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After the attempt to recentralize Yugoslavia failed, Serbia's elites switched to the concept of uniting all Serbs and Serbian ethnic territories. The rearrangement of borders, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina, could not be carried out through voluntary resettlement. For this reason, drastic measures of intimidation, expulsion and mass killing of Muslims/Bosniaks were applied in order to "liberate" the projected Serb ethnic territories and thus have them join Serbia. Even after more than 30 years, this project has not been abandoned. The war effort helped establish Serb territory in Bosnia, which was later confirmed in Dayton in 1995.

The propaganda for war preparations already clearly indicated the goals set therein, which was accompanied by extensive activities of all the elites, especially intellectuals, who were in essence the architects behind the renewed Serbian project involving the unification of all Serbs and Serb territories. What ensued after Dayton was politics using different means aimed at the integration of Serbian lands with Serbia. This undertaking has come a long way because the international community has been tolerant towards the behavior of Serbian leadership in the Republika Srpska.

Russia's infiltration into the Balkans – after the Western international community (the United States of America and the European Union) had largely disengaged from the Balkans – greatly encouraged Serbian nationalists to intensify activities towards the unification of all Serbs, which in the meantime got a new name: "Serb World", following the example of "Russian World". Russia's aggression against Ukraine has displayed similarities in both methodology and argumentation used by both Moscow and Belgrade.

Implementation of the project after Dayton

Shortly before the outbreak of war in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serb participants in the Congress of Intellectuals in Sarajevo on 30 March 1992 passed a Declaration urging "the justest possible division and delimitation in order to eliminate the causes of hatred and killing", and calling for the "unity of Serbs" which requires "that all Serb authorities, where they exist, and all Serb states, where they have already been established, the Serb church and Serb intellectuals should formulate and lay down minimum Serb national interests which at this historic moment are not at all in dispute and which must never anywhere be backed down from".[[1]](#footnote-1)

Later during the war, at the Second Congress of Serb Intellectuals in Belgrade (1994), Serb intellectuals unanimously approved the creation of a Serb ethnic state and the unification of all Serbs. Academician Milorad Ekmečić said at the time that following the collapse of Yugoslavia "through no fault of our own, it is now subordinated to the unification of the Serb people in its national state, at least until we have all of us licked our wounds clean".[[2]](#footnote-2)

Serbian elites can be satisfied with what they achieved with the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Even though Bosnian Serbs were not satisfied with the Dayton Accords, they had no means of challenging them. They considered that parts of the Serb ethnic space had unjustly been lost. (In Dayton, 20 percent of the occupied territory was assigned to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.) One should not overlook a statement made at the time because it still remains valid as far as Serbia’s policy towards the Republika Srpska is concerned. Vojislav Koštunica, then president of the Democratic Party of Serbia (DSS), said:

I don’t believe that the Dayton Accords, such as they are, will lead to further war and instability. But I am sure that in the wake of Milošević’s defeat in 1991 and Milošević’s peace in 1995, the position of Serbs has never been worse in the two centuries since they began creating their state.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Koštunica pointed out that from his room in Dayton, the Serbian President sent Bosnian Serbs a message "congratulating them on the Republika Srpska and wishing them peace and cooperation with the Muslim-Croat Federation. Now, mind you, not cooperation with the FRY, which means that he wrote them off once again and confirmed by his congratulatory message that they were going to live in another state" for "if the RS was recognized formally in Geneva, the border between the RS and the FRY was recognized in Dayton".[[4]](#footnote-4) As it later turned out, Koštunica was to announce Serbia’s real policy towards the Republika Srpska. He said that the "moment has come to consider strengthening ties between the Republika Srpska and the FRY, which ought to be strengthened in all fields".[[5]](#footnote-5)

Vojislav Šešelj, president of the Serbian Radical Party, also denounced the Dayton Accords as a "Serb defeat which is the result of the disastrous national policy of the Serbian President supported by the official policy of the USA in particular". Naturally it was Šešelj who aired the view which today predominates in the policy on "Serb lands", namely that the "Serb people will never be able to accept as final the results of this hysterically anti-Serb policy of Milošević and the international community, so a future democratic and nationally-minded government will surely know how to realize the aspirations of our people to enjoy a united and strong Serb state".[[6]](#footnote-6)

Vuk Drašković, on the other hand, was more realistic in his assessments. He said that "had the war not been brought to a halt through big power efforts, the whole of the Republika Srpska would have fallen within weeks". All the same, Drašković continued to regard Serbia as a big power in the Balkans because "Serbia occupies such a geopolitical position as to constitute a bridge between Europe and Asia and between the West and Russia".[[7]](#footnote-7)

