

**THE CENTER FOR STRATEGIC AND
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

**STATESMEN'S FORUM WITH
HIS EXCELLENCY HARIS SILAJDŽIĆ,
PRESIDENT OF BOSNIA AND HERZGOVINA**

**INTRODUCTION:
JOHN HAMRE,
CSIS PRESIDENT AND CEO**

**MODERATOR:
JANUSZ BUGAJSKI,
CSIS NEW EUROPEAN DEMOCRACIES PROJECT DIRECTOR**

**THURSDAY, MAY 24, 2007
11:00 A.M. -- NOON**

*Transcript by:
Federal News Service
Washington, D.C.*

JOHN HAMRE: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome. I'm delighted that you're here, and I'm very pleased to welcome President Silajdžić back to CSIS. Ironically, the last time that he was with us here at CSIS, I wasn't here, but Janusz was, so he remembers it vividly. It was 12 years ago. It was before the Dayton Accords had been settled, and it was sadly two weeks before Srebrenica. And when you think of the sorrow and the tragedy that accompanied those days, it's a point of remembrance for me – for all of us. I was over at the Defense Department at the time and it was quite a dramatic and traumatic time. So to come back now – I mean – in one sense, we're fortunate that those very, very ugly and difficult days are behind us, but the days are not entirely behind us, and I think that's what we're going to – we have the benefit of the president to speak to us today.

When I first went over to DOD, a friend of mine once took me through a mental exercise. And he said, imagine you have four inboxes on your desk. One inbox is for urgent and important. One is for non-urgent and important. One is for urgent but not important. And one is for not urgent and not important. He said which of those four should you first go to every morning?

And of course, your instinct is, well, you go to the box that is urgent and important. And he said, no. He said, that is a big mistake. He said, you always go to a box that is important but not urgent, because then you have time to work on the problem.

I think that's what we're here to talk about today, the continuing evolution – political, social evolution in the Balkans, and the political structure in Bosnia-Herzegovina is important. Fortunately, it's not urgent, and now we have time to work on this. And I think, President, that summarizes why you have come to Washington and why you are talking to us. We are – for being such a sophisticated country – big, powerful, sophisticated country – we really can't keep more than one idea in our head at a time. And right now, everything is Iraq. And so, if you don't come to Washington, we don't think about these problems. So you are doing us a favor to help us think about a very important problem at a time when we have a chance to do something about it.

So I'm pleased you gave us a chance. Obviously, there are many people that want to hear you today, President. Thank you for coming, and let me turn to you now to share your thoughts with everyone. Thank you, sir.

H.E. HARIS SILAJDŽIĆ: Thank you, Mr. Hamre. Okay, it is my pleasure and honor to be here again. Thank you all for coming. I am delighted to see so many friends from here, and, of course, Janusz who remembers our last meeting here. And thank you again, Mr. Hamre, for all those boxes. Four boxes, did you say? What do you do if you have four boxes? I have a proposal. Call in sick. (Laughter.) That's the best thing to do.

I intend here to bring – my purpose is actually to revitalize the issue of Bosnia in Washington, generally, and with you here today, because it is an issue that is deemed a finished job. It has been done in many ways. But there are still things that make us pay attention to this issue. And I am trying not to be so subjective, because, of course, I come from Bosnia. But it is an issue that could still – let me find the word – could still be of a concern to the international community.

I intend to give you a brief on the background for those who have not followed the case of Bosnia so intensely, and then, to talk about different concepts here that we have no in Bosnia. There are different concepts of where Bosnia should go. And then, just a few sentences about the possible repercussions, if we do not pay attention to Bosnia, if we do not solve the Bosnian questions.

So as you know, Bosnia and Herzegovina was the victim of the regime in Belgrade at that time – Croatia, too. And there was a plan to expand Serbia at the expense of the neighboring states. So I believe that the cause of the problem there was an expansionist idea, the aspirations towards our lands. And this is not a new idea. This is my view.

