

# Historical Security Council

## Maintaining law and order in the Former Yugoslavia, 2003



**Forum**

Historical Security Council

**Issue:**

Maintaining Law and Order in the Former Yugoslavia, 2003

**Student Officer:**

Romeo Buet

**Position:**

President

---

## Introduction

In the Balkan Peninsula in February 2003<sup>1</sup>, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was renamed as the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro, the raging Yugoslav Wars were decades past, the series of related ethnic conflicts pushed in the shadows, wars between neighboring nations all part of the republics of Yugoslavia: Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia. The United Nations and other international efforts paid off after years of trying to end the wars through peace accords, and the UN peacekeepers were brought in to extinguish the fighting, their presence seemed to be ineffective at the time because of large differences between the ethnic populations and their goals, the agreements established took long to arrive and be made official but they came through allowing for the independence of the countries and formation of new nations.

What was the caused of the split of Yugoslavia? How are we to re-develop and grow the economies while stabilizing the area, making sure to strengthen political ties and settle framework for governance? How can we prevent any further similar scenarios in the future fostering violence and conflict?

After the triumph of solving the Yugoslavian conflict close to ten year ago, the Security Council's duty remains to discuss the situation in the hopes of finding an efficient, sustainable and peaceful solution. Its priority is the following: to find a way to keep all parties in check and clean in the eyes of the law, while rebuilding the strength and order of each nations to be self-managed in the near future.

To achieve its hopeful objectives the United Nations Security Council needs the participation of all member states and non-permanent states, collaborating for best solution.

---

<sup>1</sup> ("BBC - History - World Wars: Yugoslavia: 1918 - 2003")



## Definition of Key Terms

### Balkan Wars

In 1912 and 1913, the Balkan conflicts erupted in the Balkan Peninsula. It was made up of two battles. The Ottoman Empire was conquered and abolished in the First Balkan War by an alliance of Balkan states. Former allies fought amongst themselves for the Ottoman spoils during the Second Balkan War.

### Yugoslavia

Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Kosovo, and Slovenia formed a former country on the Balkan Peninsula in Central and Southeast Europe, which existed for most of the twentieth century before dissolving in the 1990s. Other names include: Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1963), Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (1946), Democratic Federal Yugoslavia (1943).

### Cease-fire

An agreement, usually between two armies of different countries/nations, in order to stop a conflict and fighting therefore allowing discussions about peace. Historically, the concept existed in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, when it was known as a 'truce of God'.<sup>2</sup>

### Law and order

A social and organizational situation in which the laws and policies of a country are being respected, particularly when the police forces need to intervene for them.<sup>3</sup>

## General Overview

Although Yugoslavia, what began as a noble idea ended in war, destruction and poverty. As the remnant of the old Yugoslavia legislates itself into extinction,

### The Start Yugoslavia

---

<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge Dictionary)

<sup>3</sup> ("Merriam-Webster Dictionary")



The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was the name given to the kingdom when it was founded. The country was renamed Yugoslavia by the government in 1929. In 1939, Croatia's Banovina became an autonomous territory with extensive internal autonomy. On March 25, 1941, Prince Paul of Yugoslavia, the Prince Regent of Yugoslavia at the time, succumbed to fascist pressure and signed the Tripartite Pact in Vienna, hoping to keep Yugoslavia out of the war. Yugoslavia's population makeup at the time of World War II was exceedingly complicated. In general, there were two major ethnic groups in the region: Serbs and Croats, as well as three minor ethnic groups: Albanians, Macedonians, Slovenes and others. As one can assume, there was a lot of friction between various ethnic groups. The Yugoslav army was compelled to surrender on April 17, 1941, due to ethnic divisions and the reality that the country was being attacked from three different directions by three different armies. The Axis conquerors seized regions and divided the country amongst themselves soon after. German troops were obliged to abandon Greece, Serbia, Albania, and Bosnia-Herzegovina in the autumn of 1944, and they retreated from north-western Yugoslavia in April 1945.

Between 1941 and 1945, the Germans and their Axis allies murdered more than 850,000 to 1,200,000 Yugoslavs, according to estimates. Despite having a federal structure, the state was highly centralized, with power concentrated in the hands of Josip Broz Tito, a communist revolutionary who helped liberate the country from German rule in 1944-45, and his Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which operated under a constitution modelled after the Soviet Union. Under the strong political leadership of Tito, the country distanced itself from the Soviets between 1948 and 1963 and developed its own closely managed socialist system. The nation's name was changed to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on April 7, 1963.

