EXPLAINING CULTURAL CONFLICT IN EX-YUGOSLAVIA: INSTITUTIONAL WEAKNESS, ECONOMIC CRISIS, AND IDENTITY POLITICS

Beverly Crawford

What are the root causes of the war in the former Yugoslavia? Why did the six republics fail to peacefully separate from one another? Why was Yugoslavia unable to go the way of Czechoslovakia, with its "velvet divorce," or the Soviet Union, with its relatively peaceful demise? Why was Yugoslavia unable to persist as a state, and why was its dissolution so violent? Why did virulent "ethnic conflict" emerge in the wake of a collapsed federal state?

A virtual cottage industry of analysis has sprung up to meet the demand for answers to these questions. Most accounts focus on explanations for the violent dissolution of the state. But few recent works have specifically addressed the last question: why "ethnic" conflict defined the adversaries and the character of the war in Croatia and Bosnia, as opposed to the regional or ideological divisions that could have potentially been exploited, and why "ethnic" conflict did not break out in other parts of Yugoslavia as the federal state dissolved.

In retrospect it is clear that the Yugoslav federal state was long headed for dissolution. A quick survey of book titles from the 1980s tells that story: *Political Cohesion in a Fragile Mosaic* (1983), *Yugoslavia: A Fractured Federalism* (1988), *The Improbable Survivor* (1988), *Yugoslavia in Crisis* (1989), *Descent into Chaos: Yugoslavia's Worsening Crisis* (1989). Throughout the decade, analysts grew increasingly pessimistic about the future of a united Yugoslavia. But the most shocking and puzzling question was how neighbors who had lived together peacefully for years in Croatia and Bosnia could turn on each other so viciously as Yugoslavia disintegrated. Analysts rushed to explain the ferocity of the violence by calling on "ancient hatreds" and long-

festering historical grievances. Some blamed Serbian aggression, others blamed Croatian and Muslim nationalism, and still others pointed fingers at international forces.

In this contribution I offer an alternative explanation. I argue that the roots of "ethnic conflict" in the former Yugoslavia can be found in the institutional structure of the Yugoslav political and economic systems constructed after World War II.[1] While the postwar institutional structure offered numerous incentives for identity with an integrated Yugoslav state, as well as incentives for regional (as opposed to ethnic) political loyalty, it also encouraged interethnic rivalry through its institutions of allocation, representation, and participation. As the federal state weakened, that institutional structure offered increasing incentives to political entrepreneurs to "play the ethnic card" in a bid for political power. Regional politicians used their access to resources to build a power base among local, culturally distinct populations.

As long as the federal state remained strong, ideological and regional loyalties competed with ethnic loyalties as a source of political identity. Federal institutions could adjudicate disputes among regional elites and provide for peaceful conflict resolution and repression of exclusive ethnic nationalist politics. But ironically, in order to maintain authority by deflecting criticism for economic hardship and political discrimination, the federal government decentralized its control over both the economy and the political system. Each move toward decentralization was a move toward fragmentation and the consequent erosion of federal authority. With deepening fragmentation, local elites had more resources to distribute in exchange for support and saw fewer reasons to maintain loyalty to the central Yugoslav government.

After 1989 these local elites could have mobilized around ideological appeals—like they did in the Czech Republic. Or they could have called for regional rather than ethnic autonomy, like winning politicians did in Macedonia, or like elites in Tatarstan, Ajaria, and Dagestan in the wake of the Soviet collapse.[2] Why did elites in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia shun ideological and regional appeals and decide to engage in vivid displays of cultural symbolism that aroused ethnic emotions and provoked images of ethnic discrimination and privilege? I shall argue that their decision was largely shaped by institutional incentives created by federal Yugoslavia

throughout the postwar period. As they became more deeply rooted, these institutional incentives discouraged coalitions that would assure moderation on divisive issues.

These incentives were reinforced by new institutional rules of participation and representation designed to accommodate multiparty elections in 1990. The rules discouraged issue-based or ideological coalitions across republican boundaries and encouraged the exclusive politics of cultural identity. Initial successful displays of ethnic symbolism—often artificially contrived—drew attention to those ethnic divisions perpetuated by past institutional incentives. In particular, acts of civil disobedience and even violence vividly recalled past grievances and created new ones. Acts of civil disobedience and violence both increased public support for politicians who played the ethnic card and encouraged more violence.

The political entrepreneurs who campaigned on ethnic nationalist platforms and won elections were tempted to oppress the minority losers to maintain their reputations, credibility, and political power. Minorities then organized around their own ethnic and religious identity to oppose the winners, and as a result, the odds of violence increased. In this way, ethnic entrepreneurs were able to eclipse other political entrepreneurs who offered alternative futures for Yugoslavia, and the "bandwagoning" and "balancing effects" of identity politics were created, particularly among Serbs and Croats, the two largest ethnic groups in Yugoslavia.

The remainder of this contribution presents the evidence to support this argument. It begins with a discussion and critique of alternative explanations for the cultural conflict in Yugoslavia. This section is followed by a discussion of the theoretical considerations that support the institutional account presented here. Section three presents a more detailed description of the institutions of federal Yugoslavia that both discouraged and encouraged the practice of identity politics. This section argues that ethnic conflict was not determined by "ancient hatreds," but was shaped by institutional incentives. The fourth section explains why those institutions that promoted identity politics and ethnic conflict trumped the others as the central state disintegrated and the economy fragmented throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The fifth section describes how alternative cleavages collapsed into reinforcing ethnic divisions. The sixth section explains why political entrepreneurs in Serbia, Croatia,

and Bosnia decided to play the ethnic card and why ethnic politics escalated to violence. It also explains why elites in Macedonia made the decision to minimize identity politics in favor of regional autonomy, thus avoiding violent cultural conflict in the short run. The final section argues that Western states should pursue a policy of "getting the institutions right" in post-Yugoslav states in order to prevent future cultural conflicts there.

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

The institutional argument presented here runs counter to those made in the recent flood of literature on the violent dissolution of Yugoslavia. That literature can be divided into three rival intellectual camps. The first has been labeled the *essentialist* or *primordial* perspective. Primordial explanations stress the role of the "Balkan temperament" and "ancient hatreds" unleashed by the collapse of communism.[3]

Essentialist arguments are difficult to discredit because they are nonfalsifiable.[4] They link conflict with irrational and "natural" psychological and social tendencies to "belong" to a group and to reject the "other." Although they do not explain why the central focus of belonging needs to be an ethnic or religious group, essentialists argue that this tendency emerges when it is no longer repressed. The introduction to this volume offers a critique of the broader literature upon which such essentialist or primordial arguments are based. Here I would simply suggest that there is ample evidence in the Yugoslav case to cast doubt on these claims.

Indeed the early fateful decision to decentralize political and economic power that led to federal weakness was a response to ethnic tensions. Nonetheless, it is clear that those tensions were often muted and could have been further reduced. Throughout Yugoslav history, intraethnic cultural differences shaped by regional dissimilarities were often greater than cultural differences between ethnic groups.[5] Marriages between people of different ethnic groups in Yugoslavia were on the rise during the decade before the war.[6] After Tito's death in 1980, the percentage of the population that identified itself as "Yugoslav" as opposed to an ethnically defined nationality

(e.g. Serb, Croat, Muslim) also grew significantly.[7] There is abundant anecdotal evidence to suggest that many ordinary people did not know or care about the ethnic identity of their neighbors before hostilities began. As late as 1989, the majority of Serbs favored a liberal future for Yugoslavia, the preservation of the federal state, and Yugoslavia's integration into "Europe."[8] Ante Marković, the last Yugoslav prime minister and free-market reformer and a Croat, was the most popular politician in all six republics. And during the course of the war, Serbs living in Serbia exhibited decreasing ethnic solidarity with Serbs in Krajina and Bosnia. The postwar Serb-dominated parliament of Yugoslavia even passed a law that disqualified Serb refugees from Bosnia and Croatia from becoming citizens of Yugoslavia.[9] Finally, in 1996, after years of bloodshed in Bosnia, local Serb residents in former Muslim-dominated areas agreed to peaceful meetings with Muslims on the return of refugees to their homes until regional officials protested, organizing violent attacks on returning refugees.[10] Certainly ethnic identity was highly politicized in Yugoslavia, but the evidence suggests that these politicized identities were not fixed, and were indeed quite malleable.[11]

At the other extreme are explanations for Yugoslavia's violent dissolution that view *international* forces as central causes. There is a large body of both historical and current literature that blames Balkan war and its particular "ethnic" content on great power attempts to carve up Balkan states for their own advantage.[12] Indeed the post-World War I order in the Balkans exacerbated and created ethnic tensions with arbitrary borders separating many people from their homelands and from their "ethnic brethren." But forty years of peace in the region and the peaceful transition of other Balkan states from communism suggest that domestic institutions can rectify international failures and mitigate cultural conflict.

Some recent international approaches suggest that in a post-cold-war world, where the stability of superpower rivalry has disappeared, power positions are more fluid, and uncertainty is high about the source of the next international conflict. In a multipolar world, states may feel unprotected from one another, both because power is more symmetrical and because they are unsure about their neighbor's power capabilities. They therefore are likely to rush to protect themselves from real or imagined threats.[13] Journalistic accounts of the dissolution of Yugoslavia grounded in these assump-

tions have focused responsibility for the war on Germany's diplomatic recognition of Croatia. They explain Germany's unilateral recognition by pointing to these forces. One such account, for example, suggests that a more powerful Germany in a multipolar world without the military protection of the United States perceived the need to drive south toward the warm waters of the Adriatic Sea to protect its own security. A smaller Yugoslavia with Croatia and Slovenia as allies could realize this geopolitical aim.[14] The more sinister version of this claim was that given its new international power position, Germany was attempting to recreate its World War II alliance with an independent Croatia and impose a divide-and-conquer strategy in the Balkans to protect its interests and enhance its relative power in the region.[15]

These accounts of the recent conflict are both easily discredited and do not get to the heart of the central concern here: the causes of *cultural* conflict. Although Germany's recognition of Croatia and its utter disregard for the new government's violation of human rights against Serbs living there clearly hastened the dissolution of Yugoslavia, the war had begun six months earlier. Indeed, the specter of 1914—when great power rivalry in the Balkans ignited war in Europe—haunted the great powers in the 1990s and led them to cooperate in an attempt to end the war in order to avoid conflict among themselves. In this war, unlike the Balkan conflicts that ignited World War I, the great powers worked together to end it.[16]

A more nuanced international-level explanation for the dissolution of Yugoslavia is offered by Susan Woodward in *Balkan Tragedy*. Woodward argues that the institutional structures of the Yugoslav state provided a basis for prewar political stability in Yugoslavia. But Yugoslavia's pattern of global integration and domestic economic reform shaped by international financial institutions in the 1980s undermined those institutions. Liberalization and global integration required the weakening of those very state structures that had provided political stability.

Woodward's argument is compelling but incomplete and is disputed at times by her own evidence. While its analytic focus on international causes of the dissolution of the federal state provides an important perspective overlooked in both public and scholarly debates, it obscures both domestic institutional incentives for cultural conflict and the role of agency in igniting violence. Indeed

Yugoslavia's unique geostrategic position in the cold war led to early integration in the international economy, and Yugoslavia's integration into the international financial system was deeper than that of most socialist countries. The impact on domestic politics and institutional structures was a crucial cause of the later Yugoslav collapse. Nonetheless, Woodward contradicts her argument by showing that IMF policies in the 1980s were designed to *strengthen* federal institutions and that those policies were overwhelmingly rejected by domestic political forces.

Furthermore, a comparative perspective suggests that key causal elements are missing from Woodward's account. Two examples illustrate. Bulgaria was mired in international debt and saddled with conditionality requirements for repayment in the 1980s, and its government collapsed after 1989. But although it had an ethnically mixed population—with similarities to that of Bosnia—it did not experience cultural violence in the aftermath of debt and disintegration. Social conflict erupted in other countries with multiethnic populations in the face of IMF austerity programs, but that conflict has not always taken the form of cultural violence. Brazil provides the prime example. While Woodward does a masterful job of explaining the causes of the collapse of the federal Yugoslav state, her overarching explanation does not account for the eruption of cultural conflict.

A third explanation for the Yugoslav conflict suggests that the causes were *instrumental.* This literature places blame for the war not on primordial urges within society or great power pretensions within a changing international structure, but rather on "political entrepreneurs" like Slobodan Milošević, Franjo Tudjman, and a host of local Serb and Croat politicians and intellectuals.[17] The central argument is that these political entrepreneurs exploited ethnic differences and whipped up ethnic hatred in their effort to expand their own power base in the aftermath of institutional collapse.[18] Indeed Laura Silber and Allen Little make the argument that some of these leaders, like Milošević, engineered the institutional collapse of the Yugoslav federal state in order to gain political advantage in a new, ethnically defined institutional setting of their own creation. These arguments further suggest that successful ethnic entrepreneurs attempt to enlarge their territorial power base and ensure their security through acts of aggression.[19]

Instrumental explanations should not be rejected out of hand. Wars always require leaders, political entrepreneurs able to mobilize populations for the support of their aggressive or defensive military efforts. But instrumental accounts of the Yugoslav war beg three essential questions. First, they do not explain why political entrepreneurs made the decision to play the ethnic card and why they were *effective* in their bid to promote ethnicity as a cleavage for political advantage in Serbia and Croatia. The preservation of a multinational Yugoslavia was for the majority of Serbs a preferable alternative to ethnic disintegration. Second, instrumental accounts do not explain why other political entrepreneurs, drawing on alternative social cleavages such as class, ideology, or simply region and territory, did not gain sufficient social support to eclipse ethnic entrepreneurs in those two republics after 1989 and in Bosnia in 1992. As noted above, Ante Marković, a Croat and a liberal, was Yugoslavia's most popular politician. Why was he defeated?

This last point raises the third issue: instrumental accounts do not explain why some leaders in Yugoslavia achieved political success by promoting alternative political programs. Indeed they do not explain Tito's earlier success as a Yugoslav political entrepreneur who effectively muted cultural conflict. Accounts of early repression and terror to achieve stability miss the point. Tito was enormously popular in the larger population, even in Serbia, and most Yugoslavs endorsed his idea of the Yugoslav melting pot. Similarly, instrumental accounts do not explain why, despite intense ethnic cleavages in Macedonia, politically successful elites there made a bid for regional independence rather than ethnic autonomy in 1992 and why Albanian and Macedonian politicians there were able to form a stable coalition against the ethnic nationalists. A politician's decision to exploit ethnic divisions or refrain from exploiting them and his success or failure in that effort must also be explained.

THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The introduction to this volume has detailed the institutional perspective that informs the argument I make here. Philip Roeder's chapter provides a valuable link between the broad institutional ap-

proach and the rise of ethnic entrepreneurs in Soviet successor states. I show here how his argument can also be successfully illustrated in the Yugoslav case. Like the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavia's political system was characterized by ethnofederalism—that is, structures of accountability and opportunities for resource control that led regional and local officials to favor specific ethnic constituencies. Roeder argues that the process of economic liberalization and/or decentralization strengthens the advantage of regional over central officials by increasing the demand for their material benefits and weakening alternative resource providers of material goods. To the extent that they can gain control over key resources, regional officials are in a position to play the ethnic card in an effort to gain or maintain political power.

