

The Inevitability of Strengthening the Nation-Building Subjectivity of Ethnic and National Groups

Harun Hadzic

Abstract

This paper presents a very courageous, scientifically founded prediction, concerning the imminent and inevitable process of strengthening the political and nation-building subjectivity of national minorities and ethnic groups, i.e., minority indigenous people. For, a more lasting peace and stability, for which we want to dominate in Europe and the world, can only be achieved by deflection of the discontent of these nationalities, on one hand, and strengthening of the public recognition of their international legal subjectivity, on the other hand. This implies the exercise of their right to self-determination and the creation of independent autonomies, regions or countries, which also implies reclassification and conversion of the internal, but also of the interstate borders. These new limits must be established precisely in those parts of the world where there is a political struggle, and a long-time demand of these organized groups, which would, in effect, mean that the international community should accept their demand for creation of new states, or, at least, another, lower, level of independence.

Key words: Political subjectivity, minorities, ethnic groups, indigenous minority peoples, the right to self-determination, changes in national borders, creating new states and new federations.

Dr.Sc. Harun HADŽIĆ

1. Introduction

There are frequent requirements of national and ethnic minority groups to acquire some degree of independence – from autonomy to state. The prominent theorist of international law, Professor . Dr. Aleksandar Pavković, considering the multi-ethnic reality in Serbia and the states created on the territory of former Yugoslavia, interceded a benevolent attitude towards the territorial rearrangement and drawing of new borders in countries with intrastate, transnational issues. He claims: “I would not engage in the discussion how would these borders be budgeted since it seems to me that these are cabinetmaking games where people make maps as they like. However, some maps have already been made in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) by creating two entities; in a way some maps are made in Kosovo considering the fact that various Serbian enclaves are separated from the other parts of Kosovo by KFOR, and the three municipalities (Preševo, Bujanovac and Medveđa; author’s note) you are talking about, they too, have a special status; and the Albanian municipalities in Macedonia already have a special status. In my opinion, in the long run, it is better to follow these boundaries and create some sort of compromise that will meet these groups seeking self-determination, rather than to postpone their requests ad infinitum.”¹

Speaking further about the previously on several occasions emphasised claims - that joining the European Union will neutralize many of the requirements of various entities for secession and independence, prof. Pavković says: “ It is a great advantage to enter the EU as an independent state, and not as part of some other independent state. Thus, it is, as you know, in the very mobilization of the Slovenian population, the first effective secession in the former Yugoslavia, the demand for Europe has been talking about this logic. It is much more efficient for a national group to join the EU as an independent nation, as an independent state, rather than as a part of a larger creation, because in this way it gets much greater political rights, the right of veto in the vast number of cases, more opportunities are obtained to participate in decision-making in the EU. And the existence of the EU, as a protector of small states and as an organization that small states favour, exactly played that role for a number of territories in the former Yugoslavia to secede with the aim of entering the EU as separated, independent state. Hence, surely that even from the standpoint of the Kosovo political elite, the Albanian political elite, it would be much more convenient for Kosovo to join the EU as an independent state rather than as a part of another state ... Of course, the boundaries between different parts of Europe will have much less significance than earlier, but for the political elites that now rule in all these different states of the former Yugoslavia is much more suitable to enter the EU independently.”²

1 Pavković, Aleksandar: (2004) *Nationalism is not to be suppressed by force*, Interview given to Radio Free Europe, 09. June 2004. (Pavkovic is a professor at the Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia).

2 Ibidem.

Explaining the situation - that the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo would mean a change in the principles that the international community used when granting independence and recognition of the independence of the former Yugoslav republics, according to the decision of the Badinter Commission, when the **republics**³ took advantage of the right to self-determination and not the **nations**, Professor Pavković points out that it is inevitable to depart from the **territorial** and accept the **national** principle for secession of these territories. He further states that " there is a strange logic that justifies this present situation, it is a political pseudo - psychology, where they say that people are often excited after the conflict, that they need time to settle down and become more rational and see, in fact , that they do not need independence, that they can live without political independence." Denying the validity of this logic professor Pavković concludes: "I think it's a pretty short-sighted political psychology, that it actually doesn't happen. People will, especially politicians still have these requirements and is therefore, in my opinion, better to change the principles and try to find some solutions that are more durable rather than to keep the situation vague like this, and it seems to me that the history of this part of the Balkans speaks about the systematic application of the principles of **national self-determination** and that it is useless to assume that at some point people will consider this principle pointless and useless ...Usually these groups are continuing to look for a full self-determination , so that's what leads me to believe that this **process of self-determination has not been completed at this area** ... However, what has been clear to us up to this point is that the great powers don't have quite specific politics which they are prepared to carry out under any circumstances concerning this issue. So their policy is changed depending on the circumstances, and the circumstances are also subject to change. Thus these national group seeking independent states, always can count that if they are not complied with at one time, maybe their requests will be met in another time and of course it creates tremendous instability."⁴

These Professor Pavković's predictions are highly supported by various requests, proposals and conclusions of many politicians and scientists, both worldwide and in the former - yugoslav space. Thus, a professor of Princeton University, USA, **Gary Bass**, regarding the same issue says, "**that Republic Srpska**, in case **Kosovo** gains statehood, would be tempted to go the same route, which would leave Bosnia halved, while, at the same time, Belgium is obsessed with talks about the velvet revolution which in 1993 divided the former Czechoslovakia."⁵ Expressing fear of "a chain reaction of secession", which can

3 Some words or parts of sentences are in bold case with the intention of stronger emphasis of their meaning.

4 Pavković, Aleksandar: (2004) *Nationalism is not to be suppressed by force*, Interview given to Radio Free Europe, 09. June 2004.