President Josip Broz Tito was given a life term. The country was reformed after that, with the ratification of a new Constitution in 1974 that allowed individual republics in Yugoslavia more rights. Inflation and unemployment became important difficulties in the country during the 1980s, particularly. Following Tito's death in 1980, a weak federal administration was left in charge, which struggled to cope with the mounting economic and political issues. An economic crisis arose in Yugoslavia as a result of many major mistakes committed by Yugoslav governments, such as excessive and unplanned foreign borrowing. Such differences were directly responsible for Yugoslavia's breakup. During the 1980s, ethnic



tensions between the various countries in Yugoslavia remained strong, particularly between Albanians and Kosovo Serbs, which resulted in an increase in Serb hostility to the high level of provincial autonomy. Slobodan Milosevic came to power in Serbia in 1987, after gaining widespread support among Serbs for his centralist policies.

The 14th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was held in January 1990. The Slovene and Serbian delegations spent the majority of the convention debating the League of Communists' and Yugoslavia's futures. However, due to significant differences between the parties, they both left the Congress, resulting in the dissolution of the Yugoslav Communist Party. As a result, nationalism grew in all of the Yugoslav republics. Four of the six republics declared independence between June 1991 and April 1992. Slovenia and Croatia were the first republics to proclaim independence from Yugoslavia, doing so in June 1991. The Yugoslav Wars are still going on in the region as of October 1994. The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes was the name given to the kingdom when it was founded.



### Breakup of Yugoslavia

The Croatian government<sup>4</sup> began illegally purchasing weaponry from Hungary in the



spring of 1990, and therefore began to establish its own army. The Yugoslav People's Army, which was controlled by Serbs, intervened to quell the Croatian insurgency and keep the country together. The Croatian army was rapidly destroyed, and Serbs took control of sections of inland Croatia where the bulk of the population was Serbian, particularly the «Republic of Serbian Krajina» region. To take control of Slovenia's borders, the Yugoslav People's Army was organized.

Despite the fact that the Yugoslav People's Army outmanned the Slovenian armed forces, the Slovenian militia defeated their adversary, and Belgrade agreed to a cease-fire after ten days of warfare. Although both Croatia and the Republic of Serbian Krajina had set their borders by early 1992, and a tense ceasefire was in place in the region, the Croats retook the Serb-occupied territory in 1995, when Croatia had acquired a well-equipped army. The Croatian army committed major war crimes against the Serbs during this time, including ethnic cleansing, torture, and dynamiting their homes. Croatia had therefore pushed the Yugoslav People's Army back to its current borders, and the so-called Erdut Agreement had secured peace between the two countries.

In the case of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the state's Serbian minority felt victimized as soon as the country's quest for independence began, preferring to remain a part of an increasingly dominant ethnic group in a large country like Yugoslavia rather than becoming a simple minority in a small state like Bosnia-Herzegovina. As a result, the Serb people of Bosnia and Herzegovina formed their own "state," the Republic of the Serb People of Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose president was backed by the Yugoslav People's Army. Because the Serbian people of Bosnia feared that an overwhelming majority of Bosnians would vote for independence, they moved rapidly to justify their territorial claims and initiated an ethnic cleansing campaign against the local population, particularly the Muslim majority. However, the Croatian minority in Bosnia and Herzegovina turned against both the Yugoslav People's Army and the Bosnian army because they did not feel united with the Bosnian majority owing to cultural and historical differences.

---

<sup>4</sup> (“Serbian and Croatian Nationalism and the Wars in Yugoslavia”)





The Dayton Agreement, which ended the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina and preceded an agreement on Croatia, was signed in Paris on December 14, 1995<sup>5</sup>, marking the conclusion of NATO's greatest military operation, a tremendous humanitarian disaster, and massive population displacement. According to some estimates, 250 000 people died and 2.7 million people were displaced in Bosnia, accounting for one-third of the pre-war population. It was military developments, such as Croatian military victories in Serb-controlled portions of the nation and NATO's significant use of force. It brought the conflict to a close, raising questions about what the 'peace process' had accomplished and whether it had been correctly planned all along. The deployment of 60 000 NATO ground troops, including a sizable US component, meant that the country might expect a 12-month cease-fire, after which the multinational military Implementation Force is set to leave.