Dissatisfaction with the Dayton Accords was also expressed by the entire opposition to Milošević, above all over the loss of certain parts of "Serb territories". Serb strategists have acknowledged in their calculations the international circumstances that were to frustrate the creation of an integral state of the Serb people for a long time to come. Therefore, in their view, the Dayton Accords were a reality to be reckoned with while retaining the same long-term goals. The union of Serbia, Montenegro, and the Republika Srpska was to be put off for a more propitious moment, that is, until the international constellation has changed, because "there is nothing that stands in the way of unequivocally projecting such an objective as a strategic national interest".[[8]](#footnote-8)

The round table "Geopolitical reality of the Serbs", held in Novi Sad on 29-31 January 1997 discussed the changes in the overall global geopolitical situation, which, as president of the Institute Executive Board Milivoj Reljin said in his inaugural address, imposed on the Serbian people as a whole "essentially different conditions in which it will have to realize its state and national objectives and interests". Among the chief conclusions was the view that from the standpoint of Serb interests, "the Republika Srpska is the only bright spot in the process of breaking up the SFRY", at the same time pointing out that "Annex 7 of the Dayton Accords, that is, the Agreement on Refugees and Displaced Persons" poses the main threat to the survival of the Republika Srpska.[[9]](#footnote-9) It was also pointed out that from the point of view of Serbian national interests, "that agreement is a double-edged sword because its implementation destroys the cohesive power of the RS and strengthens the hand of those forces which are 'drowning' the Republika Srpska in the integral state of Bosnia and Herzegovina and, worse still, subordinate the interests of the Serb people to the interests of the Muslims."[[10]](#footnote-10)

According to Rajko Gnjato, the "Muslim policy" could be countered, among other things, with "the return of Serb refugees to the RS and promotion of population policy measures".[[11]](#footnote-11) However, the optimism of the participants regarding the survival and overall progress of the Republika Srpska, particularly in a socioeconomic sense, was based on the belief that at that moment, the Republika Srpska and the Serb people inhabiting it, would be needed for quite some time by a Europe furthering its own interests. Of primary importance in this regard is the role the Republika Srpska plays in preventing the penetration of Islamic fundamentalism into the heart of Europe. In other words, the Republika Srpska is made to play the part of the former Military Frontier. "When the reasons for its existence are no longer there, our enemies, Croats and Catholicism, will destroy the Republika Srpska and push the boundaries of Catholicism further east, should an opportunity arise".[[12]](#footnote-12)

With similar objectives in mind, the Academy of Sciences and Arts of the Republika Srpska held a symposium in Bijeljina (29-30 October, 1998) entitled *The Serb Spiritual Space*. The symposium was attended by the academicians from the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts who wrote the Memorandum. In his keynote report, Milorad Ekmečić defined the notion of the Serb spiritual space as follows:

The Serb spiritual space is the totality of cultural activities tending to come to fruition in a well-regulated state of the time, in all the provinces in which the Serb people and the ethnic groups as its offshoots have lived and still live, in all the forms in which they have manifested themselves.[[13]](#footnote-13)

Philosopher Ljubomir Tadić told the participants that "our deepest spiritual and political interest commands us that we must never give up Kninska Krajina, Lika, Banija, Kordun, parts of Slavonia, Srem and Baranja in which Serb people have lived for centuries, nor the towns which have fallen under Croat and Muslim power: Grahovo, Glamoč, Drvar and Petrovac".[[14]](#footnote-14) The object of such gatherings is to let the national ideologues pronounce on future territories and to gradually translate their ethnic engineering into state frontiers.

This is best summed up in the statement of Dobrica Ćosić that the "Serb people is coalescing in a living space which it can cover civilizationally and culturally and develop economically"; he also defines this process as "a territorial-ethnic rearrangement, perhaps, of a state-political consolidation of the Balkan space".[[15]](#footnote-15) National ideologues have basically resigned themselves to the fact that the Serb state boils down to Serbia, the Republika Srpska, and Montenegro. Nonetheless, ambitions remain alive to incorporate certain "Serb territories", particularly those affording an outlet to the Adriatic Sea.

The importance of the role of Serb academicians and intellectuals in the implementation and defense of the Serbian national program is clear from the number of academicians, lawyers and historians who have appeared before the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague as witnesses for Milošević. They include Mihajlo Marković, Čeda Popov, Kosta Mihajlović, Ratko Marković, Smilja Avramov, Slavenko Terzić and many others. This shows that even Serbia’s military defeat in the implementation of the Memorandum objectives has not forced the authors of the Memorandum to resign publicly; on the contrary, they continue to defend their stance from the same positions.