5 Gary, Bass: (2008) *Independence Daze*, New York Times, Available from: www.nytimes.com/2008/01.06/ [10.12.2013]

occur after Kosovo's statehood, Professor Bass says that "one should not ignore the demands for independence of **Kurdistan** from Iraq, **Chechnya** from Russia and **Pridnestrovia** from Moldova." Reminding that Vladimir Putin, on the occasion of the secession of two regions in Georgia, said that "if someone believes that Kosovo should be granted full independence, why would you deny that to **Abkhazia** or South **Ossetia**," Professor Bass, further writes that "this is not a bad question, and will certainly pursue Bush's successor in the White House". Also, explaining that the uncontrolled right to self-determination should not be approved, this American professor points out that "A group can rightfully ask for international recognition when it is a victim of such a repression that self-government becomes the best way to save lives and liberties", citing his colleague professor from Duke University, Alain Buchanan, who believes that the right to secession is only adjuvant, which is used to correct errors and which is a so-called application of remedial theories on the right to secession.

Interesting is the opinion of former U.S. ambassador to Belgrade, William Montgomery, who has repeatedly said that he considered as an inevitable solution the breaking of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the independence of Republic Srpska. He argues that it is wrong to any longer try to create a functional state of Bosnia and Herzegovina with the Republic Srpska in it, as well as still retain Kosovo within Serbia. He says, we "... steadfastly insists that it is possible, with enough pressure and encouragement, to establish a fully functioning society in Bosnia and Kosovo, without changing the borders. And we persistently ignore all the evidence saying the contrary, and label as obstructionist those who openly speak about alternative approaches. The reality is that no amount of 'stick' or 'carrot', including rapid admission into the European Union or NATO, will persuade the Bosnian Serbs to cede the central government a significant portion of its rights and privileges which they have under the Dayton Agreement, and which the Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks) and the international community are persistently trying to achieve... Both in Kosovo and in Bosnia we have to consider different solutions - those that we may not like and that will have its complications, but that would be really ... attainable. This is the only way for the international community to end its presence in the Balkans. In Kosovo, this would probably mean some kind of division between Albanians and Serbs, together with mutual recognition, guarantees of full rights for minorities and many 'candies' from the EU. Bosnia is much more complicated. There the solution would probably involve forming different relationships within Bosnia and allowing Republika Srpska, the Serbian part of this divided country to hold a referendum on independence."⁶

6 Montgomery, William: (2009) "Vijesti" daily newspaper, Podgorica, 2009. 06. 07., *The West must realize that the current policy in the Balkans is not sustainable*, article by William Montgomery, former U.S. Ambassador to Bulgaria, Croatia and Serbia / Montenegro and former special adviser to the president of Bosnia.

In the same sense, we are stating a research from April, May and June 2009 conducted by NGO *Libertas Kroacija* from Mostar, which shows that more than 95 percent of Croats from Bosnia want to conduct a referendum on the future organization of BiH, i.e. the possible secession of the Croatian part of the country. "On the referendum" this non-governmental organization believes, "the people and all citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina would decide on three entity BiH, or independence of Herceg-Bosna, the Republic Srpska and the Bosniak Union, 'how the Bosniak future independent state would be called.'" All three countries would eventually find their place in the European Union."⁷

2. The nation-state is reality

By analytical and synthetic consideration of the arguments and principles that speak of the **right to self-determination**, the principle of **uti possidetis iuris**, and various other similar theories of secession and the achievement of international legal **subjectivity** of indigenous ethnic groups, we come to the conclusion that the so-called **nation-state is not to be extinct**. On the contrary, multi-ethnic states are increasingly in crisis and there is a reasonable forecast, as the practice shows, that there will be their further dissolution, and exactly following national principles and national sutures. Any "decision on the disappearance of the nation state is not founded. Conversely, there are certain transformations in order to more effectively respond to the new global challenges in the eve of the 21st century ... the EU member states have not ceased to be a national ... The EU has neither abolished the national identity of the people in its structure, nor the independence of their countries ... the nation-state is not, therefore, displaced because of the actions of the transnational corporations, but its functions are adjusted to the changed circumstances ... The claim that the nation-states experience dusk is in contradiction to the fact of the rapid growth of the number of nation-states since the fall of the Berlin Wall and the unification of Germany."⁸

Graham Fuller expresses the following view on the nation-state: "The current international order of the existing state boundaries, drawn with only a passing consideration of ethnic and cultural desires of their settlers - is, at this point essentially obsolete. The rising forces of nationalism and cultural awakening are ready to confirm their existence. States that are unable to manage their ethnic minorities in a manner that will satisfy both past grievances and future aspirations for greater self-determination, are doomed to decay. Only defined ethnic groups, rather than the current national states, will become the basic constituent elements of the future international order."⁹

7 NGO *Libertas Kroacija*, (2009) *Croats want referendum*, "Vijesti" daily newspaper, Podgorica, 2009. 06. 23.

8 Košutić, Budimir: (1996) *Perspectives of the nation-state*, in, "Legal Life - Journal of Legal Theory and Practice", No. 5-6, Belgrade, 1996. p. 23-35.

