Policy Initiative, 2006.

suit and sent a note to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Serbia informing him of the abolishment of the Agreement on Dual Citizenship, which sparked off a furious reaction from the President of the RS Government, Milorad Dodik, and other Serb politicians, who questioned responsibility of the Minister[51] and called for his removal. On the other hand, there were very negative reactions from the Serbian side, which highlighted the inconsistencies in BiH foreign policy making. Throughout this debate, there seems to have been no process of analysis of the effects of such a policy on bilateral relations between BiH and Serbia, nor have they been placed in the context of the overall foreign policy interests of the state. Foreign policy actors often have a number of options for how they react to a certain issue, and their interests inform the choices they make. Their choice of a policy is presented through their discourse, which is in many cases an illustration of their original interests rather than a balanced and rational policy choice. According to Morgan and Palmer, "policies are tools that states use to get what they want"[52], or in this case – what they do not want.

Identities and ideas inform agents of foreign policy and constitute their positions and actions. Because the permeability of foreign policy structures through nationalist ideas and values, the profile of a country's diplomacy is constructed by the nationalist interests of political actors, who shift and adjust the focus and direction of foreign policy relative to their own ideas and values. We will look into another blatant example that appeared recently with the divergent positions of two members of BiH Presidency, Mr. Nebojša Radmanović and Dr. Haris Silajdžić, with regards to election results in Serbia.

Radmanović congratulated the President of Serbia, Mr. Boris Tadić, on the successful conduct of the elections, adding that it represents "another step in the democratisation of Serbia"[53]. Silajdžić, on the other hand, stated his concern regarding the fact that "radical forces gained most support from the citizens of Serbia", claiming that the international community should "examine their relations towards the nationalist heritage in Serbia, which obviously does not cease to exist"[54]. In the lack of any effort to converge views and discuss the issue within the institutional framework of the Presidency, this divergence of views escalated in a TV duel broadcast on PBS news in which the two members of the Presidency confronted each other in an almost infantile performance arguing back and forth over the video link whether they would officially visit Serbia[55] after the elections. The discussion was conducted in an inflammatory manner, further pushing apart the already divergent positions, but also highlighting the importance of discourse in the process of the construction of a policy. The constructivist theory pays close attention to the prevailing discourse, because discourse reflects beliefs and interests, and establishes norms of behaviour. Discourse has the capacity to shape how political actors define themselves and their interests, and thus modifies their behaviour, which eventually results in the formation of a policy.[56] In this particular case, the discourse used by Dr.

---

[51] TV Hayat, February 27th, 2007. 'Premijer RS tražiće odgovornost Alkalaja zbog note o ukidanju dvojnog državljanstva'

[52] Glenn Palmer and T. Clifton Morgan. *A Theory of Foreign Policy*, Princeton University Press.

[53] Agencija Beta, 22nd January 2007.

[54] Ibid.

[55] BHT1 news at 22.00, 23 January 2007.

[56] Stephen M Walt, 'International relations: One world, many theories', *Foreign Policy*, Washington, 1998.

Silajdžić shows that his own interests have the potential to prevail over one of the foreign policy priorities, defined as "promotion of cooperation with neighbouring countries - Republic Croatia (RC) and Serbia and Montenegro, on the basis of common interest and principles of equality, mutual respect …".[57] In the absence of an underlying foreign policy 'ideology', and instead of adequate policy planning and strategy development, the state foreign policy is thus tailored in private offices and in very close circles, without essential information and data analyses and often without a basic knowledge of the issue, in most cases announced and even discussed in media appearances. It is thus deprived from one of its most important dimensions, its ability to project and protect the state interests in the outside world.

Conclusion

Unfortunately, some of the examples presented here, show that foreign policy makers often dismiss the use of information, theories, analyses, and fail to make a link between theory and policy. We have made an attempt to deconstruct the formulation of foreign policy of BiH through the use of theory and tools of foreign policy analyses. The constructivist approach taken here, proved to be useful in the context of analyses of BiH foreign policy, since it showed how nationalist ideas can shape, but also erode foreign policy. They have potential to be mobilized to create and sustain parallel structures and actors, whose political interests are thus pursued. Constructivists argue that material structures acquire meaning through the structure of ideas and values in which they are embedded[58]. We can therefore conclude that as long as the interests of individual ethnic groups are able to penetrate and dominate the structures of foreign-policy making, it will not be possible to identify unified state interests and a foreign policy that results from it. The main reason for this is the fact that there is no consensus inside BiH about its statehood. Individual national groups represented by nationalist politicians project divergent interests on to state policies. The 'nationalist' nature of those interests, which are essentially exclusivist, inhibit the formation of a unified ideology and serve the purpose of disintegrationist interests, which preserve the status quo in order to thwart any 'state-building' potential of BiH foreign policy. Such a situation might provoke a conclusion that the status quo is the only option on the horizon, since anything else would require profound structural changes.