Their decision to play the ethnic card is shaped by institutional structures of accountability. When regional officials are still accountable to the central federal government and depend on central support to sustain them in office, they are unlikely to make extremist ethnic appeals in a bid for local support. When, however, central authority weakens and they become accountable to a local constituency, they calculate their chances of winning support with alternative political appeals. When their constituency is multiethnic, they may enter into coalitions that mute exclusive ethnic appeals and make political demands and promises that would benefit the population of their local region as a whole. But they may fear the loss of significant support to political entrepreneurs calling for the autonomy of a particular ethnic group. As noted in the introduction, this is because the political entrepreneur is sure that he can get the support of the targeted group but is less certain of the support of the wider population. Despite the persuasiveness of this logic, this explanation is not entirely satisfying. Even with the support of an "ethnic machine," a regional leader's decision to play the ethnic card does not automatically result in an enthusiastic response from the targeted population; nor will it automatically result in successful political mobilization. But ethnic appeals in the republics of Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia after 1989 resonated with the populations in these republics. Why?

Strategic interaction theories of mass political action and theories of behavioral cascades and bandwagoning described in the introduction promise a fruitful explanation. Scholarship on previous Yugoslav

crises has noted this effect.[20] Recall too that political institutions can either encourage bandwagoning effects or inhibit them. In the Yugoslav case, one analyst has argued, with the federal government fatally weakened and loyalty to the center diminished, there were no incentives for political entrepreneurs to lower the tone of their agitating and provocative discourse. Nor were there incentives for intellectuals to abhor the expression of provocative nationalist sentiments.[21] Finally, bandwagoning is related to both timing and ethnic alliances as further causes of ethnic conflict. In Yugoslavia, once nationalists had gained the upper hand in Serbia, incentives for ethnic nationalism rose in Croatia, and "sister" Serb and Croat nationalist parties were formed in Bosnia. As nationalist parties were formed and won elections and as they gained strength by forming alliances across republican borders, they crowded out other alternatives and narrowed elite political choices. By the time Bosnian elections were held, non-nationalist alternative parties did not stand a chance.[22]

This approach further suggests that if all-Yugoslav elections had been held *before* republican elections, incentives to appeal to a wider population would have been higher and political parties would have been more inclusive; ethnic bandwagons would have been slower to fill. In fact, nationalist politicians insisted on holding republican elections first; bandwagoning effects then precluded the possibility of elections at the national level. If the legacy of ethnofederalism is taken into account, however, by 1991 national elections—even following republican elections—would not have prevented the escalation to violence; people had no party organization to represent their interests outside of their own republic, and alliances between non-nationalist parties were precluded by spirals of mistrust brought on by early bandwagoning.

In sum, as we shall see in this case, postwar institutions of ethnofederalism cemented the logic of identity politics in the Yugoslav federal structure. That logic did not always dominate, particularly in the population at large, and it was more pervasive in some areas than in others. Nonetheless, as the federal system weakened and local officials became increasingly accountable to local ethnic constituencies rather than the central government, the logic of identity politics strengthened throughout the multiethnic Yugoslav republics. Institutional legacies favored the creation of ethnic nationalist parties and interethnic political rivalry; bandwagoning

and balancing effects spread in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia. The weakness of those legacies in Macedonia accounts for the more conciliatory path taken there.

INSTITUTIONAL INCENTIVES AND COMPETING POLITICAL LOGICS IN FEDERAL YUGOSLAVIA

The central premise upon which this volume is based is that authoritative political institutions channel social conflict in the direction that institutional planners prefer; thus they determine the logic that will dominate political competition and provide the basis for political mobilization. Institutions do not treat all forms of conflict impartially; they constrain some forms of competition and mobilization and encourage others.[23] They provide differential access to key resources, strengthening some actors and weakening others. In doing so, they shape political preferences and identities of both elites and publics. Institutional incentives, embedded in rules of accountability, representation, participation, and resource distribution can structure political struggle in ways that either moderate or encourage ethnic and sectarian political conflict.

After World War I, political elites in both Serbia and Croatia attempted to moderate interethnic conflict by imposing a system of pluralist political competition and an integrationist logic on the new Yugoslav state. They did so by constructing a unitary rather than a federal state system of representation and participation. That unitary state, they believed, would be based on a shared southern Slav identity and a common bond forged by the humiliation suffered at the hands of both the Ottoman and Hapsburg rulers.

Indeed some observers argue that many Croatian and Slovene elites (those who came from the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia) had joined the effort to form a Yugoslav state because they saw political advantage in participating in the governance of a unitary state over receiving minority status and enduring the restrictive franchise in Austria, Hungary, or Italy. The 1921 constitution of the newly created state of Yugoslavia was a relatively liberal one, enshrining universal male suffrage and equal civil and political rights for all Yugoslav citizens.[24]

Not all Yugoslav elites, however, were happy with this new arrangement. Many Croatian nationalists felt that they had freed themselves from Hapsburg domination only to be newly saddled with Serbian hegemony in a unitary state. They mistrusted the new constitution, arguing that it masked Serbian control over Croatia and that a national Yugoslav identity could not be created under a Serbian king, his army, administration, and Orthodox religion. Indeed, argued such Croats, this "nation" really represented the submission of a Roman Catholic people on the periphery of civilized Europe to an inferior, Oriental culture.[25]

Threats of Croatian secession, and the fact that large sections of the Croatian population did not accept the constitutional basis of the Yugoslav state combined with the increasing centralization of power in Serbia to prevent the formation of interethnic political coalitions in representative institutions. Divisions were exacerbated when parliament—the forum where a clash of interests was aired—shut down in 1929. Debate ended, and a fraction of the Croat elite turned to violence. Nonetheless, these elite power plays did not trigger widespread interethnic conflict in the population as a whole. Indeed that conflict was nurtured by the breakdown of the state and by the war raging in the region after 1939. Croatian elites broke from Yugoslavia to ally with the Nazis and quickly carried out a German-led plan to massacre thousands of Serbs. The decision of the Bosnian Muslim elites to throw in their lot with Croatia transformed them into the enemy of the Serbs as well. With the German defeat in 1945, Croatia surrendered, and Serbia took its revenge by killing thousands of Croat and Muslim prisoners. This violence created a vast reservoir of culturally defined grievances that would shape the construction of postwar institutions.

FEDERAL INSTITUTIONS OF POSTWAR YUGOSLAVIA: BALANCING "NATIONAL" INTERESTS

With memories of mutual massacres still vivid, Tito believed that national integration was not possible in a unitary Yugoslav state. He thus established a federal system of ethnic republics after the war that would provide guarantees of national equality. Like any federation, authority was distributed between the central government and the governments of the constituent units, and the distribution of

authority could not be changed without mutual consent. The Yugoslav federation held to three broad principles of federalism. First, within their respective spheres of operation, both the central government and the constituent units were independent, and neither was subordinated to the other. Second, the constituent units participated in the making of decisions at the federal level. Finally, important federal decisions required equal representation of all of the constituent units, regardless of their size and population.

Yugoslavia, however, was not a centralized federal system like that of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, or, in its most centralized form, the Soviet Union. Indeed it did not resemble most other federations, in which the central government could make many decisions without consulting the member governments of the constituent units. Instead because Yugoslavia was so divided as a result of the events of World War II, Tito created a noncentralized federalism in which the constituent units exercised a large degree of control and authority. Although the 1946 constitution placed all mineral wealth, power resources, means of communication, and foreign trade under state control, it also stipulated that the central government could make decisions in only a few narrowly restricted issue areas without obtaining the approval of the governments of the constituent units.[26]

Further, like the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia was now governed by the institutions of ethnofederalism, which were intended to transform ethnically based political identities into cultural/administrative identities and thereby prevent the reemergence of extreme identity politics as a dominant political force.[27] As Vesna Pešić argues, two kinds of national groupings were organized *hierarchically* in the constitution. Five culturally defined groups—Serbs, Slovenes, Croats, Macedonians, and Montenegrins were territorially organized in constituent republics in which, as the titular nationality, they held the status of "constituent nation." The 1971 census recognized Muslims as a separate nation, and in 1971 Bosnia-Herzegovina was recognized under the national principle as a republic, consisting of three constitutive peoples: Serbs, Croats, and Muslims. Those not members of these six "nations"—e.g., Jews, Czechs, Romanians, Russians, Bulgarians, Romany, Vlachs, Albanians, and Hungarians—were called "national minorities" and later "nationalities." These groups initially suffered from lower representative status than the constituent

nations.[28] Susan Bridge argues that the structure of formal political representation throughout the postwar period discouraged minority participation and representation through the single-member district in both party and government. But the single-member district worked to the advantage of minorities in two defined regions where the "nationality" was a majority of the population. As we shall see, after the constitutional changes of 1974, Kosovo, with a majority Albanian population, and Vojvodina, with a majority Hungarian population, gained increasing autonomy throughout the postwar period and enjoyed equal participation at the federal level with the same representative status as the constituent nations.[29]

A dual notion of federalism was embodied in representative institutions that in some ways resembled a traditional parliamentary democracy. The Federal Assembly was composed of a Federal Council, elected by citizens voting as Yugoslavs, and a Chamber of Nationalities, in which citizens were represented as nations and nationalities. This federal structure was intended to balance the interests of all the peoples of Yugoslavia. The importance of the equality of the constituent nations in representative institutions cannot be overstated. Indeed a territorially based federation was not considered fully adequate to provide an equal representation of Yugoslavia's constituent "peoples" since most territorial units, even those with titular nationalities, had mixed populations. Therefore, territorial ethnofederalism was reinforced by a system of ethnic quotas or "keys" as a central principle for the allocation of political resources. All appointments to public office (including the military) were decided by a formula for the proportional representation, or in some cases equal representation, of individuals by constituent nation or nationality. The effort to maintain balance in public institutions went far beyond the intent of the quota system. For example, in an attempt to maintain balance even in the prosecution of politically motivated nationalist activities, central government authorities often went out of their way to balance a particular prosecution with charges against people from other ethnic groups.[30]

Tito established these institutions of ethnofederalism because he believed that if the resolution of disputes between national groups appeared to favor one group over the others, the federation's internal balance would be upset and Yugoslavia would be destabilized. His goal was to preserve the central Yugoslav state. Given Serbia's dispro-

portionately large population and history as an independent state and given Croatian elites' historic distrust of Serbs, this was not an easy task. Indeed some analysts argue that the constitution implied an unwritten agreement between Tito and Serbian political elites in which it would espouse Yugoslav unity and equality of representation in order to mitigate Croatian fears of Serb dominance in the state apparatus and thus cement Croatia's loyalty to the center. One often heard the slogan, "Weak Serbia, strong Yugoslavia."[31]

Soon the institutions of ethnofederalism would come to dominate all others in decisions of allocation, participation, representation, and accountability. At the outset, however, other powerful institutions were constructed to encourage solidarity and integration into the federal Yugoslav state. The two most prominent were the Communist Party and the army, supported by both socialist ideology and a system of privileges conferred upon those who had demonstrated loyalty to the central state. Successive constitutional and economic reforms created incentives for interregional competition among political elites over the means of economic development. These reforms also created socioeconomic divisions in the larger population that transcended ethnic cleavages, and they both encouraged and codified ideological conflict between conservatives and reformers in the party.

These divisions were potentially cross-cutting. That is, different ethnic groups who were part of the same socioeconomic class had more in common with each other than with their ethnic compatriots; different ethnic groups living in the same region potentially had common regional interests that transcended ethnic divisions; both ideological consensus and division could potentially overcome regional and cultural differences. Thus, as we shall see below, a plethora of institutions within the federal system held the potential to mitigate the importance of cultural divisions that had long plagued Yugoslavia. It is to a brief description of the alternative social cleavages created by these institutions that the discussion now turns.

INCENTIVES FOR INTEGRATION AND YUGOSLAV SOLIDARITY

Integrationist logic was initially encouraged by ideology and repression. It was further encouraged by partisan privilege as an important (though certainly not exclusive) allocative principle. First,

Tito believed that the dominance of Communist ideology would reduce the salience of ethnicity as a source of political identity and replace it with a more cosmopolitan socialist one. Tito believed that the division of Yugoslavia into separate republics would be temporary and that once Marxist ideology became embedded in social practice, Yugoslavia could become an integrated, even unitary state.[32]

Initially repression bolstered this belief in the power of ideology; public debate on ethnic issues was largely forbidden, and, as in other Marxist regimes, the representation of grievances on the part of particular ethnic groups had to be articulated in economic and social terms since these were the only terms viewed by the state as legitimate.[33] Policies suppressing religion and nationalist movements were designed to stifle interethnic competition and sectarian privilege in the interest of an integrated multinational state.[34] These repressive measures were largely abandoned in the 1960s;[35] nonetheless, the political expression of nationalism remained illegal and was prosecuted. Successive constitutions prohibited the propagation or practicing of national inequality and any incitement of national, racial, or religious hatred and intolerance.[36]

Two integrationist organizations dominated Yugoslavia's political structure: the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) and the Yugoslav National Army (JNA). The LCY began as a highly centralized but carefully multinational institution which was quickly transformed after the break with the Soviet Union from an elite cadre to a mass organization. As party membership grew, it provided the only forum for political debate about alternative social interests and preferences. In fact, this horizontal political cleavage dominated all others for many years.[37] It differed substantially from the other Communist parties of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in that central to its ideological core was the belief that its leading role in society would disappear with the development of democracy in Yugoslavia.

The JNA was organized to encourage integration and loyalty to the federal center through its rules of accountability, participation, and representation. It had a constitutional obligation to maintain the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia in the face of both internal and external threats, and it was beholden to the authority of the federal presidency. All army units were composed of a mix of officers and recruits drawn from throughout Yugoslavia. Its party organization was ethnically heterogeneous, and the ethnic quota system domi-

nated the officer corps.[38] The army's political influence was substantial; it had a vote in the federal party presidency equal to the republics.

Finally, elite solidarity across national lines was initially encouraged by allocative policies that privileged partisans from all national groups who had fought against fascism. Pro-Partisan Serbs from predominantly pro-Chetnik areas, pro-Partisan Croatians and Serbs in Croatia, Partisan Muslims, Macedonians, Montenegrins, and Slovenes held top posts in the Communist Party and in government at all levels. They created local dynasties and operated politically much like a powerful lobbying group to put pressure on the central government to pursue integrationist policies and provide generous material support to their local communes and regions. These former Partisans and their families were united by ideological preferences rather than ethnic bonds; they too assumed that a Yugoslav identity would come to replace other national political identities.[39]

There are many indicators that these institutions were partially successful in moving Yugoslavia toward integration. I listed several at the outset: a rising Yugoslav national identity, especially among young people, the strong preference among Serbs for the preservation of the federal state, and the widespread political popularity of Ante Marković, prime minister and head of the only all-Yugoslav party in 1990. Polls taken in July 1990 showed Marković to be the most popular politician in all of the republics, with a 93 percent rating in Bosnia, an 81 percent rating in Serbia, and an 83 percent rating in Croatia.[40] In Bosnia by the late 1980s, 30 percent of marriages in urban areas were mixed marriages.[41] Perhaps the most significant indicator of Yugoslav integration is the outcome of the first multiparty elections: when elections were held throughout the Yugoslav republics in 1990, no ethnic nationalist party received an electoral majority in Slovenia, Croatia, or Macedonia; in Montenegro former Communists received the bulk of the vote. Most important, no party calling for an independent ethnically exclusive state received a majority vote in any of the Yugoslav republics. Indeed election results suggested a broad preference for Yugoslav integration; this preference was stronger than many analysts believed.