9 Graham E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed

That such statements from the reputable scholar Fuller and the previously cited scientists and politicians are not just bare hypothesis or theories, we saw from the previous political practice that is in circulation in the world, but, we deem it necessary, in support of the same, to provide some reflections that in recent years circulate throughout former Yugoslavia. Namely, it is openly said that the **Badinter Commission** applied the wrong principle when it ruled that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia disintegrated within the republic borders, which AVNOJ¹⁰ borders, and that, when established, did not respect the national principle, and which were drawn without conducting a referendum and disrespectful to the necessary parameters in the field. So in June 2009, the President of the Slovenian National Party **Zmago Jelinčić**, as reported by the Podgorica daily newspaper *Dan*, expressed his view that “[he]considers the on the soil of former Yugoslavia a new boundaries drawing is necessary for which **international peace conference** is necessary. Jelinčić has launched this initiative with the Government of Slovenia as well as in front of the Council of Europe. In an interview for the Frankfurt News he announced that the conference will gather representatives from Montenegro, Serbia, Republika Srpska and Slovenia.”¹¹ Jelinčić explained his proposal saying: “AVNOJ borders are nonexistent category. Neither on the first nor on the second session of AVNOJ, a single word is spoken on the issue of borders. All the boundaries within former Yugoslavia were administrative and were never determined according to an interstate and international treaty. They were the result of an agreement among communist leaders.”¹²

Commenting the proposal given by the Slovenian politician Jelinčić, the Dean of the Faculty of Law in Podgorica and head of the Department of International Law, Professor Dr. Ranko Mujović, pointed out: “ Even before, I’ve supported the idea. The borders of former Yugoslavia are artificial and are not professionally conducted. These boundaries are drawn by people without adequate education. That is why today there is almost no state created by the collapse of Yugoslavia which can be said to have finally resolved the issue of the border. Currently, the most recent are Croatia and Slovenia. However, Montenegro has an unresolved issue of the sea border with Croatia, and there were stories about the requirements of Bosnia and Hercegovina’s sea exit...

Alibasic, Paper published under the title “Remaking the world’s borders” in “Znakovi vremena” - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23. (E Graham. Fuller is a senior political scientist at the prestigious American think-tank RAND (Research and Development) Corporation and former Deputy Chief of the Council for National Security (the National Security Council) at the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).

10 At the session of AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in 1943., the decision was taken on the order of Yugoslavia at the federal principle, and made up to the already known former Yugoslav republic, with borders that were afterwards the decision of the Badinter Commission in 1992. , proclaimed national borders of the newly created states.

11 Jelinčić, Zmago: (2009) Interview, “Dan”, Podgorica daily, 2009. 06. 03.

12 Ibidem.

Because of all this, it is necessary to organize an international conference where experts would be engaged to resolve the borders' issue."¹³

It is interesting to note Graham Fuller's further reflection who expresses the attitude that "the demise of many countries will only herald the first phase of a new cycle of regeneration of the state." He believes that the newly formed ethnically based states, will quickly realize that self-determination and sovereignty are not a long term answer to their needs. States will, he says, eventually re-unite with other states and nations - but this time "as voluntary members of the new covenant, and not as forced members into a losing venture." He explains that "the reconstitution of most international borders, therefore, reflects - for the first time in history - the transition from **power** as the guiding principle in establishing states toward a reorganization based on **will** and interests of the **constituent peoples**."

Fuller also believes that "multiplication of nations, the infinite states splitting, the proliferation of sovereign entities, doubling or tripling the number of UN members over a century - are just some of the implications of the current course of **upcoming ethnic consciousness** on a global scale. This process suggests a significant dislocation and chaos in most parts of the world. Although - as seen from the political, cultural, social and economic point of view - **the nation-state** is less enlightened form of social organization than the multi-ethnic state, **it is in any case inevitable**."¹⁴

Such Fuller's prediction, which we believe are quite correct and logical, completely confirm our thesis of a growing subjectivity strengthening of the indigenous peoples, or of their certain perspective of self-determination and creation of their independent national state.

3. Statehood is conditioned by ethnicity

Until the eighties of the twentieth century both eastern and western scholars and politicians believed that the number of countries in the world is stabilised to about 180 members of the United Nations. However, after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, when fourteen new independent states were created - it was realized that there is a link between ethnicity and statehood.

The dissolution of the Soviet Union was little mourned, and it only hastened the disintegration of other states along ethnic lines. Also, by almost the same principle, Socialist Yugoslavia has disintegrated producing six newly independent states, in a bloody process, but with obvious prospects for Kosovo, as the seventh constituent unit of the former state, to gain independence and

¹³ Ibidem.

¹⁴ Graham, E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed Alibasic, Paper published under the title "Remaking the world's borders" in "Znakovi vremena" - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23.

international recognition. On the African continent, Ethiopia has, so far, given birth to one country, **Eritrea**, with some possibility of further secession from the former, also socialist state. Of the former communist Czechoslovakia, by a model "of agreed divorce", resulted two new states - the Czech Republic and Slovakia. It is quite reasonable to ask - whether Communist China would be immune to the attacks of post-communist ethnic stratification. There already are in this country open demands for secession of **Tibet**, East **Turkestan**, **Taiwan** and, perhaps, even some areas inhabited by the Mongols. However, all this is just the tip of the iceberg.