Now, there was what some people even called conflict or war. I believe that to be aggression against my country. And it lasted from '92 to '95. Within that period, we had war crimes, crimes against humanity, and finally, the worst of all crimes, genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina, now official. And I will later try to expand a little bit on that subject.

Generally, Bosnia-Herzegovina was and still hopefully is to some extent a multicultural society to which it was natural for the citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina of different cultures and religions to live together. It was not tolerance, because we did not tolerate each other; we lived together. Unfortunately, that was broken by a regime that had its own goals and some people were in the way of that regime. So they, unfortunately, killed people or expelled them from their homes. And that's why we have today in the United States over 300,000 people of Bosnia – Bosnians who came here to escape death or concentration camps. In Canada, I think probably about 100,000; I am not sure. Those are the fortunate ones. The unfortunate ones are now dead.

In 1995, upon the initiative of the international community – mainly the United States government – there was a peace agreement. We had negotiations held at Dayton, Ohio, and we reached an agreement. This agreement was naturally not perfect, of course. But it was a successful agreement, because the killing stopped; the operations also. So we finally had peace in Bosnia, that was the most important thing. Of course, the peace agreement – generally called the Dayton Agreement – was criticized for being contradictory for being legally very questionable and so on. But it was an agreement that brought peace to Bosnia, and this is the most important thing. I was there, and I would do that again under the same circumstances; I would accept the Dayton Peace Agreement.

Now, the execution of the peace agreement on the ground is a different thing, and I think that the international community followed the line of least resistance there – the philosophy of containment – and we passed an opportunity to really do something for Bosnia through the Dayton Agreement. We are now where we are. It has been years and years. There is progress in Bosnia; there is no doubt about it. Could be worse; but it could have been better. It could be better now, had we managed to actually use the Dayton Agreement to do many things, especially human rights, organization of the return of refugees, and so on – the economy.

Bosnia, because of the implementation of the peace agreement, is today mainly blocked as a country, because of the system. The system of voting, which gives practically one-fifth of the state parliament – one-fifth of the parliament – the right to block everything in the country – that is called entity voting, known to those who follow Bosnia closely. Just today, we have been discussing this with Prime Minister Dodik and the American officials at the State Department. And unfortunately, we have not reached an agreement on that and the matter of the police issue. I hope we will reach an agreement in the near future. But today, we failed to do that.

Why did we fail? Because we have two different concepts of Bosnia to be – the concept that is the concept of political parties; and my concept in Bosnia – there are people who would like to see Bosnia-Herzegovina a democracy, not ethnocracy. As a result of the aggression and the Dayton Peace Agreement, Bosnia is today divided ethnically, so the citizen of Bosnia-Herzegovina is number two; the ethnic groups are number one. So this is a question of the individual rights and the collective rights.

I am in favor of the citizens of Bosnia, not of the Bosnia of peoples, because it translates into division, and it is a divided country in many ways today – a divided economy; unfortunately, a divided educational system. And that is the worst of it, because the question is how do we raise the young generation. So Bosnia is divided into two entities. In one entity, it is divided into cantons, and so on.

My view of it is the following. I would like to get rid of the entities; I would like to get rid of the cantons, if I could. But I can't. There is no political will for this in Bosnia on the other side, and no political will on the part of the international community to really get involved once again, which is understandable.

The other side, which means political parties from the entity of Republika Srpska within Bosnia-Herzegovina – they want the status quo of the situation today, which is this division into two entities as a permanent solution. On the other side, we want to change it, because we do not see a future in that arrangement. I think that Bosnia should be a democratic country for all citizens – equal citizens – and the culture, religion, and traditions, where of course, everyone is free to believe whatever, to cherish the culture, and the tradition, and so on. So this is one concept; the other concept is the concept of the status quo and division.