As was formulated at the Fruška Gora Round Table (1997) to prevent a greater return of refugees to the Republika Srpska by all possible means, this has been achieved in practice. The year 1997 was declared the year of return to Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, the majority of refugees did not return to their former places of residence but to the entities where their ethnic community dominated. Such an essentially unsuccessful return further cemented ethnic divisions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The international community has accepted the ethnic principle as the key principle for resolving the Bosnian issue. Not only was it incorporated into the Dayton Agreement, but also later through its implementation. Among other things, Annex 7, which was essentially never implemented as intended, stipulates the following:

All refugees and displaced persons have the right freely to return to their homes of origin. They shall have the right to have restored to them property of which they were deprived in the course of hostilities since 1991 and to be compensated for any property that cannot be restored to them. The early return of refugees and displaced persons is an important objective of the settlement of the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Parties confirm that they will accept the return of such persons who have left their territory, including those who have been accorded temporary protection by third countries. The Parties shall ensure that refugees and displaced persons are permitted to return in safety, without risk of harassment, intimidation, persecution, or discrimination, particularly on account of their ethnic origin, religious belief, or political opinion.[[16]](#footnote-16)

Belgrade's actions under new international circumstances

After the fall of Slobodan Milošević, Serbia adopted a pro-European orientation. It signed the Association Agreement in 2008, and received candidate status in 2012. Between 2000 and 2012, a legal framework was established and laws and strategies defining Serbia as a European-oriented country were adopted. In parallel with this, however, Serbia persisted in its strategy of uniting Serb people. It skillfully took advantage of the geostrategic vacuum and for several years managed to successfully achieve its goals in relation to the systematic integration of Serbs in the region into the cultural, spiritual, economic and information space.

"Serb World" first appeared as a term in 2013. The constant recycling of the same project under different names is just an attempt to divert attention from a process that has been running smoothly all these years. The international community paid no attention to Belgrade's attempt to challenge the Western order in the Balkans. With its policy of favoring Belgrade, it expected to keep Serbia on the Euro-Atlantic track. Unfortunately, the "Serb World" as a concept has the support of certain international circles (sovereigntists, authoritarians), even within the European Union.

The geopolitical limbo in which the region found itself after the disengagement of both the United States and the European Union (who turned to their own problems) was ideal for Russia. According to *Samarukov*, researcher at Carnegie Moscow Center, this does not mean either complete stabilization or complete destabilization, but something in between. Russia is trying to obstruct both the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the Western Balkans for as long as possible. It does not want the frozen conflicts in the Balkans to be resolved, because they are what keep the Western Balkans away from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European Union, but it also does not want these conflicts to become active, because it too has lines that it doesn't want crossed.[[17]](#footnote-17)

It is precisely this undefined status of the Western Balkans, as well as the increasingly distant option of joining the European Union, that plays a significant role in encouraging Serb aspirations. Belgrade also defined its policy towards "Serb lands" through documents that are official Government documents. The first important document adopted by the Serbian Parliament is the Strategy for Preserving and Strengthening the Relations between the Homeland and the Diaspora and the Homeland and the Serbs in the Region (2011).[[18]](#footnote-18)

**The Strategy aims to "preserve and strengthen the relationship between the homeland and the diaspora, as well as between the homeland and the Serbs in the region.** It should serve as a key document that will determine the direction of preserving and strengthening relations between the homeland and the diaspora, as well as between the homeland and the Serbs in the region". The legal framework relevant to the preservation and strengthening of the relationship between the homeland and the diaspora and Serbs in the region is also made up of other acts such as: the Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, which in Article 13 establishes that the Republic of Serbia shall protect the rights and interests of its citizens in abroad and develop and promote relations of Serbs living abroad with the kin state; and the Law on Diaspora and Serbs in the Region, which represents the first systemic law on relations between the home country and the diaspora, as well as the home country and Serbs in the region,[[19]](#footnote-19) and as such represents a normative base for conducting a long-term policy towards the diaspora. The law clearly demonstrates the will to conduct policy towards the diaspora and Serbs in the region in a much more serious, responsible and rational manner. The same follows from other documents: Declaration on the Proclamation of the Relationship Between the Homeland and the Diaspora as a Relationship of the Greatest State and National Interest,[[20]](#footnote-20) the Migration Management Strategy,[[21]](#footnote-21) the National Youth Strategy,[[22]](#footnote-22) the National Security Strategy.[[23]](#footnote-23)

The strategy gives priority to Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro by placing them at the center of its foreign and regional policy. Bearing in mind the centuries-old unbreakable historical and civilizational ties between the two states and peoples, as pointed out, it is important to provide the Serbian people with equality and fair representation in state institutions, state administration and local self-government.