The question of whether the cease-fire provides the foundation for a more lasting peace, and whether the Dayton Accord can begin a process of reconciliation and reintegration not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also in neighboring Croatia, Serbia, particularly in relation to Kosovo, and Macedonia, remains unanswered. Peacebuilding is difficult in any country that has been wrecked by violence. Neither side has gained a definitive win in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and neither is pleased with the status quo. The basic reasons of the conflict, most notably the country's territorial divide, were entrenched rather than rectified by Dayton.

---

<sup>5</sup> ("Dayton Peace Agreement")



The success of the International Tribunal at The Hague will be another important factor in achieving a durable peace. Because the international community requires their cooperation, it is likely that the two most directly responsible for the conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the presidents of Serbia and Croatia, Slobodan Milosevic and Franjo Tudjman, will avoid prosecution. The peace deal is simply a small piece of the whole puzzle, it had its impact because of the message it spread to the rest of the world when advertised. Serbia's ostensibly positive participation in Bosnia and Herzegovina was belied by its continuous backing for Bosnian Serbs and its reluctance to take any steps toward resolving the matter in Kosovo, where the Yugoslav secessionist conflicts allegedly originated.

### Reconstruction and progress in former Yugoslavia

Slovenia, which is now prosperous, is looking forward to joining the EU and NATO, with expected admission in next year (2004). Croatia is recuperating from the war, and its territory remains intact, despite the fact that the majority of its Serbs have fled or been expelled. Bosnia and Herzegovina is split in two, a broken country now striving to recover from the war's aftermath. Ethnic violence between ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians has riven Macedonia, although the country has been spared all-out war. After the war in Kosovo, hundreds of thousands of ethnic Albanians returned, while 230,000 Serbs and other non-Albanians were forced to escape.

The conflicts have left Serbia and Montenegro poor, and their future state is far from certain even now, as their new union takes shape. Serbs and Montenegrins share a lot in common, particularly their Orthodox background, however Serbia has eight million people while Montenegro has only 650,000<sup>6</sup>. It remains to be seen whether two republics of such disparate size can work together in a federation. The new agreement calls for a loose union for three years, after which either country will have the option of declaring independence. On paper, it appears to be a reasonable compromise. In actuality, making it work will be difficult, but not impossible, if there is enough goodwill.

However, the new agreement includes no provision for Kosovo, which has been a UN protectorate since 1999 but is still nominally part of Yugoslavia - or its future state. Its primarily Albanian population has no desire to form a new union with Belgrade, and its Serb

---

<sup>6</sup> ("BBC - History - World Wars: Yugoslavia: 1918 - 2003")





population has no desire to allow it to pursue independence. If they are unable to prevent independence, they (and Belgrade authorities) would most likely prefer to partition the country, with the northern Serbian inhabited territories remaining inside Serbia. As a result, the old Yugoslav state has not yet fully disintegrated.

The presence of a significant number of INGOs directly delivering own-brand services exacerbates communication and trust issues, adds to the decline of the professional middle class, and causes local civil society activities to be suspended. The latter has its roots in 1980s social movement and grassroots activities, introducing significant innovation in methods of engaging with marginalized and oppressed groups, and there is evidence that national NGOs are beginning to influence broader social welfare policy and practice. Many people started alternative services that were not connected to or built on current social welfare programs, particularly in the psychosocial field targeted at preventing trauma. Given these findings, a fundamental recommendation is for a more thorough assessment of local civil society and its capabilities prior to donor and INGOs participation.

## Major Parties Involved

### Bosnia and Herzegovina

Bosnian Serb militias began mobilizing in many sections of the nation after Bosnia and Herzegovina declared independence on March 3, 1992. In June 1992, the JNA was compelled to withdraw from the republic's territory due to rising diplomatic pressure. The Army of Republika Srpska was founded by those Bosnian Serbs who remained in the JNA. In 1992, they were able to gain control of a large portion of the country after a series of offensives. Since April 1992<sup>7</sup>, it is estimated that over 100,000 people have been killed and over two million have been forced to evacuate their homes as a result of the war. As previously indicated, the Bosnian Serb advance has also been followed by ethnic cleansing of Bosniaks and Bosnian Croats. Inmates are subjected to assault and abuse, including rape, in concentration camps set up by the government. Bosniak and Bosnian Croat forces are also committing war crimes against various ethnic communities, though on a much lower scale.