SOCIOECONOMIC CLEAVAGES

Incentives for integration were accompanied by both the intentional creation of channels for the political representation of various producer groups in the Federal Assembly and the unintended institutional creation of new socioeconomic cleavages in the population at large through state plans for resource allocation. In 1953 a new constitutional law attempted to strengthen the political power of producer groups composed of all nations and nationalities. Planners believed that this change would weaken representative divisions among ethnic groups. According to this law, of the two chambers in the Federal Assembly, only one-half of one would now be elected according to the nationality principle, while the other half would continue to be elected by the people at large. The second chamber would be elected by workers in "socially owned" enterprises. Professional workers, individual peasants, and private entrepreneurs were not represented. The law thus embodied the belief that political differences would be along class rather than ethnic lines.[42]

Workers were also given a strong participatory role in the economy. Beginning in the 1960s, the concept of self-management was introduced as the operational principle of economic management and allocation. Instead of state ownership, there would be social ownership of enterprises, governed by strong workers' councils and powerful oversight committees.[43] Behind the self-management principle was the belief that associations of workers had the right to participate in budgetary and managerial decisions at the workplace.

The 1965 economic reform increased enterprise autonomy further by removing regulatory burdens imposed by the central state: depreciation rates were increased and capital tax on fixed assets was cut. The reform also encouraged inter-republic enterprise relationships: enterprises were permitted to lend to other firms across republican and provincial borders directly and participate in joint ventures with them. In short, the implementation of the self-management principle, bolstered by the 1965 reform, would heighten producer political participation and thus further dilute ethnic divisions. In doing so, it would structure social competition along economic rather than along ethnic lines and thus increase loyalty to the federal state. Economic interests, however, were mediated by territorially

based representative institutions; producer representatives were grouped first by commune and then by republic.[44]

Although equally represented and integrated into the management and decision-making structure of the economy, not all producer groups from all regions were treated equally when it came to allocative decisions directed from the center. In their attempt to modernize Yugoslavia, economic planners in the federal government favored some producers over others by giving some groups privileged access to material goods and services and denying it to others. Hardest hit by the new policies were the rural peasants. Yugoslavia possessed fertile agricultural land populated by an entrenched peasantry. The production of primary commodities had long been the mainstay of economic activity in the region. But the central economic goal of the postwar federal government was to transform the entire country from a backward agrarian nation into a modern industrial one. The federal government therefore poured its resources into industrial investment at the expense of the agricultural sector, thus driving peasants off the land and into the factories. Peasants who remained on the land lacked pension benefits and had little access to state housing, while they faced state-mandated prices for their produce and were provided with almost no investment capital.[45]

This policy created an important cleavage between the industrial workers and public-sector employees who had migrated to the cities, on the one hand, and those who remained on the land, on the other. Furthermore, the fastest growing economic group in postwar Yugoslavia was the white collar sector, reflecting rapid growth in the state bureaucracy at all levels of government. As long as the economy grew, the differences, particularly between white collar and blue collar workers, were resolved within both the system of self-management and the Federal Assembly. By the 1980s, however, when economic conditions took on crisis proportions, Susan Woodward argues, "The primary social divisions . . . in Yugoslav society were not defined by ethnicity but by job status. . . . In terms of how people saw themselves, ethnicity was less important than either occupation and the social status it conveyed or place of residence—urban or rural—and its related culture."[46] Whether Woodward is correct or not, there is ample evidence to suggest that economic cleavages in society (defined largely in terms of urban-rural splits) and socioeco-

nomic identities were as strong if not stronger than ethnic cleavages and identities.

IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS

The initial ideological cleavages among political elites of the 1950s and 1960s were analyzed by Western observers as the usual division between ideological conservatives and liberal reformers. During the late 1960s reformers dominated politics at the federal center. They were confident that given the chance, the general population would endorse their liberal policies. They were particularly confident in their own electoral success over the conservatives because a middle class was growing in Yugoslavia that would be particularly receptive to their appeals. They thus resolved to further democratize the electoral process in order to reduce the presence of conservative opponents in the legislative branches of government at all levels. To the extent that reformers gained a foothold in political competition, the entrenched political establishment was pressured to widen the franchise. Much like democratizing Western Europe in the nineteenth century, groups within the establishment who expected to benefit from reform introduced more democratic procedures as a strategy to weaken powerful conservative opponents.[47] Just before the 1967 elections, a wave of constitutional amendments increased the power of elected bodies at the federal level, particularly the Federal Assembly. And at all levels of government, elections were more hotly contested than ever before. Of course political rivalry was limited to intraparty ideological competition, and no thought was given to the creation of a multiparty electoral system. Liberalizers focused their political platform on the strengthening of market forces, freedom of speech, a merit-based system of promotions, and the withdrawal of the party from the arts and culture.

According to many observers, this path ended abruptly when some of the liberalizers in Croatia attempted to increase their popular support base against their conservative opponents by allying with nationalist political elements, who had become bolder and more openly critical with every move toward political liberalization. This coalition was a clear departure from the traditional coalition between reformers and conservatives against ethnic nationalists.[48]

As I discuss in more detail below, Tito crushed this alliance, and with the backing of the JNA, he purged the party of its nationalist and politically liberal elements and left centralizers firmly in power. Those centralizers, loyal to the federal state, acted quickly to suppress nationalist movements, and they were not to emerge openly again until the late 1980s.

According to Denison Rusinow and Steven Burg, with nationalist forces excluded from political participation, the early 1980s witnessed the formation of political cleavages along three separate ideological lines: the confederationists, the ideological conservatives, and the liberal reformers.[49] Confederationists, found primarily in the leaderships of Slovenia, Croatia, and Vojvodina, wanted to expand their own political autonomy and economic power at the expense of the central government in Belgrade. The ideological conservatives, found primarily among the partisans, the JNA, and the poorer republics, argued against the establishment of a market economy and were sympathetic to a more centralized and egalitarian polity. The liberal reformers, found mostly in the Serbian party, defended the introduction of a market economy in Yugoslavia and argued for a centralized foreign currency market and the elimination of interregional economic barriers.

These ideological divisions among elites were deep, and they spread to the public at large. Indeed the evidence of strong liberal leanings in Serbia suggests that had ethnofederalism not been so entrenched and had the federal state and party organization not been so weak, Yugoslavia would have undergone a transition from communism similar to that of other Balkan and East European states. The primary elite division would have been between reformers and conservatives; international financial institutions would have bolstered the political power of the reformers, supporting the institutions of the federal center, and even conservatives in power would have been pressed to follow their mandates.[50] Because federal institutions provided incentives for regional divisions, however, those divisions became more deeply rooted than either ideological or socioeconomic cleavages. It is to the issue of regional divisions that the discussion now turns.

CENTER-REGION AND INTERREGIONAL COMPETITION FOR RESOURCES

The twin economic goals of Yugoslav development policy had always been to reduce the disparities in regional living standards while maintaining a high rate of growth. As noted above, central economic planners believed that the overriding economic goal was to transform Yugoslavia into a modern industrialized nation. Priority was given to the development of industries that would contribute to the rapid growth of the country as a whole. But the individual republics had attained different levels of development, and as a strategy to encourage national Yugoslav integration, every five-year plan mandated the "equalization of conditions" between the developed and less developed regions.[51]

Resource limitations, however, produced deep tensions among the republics over the pursuit of these twin goals. Slovenia and Croatia, as the rich republics, preferred that funds be allocated by efficiency criteria; because they were most efficient, they would receive the bulk of the investment funds, and they resisted the transfer of resources to the poor. The poorer republics of Serbia, Bosnia, Macedonia, and Montenegro fought for funds as development subsidies. Because all funds were administered from a central General Investment Fund and because the central government regulated industrial development, divisions among the republics over investment took the form of center-region controversies. The poorer republics were dependent on the center for development funds, and the richer republics wanted autonomy from the center to free them from subsidies and regulation.

In addition to these conflicting pressures on central funds from the developed and less developed regions, partisan elites pressed for regional credit allocations based on political criteria rewarding partisan loyalty and punishing those who had opposed the partisans in the war.[52] Indeed behind the scenes, regional politicians used political arguments to counter efficiency and development arguments, and they used patronage networks to lobby federal officials for regional investments; those investments would create jobs and income at home which in turn would bolster the regional power base of local politicians.[53]

These conflicting goals and criteria for the allocation of limited material resources led to mutual resentments. No matter which cri-

teria were used, the republics who did not receive investment funds felt cheated. Three examples illustrate. First, all investment funds to stimulate growth were distributed directly to specific individual enterprises throughout Yugoslavia. These funds were initially allocated through a central investment bank; after 1965 they were allocated through a network of regional banks. Individual enterprises competed for these funds on the basis of interest rates and repayment schedules through a series of auctions. Enterprises in Croatia and Slovenia were always more competitive according to the criteria. Furthermore, since priority was given to industries that would contribute to rapid national growth, five-year plans mandated that raw material inputs would be underpriced to make such industries competitive. Again, priority industries were located in the developed regions of Croatia and Slovenia; most of the raw materials came from Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia, and Macedonia. The predominance of low-priced raw materials in the less developed regions and the absence of offsetting transfers meant that the poorer regions were penalized for providing the raw materials necessary to industrialize the country. The result, as one analyst put it, was that "both per capita investments and the grants-in-aid allocated to the less developed regions were consistently less than those allocated to the developed regions." Serbian political leaders complained about the huge transfers of industry from Serbia to Croatia and Slovenia that had taken place between 1945 and 1951 in the name of efficiency. And the introduction of market socialism in 1963, shifting economic decision-making from local party and government elites to workers' councils in the enterprises, clearly appeared to work to the advantage of more productive and industrialized republics.[54]

Second, as noted above, the wealthier regions complained bitterly about the huge income transfers required for the development of the poorer republics; they were particularly bitter about the forfeiture of hard currency earnings to federal treasuries. Croatian leaders complained that despite the fact that Croatia brought in half of all foreign capital as of 1969, it was allocated only about 15 percent of the total credits, an amount insufficient for its level of development. They further argued that Croatia produced most in foreign currency earnings and enterprise profits and received much less through the redistribution process. In 1971 the president of the Assembly of Croatia stated that Croatia would have to renegotiate the

size of its contribution or abandon many of its own public works programs.[55]

Finally, in the eyes of the richer republican elites, political criteria seemed to work to the advantage of the poor republics. Croatian elites pointed out that Montenegro received the most investment per capita, while Croatia, the second most developed republic able to maximize output per investment, received what Croatian leaders believed to be barely its share. This perception was formed because policies providing partisan preferences seemed to make it clear that Croatia was being punished for its record in World War II, and regions with strong partisan groups were being rewarded. Critics in Croatia and Slovenia pointed out that Montenegro and Serbia received disproportionate investment credits, largely due to the strong patronage networks of partisans in these regions.

The pursuit of conflicting goals and the overlapping institutional structure by which investment funds were distributed from the center to the republics had two important cross-cutting consequences for the locus of political cleavages and loyalties. First, as we shall see below, the accumulated allocative disputes and resentments had an important impact on constitutional debates; those debates in turn exacerbated interregional conflicts as their resolution weakened the center. Heavily, directly, and transparently dependent on the central government, the poorer regions developed the most loyalty to the center and reinforced integrationist tendencies in those regions.[56] The richer republics sought increasing decentralization of the federal system and more autonomy in economic decision-making.

A second and equally important consequence was the development of regional and republican loyalty over loyalty to the center. The institutions of economic allocation emphasized territorial over functional organization of the economy, and economic resources were distributed from the central government to the republics and regions rather than directly to individual enterprises. Thus republican loyalties replaced central loyalties, even in the poorer republics, because republican elites were responsible for procuring funds for their particular republics.

This last point is central to the argument: Because of the allocative structure, regional loyalties and divisions were created that were not necessarily congruent with "national" or "nationality" divisions. Two examples of regional loyalty (neither of which actually proves

a causal linkage to allocative principles) illustrate. The first ironically can be found in the bitter complaints of the 1986 Memorandum written by a committee of Serb nationalist intellectuals in the Serbian Academy of Sciences. The Memorandum protested Yugoslav "assimilationist" policies, arguing that they were turning Serbs living in Croatia into Croats, and it claimed that ethnic Serb writers in Montenegro and Bosnia were writing "Montenegran" or "Bosnian" literature instead of Serb literature. And they complained that Macedonian Communists had simply Macedonized Serbs.[57] With these complaints, the Memorandum suggested that republican political identities had indeed replaced ethnic political identities.

Second, even in war, Bosnian Serbs loyal to Bosnia joined in the Bosnian government and army to oppose Bosnian Serbs who fought the government. In the first elections there after 1990, 13 Serbs were elected to the assembly who were not members of the nationalist party. Indeed ethnic cleavages were not the only—nor were they necessarily the deepest—cleavages in federal Yugoslavia. As we shall see below, territorial loyalties increasingly overlapped with ethnic loyalties as the Yugoslav center collapsed. But territorial divisions unrelated to national divisions were real and they persisted even in war.

ALTERNATIVE CLEAVAGES AND ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS FOR FEDERAL YUGOSLAVIA

In sum, in Yugoslavia, as in all federal systems, the preservation of the state depended on the strength of institutions that encouraged loyalty to the central government. It further depended on the subordination of cultural cleavages, ideological disputes, socioeconomic divisions, and center-region conflict to central government authority. As the narrative suggests, a complex pattern of political cleavage had evolved within both the party and government structures. Indeed this was evident by the 1960s.[58] If institutional strength at the federal level had been maintained, political, socioeconomic, and regional divisions could have diffused social conflict, and Yugoslavia might have been preserved. But as we shall see below, the strength of federal institutions was slowly depleted and potential cross-cutting cleavages dissolved into ethnic divisions as ethnic repre-

sentation was strengthened and as the mercantilist policies of the republics drained economic resources. The center would not hold.

If federal Yugoslavia could not be preserved, its peaceful dissolution required that center-regional conflicts be resolved in favor of regional autonomy. As we shall see below, Yugoslavia was indeed moving in this latter direction. By 1974 the individual republics were close to becoming fully sovereign states. And as late as the summer of 1991, Bosnian President Alia Izetbegović and Macedonian President Kiro Gligorov had gained support from Milošević and Tudjman for an asymmetrical federation—that is, a very loose federation in which Serbia and Montenegro would constitute the "core," Macedonia and Bosnia would be semidetached, and Croatia and Slovenia could exercise as much sovereignty as they wished.[59] In fact, however, neither unity nor peaceful dissolution of the federal state was possible in 1991 because beginning in the 1970s, constitutional changes ironically designed to hold the federation together and subsequent economic decline caused center-regional disputes to increasingly deepen ethnic cleavages. It is to this story that the discussion now turns.

DECENTRALIZATION, DECLINE, AND THE GROWTH OF ETHNOFEDERALISM

The necessary condition for the dominance of cultural conflict in Yugoslavia was the entrenchment and expansion of ethnofederalism. Ethnofederalism politicized cultural identity, bolstered the power base of local elites, and thus deepened cultural divisions. The sufficient condition was the federal center's decline in power and authority and the resulting economic decline. Economic decline and periodic crises triggered conflict over resources along the regional and ethnic lines that ethnofederalism had created. Constitutional changes and economic reforms throughout the life of Yugoslavia ensured that both of these conditions were met. A brief sketch of those changes reveals the resulting rising importance of ethnic divisions over purely territorial ones.