Graham Fuller points out that the idea of nationalism, which grew out of the European revolutions of the nineteenth and twentieth century, from the unification of Germany and Italy, as well as the remnants of the dying Ottoman and Austro - Hungarian empires planted in many minds the ideal of ethnic nationalism and gave **impetus to visions of self-determination**. He says: "The idea of a state based on a particular nation is made holy as a new kind of organizational principle, alluring, mysterious and elemental in its roots. In its more benign forms, it has produced great national composers - Chopin, Mussorsky, Smetana, Kodali, and poets - Mickijevich, Pushkin, Sandor. Poland was for the Poles, Germany for the Germans, France for the French. Lesser internal ethnic groups (Corsicans, Basques, Catalans, Bretons, Flemish) were not considered in the rush for building a state."¹⁵

Fuller further explains that the nation-state was a European invention, but an invention unfit for use outside of the European area, so that in an era of global decolonization that followed World War II, the term " nation-state " was loosely applied to all new state, although ethnic and national boundaries rarely matched. For instance, he says, that in the Middle East the former imperial powers tailored the new 'nation-state' from the broader social fabric of Arabs, who never thought of so many nations. "The Arab nation without a single state, and many Arab states without an entire nation -is the way in which Arabs now describe the Western-sponsored, often arbitrary system of Arab states, many of which still don't have a strong sense of their own separate nationality."¹⁶

Further, Fuller explains how the colonial powers at their own discretion and for their interests have molded borders on the African continent, and continues: "colonial rule created a patchwork of colonies whose borders arbitrarily divided ethnic groups just to meet the requirements of European rivalries. This resulted that Africa today is an ethnic crazy quilt of ethnic groups crossing borders or swallowing other ethnic groups within a particular state."¹⁷

15 Ibidem.

16 Ibidem.

17 Ibidem.

He also points to the problems caused by setting of arbitrary borders in South Asia, where the imperial powers formed a new 'nation-states', which are essentially large empires (i.e. countries with a large number of nationalities, such as India, Indonesia), or even mini empires (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Thailand), often based on earlier imperial groupings. In most of these new states, the elite nationality dominated the state national conglomerate and considering Asia today there is a multiplicity of ethnic groups in each of these so-called nation-states - Pakistan, India, China, Russia, Burma, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, Syria, etc.

"The fact is that there are few countries in the world built by carefully drawn ethnic lines. Majority has numerous ethnic minorities whose voices will be stronger in the decades to come. Their borders are artificial. Certainly, in reality all borders are artificial - just a small number of them has ever been "scientifically" drawn. They reflect arbitrary conditions - historical events or incidents that created them. Many were drawn by a ruler to suit militarily defensible borders: along major rivers, the edges of inhospitable deserts, or impassable mountain crags. Most involved a dominant ethnic or linguistic group with which the nation was closely identified. The defeated nations, or smaller and weaker nations were swallowed at one or another large conglomerate," says Fuller, in the same place, and continues "War and conflict were determining for this process. Contracts signed at the end of the war often included arbitrarily determined new boundaries drawn according to the winner's wishes, borders guaranteed by the force of international law, until the moment when subsequent events would make them obsolete'. Even the U.S. border reflects only arbitrarily **freezing of the status quo** after one or another battle or diplomatic agreement."

Fuller further speaks about the fetichising of the existing borders in the world and then interestingly notes that today's international borders are nothing more than **mere legal fiction**. He expresses his view that after the World War II, all the nations of the world had a strongly expressed desire for peace and the birth of the United Nations continues to "encourage the unreasonable idea that the borders must be respected" because, allegedly, "how to otherwise discourage aggression"? However, even though in reality, as Fuller states, borders are nothing more than just temporary - often heavily disputed legal benefits which are the expression of the current balance of power, still for many of us who are **geopolitically aculturated during the Cold War**, these existing boundaries seem to us somehow "as part of the natural order of things which can be touched only at great risk to global stability."

Today's concept of national borders Fuller considers wrong, and among other things concludes: This is, however, time limited vision. The fact is that entire nations ended up within the limits, societies and cultures in which they have never wanted or asked to be. Who can explain to the Tibetans that, while the oppression of their people and the looting of their culture by the Chinese is regrettable, the Tibet's status within China is basically "legal" and "appropriate"?

Why? Because the British Empire (which no longer exists) found it necessary to resolve its rivalry with Imperial Russia (which is no more) about influence in the region with common recognition of the very much disputed claims of the **Qing Dynasty** (which also no longer exists) of “sovereignty” over Tibet? One need not be a Tibetan to realize such an arrangement surreal. With similar consideration **Kashmir** must not be allowed to decide its own destiny, says New Delhi. Otherwise, the very logic of India (as a state) comes into question. Does it? Fuller without doubt further states: “regardless of the virtues of the older order of legally accepted international borders, no matter how they are reached at, they would very likely prove fragile in the next century. If ethnicity - through active and persistent choice of dozens of people -imposes as a true organizing principle for determining state borders in most parts of the world in the next century (in that case) redrawing of international borders will be a long and complex process. We all naturally loath to contemplate the chaos which will reconfiguration of so many boundaries cause. However, the pressures of these changes will be hard to resist. Perhaps the best thing we can do is to anticipate them in order to be able to go out with them at the end, “¹⁸ says Fuller.