That is why we still renegotiate the Dayton Agreement; we still try to find the middle ground. But we are not succeeding as yet. Those are the two concepts. And it's not easy to find the middle ground between these two concepts, between the individual rights and collective rights, between having two entities and having a stronger central government – not centralized, but enough of a central government, the minimum of it in order for Bosnia-Herzegovina to be able to fulfill its duties internally and externally.

And that's what discussions are all about. Bosnia-Herzegovina is on its path towards full membership in the European Union. But we have problems there, because the European Union requests us to have some reforms first, like the police reform. And we are stuck there, because in my mind, the reform is a reform. In the minds of people like Prime Minister Dodik, the police of Republika Srpska should remain there as it is today.

Now, I must introduce the other element in this picture, being very brief, of course. And that is, the judgment of the International Court of Justice of the 26th of February, which made genocide in Bosnia-Herzegovina official after 14 years of deliberation. And it says there was a genocide; it says who committed the genocide. Those are the institutions of the entity of Republika Srpska – the police and the army. That's one of the reasons why I cannot accept that within the new arrangement we have the police of Republika Srpska, because it is guilty of genocide. And also, we need to make reforms, and that is what we are requesting. The European Union demands reform of the police.

There we cannot agree; we disagreed even today, an hour ago. And not only me of course, but those that I represent as the president of the party and other citizens, I believe that that name and that organization should not be there because it has committed genocide. Not only the name of it, but sometimes persons – and we have a list of about 500 people that are within that police and are on the list of those who took part in the operations leading to the genocide.

And I hope you understand what I am trying to convey to you – the climate and the immediate problems that we have now. And all of that boils down to one thing, whether Bosnia should remain as it is today, despite the fact that we now officially have genocide, or do we ignore that fact and proceed. I cannot bring myself to ignoring the judgment, of course, and it is not my right. The judgment is there; it absolved mostly Serbia. Serbia is guilty only of non-prevention of genocide, non-punishment of the perpetrators. And the genocide, according to the verdict, is committed by those institutions.

The question is whether this verdict has consequence, or is the judgment of the International Court of Justice, an NGO pronouncement, a declaration – no harm done to the NGOs, of course. But this judgment is being ignored at all levels. And I had to bring this up with the new Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Moon, telling him the following. Your organization committed colossal mistakes in Bosnia-Herzegovina, admitted it through the former secretary general. And those mistakes cost ten thousands

of lives in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Now, we have the judgment that it was genocide and you are silent as an organization. And I hope they will have something to say about that, because this is the court of the United Nations that ruled that there was a genocide in Bosnia and that the institutions of the entity of Republika Srpska within Bosnia-Herzegovina committed this genocide.

So that is the question – whether we ignore it – and this is the first judgment of that court in history. This is the first time. And it's very important, not only for Bosnia, not only in Bosnia, but for the whole world. The question is, can you kill people and get away with it or not? You just let some time pass and forget about it. Can we afford that? That is the question not only for me, of course, and I cannot say anything but I do not believe that the International Court of Justice judgment can be ignored. That would present a very, very bad message for the future. And that will present a problem in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

And with this, I will finish now. If that is the case, if the judgment has no bearing on the internal situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, that would lead to frustration in Bosnia, especially the victims of genocide – their families. And they are mostly – not exclusively, but mostly – Bosniacs or Moslems. The Muslim population in Bosnia-Herzegovina – it's about 50 percent of the population – has proved to be a constructive and civilized element in Bosnia-Herzegovina. They were tested during the war. They never returned the same. They did not create concentration camps. They did not commit genocide – they could. So they deserve to be treated as constructive citizens of Europe.

But if this judgment is ignored, this is going to have consequences, because this is a message. If the message is ignored, then the message is, you don't have the right to the judgment even – not only that you don't have the right to live; but you don't have the right to judgment. We had to do this, but it doesn't mean anything. That is the message, and the message is important, because these constructive, civilized people can turn the other way and say, okay, so we are not welcome. Anyone can come and kill us at any time that they want. And you know what, this creates a fertile ground for extremism. And we are doing this while we are all saying that there should be a dialogue; we should fight against extremism globally. So there is a contradiction there.