Distributive quarrels among republican elites in the Communist Party emerged from the outset. These quarrels were rarely

played out between republics directly but were always directed toward the central government. Indeed there was no forum where the republics and provinces could negotiate directly with each other.[60] As suggested above, the deepest discontent was in Croatia and Slovenia, the richest republics and the two most unhappy with central administrative controls. Fearful that this discontent would lead to calls for autonomy, aggravate ethnic conflict—particularly in mixed economic regions—and thus thwart the drive for Yugoslav integration, Tito attempted to deflect criticism and undermine autonomy demands by decentralizing most political and economic activity. The LCY thus undertook measures that conferred increasing political authority on the individual republics in the belief that more autonomy within the federal state would undermine divisive nationalisms. Indeed by the time of Tito's death, there were very few funds, favors, or power resources left in the center to distribute; republican quarrels over central resources were fierce but bore little return for the winners.[61] But as we shall see below, the decline in central powers led to a disintegration of the Yugoslav market and thus a decline in economic efficiency and growth. As the economic pie got smaller, competition over resources increased and national resentments deepened even further. As Rusinow argues, by the 1970s the disintegration of the Yugoslav market into "eight mercantilist and protectionist regional fiefdoms" exacerbated the tendency on the part of regional political elites to regard the republics as separate political and national communities.[62]

CONSTITUTIONAL REVISIONS AND ECONOMIC REFORMS

Successive constitutional revisions and economic reforms both codified and induced decentralization and representation by nationality or ethnic group. The 1953 constitutional amendment reduced the administrative role of the central state to five areas: foreign affairs, defense, internal security, and state administration. Although the "national economy" remained in the hands of the federal government, republics were given their own budgets over which they exercised independent control. In the search for a more impersonal allocative mechanism that would deflect criticism from the federal government, central authorities introduced administrative market

socialism. Fixed wages were abolished, centralized planning mechanisms were weakened, and financial instruments replaced administrative rules in macroeconomic coordination. The republican governing bodies were made legally independent of the federal government.[63]

By 1963, however, economic conditions began to worsen. Recall that the industrialization drive had pushed peasants off the land and into the factories in urban areas. Wage earners pouring into the cities exerted pressure on demand for consumer goods that were in short supply. Expanding demand forced accelerated imports, and the balance of payments deficit dramatically increased. The IMF was called in to provide a structural adjustment loan; its conditionality requirement was that Yugoslavia further liberalize its economy. But as exporters, Croatia and Slovenia were suffering from the 1961 recession in Western Europe, and their exports sagged dangerously.

Squeezed both externally and internally, political elites in both republics continued to see the federal government as the target of their discontent. They saw federal fiscal policies intended to equalize levels of development among the republics as a transfer tax that would disproportionately benefit the less developed republics. Most dangerously, nationality came to be associated with locality and caused divisions within the party that cut across those between reformists and conservatives.[64]

Again to deflect attacks against the center as the cause of these economic problems and to weaken discontent, a new constitution was formulated in 1963. It further decentralized the economy. This time, however, decision-making authority and autonomy devolved to the communal level. According to some observers, it seems that the aim was to localize power without further diluting the authority of the central state since the federal government still had direct links to the communes without going through the republican assemblies.[65]

At the same time, the constitution expanded the meaning and practice of "ethnic balancing" in an attempt to further solidify loyalty to the center. The Chamber of Nationalities was given more legislative power. Its primary task was now to discuss and approve legislation of the assembly *on an equal basis* with the economic, education and culture, welfare and health, and organizational-political chambers which had developed out of the Council of Producers.[66] The Chamber of Nationalities was upgraded again in 1967. Elected

by republican and provincial assemblies, it now replaced the federal chamber as the senior of the five chambers, and the federal chamber was sharply downgraded.[67]

This organizational change had an important impact on the locus of political accountability and thus on the locus of political loyalty. Previously most members of the Federal Assembly had been responsible only to individual communal assemblies or to the voters at large in given electoral districts. With the upgrading of the Chamber of Nationalities, however, most members were now accountable to their republican and provincial assemblies. Because no federal legislation on any subject could be passed without the consent of the members of the Chamber of Nationalities and because members of that chamber were accountable to their regional assemblies, the republics sharply increased their power at the federal legislative level. In the 1971 census, the status of "nation" was conferred upon Yugoslav Muslims.[68] Muslims could therefore be represented in the Chamber of Nationalities.

The strengthening of the Chamber of Nationalities not only deepened ethnic and regional political power, but it also exacerbated ethnic tensions. Representation in the Chamber of Nationalities was accorded by the principles of equality and proportionality. Twenty delegates to the Chamber of Nationalities were chosen by each of the six republics, regardless of population. This "balancing" effort bred resentment along ethnic and national lines. Serbs, for example, had 40 percent of the total population but had only 14 percent of the votes in the Chamber of Nationalities, while Slovenes represented 8.5 percent of the total population and had the same percentage of votes.[69] Equality in representation benefiting the richer and smaller republics was intended to offset the disproportionate economic burden placed on them by regional development policy. But the policy backfired because it channeled resentments and privileges away from territorially defined republics and directed them toward specific ethnic groups who dominated those republics. Serbs began to resent *Croats,* not just *Croatia,* for both their wealth and its representative weight in the powerful Chamber of Nationalities. That representative weight, Serb elites believed, eschewed economic allocation to benefit Croats and was unfair to Serbs. Croats, in turn, resented the disproportionate representative weight of smaller nations which provided them with political clout to push for redistributive policies

that would drain economic resources from richer republics like Croatia.

Ethnic tensions thus colored debates about regional development policy. Despite efforts to equalize levels of development among all of the republics, the gap between the rich and poor republics grew; elites in the richer republics saw little reason to continue to transfer resources to the poorer ones.[70] They thus argued for allocation of investment funds based on profitability and efficiency. The poorer republics defended their position that they needed continued transfers in order to grow.

The result was a stalemate; there was no agreement on how investment funds should be allocated in the future. This immobilism at the center, combined with the growing deficit and pressure from the IMF for further liberalization and the representative weight of the rich but small republics in the Chamber of Nationalities, led to the economic reform of 1965. The reform itself suggests a triumph for the richer republics and the decentralizers as the center was further weakened; in the course of the debate, the central government was removed from its role as the provider of investment funds to the republics and a network of republic-level banks was created.[71] They were authorized to take primary responsibility for investment finance. These banks had previously been simply the administers of government investment funds; now they were autonomous enterprises under regulatory control of the republican governments. Finally, the reform turned over most of the federal authority to raise taxes to the republics.

These changes meant an important power shift from the federal to the regional level and from territorially defined regions to ethnically defined republics. The shift in authority to the republic level doomed the regional development policy that was supposed to cement solidarity among the republics and loyalty to the federal center as it weakened the federal government even further. While the 1963 constitution had given more autonomy to the communes at the expense of the republics as a way of decreasing republican power, the 1965 reform returned authority to the republic level, and the commune's economic authority was limited to attracting industry within its territorial boundaries. Here, Comisso argues, urban areas enjoyed immense advantages over rural communes, and this served to widen urban-rural social and economic divisions. The shifting of account-

ability from the center to the republics and the shifting of representative authority to the "nations" and nationalities shifted resentments away from the center and on to specific national groups.

1974: YUGOSLAVIA BECOMES A DE FACTO CONFEDERATION

Most analysts agree that the 1974 constitution was a watershed that turned Yugoslavia into a de facto confederation of sovereign states.[72] The powers of the federal center were reduced to foreign policy, defense, the protection of national rights, and a minimum of economic instruments. Even in these realms, decisions had to be made by consensus among representatives of the republics and the autonomous provinces.[73]

The constitution further widened and deepened the system of ethnic and republican quotas to guarantee the smaller republics and nationalities that they would be equally represented. Where previously the quota system had generally followed the principle of proportional representation in federal appointments, it now stipulated that equal numbers from each republic regardless of population would be appointed to federal posts. Appointments to senior and mid-rank positions in federal and lower-level administrative and elective institutions, including the party, now came under the authority of republican and provincial party and state leaderships.

Finally and perhaps most important, the 1974 constitution changed the status of Kosovo and Vojvodina to autonomous provinces. They had been granted increasing authority over their investments and budgets after the 1965 reform. This constitutional change, however, moved them from a status of near-parity in the federal decision-making structure to complete equality with the republics. This meant that the Albanians in Kosovo now had de facto equal political status with the constituent national groups at the federal level. Now all six republics and the two provinces were equally represented in both chambers of the federal assembly regardless of their size. When collective leadership at the federal level was introduced, the two provinces joined in an eight-member presidency, in which each member had an equal vote.[74] Indeed such an equal representation of the constituent units in both chambers of a bicameral federal legislative assembly is not found in any other contemporary

federation. In comparative perspective, the small federal units in Yugoslavia were highly overrepresented, while large units were correspondingly underrepresented.[75]

Indeed, the 1974 Yugoslav constitution established a more decentralized system of industrial, political, and territorial decision-making than any other existing federation. Over the twenty-year period from 1953 to 1974, the constitutional move toward decentralization from the federal level toward republics and provinces gave legal status to the republics as power centers, making them in fact the highest self-governing communities in Yugoslavia. And the equal status conferred upon the republics and the provinces combined with the principle of unanimity in federal decision-making bodies to ensure immobilism at the center. Any representative who felt that the interests of his republic or province would not be met by a particular federal policy could block its implementation.[76] Ethnic identity was given increasing political weight as ethnic representative bodies became more powerful and as the quota system was widened and deepened.

THE RESULTS: ECONOMIC FRAGMENTATION AND DECLINE

The result of this loss of power and authority at the center was increasing economic fragmentation of markets, duplication of investment projects, and a subsequent sharp decline in the economy as a whole. The complete story of Yugoslavia's economic decline is a complex one, beyond the scope of this essay, and is yet to be written.[77] I provide only a few examples here to illustrate the relationship between decentralization, the fragmentation of markets in Yugoslavia, and economic deterioration.

Once the regionalization of the economic policy was in place, the incentives for economic autarky increased.[78] The regionalization of the banking sector witnessed the creation of as many banks as republics and regions. Bank authorities controlled allocation to individual firms, and regional regulatory authorities controlled banking practices. This regionalization of the banking structure made a nationwide monetary policy unattainable and blocked the possibility of interregional economic activity.[79]

With the regionalization of the banking system, preference in investment decisions was given to local objectives over the efficiency and profitability of the economy as a whole. Regional self-interest led to an increase in import substitution and the duplication of investment projects throughout Yugoslavia. In the period 1970-76, inter-republican trade in goods dropped from 27.7 percent to 23.1 percent of the national social product, while in 1981, 66 percent of all trade was intraregional and only 22 percent was interregional, with only 4 percent of all investment crossing republican and regional borders.[80] Invisible but thick economic walls between the republics were gradually being constructed.

The devolution of authority to the republics to collect taxes worsened the economic situation further. It prevented the central government from having a coherent fiscal policy, and because the republican tax base was smaller, local and republic taxes on incomes were higher. Higher taxes reduced consumer purchasing power. By 1982, this, along with other problems associated with regional fragmentation, was reflected in a 36 percent drop in the volume of imports.[81]

As investment projects were duplicated and markets fragmented, overall economic growth ground to a halt. In 1982 real gross fixed investment fell by 37 percent. Labor productivity in the public sector fell by 20 percent, and public sector earnings fell by 25 percent. The average annual growth rate fell to 0.9 percent, a drop from an annual rate of 6.3 percent.[82] As the economy worsened, regional fragmentation increased; the conduct of economic policy now depended on the wishes of the regional party organizations. Regional enterprises were subsidized as a part of patronage systems; patronage investments could only be financed by increased borrowing; increased borrowing deepened Yugoslavia's external debt and worsened the economic system further.

As a result of uncoordinated investments, foreign reserve imbalances, and overborrowing in the 1970s, the 1980s witnessed permanent economic crisis in Yugoslavia. By mid-decade, inflation had reached 100 percent annually, while wages were frozen. The federal government faced a mounting debt obligation without any return on moneys spent. Unemployment rose from 600,000 in 1982 to 912,000 in 1983, not including the 700,000 who had been forced to emigrate abroad in order to find work. In 1981–85, unemployment in Serbia

proper was 17–18 percent, and in Kosovo it was over 50 percent. By 1985 one million people were unemployed, and in all republics except Slovenia and Croatia the unemployment rate was above 20 percent.[83]

IMF structural adjustment loans only exacerbated regional tensions. For example, one requirement of the stabilization program was that the dinar be devalued. Bosnia was strongly opposed to devaluation because it was heavily dependent on imported intermediate goods from convertible currency areas. As the major exporters to the West, Croatia and Slovenia supported the decision to devalue. Because devaluations had to be approved by all republics, negotiations were time consuming, bitter, and divisive. Ultimately devaluation occurred, but exports failed to rise significantly and all economic indicators declined sharply. It was in this context of increasing fragmentation and permanent economic crisis that the centralizing organizations of party and army weakened, regional political entrepreneurs held sway as loyalty to the center dissipated, socioeconomic divisions dissolved into ethnic resentments, and center-region conflict gave way to national political rivalries. How and why ethnic divisions came to trump all others is the subject of the following section.

THE GROWTH OF CULTURAL CONFLICT: FROM MULTIPLE CLEAVAGES TO REINFORCING ETHNIC DIVISIONS

Above we saw that in order to maintain authority by deflecting criticism for economic hardship and political discrimination, the federal government decentralized its control over both the economy and the political system during the period 1953–74. With weakening power at the center, decentralization gave way to fragmentation, and fragmentation led to economic crisis and decline. As we shall see below, fragmentation also changed the rules of political accountability to make regional elites increasingly responsible to their local constituencies. Similar institutional changes increased constituents' dependence on those elites and gave them more resources to distribute in exchange for support. Below I describe how, in the context of fragmentation and economic decline, the institutions of ethnofeder-

alism permitted the logic of identity politics to shape the preferences of regional elites, weaken integrative institutions, and turn all potential social divisions into nationalist rivalries.

DECLINE OF LOYALTY TO THE CENTER

With the decentralization of political authority to the republics and the decline of central power came diminishing loyalty to the federal state. The devolution of power had an important negative impact on party loyalty at the federal level and on the cohesion of the army, the two institutional pillars of federal strength.

The more decentralized the system became, the more empowered were the regional party elites. As I have demonstrated above, as early as 1953, significant areas of political and economic authority had begun to devolve to the republics, and over the next ten years the republics gradually became important decision-making and patronage-dispensing centers.[84] Recall that members of the Federal Assembly, previously accountable to communal assemblies, became accountable to the republican assemblies when the Chamber of Nationalities was upgraded in 1963 and 1967. With this institutional restructuring, ethnic and regional loyalties were bolstered and loyalty to the federal center weakened.