However, such changes would bring into question the already established ethno-cratic principles and positions, primarily the role and structure of the BiH Presidency, which has a prerogative for the formulation of foreign policy. Its tri-partite structure is continuously replicated in the definition of three or more foreign polices, and as long as it is in place, this Dayton structure will continue to make it difficult to formulate a unified foreign policy.

---

[57] General directions and priorities for implementation of foreign policy of Bosnia and Herzegovina, BiH presidency 2003.

[58] Wendt, A. 'Constructing International Politics', *International Security*, 1995.

Nationalism thus has a compelling impact on the conduct of international relations, at both a theoretical and practical level. We have demonstrated through a review of various academic works that nationalism can be seen as a reality based on the mythological and notional sense of 'belonging to a nation', which is a modern phenomenon. If we put the practical foreign policy formulation in BiH into the theoretical context described earlier in this paper, we can see that from a realist point of view, BiH foreign policy obviously lacks stable and functional structures, institutions capable of designing and implementing a foreign policy and actors who would abide by it without any reservations.

From a liberalist perspective, foreign policy should promote values, which are in essence non-chauvinistic and non-exclusionary. Unfortunately, this is completely contrary to the values promoted by 'ethnic' nationalism and represents the main point of contention between those theories and foreign policies, which take nationalism as their predominant 'ideology'. Liberal theories contend that nationalism can undermine state sovereignty from within, and that is exactly the paradox of BiH foreign policy. On the one hand, foreign policy should integrate the state and society, it should be a pillar of the 'state-building' process. On the other hand, nationalism, which has penetrated its structures and imposed itself as a replacement of foreign policy ideology, has exactly the opposite effect.

The constructivist approach centers ideology at the core of foreign policy formulation. It draws attention to the internal, domestic determinant of state policies and enables the explanation of variations of identity and interests, and policies of a state that result from them. This approach is particularly useful for the study of the way in which Bosnia and Herzegovina, a multi-ethnic state with equally 'multi-ethnic', 'joint' institutions, engages in foreign affairs. In the absence of stable structures and values, ideology should position itself as an element of stability and continuum, because ideology represents a "set of core values that are untouchable and not debatable".[59] As such, ideology should project itself and justify a certain socio-political order.[60] In the absence of such a set of 'untouchable', unified principles, what is projected onto BiH foreign policy as a representation of its socio-political order is nationalism. Nationalism assumes the role of an ideology. By placing itself at the core of BiH foreign policy formulation, nationalism is well positioned to expand into other areas where there is a vacuum – institutional structures, political interests and identities. The purpose of nationalism is to turn a 'constructed' and 'imagined' idea of nation into reality. The reality which it creates in the form of a foreign policy is thus also false and flawed, because it is created on the basis of a 'constructed' interest, which is exclusivist and divisive by nature. By permeating the foreign policy, nationalism makes it disintegrationist, a reflection of the internal tri-partite arrangement, which disables its statehood attributes. BiH foreign policy is suspended, immobilized, and projects to the outside world an extremely distorted picture of the state. In fact, three pictures are projected, each representing individual nationalist interests, each representing a separate constituency. Taken together, the three pictures are reflections of the existing internal parallelisms, which can only create policies based on the 'smallest common denominators', which are hypocritical to say the least. To the outside world, this internal

---

[59] Fawn, Rick. *Ideology and National Identity in Post-Communist Foreign Policies*. p. 3.

[60] Ibid.

hypocrisy reveals state's deficiencies and weaknesses. This produces a lack of trust of the international actors, who can barely recognize BiH as a serious partner.

So in spite of the fact that one of the intentions of the Dayton Agreement was to preserve the legacy of BiH as a state, the 'ethnic principle' which became the *raison d'etre* of the post-Dayton BiH, institutionalized the subjective category of nation into reality. Those who subscribe to realist approaches use this newly acquired dimension of nations in order to impose the view that only this 'reality' can explain BiH. They claim that anything else, which does not take nations as given, is an escape from reality. In doing so, they create an atmosphere of 'realist' hopelessness and despair, in which nations as social axioms are not challenged, and are taken for granted.

However, this paper has attempted to deconstruct that perceived 'reality' and to identify a need for the formulation of a unified, comprehensive, and substantive foreign policy, which would determine the position of the state on priority political, economical, security and all other international issues. In order to achieve that, the first requirement would be:

- ♦ to secure a maximum level of professionalism, which would ensure a minimum of dignified international representation.

- ♦ Secondly, different theories which explain international relations should be taken into account, which would help inform BiH foreign policy about the world today, and its place in it.

- ♦ And, as a third requirement, BiH should have a foreign policy strategy, which would mediate diverse nationalist interests into non-hypocritical policies over which there exists a general consensus. Such a strategy should seek to thwart the poisoning of political consensus by nationalist policies and formulate a single foreign policy that would represent the interests of the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina, rather than its parts.

Otherwise, BiH will continue to merely "engage in foreign relations", in a purely reactive and pragmatic manner.