I will end with this, and I will thank you again for coming – this big number. Thank the organization here to have me, and of course, for Janusz.

(Applause.)

JANUSZ BUGAJSKI: Thank you very much, Haris. We have about 25 minutes, because the president has a very important appointment, has to leave at 12:00. So please keep your comments or questions very brief and to the point. State your name and affiliation. I'll start on the left with Ed, our local provocateur, please.

Q: Not this morning. Thank you, Janusz. Good morning, President Silajdžić. I appreciate it.

MR. BUGAJSKI: Do introduce yourself.

Q: Edward Joseph, Johns Hopkins, SAIS. And President Silajdžić, I appreciate very much your remarks and agree, the system is blocked; desperately needs internal reform. And yet, there is no international community will, as you so correctly stated. And as we all know, instead of that will, there is the fallback or default strategy is EU accession. You only mentioned that in passing in the context of police reform. But I really have to ask you, Mr. President, is that correct, first of all? Is that strategy of depending on EU accession process to resolve these ancillary problems that you sketched out so eloquently, and the legacy of the conflict that you sketched out? Or is it perhaps not quite as important in the overarching immediate priority for the people who elected you, as so many diplomats believe?

Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Can I answer this question immediately? Yeah, okay. They require reforms before the accession, so we have to do things, right? And I must tell you that the American government – this administration – with which I have problems sometimes, to tell you the truth – they are helping us and have patience and endurance, like yesterday and today, which I do not see from the part of the European governments – they just request things. So I would like this process to be more dynamic, more vital, but the situation is, they ask for something we cannot do now so the process is blocked.

I do not know what we can do there. I, for one, cannot accept the existence of the Republika Srpska police – excuse me – knowing that that name is there in the verdict saying that it has committed genocide. I'm sorry but it's like Holocaust victims being controlled by Gestapo. That's what it is to Srebrenica survivors. There, the international community could have said, well, there are some limits here. We want cooperation; we want dialogue and everything. But some limits must exist. And the limit is you cannot have the genocidal name there in the new agreement, period. But I am not saying that. They say, okay, if you can agree upon something – that's where the shortcoming is, especially from the European side. Thank you.

Q: Good morning, Mr. President. Robert Beecroft, head of the OSCE mission in Bosnia-Herzegovina from '02 to '05, and 10 years ago worked with you as special envoy for the federation. Sir, I'd like to change the focus slightly and ask about the federation. We've been talking about Republika Srpska understandably. But I would argue that both sides are broken. And the federation is certainly not functioning well, either economically or politically. What is, in your view, the possible or potential viability of the federation over the longer term? I assume that if you're talking about a single unitary state, the federation also would go away. But could one look at it the opposite way in terms of a potential third entity, which is something that the Croat people have been pushing for, for a long time, or would that just complicate matters further?

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: I think it would complicate matters, and frankly, I refuse to even talk about this, because this means federalization of Bosnia. The federalization means that federal units have the right of secession and so on. We all know that. So that is not the solution. And the federation as is today is not a solution. It has 10 cantons. Every single canton has parliament and government. It eats money needed for something else.

The economic situation, the investments are coming, but blocked by the system – and you know that – by the system. There is not a single economic space there. The laws are not harmonized, although we have foreign investment flow, which is liberal and okay. But when it comes to the ground, it's very difficult; it's complicated; it's very bureaucratic, because we do not have one economic space there. And how can we compete with the surroundings, with other countries around where things are much easier for the investors? So I have to – and I called the investors to come to Bosnia – I have to tell them, please be prepared. You will be okay, but for the first couple of years, this is what it is, starting from the registration. It's the residue of the old and the confusion of the new.

But you are right. You are right. The questions is, as I said, if I could, I would do away tomorrow with the entities and the cantons, if I had my way. If I could my way, I would have the state government and the local government and the economic regions in the middle. But I can't have it.