The regional party elites achieved key positions of power for two reasons: they were the most important economic actors and they were the most important party functionaries in the administration. The most powerful political leaders were those who had access to the state resources of the individual republics and the federal government. With those resources, politicians could create significant patronage machines. The deepening economic crisis made their role even more important because their aid became indispensable in keeping both enterprises and individuals afloat. As the central economic players, they controlled up to 70 percent of all federal investment funds, investing them in their own regions. In their role as regional party leaders, they made significant political and administrative appointments; for example, they controlled 25 percent of all employment in Kosovo; one out of four people was employed in administrative work within state-owned organizations there. In

Slovenia one out of seven jobs was under the control of local and regional politicians.[85]

The changes in the 1974 constitution enhanced their power further. After 1974, when cadre selection was federalized, those with political ambitions knew that their careers were dependent on the approval of the republican and provincial bodies who sent them to Belgrade and knew that they would return to those bodies after federal service. The status of federal service was declining, and these career officials were often reluctant to accept a federal post. When they did enter federal service, they were always responsive to their home constituencies. The rules of accountability increased the power and attractiveness of local offices while reducing the power of the central ones. As some observers have noted, the party as such seemed to exist only for the duration of the party congress; by 1974 it had devolved into an umbrella organization, and regional LCY leaders viewed any effort to encourage Yugoslav integration as an attempt to undermine their respective power bases. As Cohen argues, "In place of the unified party elite that dominated the communist system in its initial postwar phase, the regime was now characterized by six republican and two regional party elites that skillfully utilized decentralized authority for their respective parochial interests."[86]

In addition, as the center weakened, the allocative policies privileging partisans of all nationalities began to backfire. Recall that partisan privileges were intended to encourage Yugoslav integration and loyalty by cementing elite solidarity across national lines within the party. But integrationist goals were thwarted as these partisan elites created local dynasties and began to operate much like a powerful lobbying group, putting pressure on the central government to provide generous material support to their local communes and regions. In some areas, official veterans' organizations exerted pressure on Belgrade to pursue policies favored by the local political machines of which they were a part. As the power of the center declined, partisan elites guarded their entrenched status jealously and were determined to ensure themselves the influence they felt was their due.[87]

The last pillar of Yugoslav loyalty to crumble under institutional incentives for decentralization was the JNA. Throughout the process of federal dissolution, the army had clung to its constitu-

tional mandate to maintain the territorial integrity of Yugoslavia. It maintained its loyalty to the federal presidency. Even as the center disintegrated, it continued to pride itself on its multiethnic officer corps. But both external and internal pressures eroded the military's integrationist function. First, the rich republics threatened its funding throughout the 1980s by continually grumbling over the size and destination of their contribution to the federal budget. The Croatian parliament voted to oppose federal financing for defense in general, and the Slovene parliament balked as well.[88] Indeed because of its large share of the federal budget, the army became an important scapegoat for regional discontent against the center.

Internal problems in the army surfaced as well. Ethnic quotas in the appointment of officers had long fostered resentment, particularly among Serbs. Coming from the largest national group, they represented the majority of junior officers in the army but were restricted in opportunities for promotion by the quotas for national equality. After the Croatian crisis of 1971–72, Croatian soldiers balked at serving outside Croatia.[89] Further, republican loyalty to the JNA was threatened when in 1987–88, the government of Slovenia supported demands that young men be allowed to do their military service at home in Slovenia rather than be sent to another republic. Tensions within the military were further heightened when the Slovene government called for the use of the Slovene language in all military communications and supported young people who campaigned for conscientious objector status.[90] Both Djilas and Silber and Little suggest that by end of the 1980s the JNA began to mirror the weakness of the federal government as a whole. Shortly before Croatia and Slovenia moved toward secession, the officer corps was disproportionately Serb: with 40 percent of the population, Serbs represented 65 percent of the officer corps.[91] By 1990, when Muslim and Croat youths ignored their induction notices completely, the army rank and file rapidly turned into a virtually all-Serb force.[92]

THE COLLAPSE OF SOCIOECONOMIC CLEAVAGES INTO REGIONAL DIVISIONS AND ETHNIC RESENTMENTS

Above I suggested that ethnic divisions had been partially dissolved through socioeconomic cleavages in the 1960s and 1970s. But again, decentralization, deregulation, and the ever-worsening eco-

nomic situation transformed those cleavages into territorial and republican divisions. Three examples illustrate. First, producer associations were never organized functionally and thus were never able to enter into coalitions across republic lines. Recall that in the representative institutions of federal Yugoslavia, economic interests were mediated by territorially based institutions; producer representatives in the Federal Assembly were grouped first by commune and then by republic.[93] Because they were subordinated to the republics and the communes, these associations never achieved autonomy; their functional interests were institutionally subordinated to the territorial interests of the republics. To the extent that ethnic divisions and political preferences granted according to ethnic identity coincided with territorial divisions, ethnic preferences and identity politics were reinforced by the representation of producer associations in the Federal Assembly.

Second, producers' territorial dependence in representative institutions was reinforced by economic dependence on republican authorities. Recall that in the 1965 economic reform, all social investment funds, previously allocated to the enterprises directly from the central government, were transferred to communal banks.[94] As a result, "extremely close" relationships developed among politicians, banks, and enterprises. As economic conditions declined and firms increasingly needed subsidies to stay afloat, their appeals to republican political authorities for favors multiplied. Local or republic governments would either aid the firms directly or, if they lacked the resources, would pressure the national government for more.[95]

With enterprises increasingly dependent on regional authorities, socioeconomic issues that could have transcended republican boundaries were increasingly translated into the long-standing center-region conflict. The more successful enterprises were concentrated in the more advanced republics of Croatia and Slovenia, and from the early 1960s onward, they increasingly found central government regulation constraining. They thus entered into informal coalitions with republican authorities to push for a decrease in federal control over their activities. On the other side were the centralizers, an informal coalition of politicians from the less developed republics, regions, and firms dependent on political subsidies and favoritism.[96] Although the decentralizers triumphed in the 1965 eco-

nomic reform, the patron-client relationships that lined up on either side of the conflict continued.

These relationships and the economic commitments they fostered resulted in the virtual absence of pan-Yugoslav economic integration at the firm level and a total lack of interrepublican investment and joint venture projects. The result was a dearth of countervailing pressures to diffuse the center-region conflict. A 1962 integration campaign had failed to produce any mergers across republic boundaries. As we saw above, interrepublican trade had dropped sharply by the late 1970s and never recovered. Indeed by the end of the 1970s, the Yugoslav market had disintegrated into eight separate mercantilist economies.[97]

Finally, by the 1980s, although occupation and resulting status differentials had the potential to create cleavages that crossed republican lines, the worsening economic situation and the subsequent collapse of the social welfare system led to a rise in the use of patronage networks, quotas, and cultural and ethnic bonds as the central mechanism by which scarce resources were allocated. Woodward writes that "in those poorer communities where job cuts were most severe and federal government subsidies and employment had been critical to the local economy, the employment requirement of proportionality and parity among national groups made ethnicity more salient rather than less."[98] In sum, at the elite level economic competition was subsumed in center-republic conflict, and for the public at large, economic decline and crisis fed ethnic resentments.

THE COLLAPSE OF IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS AND CENTER-REGION DISPUTES INTO NATIONALIST RIVALRIES

As we have seen, before the 1960s the central ideological dispute at the elite party level had emerged between the conservatives and liberal reformers. However, this division dissolved when liberals in Croatia allied with nationalists there to increase their political leverage against conservative forces. To gain the popular support of those who sympathized with nationalists, liberal reformers in the party began to issue increasingly vocal complaints about Croatia's disadvantaged position in an "unfair" federal system. They began to call for an end to economic exploitation by Belgrade, reform of the

banking and foreign currency systems, curbs on the wealth of Serbia's export-import firms, and the redistribution of former federal assets that had been taken by Serbia after the reform. As a result, the liberal-nationalist coalition turned the initial liberal-conservative debate into a centralizing-decentralizing debate at the federal level.

In Croatia the liberal-nationalist alliance terrified the Serb minority and frightened potential liberal allies in other regions. Thus isolated, Croatia's leadership relied on popular support and the increasingly bold alliance with nationalists within Croatia, further heightening tensions between Croats and Serbs both inside and outside the republic. Then in 1971 the liberalizers found that they could not end a strike at Zagreb University, organized by a militant group that they themselves had encouraged.[99] Tito called in the JNA to quell the demonstration and, more important, to suppress the liberal-nationalist coalition. With backing from the JNA, Tito purged the party in Croatia of both its nationalist and liberalizing elements, leaving more conservative centralizers firmly in power.[100]

The "demonstration effect" then took hold. Liberalizing tendencies in the party had emerged throughout Yugoslavia, especially in Serbia.[101] But the Croatian crisis suggested that an expansion of liberalism could open the door to nationalism. Thus in 1972 and 1973 liberals were removed from party leadership in all of the republics. By eliminating the liberal opposition in this way, the party ensured that in the case of its own demise, there would be no civil society to absorb the shocks of a transition.

While political liberalism had been crushed, economic liberals took sides in a fierce debate among the liberal reformers, ideological conservatives, and confederationists. The liberal reformers and defenders of a market economy were located primarily in the Serbian party. They argued for a unified Yugoslav market and the removal of economic barriers among Yugoslavia's republics. Liberalizers were supported by IMF officials, who had stipulated a strengthening of federal institutions to unify Yugoslavia's market. Confederalists, represented primarily by elites in Slovenia, Croatia, and Vojvodina, argued against the unification of the Yugoslav market; such unification would curtail the expansion of their own political autonomy and local power base. With their opposition to a market economy, they found unwitting allies in the ideological conservatives.

While always overlapping, ideological debates thus began to merge with conflicts between the center and the regions. Specific disputes between the centralizers and decentralizers took on new meaning; the centralizers—found mostly in Serbia and particularly in the Belgrade party—argued against the fragmentation of the national market and for the institutionalization of market mechanisms throughout Yugoslavia. The decentralizers—found primarily in Croatia, Slovenia, and Vojvodina—argued for the increasing use of self-management agreements on an enterprise (and thus a regional) basis in lieu of the market. Their rationale was that market mechanisms would constrain the decision-making rights of self-managed firms. By the end of the 1970s these center-region controversies began to be couched in veiled terms of national rivalries.[102] In particular, anti-Serb rhetoric permeated the arguments of the decentralizers. But national rivalries would not break out in the open until Serb elites lost their loyalty to the center.

Indeed the Serbian party had always been on the side of the centralizers, in coalition with the poorer republics seeking subsidies from the federal government. But after the status of Kosovo and Vojvodina changed in the 1974 constitution, elites in both autonomous provinces argued on the side of the decentralizers, and Serb elites saw fewer reasons to remain loyal to the central Yugoslav government. By the late 1970s it appeared that the central state had ceased to serve the interests of Serb elites. With representatives in federal, republic, and party bodies from the national minority groups, both Kosovo and Vojvodina had the legal power to change the Serbian constitution and often voted against Serb preferences.[103]

This was to be the final blow to the center-region controversy. As we shall see below, Serb elites began to retreat from their support for federal institutions and openly encourage ethnic preferences for Serbs in response to Albanian discrimination against Serbs in Kosovo. Respect for minority rights was abandoned. At the federal level, Serb politicians began preparations to abolish the autonomous status of Vojvodina and Kosovo. Because of the increasing strength of republican party organizations, this move was entirely legal and politically possible. If the eight-man federal presidency were left in place after autonomy was abolished, Serbia would directly control three out of the eight votes. Other politicians would find this unac-

ceptable, and they too would abandon federal institutions and retreat fully into republican sovereignty.[104]

In sum, by stealing all political loyalty from the center, fragmenting the organizations that propped up central authority, and providing local political entrepreneurs with resources and deepening ethnic resentments both among elites and in society at large, the institutions of ethnofederalism set the stage for identity politics to be played out in Yugoslavia. As we shall see in the following section, where ethnofederalism had been most entrenched, identity politics would be most vociferous. Where ethnofederal institutions were not well established, the destructive tendencies of identity politics did not take root.

THE DECISION TO PLAY THE ETHNIC CARD: SUCCESS AND FAILURE

The legacy of ethnofederalism in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia provided three incentives for ethnic bandwagoning and balancing to take hold and for regional politicians to play the ethnic card in their bid for political power. The first and most important effect was the demise of central power, which wiped out federal protection for national and minority rights and led to domination and discrimination of minority groups wherever one ethnic group enjoyed a majority. Domination and discrimination in one area prompted countermeasures in another, encouraging the escalation of open ethnic discrimination and violence. This in turn provided incentives for local politicians to exploit ethnic resentments for their own political advantage. Where the legacy of ethnofederalism was strongest, nationalist parties won the first "free" elections in federal Yugoslavia, held in 1990. Where they dominated republican governments, they created exclusive institutions and prevented losing ethnic groups from obtaining citizenship rights in their state, thus encouraging more secessionist violence.

Ethnofederalism's second effect was to prevent the formation of political coalitions *across ideological lines* that could reverse this trend. It thus prevented the "pacted" and peaceful transition to democracy that had taken place in Latin America and Southern Europe.[105] Third, by preventing political coalitions *across regional*

lines, the legacy of ethnofederalism blocked liberal politicians from obtaining positions of power. To counter nationalist political forces, liberals needed pan-Yugoslav coalitions that regional fragmentation prevented. Given the absence of loyalty to the center, the absence of incentives for ideological and regional coalitions, and the presence of ethnic resentments spurred by institutions of accountability and representation, the dominance of identity politics and its escalation to violence in Croatia and Bosnia were assured.

BANDWAGONING AND BALANCING

The first move in the slippery slope toward ethnic violence was taken in Kosovo. Smoldering beneath the surface there—and encouraged by increasing autonomy—had been a radical Albanian move for republican status or even secession. Ethnic violence began to escalate as Albanians assaulted Serbs and vandalized their property. In 1981 riots broke out in Priština University in which Albanian students called for more autonomy; the JNA was called to intervene. Legal rights were weakened as Albanian officials hesitated to charge Albanians with hate crimes.[106] Serbs and Montenegrins began to leave Kosovo by the thousands.

As Serbs continued to emigrate from Kosovo, economic hardship within Serbia deepened—partly as a result of the pressures of immigration. The immigration crisis, combined with the restriction of Serbia's influence at the federal level by Kosovo and Vojvodina, pushed Serb elites to assert republican power over federal law and institutions. To halt immigration, the Serbian LCY implemented a series of affirmative discrimination measures favoring Serbs who stayed in Kosovo. It provided automatic admission of Serb students to Priština University, regardless of their qualifications. It prohibited the sale of land and buildings by Serbs and Montenegrins to Albanians. It promised jobs, housing, and schooling for Serbs and Montenegrins returning to Kosovo, and it built factories for Serb workers.[107]

The Kosovo crisis was interpreted in terms of ethnic discrimination and privilege in the public debate; this interpretation opened the door for ethnic nationalist sentiments to be freely expressed. As is now well documented in all of the literature on the Yugoslav collapse, Slobodan Milošević—then head of the Serbian LCY—took up

the appeals for help from Serbs in Kosovo and supported them in order to enhance his own popularity. With a push from Milošević, the ethnic nationalist bandwagon began to roll: the demonstrations to protest Albanian discrimination against Serbs in Kosovo began with small groups of protesters from Kosovo but expanded to crowds numbering from 10,000 to as many as one million. Silber and Little report that Milošević's staff set up a company to provide the transportation and organize protests, bussing workers in from provincial factories to attend meetings and providing them with free food and drink.[108] With these incentives, the bandwagon quickly filled. Milošević used the Kosovo crisis and his growing popular support to stage an inner-party coup, replacing with his own party faction those liberals who had avoided taking a hard line against the Kosovo Albanians.[109] The party thus began to support a Serb nationalist policy. By the summer of 1990 the Serbian government had dissolved the Kosovo assembly and purged Albanians in government posts. It then reduced the status of the two autonomous provinces to "little more than municipalities."[110]

With the open expression of nationalism now politically acceptable in Serbia and with the federal pillars of Yugoslav integration crumbling, the costs of using provocative nationalist rhetoric and engaging in ethnic violence were lowered throughout the Yugoslav republics. Extremist appeals crowded out moderate political platforms. Voters did not give ethnic entrepreneurs majorities in multiparty elections, but electoral rules combined with the political machines created under ethnofederalism and with incentives to bandwagon and balance at the elite level as more nationalist parties captured political space to escalate exclusive nationalist conflicts.