4. Factors for changing the borders

In order not to be understood that we present only bare suggestions and arbitrary assertions that there will be changes to the boundaries, and that the existing boundaries are outlived, we outline several factors cited by Graham Fuller. He explains why it is difficult to prevent the strengthening of international legal subjectivity of the indigenous people and all the other minority groups, and to preserve the present international boundaries of the existing states, and says:

1) Removing the communist countries has shown that a multi-ethnic empires controlled by force, by all indications, can not outlive the 21st century. The Soviet Union fell apart for many reasons, but the deep ethnic divisions were among the key factors, although the totalitarian order is believed to have cut out ethnicity as a political force. Of course it was just one big illusion and self-deception. Because, Moscow has only deep frozen ethnicity and ethnic conflicts, so that, once they thaw, these conflicts are re-emerged and much deadlier than ever before. Thus, immediately after the government totalitarian discipline eased, many constituent ethnic groups and peoples seceded. However, as the continuation of conflicts in Chechnya, Abkhazia, Ingushetia and some Caucasian entities, shows, the story in Russia is not yet completed. Thus, the example of the Soviet Union relentlessly shows that the boundaries of the remaining multi-ethnic states, of the so-called “empires”¹⁹, large and small, are unsustainable.

¹⁸ Ibidem.

¹⁹ The term “empire” is used by Graham Fuller to denote a group of people who live under one government, and not voluntarily agree to it.

2) As we can see, international system based on the principle of the nation-state is doomed to failure when its constituent elements are not really a nation-state. It is quite well known that the recent stability of national borders in the so-called Eastern bloc and the Third World, was solely the result of the authoritarian governments. Most ethnic minorities and people have been “persuaded” that non-acceptance of the domination of the ruling nationality would be fatal to their health - as, according to Graham Fuller, Saddam Hussein repeatedly demonstrated to its Kurds, or as Guatemala has to their Indians - the Maya.

3) In the absence of the Cold War discipline, international order in which all ethnic conflicts were potential spark for nuclear confrontation, we find ourselves today in an era in which many factors are permanently working on the awakening of new / old ethnic desires for autonomy or independence. Ironically, the West is the one that produced the most ideological and intellectual premises on which the demands for self-determination lean. The democratic principles suggest that the desire of people are crucial in determining the kind of government they will have. Principles of human rights requires that those who seek peaceful change are not to be tortured, killed or otherwise abused by the state. Modern communications bring world events on every door, so no one can remain unaware of what Palestinians, Tamils, Tibetans, Chechens or Indians - Maya, Aborigines, Maoris, etc. want.

Organizations of Human Rights search the world looking for misdemeanors of the principles of justice, and provide legal aid to those who seek it. “Zapatistas” (Mayan Indians) rebels from the Mexican state of Chiapas, promote their fight on the internet, so the state mechanisms become increasingly powerless to control the information flow - and even less the events - about what is happening within their borders.

Today, in the world increasingly less is raised the question - “Why would some indigenous people sought separate state,” and even more - “**why not?**” For almost every nation that feels that so far in history didn’t have a fair chance to find their place on the world political scene, to feel the dignity of sovereignty and to exercise their right to self-determination, the moment is to require all this, unless, as Fuller notes, “if it is not being presented powerful reasons not to do it.”

5. Dignity or economy

Western values concerning individual human rights, the rule of law and equality in front of the law -no matter how imperfectly been applied - have created new standards. As a result, we have new mottos of ethnic entities around the world, including even the United States, and those are “**dignity**” and “**respect**”. “**Respect**” is highly rated, almost as well as “economic equality” in

considerations of minorities everywhere in the world, and especially indigenous or minorities people. Such ideas are contagious and will infect minority groups and indigenous people everywhere, even where the rule of law is far from realization.

Throughout history, people have always rebelled against their oppressors, so that no matter how the state through media or otherwise isolate and demotivate their minorities and indigenous people, it is more and more difficult to prevent breakthrough ideas from outside or to keep rebel groups inside.

And the state itself is under attack. Its sovereignty is limited by UN resolutions from the “**top**”, declarations on human rights and international conventions, as well as from the “**bottom**” from the growing demands of a better - informed public. China may be angry about the status of Taiwan, or Serbia on Kosovo’s status, saying they were “strictly their internal affairs”, but everyone knows that they are not. Global economic trends clearly suggest that the centralized states, those dinosaurs that are held by force, will need to be redefined.

Decentralization is, obviously, an forthcoming order both on the economic and administrative-management plan. IT systems, communications and cross-border cooperation, make existing borders virtually irrelevant to the principle of economic creativity and productivity. Arbitrary state boundaries in the past have little economic or even an administrative sense in the context of broad regional economic groupings and their relationships with other such regional actors.