This Strategy was perceived in the region as Memorandum II. Its disclosure caused great public uproar in all neighboring countries. It *de facto* represents the implementation of part of the Memorandum on preventing threats to Serbs living outside of Serbia. It is an operational document with precise instructions for activities. It is an action plan for the action of Greater Serbian nationalism under new conditions, and involves instructions on how to achieve a united Serbia "through peaceful and democratic means", against the unity and integrity of the countries in which they live.

As the only legitimate cross-border institution in the region, the Serbian Orthodox Church (SPC) plays a key role in the implementation of the mentioned strategy. During the 20th century, as stated in the Strategy, it was practically the only integrative institution and bridge between the home country and the diaspora. In addition to religion, the Church also preserved the national culture and language of the Republic of Serbia. The strategy envisages logistical and any other support for the Serbian Orthodox Church in order to carry out its religious mission, but also for its cultural and educational role in the diaspora, which it *de facto* has. In practice, the action plan boils down to: relativizing and denying war crimes and genocide committed by the armies and police of the Republika Srpska and Serbia; destabilizing governments and authorities in neighboring countries by raising awareness of their inefficiency; insisting on the constitutionality of Serbs in Montenegro, Kosovo and Croatia; supporting separatist politics in the Republika Srpska, etc.

In the meantime, the **National Security Strategy of the Republic of Serbia (2020)**[[24]](#footnote-24) was adopted, in which it is emphasized that the most important foreign policy priority of Serbia is the preservation of the Republika Srpska; as was the **Charter on the Serbian Cultural Space (2019)**,[[25]](#footnote-25) which was signed by the Ministers of Education of the Republic of Serbia and the Republika Srpska. This charter is similar to the Russian one from 2007, when the state fund Russian World was established.[[26]](#footnote-26) The Charter on the Serbian Cultural Space points out that the strategic starting point of Serbian cultural policy is based on the belief that, prior to any broader integrations, the first and inevitable step is to strengthen cohesion within the Serbian cultural space. This is just a step away from proclaiming the unification of all Serbs, as was the case in the 1990s.

The essence of the Charter boils down to the fact that the cultural policy of Serbs outside their home country need not be harmonized with the cultural policy of those countries, but only with the policy of the mother country, i.e., as it is written in the Charter, Serbs in their entire cultural area should lead a "mutually harmonious cultural-educational policy". Particular emphasis is placed on the view that a nation is most tightly bound by "memories of collective suffering" and that this, more than anything else, is what holds together all Serbs, who are extremely rich in suffering.

**The Cultural Development Strategy of the Republic of Serbia 2020-2029**[[27]](#footnote-27)also fits into the project of the Serb World. The Strategy, among other things, is primarily "committed to the protection and nurturing of national culture", that is, "the Strategy, given that the Republic of Serbia represents the mother country of the Serbian people living in the region and in different parts of the world, is committed to preserving and connecting the Serbian cultural space, that is, the protection of cultural heritage and the promotion of cultural creativity of all bearers of Serbian cultural identity, regardless of where they live". The main goal is the measure "cultivating the Serbian language and Cyrillic alphabet and connecting the Serbian cultural space, which is of great importance for the preservation of the cultural identity of the Republic of Serbia and Serb people, and which is dedicated to achieving the priority of encouraging the role of culture in the development of society, especially bearing in mind the key role culture in creating, shaping and passing on social and cultural values ​​and the importance of preserving, presenting and interpreting cultural identity."

This is a set of measures that round off Belgrade's policy when it comes to the Serbian cultural space, that is, the "Serb World". This "Serb World" project has the support of all elites, including a significant part of the civil sector. This was especially evident in relation to Kosovo during the so-called internal dialogue, when the majority took the position that Kosovo should remain a frozen conflict in anticipation of a suitable moment for its division. The current government is working on the project on all fronts.