Q: Rich Kauzlerich, former U.S. Ambassador in Sarajevo. Mr. President, you spoke in very general terms about taking the decision of the court and implementing it. I wonder if you could be specific about what you would see as how that would accomplish your goal, creating a democratic multi-ethnic Bosnia and Herzegovina that looks ahead to the future, because obviously, the court has stated what it has stated. We know the history as you have laid it out. But it would appear that now is the time to take this and start building for a future that puts Bosnia squarely in the European experience.

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Well, I believe that my concept would do just that, the concept of the Bosnia-Herzegovina of citizens, not ethnic groups. Furthermore, I don't think it's a statement by its ruling of the International Court of Justice. It's a judgment. It's not just a statement. I can issue a statement. You can issue a statement. This organization can issue a statement. But that is the judgment of the International Court of Justice. I am not a lawyer. I cannot tell you, but something must be done. There must be an implementation of that judgment. Otherwise, it's just a statement.

What does it mean for our internal situation? It means that we can use that judgment to do what both of us want for Bosnia. And that is to get rid of this ethnic division there, because the ethnic division is a direct result of the genocide. The question is now whether the international community has strength to say, well, you cannot kill thy neighbor and get away with it. Something must be done or nothing. I do not know – (inaudible) – of the United Nations. This is their report and Bosnia and Herzegovina is member of the United Nations. Let them tell us what to do. There are draft articles of

the International Law Commission saying that all countries are obliged to work to erase the results of genocide. This country is obliged, my country too, all countries.

But what actually struck me as odd is the deafening silence on the first ruling of genocide in history. As we know, Nürnberg happened before the court. But then we had the court. And the court rules, and it's like nothing. That is what perplexes me. Where do we want to go? Do we have important nations? Do we have unimportant nations? Important people, unimportant people in this global situation? We are all in one boat. And if it is rocked by genocide, we are going to have problems. That is why genocides must be punished. I am not asking for people to be killed because of that, but I am asking the international community to reconsider the situation in Bosnia brought about by genocide. How about that? That is what we are asking.

Our legal problem is we have to show our own country, because those who committed the genocide are Bosnian citizens. Unfortunately, that was also a political decision by the court to absolve Serbia. We all know what happened. We all know that. But they absolved Serbia. They said they are only guilty for non-prevention, which is a mistake in my opinion, but still I have to respect the International Court of Justice, because this is the highest authority that we have in this world.

Q: John Bosnic (sp) from the Serbian Unity Congress. I am afraid I have to agree with the president on some of the key points that he has raised here, especially on the point of genocide. I am named John after my grandfather's brother Jovan who died at Jasenovac. Jasenovac is a genocide that predates the killing of an estimated 8,000 men in the Battle of Srebrenica. The estimated number of people killed at Jasenovac by Croatian Fascists with the assistance of Bosnian Muslim Fascists in World War II is 800,000 people.

Now, very little has been done by your government, Mr. President, or by any other institutions in Bosnia, to make even an apology for the slaughter of 100 times more people than were ruled to have been slaughtered by this International Court of Justice decision. What we're suffering here is selective amnesia and –

MR. BUGAJSKI: Excuse me, could you keep it brief. (Cross talk.)

Q: Okay, and I'll try not to be cut off. Mr. President, could we not start this problem – start the resolution at its roots? The root of this recent conflict was the memory – at least on the Serbian side – was the memory of the genocide committed against them by the Bosnian Moslems and the Croats. Could your government do something to mitigate or somehow compensate for the results of a genocide 100 times worse – more numerous let's call it – than the one that was suffered at Srebrenica? And specifically, what are you going to do to reverse the effect of Jasenovac and to bring to justice those people in Bosnia who are still living and were complicit in the genocide that led to all of this fighting and all of this killing?