The emergence of **ethnic regions** as **economic entities** is inevitable, which are spread across the borders of existing nation states. Isn’t the concept of the so-called European “cross-border regions” a hint of quiet recomposition of the existing “**quasi - national states**.” But on the other hand, Switzerland is an example of that in the civilized European Union, perhaps the demands for autonomy may become moot simply because the existing state borders anyway do not matter much anymore, but this is just a maybe. For the case of dissolution of the communist states, and some secessionist demands in Belgium, Spain, Canada and even the UK (Scotland, Wales), are telling us that the process has already begun, and the question is who will be able to stop it? Fuller notes that “virtually all countries are at risk to some extent, and many will use force to prevent any changes to their borders. However, which great powers will intervene to prevent significant changes for a longer period? The war in Iraq has demonstrated that the United States are more reluctant to intervene by force, except where American vital interests are clearly large. Washington has probably already figured out that it is difficult to cope with this slow destabilizing process, but how can it stop it? After all, if the existing states are not able to satisfy their constituent people, why would the international order intervene to preserve by force what is clearly unsustainable arrangement?”²⁰

20 Graham, E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp.. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed

6. The force and dictatorship will not preserve state

In today's modern world, the way it is, with the increasing growth of education, the awakening of national consciousness and the development of the emancipation of the people, minorities and groups, more and more will grow their feeling of freedom and dignity. From these facts, the message for most of the states is clear - as the world is moving toward a democratic and law-based order, the state can preserve boundaries only by force and renunciation of democratic government. However, the use of force and trampling of democracy, simply, is no longer trendy and the cultural world would consider it a crime. "Such countries will increasingly be rejected at the international level. Continuing internal clutter will distract international economic investors. Indeed, the state whose main reason for existence is the preservation of the dieing, closed and sterile political order, will be able to offer very little to its people and the international order."²¹

Modern politicians are increasingly realizing that the use of force against ethnic groups, does not neutralize their national feeling. On the contrary, it inspires, gives it the right and strenghtens it. Iraq is the most recent example. Time will show, contrary to the desires to preserve this country as one state, bearing in mind the cruel history of poor treatment of minorities in the last few decades that this country will dissolute or at least federalize. Iraq, as a single unitary state, was possible only under Saddam Hussein. Today, when there is no Saddam and when America will one day completely withdraw, the collapse of the state is highly probable, unless its wiser heads do not agree on a federal solution which would, in turn mean the application of national principles and the principle of self-determination with international legal subjectivity of all indigenous and constituent people of this country. The issues of Libya and Syria are just great unknowns. Maybe even of Egypt, perhaps even of Turkey.

No matter that the economy leads to a prosperous life of people and their well-being, yet it will not hold them together if at the same time it doesn't contribute to their national subjectivity. On the contrary, economic globalization will continue to accelerate ethnic stratification in many cases. "As globalization takes momentum, the economic winners and losers will inevitably emerge. When the line between winners and losers matches ethnic lines, it will reinforce the incentives for minorities to opt out of a state that makes a failed or failing to meet their expectations."²²

Unfounded is the complaint often heard from opponents of national self-determination that says - that most nations of the world are guided by their

Alibasic, Paper published under the title "Remaking the world's borders" in "Znakovi vremena" - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23.

21 Ibidem.

22 Ibidem.

own interests, and have little desire for an insistence on ethnic goals. For example, "in the Western, materially-oriented political theories almost always is understood and accepted only the "interest" and the 'rational choice' in purely economic and material meanings. There's little sense of the immaterial, so-called 'psychic benefit' or similar imperatives that push small nations, such are the Chechens, to continue to die over the centuries in the **name of independence**. Westerners are less inclined to the idea that the sense of a peoples self, dignity and community, may also be of profound significance. Palestinians could easily decide to assimilate into Arab societies, however, they wanted to preserve their uniqueness. Jews have long been attributing enormous importance of preserving their precious and unique heritage from assimilation. The emotional significance of identity can not be dismissed as, irrational."²³

Indigenous people, minorities and groups who are fighting for self-determination, ask the question - whether it means that "nationalism" is rational only for those who already have their sovereignty and the nation-state, and irrational for those who do not? Thus, despite the great importance of economic factors and the progress of nations, when winners and losers in national economy are ethnically determined, the emphasis on ethnicity will be even more enhanced. This will contribute the processes of globalization as well. This means that, as the population grows, the social situation is deteriorating, unemployment is rising, new cities springing up, social services threaten to fall and state control weakens. In this situation, the desire for finding solutions through self-determination will increasingly strengthen.

7. Every nation has the right to a state

A difficult question is raised-who has the right to a state. Do tens of millions of Kurds scattered in several neighboring countries - Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria, still not have all the qualifications for their own state, while on the other side a million Estonians, a couple of tens of thousands of Maltese, a couple of hundred thousand Montenegrins have. Two million Tibetans who inhabit vast space within today's China and having a completely separate language, culture and religion, also do not have it. There are also millions of Kashmiris, Catalans, Basque. Surprisingly, if the number of population, the size of territory, culture or the degree of distinctiveness of political development, do not determine who qualifies for a state, what does? "Economic viability" which has long and intrusively offered as an important criterion, is as we already noted, now considered subjective and changeable factor since it does not have to have anything in common with the population, the size of the territory, or even owning natural resources but it largely depends on the skillful management of existing resources. Hong Kong, Israel, Singapore, Montenegro and Kosovo are

23 Ibidem.

instructive examples. **“The creation of the state has never depended on the economic viability, but the historical (unexpected, random) event. When the event appeared the state was created, regardless of economic assumptions.”**²⁴

History, as well as legal and political theory and practice, have shown that there are no clear-cut qualifications for statehood states. The nations who meet the conditions for autonomy or independence are those that require them, and who are willing to spend a little effort, and often blood, to acquire them. Naturally the support of the major powers in the process often has a crucial part in it. **The emergence of the states in the Balkans in the 19th century, for example, was a direct result of Western interests around the gradual dismantling of the Ottoman Empire.** Also, the Western fears of the requirements for **self-determination** were significantly mitigated when the Soviet Union, as a hostile force, became under impact from national disintegrations.