Slovenia was the first republic to hold multiparty elections in April 1990. The DEMOS, an anti-Communist six-party coalition, won 53 percent of the vote and took control of the parliament. Milan Kučan, the former Communist leader, won the presidential race.[111] To balance what he saw as overwhelming Serb power at the federal level, Kučan had supported Albanian autonomy, publicly linking Albanian civil rights with the constitutional principle of territorial sovereignty and the right of secession. He portrayed Serbia as the enemy of Slovene democracy, as witnessed by its repression of Albanian rights, clearly heightening tensions between Serbia and Slovenia.[112]

Croatia was the next to hold multiparty elections. On 22 April 1990 the nationalist Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) won the most votes in a majoritarian election and controlled two-thirds of the seats in the parliament. The electoral system underrepresented minorities and produced a legislative majority from a mere plurality of votes. The representation of minority parties, opinions, cleavages, and ethnic groups was thus artificially diminished. With only 41.5 percent of the vote, the HDZ got 58 percent of the seats in parliament. The single-member constituency electoral system further ensured that small parties were weeded out of any position of power or influence.[113]

The parliamentary majority of the HDZ permitted Croatia's new president, Franjo Tudjman, to refuse minority rights to the 600,000-strong Serb population in Croatia, and the first constitution violated the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) principles on minority rights.[114] Serbs were expelled from jobs because of their nationality. In Dalmatia, Croat gangs, often aided by the police, firebombed homes, smashed storefronts, and arrested Serb leaders. Croatian Serbs responded by demanding their civil and nationality rights. These demands fell on deaf ears; the federal government was now too weak to protect them. They thus held an autonomy referendum and built roadblocks around their areas to prevent Croatian interference.[115] Croats living in mixed areas where Serbs began to mobilize saw this as Milošević's hand stretching into Croatia.[116] For Serbs in Croatia, these events gave credibility to the rising tone of nationalist rhetoric in Serbia. Local Serb leaders demanded that Serb-dominated territory be taken out of Croatia.[117] Autonomy demands escalated to violence.

Bosnia-Herzegovina was the last republic to hold multiparty elections in December. On the surface it appeared that the elections would bring a successful multiethnic government to power. Although the three nationalist parties won the most votes, each from their own national group, none of the nationalist platforms was belligerent or aggressive. Although the Muslim party, the SDA, was represented by Islamic symbolism, its platform was a pluralist one. The Serbian party, the SDS, led by Radovan Karadžić, campaigned on a nationalist platform calling for the defense of Serb rights. But the party's campaign did not call for the division of Bosnia. Thus those who voted for the SDA and the SDS were not voting for parti-

tion and war. Furthermore, unlike Croatia, Bosnia's electoral rules followed the system of proportional representation. The system provided a close proportion of seats to votes, so that no one political party was underrepresented. Muslims gained ninety-nine seats in the assembly, Croats gained forty-nine, and Serbs from the SDS and other parties gained eighty-five. These seats closely represented the percentages of the vote gained by each party. Izetbegović formed a grand coalition among the three major parties, and government posts were divided among them.

This coalition, however, turned out to be a coalition of convenience in that it was created merely to form a government and not to achieve lasting accommodation, moderation, and compromise among the three dominant national groups.[118] It quickly fell apart as Serbs began to declare large parts of the country "autonomous regions," and SDS members of the republican presidency began to boycott presidency meetings. By October 1991 the SDS had left the assembly, which then promptly voted for Bosnian sovereignty. Several days later Karadžić set up a Serb Federal Assembly in Banja Luka. When a referendum was held on Bosnian independence, Karadžić's SDS boycotted the election. On 26 April 1991 the Serbs of Bosnian Krajina created a separate assembly. Less than a year later, Serbs, Croats, and Muslims in Bosnia were at war.

Why did this happen? The Bosnian electoral system and government contained the key features of proportional representation and power-sharing that elsewhere have brought stable multiethnic governments to power in other divided societies.[119] The system of proportional representation with very close proportionality was constructed to be fair to all constituent groups. It encouraged a proliferation of political parties so that all interests could be represented. Indeed forty-one parties, including the LCY, socialists, and Marković's Alliance of Reformist Forces, took part in the electoral competition.

Part of the explanation for the political breakdown can be traced to the timing of the Bosnian election and the ethnic alliances that had formed between Serb nationalist political elites in Bosnia and Serbia and Croat nationalist elites in Bosnia and Croatia. Bosnia was a latecomer, the last republic to hold elections, and nationalist parties had formed and won elections throughout Yugoslavia. Ethnic tensions had escalated in Croatia, lowering the cost of jumping on

ethnic bandwagons in other republics. Nationalists were firmly in power in Serbia and Croatia. The success of Croat and Serb nationalists in their titular republics induced Bosnian politicians to pursue exclusive ethnic or religious nationalist strategies with the aid of their ethnic "brethren." Bosnian Muslims had been granted the status of nation and thus believed they were justified in holding power as a nation. Indeed as Izetbegović noted, political parties would be doomed if they did not provide a nationalist agenda. When ideological and pan-Yugoslav bandwagons were constructed, the ethnic bandwagons had already filled and there were few left to support the alternatives. Although other parties won thirty-two seats in the Bosnian assembly, the three nationalist parties gained votes almost directly proportional to individuals' choices of national identity in the 1981 census.[120] As noted above, the broader public did not support violent nationalist aims. But ethnofederalism had provided them with few alternatives to the ethnic nationalist parties, and these parties had crowded out other options.

Furthermore, ethnic alliances had formed across republican borders, bringing material and symbolic resources to the Serb and Croat parties. Malcolm reports that Milošević had arranged to deliver arms from Serbia to the Bosnian Serbs; Prime Minister Ante Marković released a tape recording of a conversation between Milošević and Karadžić confirming arms shipments. Karadžić reported to a British journalist that he and Milošević spoke on the phone several times a week.[121] Woodward reports that the most active wing of Croatia's HDZ was the western Herzegovina branch from Bosnia. Indeed in 1990 Croats in this area were granted dual citizenship with the right to vote in Croatian elections.[122]

In short, ethnofederalism had prepared the way for these bandwagoning effects to induce political entrepreneurs to play the ethnic card. Slovenia and Croatia had long been the strongest advocates of decentralization and republican autonomy. By the 1990 elections, political and economic resources were in the hands of their regional and exclusive nationalist politicians. Serbia had long been a supporter of centralization but was pressured by new accountability rules in the 1974 constitution to relinquish political control over its territory. This intensified ethnofederalism induced Serb politicians to drop their support of the federal government and take control of territories populated by majority nationalities. Where other titular

nationalities were making exclusive claims to territory, Bosnian Muslims also began to make territorial claims. The bandwagoning effect of exclusive national claims to territory reduced incentives for pan-Yugoslav coalitions and increased incentives for an escalation to violence.

THE ABSENCE OF IDEOLOGICAL AND REGIONAL COALITIONS

The exclusivity of nationalist parties in power prevented significant political coalitions across ideological and regional lines. With the rise of nationalism, claims on resources and territory were increasingly based on ethnicity and religion, and they were often incompatible. Ethnic discrimination and repression was so widespread that a spiral of mistrust emerged in the highest levels of government. In particular, Milošević's nationalist rhetoric was perceived by Croats and Slovenes as aggression against them.

Certainly there were explicit tradeoffs among elites at the federal level, but they entailed no compromises that would injure republican power and autonomy. Each tradeoff furthered national goals. For example, in his effort to end the autonomy of Kosovo and Vojvodina, Milošević made a deal with Slovenia's Kučan in the LCY Central Committee that he would approve all of Slovenia's amendments to the federal constitution if Slovenia would approve the changes that Serbia wanted with regard to Kosovo.

Woodward argues that although much of the population in Serbia favored political liberalization, liberal politicians could not counter nationalist opposition alone.[123] To further a liberal political program, they would have to gain support from liberals in other republics, particularly Croatia and Slovenia, where economic interests in Western-oriented liberal policies were most substantial. Recall, however, that liberals in those republics were strongly antifederalist, increasingly nationalist, and mistrusting of Serbs.

With bandwagoning and balancing effects in full swing; with nationalist parties backed by ethnic machines in power in Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia; and with strong secessionist impulses in Slovenia, chances of coalitions that had historically bridged ethnic and religious differences were nil. The important exception to this process in 1990 and 1991 was Macedonia. There ethnofederalism had

not provided particular ethnic groups with territorial autonomy. Ethnic entrepreneurs did not have enough resources to successfully play the ethnic card. Proportional representation brought a coalition government to power willing to compromise. That government undermined the political power of ethnic nationalist elites and constructed inclusive rather than exclusive political institutions. It is to a brief description of this exceptional case that the discussion now turns.

MACEDONIA AS THE EXCEPTION

By all important indicators, Macedonia, like Croatia and Bosnia, should have erupted in ethnic violence. Of course the Serb and Croat population in Macedonia was small, and Macedonia was much less important in Serb nationalist mythology than Kosovo. But the Albanian minority there had long suffered institutional and social discrimination. In 1989, following Serbia's lead, Macedonia eliminated all the clauses from the republican constitution that protected Albanian and Turkish minorities. Cultural autonomy had never been granted for Albanians, and Albanians were effectively barred from government employment.[124] The VMRO, the radical nationalist party, received the most votes of any party in the 1990 election (although, like the HDZ, it did not receive a majority). Like Bosnia, Macedonia held elections late in the year, after ethnic nationalist parties had formed in other republics.

Why then did Macedonia not follow the lead of Croatia and Bosnia and erupt in ethnic violence? The lessons of this study provide a partial answer. First, as one of the most underdeveloped republics, Macedonia's political elite had always supported a strong central government and had no reason to stop its support. Growing ethnofederalism that had benefited the richer republics by providing them with autonomy and relieved them of transfer payments to the poorer regions had only harmed Macedonia. Macedonia's leaders had been schooled in a long tradition of political compromise to maintain the center, and Communist-era leaders held centrist views for which they were renowned after communism fell.[125] Gligorov had even joined with Bosnia's Izetbegović to present the idea of a loose federation that would save Yugoslavia.

But a history of commitment to the federal center was not enough to prevent the outbreak of violence. Indeed Bosnia's political role in the federation was that of a supporter of central institutions. A political structure that provided incentives for compromise was also required to prevent a bellicose and strident nationalist agenda from dominating politics. In addition to having a strong commitment to the center, Macedonia's 1990 electoral rules, like Bosnia's, provided for proportional representation. The December 1990 elections witnessed the emergence of twenty parties for electoral competition, with six of them entering parliament. With 32 percent of the vote and a similar percentage of seats, the VMRO was the strongest party but could not form a government alone. Its exclusivist claims prevented it from entering into political coalitions. Instead Albanian party leaders joined with the centrists and former communists to exclude the VMRO from government. The government then constructed a constitution that granted all ethnic groups full citizenship rights.[126] The new president, Kiro Gligorov, a former leading Communist, made no irredentist claims vis-à-vis neighboring Greece, although he reluctantly supported Macedonian autonomy.[127] No alliances were created between Macedonian parties and ethnic nationalist parties in Serbia and Croatia.

This brief comparison is only suggestive. But what it suggests is that cultural conflict was muted in Macedonia because ethnofederalism there was weak and thus coalitions could form. Ethnofederalism was weak for two reasons. First, the Albanian minority did not identify as "Muslim" when Muslims were elevated to the status of nation. Pressure for that enhanced status had come exclusively from the Bosnian Muslims; Albanians clung to their original status as a nationality. The 1961 census allowed people to call themselves "Muslim in the ethnic sense," but the Albanian minority was already "Albanian in the ethnic sense." This meaning carried over into the 1971 census as well, even though the phrase "in the ethnic sense" was dropped. Second, the Albanian minority never received its own territory like it did in Kosovo. Thus there was no historical legitimacy to a territorial claim that could incite a backlash on the part of other groups and ignite the escalation effects of identity politics.

Under the condition of this weak ethnofederal legacy, the electoral system was able to encourage coalitions and prevent the extreme nationalist party from coming to power. Like the HDZ in

Croatia, the VMRO had gained a plurality of the votes. But unlike in Croatia, proportional representation prevented the conversion of this electoral plurality to a parliamentary majority. It thus prevented the VMRO from forming a government. And because ethnofederalism was weak, a coalition that induced moderation, accommodation, and compromise could form.

Certainly undercurrents of conflict persist. The Albanian minority is growing; some analysts argue that Albanians comprise 40 percent of the population, and Macedonian nationalists perceive Albanian population growth as a political threat.[128] Albanian radicals threaten violence if minority rights are not reinstated.[129] An assassination attempt on Gligorov in October 1995 left him seriously injured, tragically ending his political career. Without Gligorov's political strength and consistent pursuit of moderate policies, the future is uncertain. Since 1992 potential conflict has been prevented by 400 U.S. troops in Macedonia under UN command.

Despite the uncertainties, the initial peaceful transition of Macedonia to autonomy and to a fragile democracy reinforces the central lesson of this essay: political institutions matter to the outbreak and prevention of cultural violence. Political institutions shape the motivations of politicians who have the power to stir up or attenuate ethnic resentments in the population at large. Even more important, institutions shape political culture. In the former Yugoslavia, the West should work to get the institutions right so that a new political culture can grow there, one that exhibits cultural tolerance and respects cultural diversity. Only then can future cultural conflicts be prevented. I conclude with an elaboration of this policy prescription.

POLICY PRESCRIPTIONS

If the West is to have an influence on the future of the five new states of the ex-Yugoslavia, a clear understanding of the roots of the war there is essential. Policy prescriptions attempt to eradicate initial causes and punish the perpetrators. If causal beliefs are faulty, policies will be flawed and ultimately ineffective. The predominance of essentialist beliefs in the causes of this conflict initially led to policies

of inaction on the part of the West. Early in the war, NATO documents suggested that the very primordial nature of "ethnic conflicts" in Yugoslavia meant that war was inevitable in this region of mixed populations and that war aims would be limited to the ethnic groups involved.[130] Throughout the conflict, this perception of the war's origins weakened any enthusiasm for either independent military action or the initiation of collective security measures to halt the conflict. A belief in instrumental accounts led some Western powers to blame the conflict on one or the other of the warring parties and then to pursue policies that sought to punish the perpetrator of "aggression." Germany's belief in instrumental accounts that blamed Serb aggression led to its support of Croatia. That support aggravated the conflict and fueled its spread to Bosnia.[131] International explanations lead to policies that treat the perpetrators as victims and avoid policies that would provide incentives for domestic actors to take responsibility for avoiding conflict. In short, because all three of the dominant schools of explanation for the war are flawed, they have led to flawed and ineffective policies on the part of the West.