### Macedonia

---

<sup>7</sup> (“Bosnian War | Facts, Summary, Combatants, & War Crimes | Britannica”)



After having declared independence in the fall of 1991, Macedonia enjoyed a peaceful separation. The country, populated by a majority of ethnic Macedonians and a large Albanian majority, has remained at peace through the Yugoslav wars up until now.

### Montenegro

Montenegro has remained a part of a smaller Federal Republic of Yugoslavia along with Serbia. During the ongoing Bosnian War and Croatian War, Montenegrin military forces have joined Serbian troops in the attacks on Croatia. These operations seem to be characterized by a pattern of large-scale violations of human rights.

### Croatia

The influence of xenophobia and ethnic hatred has become increasingly clear in the ongoing Croatian War. Propaganda by both Croatian and Serbian sides is being used to spread fear, claiming that the other side would engage in oppression against them and would exaggerate death tolls to increase support from their populations. In many places, ethnic tensions have exploded into violence. The conflict itself is very much ongoing with bombing being used most often as the main kind of attack. The JNA is also actively involved.

### Slovenia

Slovenia's withdrawal from the Yugoslav Federation turned out to be comparatively bloodless. Since the end of the Ten-Day War and the withdrawal of the JNA soldiers and their equipment, Slovenia has not been involved in any further conflict.

### United States of America (USA)

Besides the member states of Yugoslavia and the United Nations, the United States of America is the only party separately involved at this time. American diplomats tried to help set up a new Yugoslav government, however this only lasted from May to December 1992. Representatives of the USA and Yugoslavia are still in discussion with regards to peace, yet as of now no clear progress is being made.

Any other international peace efforts are solely being attempted through the channels of the United Nations and their councils. As of May 30th, 1992, the majority of states from the United Nations have severed economic ties and have imposed sanctions on FR Yugoslavia.



## European Union (EU)

After holding a reluctant stance over the first years of the 1990s, the leading European powers, especially Britain, France and Germany, started taking some initiative to get the feuding ethnic factions in Bosnia-Herzegovina to work out a peaceful political solution. The plans of the Europeans, however, got spurned by US officials. When their effort faltered, the European leaders looked to Washington to take the lead in addressing the issue in Bosnia.

## International Court of Justice (ICJ)

Many countries brought cases to the ICJ in the aftermath of the Yugoslavian war, the most prominent being the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia filed in the Registry of the Court Applications instituting proceedings against Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, United Kingdom and United States of America for alleged violations of their obligation not to use force against another State.<sup>8</sup> While countries former Yugoslavia pursued each other for liability of structural damages, as example when Croatia filed an Application against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) “for violations of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide”.

## The United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY)

The first United Nations criminal tribunal for Europe, acted shortly after the Yugoslav Wars, in May 1993. Since 1991, the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia has been operating under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council, which was established under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. The Tribunal has been given the competence to try individuals who are liable for particular crimes committed in the area of what is known as the former Yugoslavia since January 1991.<sup>9</sup>.

## Timeline of Key Events

Date	Description of event
------	----------------------

<sup>8</sup> (“Latest Developments | Legality of Use of Force (Yugoslavia v. Spain) | International Court of Justice”)

<sup>9</sup> (“OHCHR | Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia”)