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Mr. Bosnic, you will have to get some information more on Jasenovac other than propaganda material that you have. If you do that, you will certainly then know how many Moslems died in Jasenovac. You obviously don't know that. I don't blame you, so please do inform yourself on the facts of life there. It's not a small number, by the way. What do we do, if you, as an informed intellectual says that the cause of it is the memory of Jasenovac? Do you absolve the regime in Belgrade and Milosevic by that or do you justify the genocide because of some memory there? It's not the memory; it is more than 140-year old plan of Greater Serbia, which lies in the roots of the problem – Greater Serbia, starting from the Russians and so on, to the academy – the Serb Academy – and we know – and I'm sure you know about all that – the creators of Milosevic, if he needed a creator. So do not tell me that the cause of it is a memory. No, it's a project in cold blood. You know that; I know that. Cold blood – I am talking about the project of Milosevic, the project that is older than Jasenovac, a lot older. And do not tell me that because of Jasenovac, Muslim population in the Drina Valley was killed; Draža Mihailovic's order saying that all of them should be eliminated, regardless of age and sex – before Jasenovac, regardless of age and sex. And that is a written order, kept in one archive of the United States of America, and I think it's in Los Angeles. But this is all very well known to you. So the root is not Jasenovac; the root is the project – and the root is primitivism and fascism. And how do we get rid of it?

That's why I was talking about the education – the education – not ethnic education but a normal education of people who get information. People, again, can go in one school. In Bosnia, unfortunately, I must tell you that we have today schools, ethnic schools. Children do not go to the same school. How about that? I mean, this is – and this is all under the watchful eye of the international community. And I think there is the root of the problem.

Q: (Off mike) – is perfectly peaceful.

MR. BUGAJSKI: Okay, no more speeches, please, because we have a number of people here –

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: It is yes, but in Canada they did not have the genocide.

Q: Of course they did.

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: We – no, we had the genocide 10 years ago, and if you send people, young people, to different schools with all those fresh wounds, what would they teach them?

MR. BUGAJSKI: Okay, please.

Q: Janet McElliott, McElliott Associates. I served as a spokesman for the Sudanese peace talks, and in Washington especially, there seems to be a great focus on Darfur as genocide. But if you go there you see it's really probably the world's first war

over water and resources, and is not a genocide. Do you think that if you could marshal some of the Darfur genocide people to your side that you could achieve some of the goals that you were talking about achieving? Because they seem to be very active in the Holocaust Museum and the genocide stuff, and they're trying to prevent something. But could you marshal groups like that to actually work proactively for you?

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Maybe I'll take a few questions so there is enough time –

(Cross talk.)

Q: Mr. President, it's good to see you again. Jonathan Landey, now with McClatchy Newspapers but spent many years covering the crisis in Bosnia.

I'm wondering if you could elaborate on what your perception of Mr. Dodik's position is in terms of his motivation. Is he not reflecting the wishes of his voters in taking the positions that he is? And secondly, I'm wondering if you could talk about the impact that the political situation in Serbia is still having on Republika Srpska and what you think might happen should the radical party in Serbia actually come to power.

MR. BUGAJSKI: Good, thank you. One more.

Q: Yes, thank you. Mr. President, you were recently with your fellow presidents

–

MR. BUGAJSKI: Please introduce yourself.

Q: I'm Nathan Bein, Department of Defense. You were recently in Iraq with your fellow presidents to meet and see your troops there, who have performed very well and have shown what Bosnians can do to work together for a common goal. So I wondered what lessons did you learn when you saw those troops over there. What did you bring back home from that trip?

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Okay, well, thank you very much for the suggestion on Darfur. Of course we need all the help we can get, although the situations are very different. Bosnia-Herzegovina, by the way, is the richest country with water in Europe. We have rivers and the hydropower. We are going to build plants and so on. But thank you for your suggestion anyway.