However, even if we grant that there are numerous people who have a reasonable desire for autonomy or independence, we must also ask a reasonable question - where will the process of dissolution of the state stop? After the collapse of the USSR the process has not stopped. Little Georgia also became free, but then immediately Abkhazia in its northwest requested independence. Then the northern Muslim Abkhazia, requested a separate status from the Southern Christian Abkhazia.

We have already pointed out that Quebec seeks independence from Canada. If its desires are fulfilled, whether the Inuit (Eskimos) in the north of Quebec are to seek their own state? So, with the advent of each new region and country, there are also new minorities, new groups, new sources of future unhappiness, and even apostasy. In front of the international community the crucial question is posed - how to infatuate order and at the same time not to deny anyone the legitimate right to self-determination. International lawyers must pay particular attention here. Especially because there is no in advance reached agreement on who should have a state in the future. And we have already asserted the inevitability that every group of people, indigenous people, minorities, who really want state, or at least autonomy, will, most likely, in the end get it.

Because, “Every country that can not meet the needs and aspirations of its minorities is doomed to civil war and the eventual breakup. And while this present world does not easily forgive nationalism, it feels more and more uneasy and is less willing to accept the gross violations of human rights committed in the name of omni-justifying principle of the inviolability of national territory. When Nigeria with use of extensive and brutal military force suffocated the attempt of ethnically distinct Bijafre to secede in the late 1960s, few protested. Today , more difficult questions would certainly be asked, especially with regard that the government of Nigeria is now considered as a model of bad government.”²⁵

24 Ibidem.

25 Ibidem.

Referring to the polemics between the Russians and the Americans, regarding the brutal Russian war against secessionist Chechnya, Fuller states the Russian objection –didn't Abraham Lincoln go to war to preserve the United States, and then states the U.S. counter complaint - Chechnya unlike American South has never given prior consent to enter the Soviet Union. Fuller points out further that the American war used to be, and Chechnya is happening now, and concludes that is "unlikely that President Clinton would sent U.S. troops to kill Americans if, say, California voted to withdraw from the Union."²⁶

And, of course, here follows a foregone conclusion - it is an undeniable fact that the local population of any state is less willing to accept that their current rulers, who are imposed on them by a twist in history, have the absolute right to govern them. Moreover, in the modern world "states are more and more vulnerable to determined nationalists that can wreak their anger on national infrastructure, particularly in open societies, to the point where the cost of preserving the unity goes beyond the benefits of that unity."²⁷

8. Myth as a factor in the creation of a nation

There is no clear and generally accepted definition - what defines an ethnic group. Are these biological factors, or some objective, historical facts? Scientific studies have shown that blood ties,²⁸ linguistic similarities or historical events, as it turns out, are not relevant to the determination of ethnicity. On the contrary, it has been shown that **there is only one common sense and practically proven response: ethnic group defines itself.** If one group feels that it makes nationality, nation, then it is so, and no degree of rational proof can change that.

Events in Palestine related to the creation of the state of Israel created the Palestinian people that is now as real as any other nations.

Negating some of the Balkan and former-yugoslav nations - for example, the Bosniaks, the Montenegrins etc. is futile and retrograde job. The fact of origin of people is factual matter, nations are formed, even in the mythology.

"People create myths about themselves, their origin, their history, their national character, their great moments of triumph and their enemies. Myths, fantasies, fictions and even lies, are the tissue of nationhood. What 'really' happened in history is irrelevant. How did the people and nations emerge is not essential. It is essential that they now exist. Operational 'facts' are myths and fantasies."²⁹

²⁶ Ibidem.

²⁷ Ibidem.

²⁸ Bogdanović, Miloš: (2004) *Prokletsvo nacije*, Beograd, p. 66-99

²⁹ Graham, E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed Alibasic, Paper published under the title "Remaking the world's borders" in "Znakovi vremena" - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23.

9. The future of multi-ethnic state

It should not be understood that this works at all costs and a priori wants to justify the nation-state, i.e., that it wants to promote an ethnically based state. No, that is not our aim. We just want to point out some inevitable processes. There are many theorists, as well as practical examples that are manifested through for example the existence of the former empires - the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman, which show that the multi-ethnic and multi-religious country quite successfully survived and functioned. Famous writers, lawyers and researchers, as for example **Tocqueville** and **Lord Acton**, have more than a century ago noticed, looking at the American society, "that the multiethnic and multicultural democracies are generally intellectually richer, fuller in life, and by definition more tolerant than the ethnically homogeneous states".³⁰ However, there is a huge difference between the various types of multi-ethnic societies, which in this paper we must point out.