<b>December 1st, 1918</b>	The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes is declared in Belgrade
<b>October 3rd, 1929</b>	The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes is renamed to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.
<b>April 6th, 1941</b>	Hitler attacks Yugoslavia
<b>April 17th, 1941</b>	The Yugoslav army is forced to surrender
<b>April, 1945</b>	The final German troops retreat from Yugoslavia
<b>1946</b>	Yugoslavia is established as a socialist state, a federation of six equal republics: Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro and Macedonia
<b>April 7th, 1963</b>	The nation changes its name to Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY) & Josip Broz Tito is named President for life
<b>1983</b>	The International Monetary Fund (IMF) starts demanding economic restructuring as a prerequisite for further financial support
<b>June 25th, 1991</b>	Slovenia and Croatia are the first republics to declare independence from Yugoslavia
<b>June 26th, 1991 - October 26th, 1991</b>	Ten-Day War was initiated by the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) following the independence declaration by Slovenia, when asked to guard the borders in Slovenia, local authorities blockaded roads which led to stand-offs across the republic
<b>7<sup>th</sup> July 1991</b>	Brioni agreement is a document signed by representatives of Slovenia, Croatia, and Yugoslavia under the political sponsorship of the European Community (EC) to create an environment in which further negotiations on the future
<b>1991 - 1995</b>	Croatian War of Independence - fight between Croat forces on behalf of the Government of Croatia and the Serb-controlled Yugoslav People's Army (JNA) along with the local Serb forces.
<b>25 May 1993</b>	The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, also known as the ICTY, was established by UN Security



	Council Resolution 827.
<b>14 December 1995</b>	Dayton Agreement is signed
<b>9 June 1999</b>	Rambouillet Agreement was signed <sup>10</sup> , as a proposed peace treaty between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and a delegation representing Kosovo's ethnic Albanian majority
<b>November 2003</b>	The Security Council convenes

## UN involvement, Relevant Resolutions, Treaties and Events

The United Nations first became involved in the situation in Yugoslavia on September 25th, 1991, when the Security Council adopted resolution 713 (1991) in which deep concern was expressed at the fighting in the country. The UN Security Council has since the end of the war focused its attention on other critical issue, however its key involvement surrounds the justice served to all the accused criminals from the conflicts. The most important of those resolutions are listed below:

- United Nations Security Council Resolution 1116, May 13th, 1998 (S/RES/1116)
- United Nations Security Council Resolution 1329, Nov. 30th, 2000 (S/RES/1329)
- United Nations Security Council Resolution 1350, August 13th, 2001 (S/RES/1350)
- United Nations Security Council Resolution 1431, August 14th, 2002 (S/RES/1431)
- United Nations Security Council Resolution 1481, May 19th, 2003 (S/RES/1481)

## Previous Attempts to solve the Issue

The United Nations Security Council has interfered and proposed solutions to the former Yugoslav states numerous times in the past, as evidenced by the number of relevant resolutions submitted from 1995 onwards. An immediate cease-fire was agreed upon during a conference between the Personal Envoy and all Yugoslav parties. All former Yugoslav

<sup>10</sup> ("Interim Agreement for Peace and Self-Government in Kosovo (Rambouillet Accords)\* | UN Peacemaker")



parties also indicated a strong desire for the United Nations to establish a framework for recovery.

Past UN peacekeeping and peace-enforcing missions have included civilian personnel in various operational phases but were designed to rely mostly on the military. This is because at every stage of a crisis (including graduation into post conflict resolution and reconstruction), life-threatening disorder requires the deployment in the field of a significant force of armed, disciplined, and trained units to deter and contend with violence, together with associated logistical support of rapid transport and communications, which only the military possess.

The role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in social reconstruction in conflict and post-conflict societies, became increasingly central to international debates on how to link relief and development in so-called complex emergencies. Leeds Metropolitan University's International Social Policy Research Unit has been conducting research in Post-Yugoslav countries, particularly Croatia, Slovenia, and, more recently, Bosnia and Herzegovina, since late 1993, and has begun to outline alternative policy and practice options for donor agencies and international NGOs. In terms of social development, the research has revealed significant discrepancies amongst the countries analysed. The form of INGOs' emergency intervention has an impact on the creation of a sustainable local NGO sector, according to the research. Other studies also raised concerns about the formation of parallel welfare systems in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina, with INGOs working primarily with refugees and displaced individuals on the one hand, and local and central government services dealing with the local poor on the other. Where donor agencies and INGOs worked through governmental institutions or local partner NGOs, this might result in rivalry for scarce resources with autonomous local NGO projects, resulting in a drain on local skilled personnel. Although there may have been legitimate concerns about the legitimacy and accountability of national government organizations and agencies, setting up and maintaining parallel services does not solve the need for long-term partnerships between local NGOs and the government. Donor agencies and INGOs could promote social welfare for all, particularly for the poorest and most vulnerable sectors of society, by conducting a clear social policy assessment, making their own implicit social visions explicit and open to debate, and building on existing welfare infrastructure where possible.