However, it should be emphasized that this is not a personal project of *Vučić* or *Dodik*, but a state project that each new government implements in accordance with the given circumstances. Members of the government openly advocate "unification", and the most agile advocate is *Aleksandar Vulin*, the Minister of Internal Affairs (before that, Minister of Defense). He points out (he repeated this on several occasions) that "the task of my generation of politicians" is to continue the struggle for "the unification of all Serbs into a single state and political community", which must be carried out peacefully.[[28]](#footnote-28) Among other things, he defends this with the position that "a people who have experienced repeated genocide in every generation and always by the same perpetrators has no right to leave their children with any opportunity to experience the extermination of their compatriots in parts of the nation where the state does not protect them. Thanks to Vučić, Serbs have become a unified political nation and the process of unification has begun, and it will no longer be possible to stop".[[29]](#footnote-29)

"Disciplining" the Republika Srpska

After many years of neglecting Bosnia and Herzegovina and tolerating ethno-nationalist leaders who systematically destroyed the possibility of its functionality, the European Union and the United States have been engaged in the policy of taming Milorad Dodik in recent months. The goal was to stop his provocations and to have the Republika Srpska officials return to state institutions. During German Chancellor Olaf Scholz's visit to Washington, US President Joe Biden reaffirmed the commitment to completing the work of integrating the Western Balkans into the European institutions and to finally realize a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace.[[30]](#footnote-30)

It was only after Russia's aggression against Ukraine that the European Union became aware of the dangers and numerous omissions when it comes to the Balkans. Although there were a lot of reactions to Russia's malignant influence, it was not accompanied by adequate European policies, primarily because it allowed within itself the possibility of Russia corrupting the right-wing (but also left-wing) movements as well as numerous politicians. This created an image of the West as decadent and incapable of solving its own problems.

For years, the European Union tolerated Serbia's behavior in the region and allowed its aspirations to become a reality. The Republika Srpska is perceived as the only spoils of war that Belgrade will have a hard time giving up without much pressure. The narrative of Serb nationalists, both in Serbia and in the Republika Srpska, has been reduced for years to the fact that Bosnia and Herzegovina is unsustainable and that its disintegration is imminent, that the Muslims overthrew Yugoslavia (a thesis that is increasingly used in Belgrade), that Bosnia and Herzegovina is regressive, that the Republika Srpska was created to prevent genocide (Ana Brnabić), that there was no responsibility of the Bosnian Serb leaders in 1992 for the war's outbreak (Željka Cvijanović), that it was a mistake that Belgrade did not recognize the Republika Srpska (Milorad Dodik) and that the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was a war of liberation of Serbs (Dobrica Ćosić, a generally accepted stance).

Milorad Dodik is the most prominent exponent of Moscow, but also the most unpredictable factor in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this sense, he is also a potential generator of violent conflict. Dodik's insolence and arrogance continued even after the West sanctioned him. He has persisted with his rhetoric of challenging the legitimacy of the newly appointed High Representative Christian Schmidt, because he was not confirmed by the Security Council. It's just an echo of what Moscow keeps repeating. Thus, after the High Representative annulled the Law on Immovable Property of the Republika Srpska, Dodik declared "that the Republika Srpska's finest sons did not die so that the unelected German Christian Schmidt could barter with what they gave everything for".[[31]](#footnote-31)

Russia's behavior towards Bosnia indicates its ambition to reduce Western influence and undermine Western political projects outside the former Soviet space. It is working on this systematically in order to establish a new international security architecture, which would marginalize the United States of America and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Bosnia as a central country is the perfect opportunity to overthrow the Western system in the Balkans, set up after 2000. For this reason, Russia has for years been supporting nationalist and anti-democratic forces in the region, especially in the Republika Srpska.

Russia's aggression against Ukraine has also raised questions about the future of the Euro-Atlantic integration of the Western Balkans. Although it is surrounded by member states of the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the region is only partially integrated into the Euro-Atlantic political and security structures. The European Union's undefined policy during the last decade has contributed to the regression of the region and its turning towards other partners.

Serbia is the only country in Europe that has shown solidarity with Russia. Because of this, it is under enormous pressure, or as President Vučić says, "in a much more difficult situation than it appears". Serbia is required to reach an agreement with Priština which would practically recognize Kosovo, followed by a "disciplining" of the Republika Srpska and renunciation of Russia, i.e. the introduction of sanctions against it. Christopher Hill, US Ambassador in Belgrade, stated in an interview for Politika that there is only a wrong or a right path and that Serbia must make a choice. He suggests that "there is only one way, and that is the West, that is the European Union".[[32]](#footnote-32)

The current circumstances in Europe, but also in Serbia, is a unique opportunity for "Serbia to finally avoid its relations with Russia determining its strategic future".[[33]](#footnote-33) That is why President Vučić is facing his life chance to demonstrate a constructive sense of statecraft. It would thus help remove Serbia from Russia's embrace.
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