Now, the situation in Serbia of course influences the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and now we don't have time, and frankly I would like not to go into the question of Kosovo and all that, but the existence of the radical party, people who do not recognize borders, who still talk about Croatia and Bosnia and so on like it's their turf and so on. The existence of that party is a source of concern because that's the single-biggest party in Serbia. And when I listen to them, you know, it's like, you know, I think, when are we going to get rid of this in this region – people like Nikolic, for

example, and – (unintelligible). That is frightening sometimes that they do not move with history. It's always greater Serbia; it's always borders that they have in mind and so on. Well, that's all I can say. It's a very long story.

Generally I think that the international community should do more to encourage democracy, real democracy there, not to be so lenient sometimes when – like when they ask for – when NATO and the European Union ask for Mladic and Karadzic. Now Karadzic is forgotten and I did not hear – I don't know, like he died, but he did not die. People are not talking about Karadzic. Mladic, that was – the demand by the European Union, they dropped it; by NATO, they dropped it. I don't think those radicals understand this – you know, this soft approach. I don't think they understand. So that's my great concern, these radical forces.

Well, I have a question to answer here about that. Yes, we went to Iraq and Baghdad and Diwaniya (ph) by helicopters and we saw our troops there in the camp. By doing a very good job they have defused, so far, 45,000 explosive devices. It's not a big unit, but they'll say they're doing a very good job. Generally the situation there is not one that I would like to see in Bosnia. It's sad; even while we were in the green zone you could hear explosions, and it reminded me of the times when Sarajevo lived the longest siege in history. Sarajevo endured the longest siege in history, and if the court – International Court of Justice was really the International Court of Justice, they would have pronounced that genocide. There we have 1,400 children killed, and that is the longest siege in history of a major town.

Well, let's hope, let's be optimistic, but it's still very, very difficult there. You can smell the war there.

MR. BUGAJSKI: Okay, last two very brief questions. The person in the back.

Q: My name is Brian Beary and I report for Europolitics. You were saying that the EU – slightly critical of its shortcomings and saying that the international community should be more involved. What specifically would you like the EU to do in terms of their strategy? For example on police reform and constitution reform, do you think that they could take a more hands-on approach in mediating the issue? Or what is it you would like to see?

MR. BUGAJSKI: Generally, abandon the philosophy of the least line of resistance that has been followed ever since 1992 – the least line of resistance and containment, and be more aggressive in requesting reforms in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and isolating those who are against those reforms because the price is paid by all citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Well, you know, there are good things they do, but I believe that Bosnia-Herzegovina is not just a case like Czechoslovakia or Hungary – Czech Republic or Hungary or Bulgaria, and that is it merits special attention there, because there are good things in Bosnia going on. It's not a bad economy, actually. Our economy is better than

the economy of some countries, members of the European Union, right now – high standards. But the thing is that we have a political legacy. There they should be more determined to really solve these problems. And I think sometimes they do it but then it's not very consistent. And isolate those who do not want the reforms. If it is Haris Silajdžić, then do something with him, you know.

MR. BUGAJSKI: The last question to Dr. Silajdžić.

Q: I'm enough old to remember many things, but I would like to start with this: Bosnia and Herzegovina was not conquered by army of Serbia in 1918, but parliament of Bosnia invite Serbian army to come, and we decide to be part of Yugoslavia. It's important. Second, we are dealing with two problems. One is dissolution of Yugoslavia; another one is changing economic system from socialist, communist to free economy, and it is the reason why we have more problem.

Third thing: At 16 years old, I was in Ustasha jail. Ustasha didn't just put in jail Serbs, but put anyone who didn't like them. In Jasenovac was killed my uncle. We have the book with the names – hundred and thousand names of Muslims who were killed in Jasenovac, and it is important to remember. Besides, if you look command of Jasenovac and Dadik (ph), concentration camp of Ustasha, you will not find any Muslim's name in that position. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Thank you.

MR. BUGAJSKI: Okay, thank you very much. I'd like thank the president. He's obviously started an initiative, a very important debate on how to make Bosnia into a truly functional state that can integrate into European Union and NATO. And we will be watching and helping where we can. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SILAJDŽIĆ: Thank you all.

(END)