As an illustration, Prijatelj, a local NGO that worked with Roma, refugees, and others in a particularly deprived neighborhood of Zagreb, began to prioritize joint work with the local Health Centre and Centre for Social Care. Specific case studies illustrate that grassroots initiatives, including volunteer projects like Pakrac and Gornji Vakuf, provided chances for the emergence of new social meanings and, as a result, for peace from below by identifying alternative community leaders. Recent attempts to promote more isolated, project-type approaches based on micro-sociological understandings were considered as significantly less useful than an integrated approach to peace-building as social development. Poverty, unemployment, and social exclusion must be investigated not only on the basis of race, but also on the basis of age, class, gender, ability, and sexuality.

## Possible Solutions

At this point, the international community is sending mixed signals with regards to the next steps to take in the former Yugoslavia. On the one hand, they are defending the

General lawlessness and lack of order not only hampered or denied progress toward peace but also in the interim seriously thwarted the growth and redevelopment operations. Early restoration of the rule of law will always make for safer peace-maintenance. If achieved, it will also reduce the level of military security that is required, which in turn will lead to much cheaper missions. The utility of some degree of law and order in the early phases of peace maintenance is self-evident, like in the case of the former Yugoslavian states by maintaining tight military and police power spread out to knock out as quickly as possible any insurgence.

NGO development and infrastructure repair should not be considered as a goal in and of itself, but rather as part of a larger picture of social welfare and peacebuilding. Thus, the Centre for Peace Studies, a Croatian NGO, combines peace-building training for activists from post-Yugoslav nations with efforts to guarantee that lessons learnt from grassroots initiatives are taken into account by UN agencies, donors, and INGOs.. Rather than seeing NGO work in conflict-affected areas as inextricably divided between low-cost service delivery and a hazy desire to rebuild civil society, the study worked closely with local activists to break down these barriers through local community development programs, legal advice centers, and other means. New links between politics and development emerge as a result of this process, casting doubt on simplistic ideas of NGO activity as apolitical. In ongoing



arguments regarding social integration, questions of entitlement, capability, and sustainability, as well as their polar opposites, need, vulnerability, and distortion, are vital.

Equally important for the promotion and protection of human rights, social cohesion and justice in the region is the development of independent, efficient and effective national human rights institutions (human rights commissions, ombudsmen or comparable institutions) All states concerned have established a wide range of national human rights institutions. However, they have had to overcome major obstacles from their inception. In certain cases budgets have been reduced; a situation that has led to the reduction of the efficiency of these institutions. The lack of implementation of decisions of national human rights institutions is another obstacle to their effectiveness. To this end these institutions need wide political support notably from national leaderships that should recognise the former as valuable contributors to their efforts to ensure full respect and protection of the rule of law and human rights. Lastly, education is another vital sector where reforms are necessary in order to achieve post-conflict justice and peace. Given the persisting ethnic polarisation in the region, the extensive expertise of the Council of Europe in this sector may be well used by all states concerned in order to enhance human rights, democratic citizenship and cultural diversity in their education systems. Genuine knowledge of history facilitates understanding, tolerance and trust between individuals, especially the younger generation, and peoples. All countries concerned should realise the vital need to teach history without resorting to one single interpretation of events. It is only through an open dialogue, knowledge of the truth and deep reflection that members of post-conflict democracies in Europe may attain social cohesion and preserve their inherent, valuable pluralism.

To conclude, the solutions you will be proposing on your drafted resolutions should mainly focus on maintaining the law and order of the aforementioned states, the deployment of UN advisory panel for economic stability, overview of police forces for ethical practices, prevention of revolutionary movements, clear leadership and policies, transparency in communication & coalition for preparation of future years.

## Bibliography





“Part of Yugoslav Wars”; <https://archive-media-1.nyafuu.org/wg/image/1507/61/1507610294917.jpg>. Accessed 24. Sep. 2021.

Wilde, Robert. “History of Yugoslavia - Overview.” *ThoughtCo*, ThoughtCo, 24 Sep. 2021, [www.thoughtco.com/yugoslavia-1221863](http://www.thoughtco.com/yugoslavia-1221863).

“What Is the Former Yugoslavia?” *What Is the Former Yugoslavia? | International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia*, [www.icty.org/en/about/what-former-yugoslavia](http://www.icty.org/en/about/what-former-yugoslavia).