This essay has argued that political institutions are essential in both fostering and attenuating cultural conflict. Sadly, however, the Dayton accords produced political institutions in Bosnia that replicated those features of the Yugoslav constitution that encouraged ethnic rivalry and weakened the central government. Like Yugoslavia, Bosnia is constructed as a "noncentralized federation," composed of two separate entities, the Republika Srpska and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, a federation of Bosnians and Croats within the larger Federation of Bosnia. The constitution of the Republika Srpska allows it to enter into an "association" with Serbia, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina can enter into an association with Croatia. Bosnia is thus partitioned into ethnic regions, and the Croats and Serbs each have powerful patrons.

The central government is constructed to be weak and ineffective. It takes many of its institutional features from Tito's Yugoslavia and the 1974 constitution. The constitution provides for a parliamentary assembly constructed of two houses, a House of Representatives and a House of Peoples, similar to the Chamber of Nationalities.[132] All decisions in each chamber are made by a majority of those present and voting. Robert Hayden argues that constitutional provisions make it possible for Croat and Muslim members of the House

of Representatives to assemble without the Serb members, declare themselves a quorum, and pass valid legislation. The constitution further specifies, however, that in the House of Peoples a quorum consists of nine members and must include three Serbs, three Muslims, and three Croats. No legislation can be passed if one group boycotts the House of Peoples. This means that legislation can be blocked by absenteeism. Like the federal presidency created in the 1974 constitution, the Bosnian presidency consists of three members, a Serb, a Croat, and a Muslim, with a rotating chair.

If the argument of this essay holds, then Western policy should be directed toward the construction of more viable institutions than those that have been constructed in Bosnia. The story told here warns that federal systems in multiethnic states must create a strong center if they are to survive. They must be strong enough to protect and maintain the rule of law and civil and political rights, and their governments must be committed to those rights. Institutions of the presidency and parliament must be constructed so that stalemates do not repeatedly occur and in which only negative majorities—able to veto decisions but unable to take positive action—do not dominate.

Strong federations can be created that do not fragment political life. Alternative institutional channels can be constructed to ensure that social cleavages will be cross-cutting and not reinforcing. The institution of market rationality can reduce the influence of patronage networks. Institutions can be created that both depoliticize and respect cultural identity. These kinds of institutions must form the basis of the post-Yugoslav states if the incentives for intercultural cooperation are to outweigh the incentives for cultural conflict.

NOTES

1. While many analysts mention institutional factors, none have presented a systematic institutional explanation. Aleksa Djilas, for example, writes that "the Party failed to establish a stable federal system that could have institutionalized and regulated relations among national groups" ("Fear Thy Neighbor: The Breakup of Yugoslavia," in *Nationalism and Nationalities in*

the New Europe, ed. Charles Kupchan (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), p. 89.

2. See for example, Edward W. Walker, "The Dog That Didn't Bark: Tartarstan and Symmetrical Federalism in Russia" (Berkeley, 1995); unpublished manuscript.

3. President Clinton made reference to "ancient hatreds" in his inaugural address, reprinted in the *New York Times,* 21 January 1993, p. A15. Laura Silber and Allen Little claim that foreign ministers from the European Community, sent to Yugoslavia in 1991 to resolve the crisis, often alluded to the "Balkan temperament, a south Slavic predisposition—either cultural or genetic—toward fratricide" (*Yugoslavia: Death of a Nation* [New York: TV Books, 1996], p. 159). John Mearsheimer and Robert Pape have suggested that because Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Muslims could *never* get along, it was better that they be separated ("The Answer," *New Republic,* 14 June 1993, pp. 22, 25, 28). Other examples include Vladimir Gligorov: "What If They Will Not Give Up? Civil War in the Former Yugoslavia," *East European Politics and Societies* 9, 3 (Fall 1995): 499–513, and "Balkanization: A Theory of Constitutional Failure," *East European Politics and Societies* 6, 3 (Fall 1992): 283–302; Cvijeto Job, "Yugoslavia's Ethnic Furies," *Foreign Policy,* no. 92 (Fall 1993): 52–75; Heidi Hobbs, "Whither Yugoslavia? The Death of a Nation," *Studies on Conflict and Terrorism* 16, 3 (July–September 1993): 187–200; Peter Vodopivec, "Slovenes and Yugoslavia, 1918–1991," *East European Politics and Societies* 6, 3 (Fall 1992): 220–42; Robert Kaplan, *Balkan Ghosts: A Journey through History* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993).

4. See the critique of the essentialist school in Lawrence R. Robertson, "Ethnic Minorities, Indigenization, Migration, and Conflict Contagion in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union"; paper prepared for annual meeting of American Political Science Association, Chicago, 31 August–3 September 1995, pp. 4–6.

5. Djilas, "Fear Thy Neighbor," pp. 86–87.

6. Susan Woodward cites a 1991 report by Silvano Bolǎć claiming that 3 million people in Yugoslavia (in a population of 22 million) were products of ethnically mixed marriages or were married to someone of a different ethnicity (*Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War* [Washington, D.C.: Brookings, 1995], p. 36, n. 32). See also Ivan Simonović, "Socialism, Federalism, and Ethnic Identity," in *Yugoslavia: A Fractured Federalism,* ed. Dennison Rusinow, pp. 50–51 (Washington, D.C.: Wilson Center Press, 1988).

7. The 1981 census indicated that the fastest growing nationality in Yugoslavia were the Albanians because of consistently higher population growth rates, low mortality rates, and a weaker tendency for mixed marriages. Those identifying themselves as Albanians increased 230.6 percent between 1948 and 1981. The next fastest growing group were those who defined themselves as Yugoslavs, approximately 1.2 million people, or 5.4 percent of the total population. This number was five times as high as that of the 1971

poll. In the mid-1980s, 15 percent of the youth defined themselves as Yugoslavs, and 36 percent of the surveyed youth declared that they preferred it to any other ethnic classification. Yugoslav identity rose in some areas from 0 to 10 percent and in some areas to more than 25 percent, indicating a remarkable assertion of shared political identity (see Steven Burg and Michael Berbaum, "Community, Integration, and Stability in Multinational Yugoslavia," *American Political Science Review* 83, 2 [1986]: 535–36). In Bosnia the declaration of national identification as Yugoslav jumped from 1 percent to 9 percent of the total population between 1971 and 1984 (see Pedro Ramet, *Nationalism and Federalism in Yugoslavia, 1963–1983* [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984], p. 149).

8. When Slobodan Milošević took it over, the Belgrade Communist Party organization had been the most liberal in all of Yugoslavia (see Woodward, pp. 93 and 97).
9. Reported in the *Wall Street Journal*, 17 July 1996, p. 1.
10. Mike O'Connor, "Violence Flares as Bosnians Try to Regain Prewar Homes," *New York Times,* 22 April 1996, p. A3.
11. See Aleksa Djilas, "The Breakup of Yugoslavia," *Foreign Affairs* 72, 3 (Summer 1993): 86–88.
12. For historical literature, see, for example, M.D. Stojanović, *The Great Powers and the Balkans, 1875–1878* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968); Charles and Barbara Jelavich, *The Establishment of Balkan National States 1804–1920* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977); and M. S. Anderson, *The Eastern Question 1774–1923* (London: Macmillan, 1966). Current international explanations include Simon Nuttall, "The EC and Yugoslavia: Deus ex Machina or Machina sine Deo?" *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32, 3 (September 1994): 11–26; David Rieff, *Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994); Mark Almond, *Europe's Backyard War: The War in the Balkans* (London: Mandarin Press, 1994); Stevan Pavlowitch, "Who Is Balkanizing Whom? The Misunderstandings between the Debris of Yugoslavia and an Unprepared West," *Daedalus* 123, 2 (Spring 1994): 203–24; Christopher Cviić, "Who's to Blame for the War in Ex-Yugoslavia?" *World Affairs* 156, 2 (Fall 1993): 72–80; Rosalyn Higgins, "The New United Nations and Former Yugoslavia" *International Affairs* 69, 3 (July 1993): 465–84; Woodward; and Paula Lytle, "U.S. Policy toward the Demise of Yugoslavia: The Virus of Nationalism," *East European Politics and Societies* 6, 3 (Fall 1993): 303–18.
13. See John Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *International Security* 15 (Summer 1990).
14. This geopolitical argument is made by Pierre M. Gallois, "Vers une prédominance allemande" (Toward a German predominance), *Le Monde,* 16 July 1993, p. 1; cited in Wolfgang Krieger, "Toward a Gaullist Germany," *World Policy Journal* (Spring 1994): 26–38. This view has become conventional wisdom in much of the academic literature as well. See, for example, Djilas: "Germany pressed for recognition partly because it was well aware

that historical ties and proximity would entitle it to considerable influence in an independent Croatia and Slovenia" ("The Breakup of Yugoslavia," p. 97).

15. See Eberhard Rondholz, "Deutsche Erblasten im jugoslawischen Buergerkrieg" (The burden of German history in the Yugoslav civil war), *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik* (Journal of German and international politics) 37 (July 1992): 829–38. For a more detailed discussion and critique of these claims, see Beverly Crawford, "Explaining Defection from International Cooperation: Germany's Unilateral Recognition of Croatia," *World Politics* 48, 4 (July 1996): 482–521.

16. This time it was not the danger of a wider war resulting from opposing alliances, but rather the danger of heightened political tension—clearly suggested by Germany's partisan response to the initial crisis. That tension, it was believed, would undermine multilateral security and conflict-resolution institutions which were under intense scrutiny in the post-cold-war period. For a detailed account of international cooperation in the war, see Beverly Crawford, "An Empty Nest: Reconciling European Security Institutions in the Bosnian Crisis," in *Crafting International Institutions: Bargaining, Linkages, and Nesting*, ed. Vinod K. Aggarwal (forthcoming).

17. This is certainly the most popular explanation in the literature. Examples are too numerous to provide a complete list here. They include Djilas, "The Breakup of Yugoslavia"; Sumantra Bose, "State Crises and Nationalities Conflict in Sri Lanka and Yugoslavia," *Comparative Political Studies* 28, 1 (April 1995): 87–117; Warren Zimmerman, "The Last Ambassador: A Memoir of the Collapse of Yugoslavia," *Foreign Affairs* 74, 2 (March–April 1995): 2–21; Bette Denich, "Dismembering Yugoslavia: Nationalist Ideologies and the Symbolic Revival of Genocide," *American Ethnologist* 21, 2 (May 1994): 367–94; Milica Bookman, "War and Peace: The Divergent Breakups of Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia," *Journal of Peace Research* 31, 2 (May 1994): 175–88; Bogdan Denitch, *Ethnic Nationalism: The Tragic Death of Yugoslavia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Obrad Kešić, "Serbia: The Politics of Fear," *Current History* 92, 577 (November 1993): 376–81; Vesna Pešić, "A Country by Any Other Name: Transition and Stability," *East European Politics and Societies* 6, 3 (Fall 1992): 242–60; Anton Bebler, "Yugoslavia's Variety of Communist Federalism and Her Demise," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 26, 1 (March 1993): 72–87; Juan Linz and Alfred Stepan, "Political Identities and Electoral Sequences: Spain, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia," *Daedalus* 121, 2 (Spring 1992): 123–40; Ivo Banac, "The Fearful Assymetry of War: The Causes and Consequences of Yugoslavia's Demise," *Daedalus* 121, 2 (Spring 1992): 141–75; V. P. Gagnon: "Serbia's Road to Democracy," *Journal of Democracy* 5, 2 (April 1994): 117–31; and "Ethnic Nationalism and International Conflict: The Case of Yugoslavia," *International Security* 19, 3 (Winter 1991): 130–67; Branka Magaš, *Destruction of Yugoslavia* (London: Verso, 1993).

18. Silber and Little (esp. p. 33), for example, trace the causes of war to nationalist Serbian intellectuals who exploited nationalist sentiments among the

Serbs and primarily to Slobodan Milošević and his ability to tap those heightened sentiments and destroy federal institutions in his drive for political power. See also Djilas, "Fear Thy Neighbor," pp. 85–121.

19. Barry Posen argues that "power differentials among competing groups may create incentives for preventive expropriation, which can generate a spiral of action and reaction." He applies this logic to an explanation for initial Serbian offensives in the outbreak of war (see "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," *Survival* 35, 1 [Spring 1993]: 27–47; quote is on p. 34). His argument is structural rather than instrumental.

20. See Dennison Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy and the 'National Question,'" in *Yugoslavia in the 1980s,* ed. Pedro Ramet (Boulder: Westview, 1985), p. 134.

21. Denitch, pp. 136–37.

22. Rogers Brubaker describes a triangular configuration of strategic interdependence between the decisions of elites in the Croatian "nationalizing state," local elites of the Serb "national minority" in Croatia, and elites in the Serb "homeland" that stimulated logic described here as bandwagoning and balancing. The strategic interdependence and interactive dynamic that shaped elite decisions to escalate identity politics to violence that Brubaker describes goes beyond ethnic alliances, and his framework argues for the importance of this triangular relationship between a nationalizing state, national minorities in that state, and the external national "homelands" to which they belong in stimulating and escalating violence. His account combines both timing and ethnic alliances in an explanation in which both are dependent upon this triangular relationship (see "National Minorities, Nationalizing States, and External Homelands in the New Europe," *Daedalus,* Spring 1995, pp. 107–32).

23. E. E. Schattschneider, *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960).

24. Alex N. Dragnich, *Serbs and Croats: The Struggle in Yugoslavia* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992), p. 46. Stevan K. Pavlowitch argues that the similarities and common interests of the Yugoslavs were strong enough to give birth to a Yugoslav movement, to overcome the obstacles that had molded them into several distinct historic entities and to lead them to a common solution of their existential problems (see *The Improbable Survivor: Yugoslavia and Its Problems 1918–1988* [London: C. Hurst: 1988).

25. See Pavlowitch, *The Improbable Survivor*; Alex N. Dragnich, *The First Yugoslavia* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1983); Peter Jambrek, *Development and Social Change in Yugoslavia* (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975); Dusko Doder, "Yugoslavia: New War, Old Hatreds," *Foreign Policy,* Summer 1993.

26. See Vojislav Kostunica, "The Constitution and the Federal States," in Rusinow, ed., pp. 78–79. The distinction between centralized and noncentralized federalism comes from William Riker, "Federalism," in *Handbook of Political Science,* ed. Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1975), vol. 5, pp. 93–172.

27. Dennison Rusinow goes so far as to argue that Yugoslavia's early postwar institutional system was a virtual carbon copy of the Soviet "solution" to the national question (see "Nationalities Policy," pp. 133–65). Susan Woodward (p. 30) agrees.
28. Vesna Pešić, "Serbian Nationalism and the Origins of the Yugoslav Crisis," *Peaceworks,* no. 8 (Washington: D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace, 1996), p. 10.
29. Susan Bridge, "Some Causes of Political Change in Modern Yugoslavia," in *Ethnic Conflict in the Western World,* ed. Milton J. Esman (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 345–47.
30. Woodward, p. 37.
31. See, for example, Pešić, "Serbian Nationalism"; Banac, p. 145.
32. As discussed in Dijana Pleština, *Regional Development in Communist Yugoslavia: Success, Failure, and Consequences* (Boulder: Westview, 1992), in an interview with Milić, Institute of Agricultural Economics (Belgrade, 1983), p. 46.
33. See Maria N. Todorova, "Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Communist Legacy in Eastern Europe," *East European Politics and Societies* 7, 1: 135–55.
34. Because of its collaboration with the Ustaša in Croatia and Bosnia, the Catholic Church was treated most harshly. The Orthodox Church too was suppressed, and Islam was treated with particular harshness (see Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History* [New York: New York University Press, 1994], pp. 194–95).
35. Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy," p. 135.
36. Woodward, p. 37.
37. Bridge, p. 347.
38. *Ibid.,* p. 358.
39. See *ibid.,* pp. 348–49; Malcolm, pp. 210–11.
40. See Robert Hayden, *The Beginning of the End of Federal Yugoslavia: The Slovenian Amendment Crisis of 1989* (Pittsburgh: Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh, 1992), p. 7; Carl Beck Papers, No. 1001.
41. Malcolm, p. 222.
42. Steven Burg, *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 26.
43. Wolfgang Hoepken, "Party Monopoly and Political Change: The League of Communists since Tito's Death," in Ramet, ed., pp. 29–30. The primary source on the 1965 economic reform is Ellen Comisso, *Workers' Control between Plan and Market* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), pp. 115–68.
44. See Bridge, p. 350.