Forum: Imaginary Security Council. [www.dsamun.gr/archives/22nd-conference-2019/study-guides/314-the-yugoslav-conflict-historical-security-council/file](http://www.dsamun.gr/archives/22nd-conference-2019/study-guides/314-the-yugoslav-conflict-historical-security-council/file), 10.1093/oi/authority.20110803100308582. Accessed 30 Sept. 2021.

“Mandate and Crimes under ICTY Jurisdiction | International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.” *Icty.org*, 2017, [www.icty.org/en/about/tribunal/mandate-and-crimes-under-icty-jurisdiction](http://www.icty.org/en/about/tribunal/mandate-and-crimes-under-icty-jurisdiction). Accessed 20 Sept. 2021.

“Timeline: The Former Yugoslavia.” *Infoplease*, Infoplease, [www.infoplease.com/spot/timeline-former-yugoslavia](http://www.infoplease.com/spot/timeline-former-yugoslavia).

“UNITED NATIONS: SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS REGARDING the SITUATION in the FORMER YUGOSLAVIA.” *International Legal Materials*, vol. 31, no. 6, 1992, pp. 1427–1484. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/20693757](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20693757). Accessed 30 Sept. 2021.

Deutsche Welle. “Yugoslavia, 1918: Birth of a Dead State | DW | 01.12.2018.” *DW.COM*, [www.dw.com/en/yugoslavia-1918-birth-of-a-dead-state/a-46538595](http://www.dw.com/en/yugoslavia-1918-birth-of-a-dead-state/a-46538595).

Wever, Ana. “The Situation in Yugoslavia, 1994 Model United Nations International School of the Hague.” 2019.

Plunkett, Mark. “Reestablishing Law and Order in PeaceMaintenance.” *Global Governance*, vol. 4, no. 1, 1998, pp. 61–79. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/27800184](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800184). Accessed 30 Sept. 2021.



Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. "Illyrian Movement." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., [www.britannica.com/topic/Illyrian-movement](http://www.britannica.com/topic/Illyrian-movement).

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. "Refworld | Yugoslavia: Criminal Code of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia." Refworld, 2021, [www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b5fe0.html](http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6b5fe0.html). Accessed 30 Sept. 2021.

Sheridan, Michael. "United Nations: What's Gone Wrong? / The High Cost of Peacekeeping." *The Independent*, Independent Digital News and Media, 23 Oct. 2011, [www.independent.co.uk/voices/united-nations-whats-gone-wrong-the-high-cost-ofpeace-keeping-failure-in-yugoslavia-1501437.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/united-nations-whats-gone-wrong-the-high-cost-ofpeace-keeping-failure-in-yugoslavia-1501437.html).

Boelaert-Suominen, Sonja. "The International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Kosovo Conflict - ICRC." *Icrc.org*, 31 Mar. 2000, [www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/article/other/57jqd2.htm](http://www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/article/other/57jqd2.htm). Accessed 20 Sept. 2021.

"OHCHR | Statute of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia." *Ohchr.org*, 2019, [www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalTribunalForTheFormerYugoslavia.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalTribunalForTheFormerYugoslavia.aspx). Accessed 24 Sept. 2021.

"The historical boundaries of Yugoslavia from 1919 to 1992"; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Yugoslavia-former-federated-nation-19292003/media/1/654783/42975>. Accessed 24 Sep. 2021.

"Case Law of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (Human Rights Watch, February 2004)." *Hrw.org*, 2021, [www.hrw.org/reports/2004/ij/icty/index.htm](http://www.hrw.org/reports/2004/ij/icty/index.htm). Accessed 24 Sept. 2021.

"5. The Former Yugoslavia: The War and the Peace Process | SIPRI." *Sipri.org*, 2021, [www.sipri.org/yearbook/1996/05](http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/1996/05). Accessed 25 Sept. 2021.

## Appendix or Appendices



- I. Parenti, Michael. *To Kill a Nation: the Attack on Yugoslavia*. Verso, 2002.
- II. *Latest Developments | Legality of Use of Force (Yugoslavia v. United States of America) | International Court of Justice, [www.icj-cij.org/en/case/114](http://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/114)*.
- III. *General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and selections from the Annexes*