45. The proportion of agricultural workers in Yugoslavia shrank from 67.2 percent in 1948 to 28.8 percent in 1981, a rapid change when compared to the United States, where it took three times as long to achieve a similar result. In Japan it took seventy-three years to move from 76 percent in 1887 to 33 percent in 1960 (see Gregor Tomc, "Classes, Party Elites, and Ethnic Groups," in Rusinow, ed.; see also Comisso, pp. 165–77). State policies of discrimination against the rural sector were not unique to federal Yugoslavia. Peasants were heavily taxed under the first Yugoslav state, and few resources were invested in improving agriculture (see Djilas, "The Breakup of Yugoslavia," p. 88).
46. Woodward, p. 44.
47. See Bridge, p. 355. It should be noted that these reformers were not liberal democrats. At most they wanted to increase the autonomy of other organizations and institutions in society outside of the party, but they stopped far short of calling for an abrogation of the LCY's power or its division (see April Carter, *Democratic Reform in Yugoslavia* [London: Francis Pinter, 1982], p. 245).
48. See, for example, Dennison I. Rusinow, *Crisis in Croatia: Part I;* American Universities Field Staff Report, Southeast Europe Series 19, 4 (1973); Bridge, pp. 363–64;
49. Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy," pp. 156–57. Rusinow quotes Steven L. Burg, "Yugoslavia in Crisis" (September 1984), unpublished manuscript, pp. 30ff.
50. For this argument, see Beverly Crawford, "Post-Communist Political Economy: A Framework for the Analysis of Reform," in *Markets, States, and Democracy: The Political Economy of Post-Communist Transformation,* ed. Beverly Crawford (Boulder: Westview, 1995), pp. 3–42.
51. The main source of center-directed developed republic (DR) funds went through the federal fund for the accelerated development of the insufficiently developed republics and the autonomous province of Kosovo. It was primarily an income redistribution mechanism that drew its funds from a percentage levy on the income of the developed republics and sent it down south in the form of monetary aid for infrastructural programs. There were also the payment in kind funds that were primarily commodities that were given in lieu of money.
52. See Bridge, p. 355.
53. Egon Neuberger, *The Impact of External Economic Disturbances on Yugoslavia: Theoretical and Empirical Explanations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978).
54. Bridge, p. 355.
55. See Pleština, *Regional Development,* p. 89, and Bruce McFarlane, *Yugoslavia: Politics, Economics, and Society* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1988), p. 131.
56. Burg and Berbaum, p. 547.
57. Cited in Malcolm, p. 207, and Pešić, *Serbian Nationalism,* p. 19.

58. Bridge, p. 351.
59. Silber and Little, p. 148.
60. Bridge, p. 354.
61. Rusinow "Nationalities Policy," pp. 140–41.
62. *Ibid.,* pp. 141–42.
63. From Burg, *Conflict and Cohesion,* p. 26, and Bridge, pp. 350–51. See also Joze Mencinger, "From a Capitalist to a Capitalist Economy?" in *Yugoslavia in Turmoil: After Self-Management?,* ed. James Simmie and Joze Dekleva (London: Pinter Publishers, 1991), p. 73; R. Bičanić "Economic Growth under Centralized and Decentralized Planning: Yugoslavia, A Case Study," *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 5: 63–74; and Dennison Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment: 1948–1974* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), p. 71.
64. Pavlowitch, *The Improbable Survivor,* p. 25. See also Comisso.
65. Comisso writes that prior to 1965 the importance of the commune in the local economy derived from its position as the lowest unit of the national plan. With the decline in federal planning, the commune became less important.
66. See Anton Vratuša, "The System of Self-Management," in *Yugoslavia in the Age of Democracy,* ed. George Macesich (London: Praeger, 1992), p. 125; and Jim Seroka and Radoš Smiljković *Political Organizations in Socialist Yugoslavia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986), p. 83.
67. Bridge, p. 356.
68. See Malcolm, p. 199.
69. Bridge, p. 360.
70. Comisso, pp. 115–68, is the primary source for this material. See also Paul Shoup, *Yugoslav Communism and the National Question* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), pp. 228 and 246.
71. Comisso (*Workers' Control between Plan and Market*) states that the central General Investment Fund was formally abolished in 1963; in its place, a smaller Fund for Development, into which all enterprises paid a small contribution, was set up as a compromise measure to continue a reduced volume of capital transfers to the underdeveloped republics and provinces. The decision to use the market as the basic coordinator of economic life was more a decision by default than an act of positive policymaking. Investment planning was abandoned because political leaders could no longer agree on investment priorities and on who should do the planning; political restrictions on the operation of the market were cut because consensus was lacking on how the market should be restricted and to what extent it could be. See also David A. Dyker, *Yugoslavia: Socialism, Development, and Debt* (London: Routledge Press, 1990).

72. Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy"; Djilas, "Fear Thy Neighbor"; Stojan Bulat, "Foreign Capital, Private Property, and the Firm," in Macesich, ed., p. 139; Dyker, pp. 85–89; Burg, *Conflict and Cohesion*, p. 241; Seroka and Smiljković, p. 219; Zagorka Golubović, "Characteristics, Limits, and Perspectives of Self-Government: A Critical Reassessment," in Simmie and Dekleva, eds., p. 41.
73. Previous constitutions of 1946, 1953, and 1963 did not provide for the unanimous consent of the federal units' legislatures on constitutional amendments. To amend the constitution, a qualified majority in the federal legislative assembly was considered sufficient without any kind of consent by the federal units' legislatures.
74. In the case of an emergency, when the parliament and the cabinet could not agree, the collective presidency of the six republics and the two provinces had to reach a unanimous decision (see Steven Burg, ed., *Yugoslavia after Tito* [Washington, D.C.: Kennan Institute, 1982], p. 19. No. 157).
75. Kostunica, p. 81.
76. Harold Lydall, *Yugoslavia in Crisis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), pp. 21–22.
77. For a more detailed discussion of the economic problems resulting from decentralization of credit allocation, foreign exchange, and enterprise control and planning, see Donald Green, "The Outlook for Yugoslavia's Foreign Trade and External Debt in the 1980s," in Burg, ed., p. 47; Laura Tyson, "Can Titoism Survive Tito? Economic Problems and Policy Choices Confronting Tito's Successors," in Ramet, ed., p. 184; Fred Singleton and Bernard Carter, *The Economy of Yugoslavia* (London: Croom Helm, 1982).
78. Bičanić, pp. 120–41.
79. Dyker, pp. 74–75.
80. Tomc, pp. 58–77.
81. See Comisso, pp. 115–68, and Lydall, pp. 24–25.
82. *Ibid.,* pp. 24–25.
83. Woodward, pp. 64 and 73.
84. Bridge, p. 351.
85. Tomc, p. 71.
86. Lenard Cohen, *Broken Bonds: The Disintegration of Yugoslavia* (Boulder: Westview, 1993), p. 33. See also Hoepkin, p. 37; Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy," pp. 136–37; and Burg and Berbaum, p. 538.
87. Bridge, pp. 351–52.
88. Woodward, p. 69.
89. Robin Allison Remington, "Political Military Relations in Post-Tito Yugoslavia," in Ramet, ed.
90. Woodward, pp. 89–90.

91. Aleksa Djilas, "A Profile of Slobodan Milošević," *Foreign Affairs* 72, 3 (Summer 1993): 91.
92. Silber and Little, p. 215.
93. Bridge, p. 350.
94. Pavlowitch, *The Improbable Survivor*, p. 25.
95. Joel Dirlam and James Plummer, *An Introduction to the Yugoslav Economy* (Columbus: C. E. Merrill, 1973).
96. Comisso, pp. 115–68.
97. Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy," p. 143.
98. Woodward, p. 56.
99. At this time, Croatian nationalist movements were centered around the traditional Catholic cultural organization Hrvatska Matica, a group that advocated cultural separatism. Among the demands made by the students was a separate Croatian membership in the United Nations (see Djilas, "The Breakup of Yugoslavia," p. 90). This demand worried Tito the most; he believed that if Croatia had a separate seat, it would ally with the Soviet Union against him.
100. Bridge (p. 364) reports that Vladimir Barkarić who had dominated Croatian politics for a generation and who remained in power after 1971, was a liberal who never questioned the value of the Yugoslav federation.
101. See Djilas, "The Breakup of Yugoslavia," p. 89.
102. Rusinow, "Nationalities Policy," p. 143, and Hoepkin, pp. 38–42.
103. Djilas, "A Profile of Slobodan Milošević," p. 82.
104. Silber and Little, p. 63.
105. The literature on these transitions is vast. Examples include the following: Philippe C. Schmitter with Terry Lynn Karl, "The Conceptual Travels of Transitologists and Consolidologists: How Far East Should They Go?" *Slavic Review* 53, 1 (Spring, 1994): 173–85; Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Karen Remmer, "Democracy and Economic Crises: The Latin American Experience," *World Politics* 42, 3 (Spring 1990); Terry Karl and Philippe C. Schmitter, "The Types of Democracy Emerging in Southern and Eastern Europe and South and Central America," in *Bound to Change: Consolidating Democracy in Central Europe,* ed. Peter Volten (New York: Institute for East-West Security Studies, 1992), pp. 42–68.
106. Sabrina Ramet, "The Albanians of Kosovo: The Potential for Destabilization," *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 3, 1 (Winter/Spring 1996).
107. Lydall, pp. 208–12.
108. Silber and Little, p. 63. Woodward reports that the demonstrators were often paid by their employers to attend but increasingly came from among the unemployed, who needed a handout or had nothing else to do.

109. Woodward; Djilas, "A Profile of Slobodan Milošević," p. 90.
110. Woodward, pp. 120–21.
111. The source for this material is Djilas "Fear Thy Neighbor," pp. 92–93, and Woodward, pp. 117–32.
112. *Ibid.*
113. Silber and Little, p. 90.
114. The constitution gave the president broad emergency powers; there is little separation of powers and horizontal accountability in the government. The judiciary lacks independence; its appointments and dismissals are controlled by the parliament and there is little freedom of the press. Dijana Pleština argues that the concentration of political power has given rise to a new elite of party-state functionaries "whose major decisions are made outside the proper government sphere." The constitution further states that only those of Croatian ethnicity can be citizens of Croatia, whether they live there or not. Members of other ethnic groups are not accorded the same rights of citizenship (see Dijana Pleština, "Politics, Economics, and War: Problems of Transition in Croatia" [Berkeley: Center for German and European Studies, 1993]; working paper 5.15; and Robert Hayden, "Constitutional Nationalism in the Formerly Yugoslav Republics" [Berkeley: Center for German and European Studies, 1992, working paper 5.2]).
115. Woodward; Posen, p. 37.
116. Woodward, pp. 107–8.
117. The best blow-by-blow account is Misha Glenny, *The Fall of Yugoslavia: The Third Balkan War* (London: Penguin Books, 1992). See also Woodward, pp. 102–3; Djilas, "Fear Thy Neighbor," pp. 92–94; and Sabrina Ramet, *Balkan Babel: Politics, Culture, and Religion in Yugoslavia* (Boulder: Westview, 1992), pp. 27–43.
118. On coalitions of convenience, see Donald Horowitz, *A Democratic South Africa? Constitutional Engineering in a Divided Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), pp. 170ff.
119. The most important work on this subject has been done by Arend Lijphart. See *Democracy in Plural Societies* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977), and *Power-Sharing in South Africa* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1985).
120. The SDA, 33 percent, the SDS, 29.6 percent, and the HDZ, 18.3 percent (Woodward, p. 122).
121. Malcolm, p. 225.
122. Woodward, pp. 230–31.
123. The above material is from *ibid.*, p. 97.
124. As of 1994, very few classes in Macedonian schools were taught in Albanian, even in areas where they are in the majority. Less than 5 percent

of government employees were Albanian. A new law requiring and enforcing Cyrillic-only script in public was used to close down Albanian-owned businesses. Gypsies remained ostracized and marginalized from the Macedonian mainstream (see Hanna Rosin, "Greek Pique: Why We Flip-Flopped on Macedonia," *New Republic* 210, 24 [13 June 1994]: 12; Amanda Sebetsyen, "Walking the Tightrope in the Balkans," *New Statesman and Society* 7, 319 [9 September 1994]: 22–23).

125. Cohen, pp. 150–51.

126. The constitution granted citizenship to residents that had been there for at least fifteen years. This meant that minorities could be citizens, but still citizenship was denied to thousands of Albanians that had emigrated to the area from Kosovo in order to avoid Serb oppression and the thousands of Bosnian Muslims that fled their homes (Janice Broun, "Worse Yet to Come? Kosovo and Macedonia," *Commonweal* 120, 2 [29 January 1993]: 4).

127. In 1994 Greece imposed an embargo on Macedonia to protest the use of "Macedonia" as the state's name and to protest the flag, which used Greek symbolism. In September 1995, to stop the embargo an agreement was reached in which the Macedonian government adopted a new flag.

128. Interview with VMRO officials, April 1994. See also Paul Mosjes, "Travels in the Balkans: Tensions and Aspirations in Macedonia," *Christian Century* 111, 16 (11 June 1994): 500.

129. Menduh Thaqi, the most vocal and radical leader of the Albanian party, has threatened a campaign of civil disobedience if positive minority rights are not granted to the Albanian minority. Following the example of Serbs in Bosnia, he has threatened that the Albanians would establish their own political structures, including an Albanian assembly (see Rosin, "Greek Pique," p. 12).

130. See NATO Press Service, press communiques M-1 (91) 42, 6 June 1991; M-2 (91) 60, 21 August 1991; S-1 (91) 86, 8 November 1991. See also Hans Binnendijk, "NATO Can't Be Vague about Commitment to Eastern Europe," *International Herald Tribune,* 8 November 1991; James Eberle, "Defence without an Enemy," *The Guardian,* 8 November 1991. For later statements to the same effect with regard to the war in Bosnia, see "Die NATO wird nicht nach Osten ausgeweitet" (NATO will not extend to the East), *Die Welt,* 31 January 1992, p. 1; and "NATO Could Supply Europe's Peacemaking Force," *International Herald Tribune,* 7 May 1992, p. 1.

131. See Beverly Crawford, "Explaining Defection."

132. The material in this section is taken from Robert M. Hayden, "Constitutionalism and Nationalism in the Balkans: The Bosnian 'Constitution' as a Formula for Partition," *East European Constitutional Review,* Fall 1995, pp. 65–68. The House of Representatives has forty-two members, two-thirds of which must come from the Muslim-Croat Federation and one-third from the Republika Srpska. The House of Peoples consists of fifteen members—five Serbs, five Croats, and five Muslims.