Specifically, one must make a distinction between the **traditional multi-ethnic state**, on the one hand, and **immigrant societies** such as are the United States today, on the other hand. "Traditional multi-ethnic state is one that is made up of several different historical homelands (which can also be called native habitat, the fatherland, or national cradle), distinct people and cultures ... Most of these homelands are integrated, mostly by force, into larger national units which are usually dominated by one nationality (as in China, Russia, Pakistan, Indonesia, Iran, Sudan, Peru, Spain, etc.). Historically speaking, the residents of these homelands are not inclined to favor living under the domination of others."³¹

Practice has shown that the traditional multi-ethnic state, in most cases, poses more intractable ethnic problems than the immigrant society because it is based on involuntary undemocratic association.

Other factors for the dissolution of multi-ethnic states, such as poor management in the past, wars, genocide, crimes, historical heritage and level of development of self-conscious ethnicity in minority and minority indigenous people, shall, in accordance with, for example, the so-called remedial theories, also play a role. For this reason, work on negotiating the transition from an authoritarian state to a multi-ethnic democracy is complex and more burdensome dangers. Because the question arises - whether minority or indigenous nations, so impatient to try to escape the first chance from the non-democratic multi-ethnic state, or will waive their right to self-determination and strive to improve their situation within the evolving state of the existing system?

30 Ibidem. (Also see the Alexis de Tocqueville, a French political writer (1805-1859): *On Democracy in America*, S. Karlovci-Titograd, 1990).

31 Ibidem

Maybe the international community will try to help countries to preserve their integrity, but if the multi-ethnic state does not understand or is unwilling to acknowledge the existence of the problem, and not be able to successfully utilize international assistance, or even arbitration in managing its ethnic divisions, then “amicable divorce” is preferable to the inevitable civil war in such a state. Because the value of a multi-ethnic state, i.e., multiculturalism and interculturalism, no matter how large may be, can never be imposed by force. One can only be acquired voluntarily and willingly accepted.

10. Perspectives of nationalism

We can surely say that we can expect a long and inevitably messy, perhaps even bloody, realignment and national regroupings in many parts of the world. But it will not be the end of the story, because the cycle of nationalism has far advanced. We can not claim that all countries of the world will fall apart – isn’t Western Europe looking for new forms of unification? However, we should point out the fact that these European integrative processes come only at the end of a long era of national struggle for ethnic self-fulfillment and the creation of nation-states. Does anyone believe that the present level of more mature European nationalism, now ready to make compromises within the freely chosen and rational planning, could be achieved if the western european “**nationalist interval**” was not crossed.

Thus, inevitably follows the syndrome of initial breakup of the present, multiethnic, by force generated societies, and then will follow, according to Fuller’s understanding, the return to the old state. Most people who have never had their own state in the modern era of nation-states, nor a greater degree of self-determination realized, are destined to seek some form of statehood or federal status of their region. There will be a general realization of the national state. The new found freedom will be celebrated. Indigenous, minority and indigenous languages will **become national languages**, sovereignty, independence, and international subjectivity of the new states will be achieved.

However, after the euphoria of freedom, and the acquisition of statehood, people must find ways to live in the real world. The newly formed states will have to be flexible and creative in establishing economic and political relations, often with their erstwhile masters, oppressors and enemies.³² For, the new relationships will be based on healthier psychological bases and on voluntariness, as well as on at least nominal equality of the negotiating positions between now legally sovereign nations, which will have full international legal subjectivity and any kind of sovereignty.

32 During the ten-year war between Iraq and Iran the economic ties have never ceased, even embassies are not withdrawn nor diplomatic relations were interrupted. Also today are already established the economic and diplomatic relations among former yugoslav republics that have been at war with each other since 1992. until the Dayton Agreement in 1995.

“This does not mean that multinational states, similar to what were once the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, will no longer exist. However, the benefits of unity will have to be clearly valid to the parties involved. Such a union would no longer be established through force, dictation, complete unbalance of force and denial of free choice. In short, rationality, legal equality and consent will become the dominant forces in redrawing international and internal borders in the 21st century.”³³

11. Global implications

How will the proliferation of nations and redrawing of many national borders in the world, be reflected in practical terms? Using the Fuller predictions, we can conclude the following :

1) Not all nations, groups and minorities in the world will seek full independence. Expected abandoning the argument of force and a new flexible political and administrative arrangements that include various forms of political and cultural autonomy, the new unions of divided peoples, and surrendering of power from the center to local authorities may meet the needs of many. Thus, the sooner the governments recognize that the challenge of minorities and minority - indigenous people can not be put under the carpet and bypassed, but that it must be met, there will be better chances of preserving the peace and stability of the existing state.

2) The transition into a new international order will indeed be messy, but it will also bring significant benefits. In a world awash with new states, the importance of national sovereignty will inevitably be heavily watered down - a process that is already underway in the European Union. In such a situation, when the number of states is doubled or even tripled, the national sovereignty can mean little more than the recognition of ethnic and national peculiarities. These small states will inevitably feel the need to come together in a broader alliance and pool their resources in order to better deal in the international market economy and power.

3) National and economic containment of society and the state will become increasingly unprofitable concept. The national plebiscites may become more common feature of the international landscape in the 21st century, but a small sovereign entities - states, will negotiate with each other about their economic services and benefits with other countries in the new economic order. Small states may even offer “exclusive contracts” to stronger states, such as for raw materials - especially energy - in exchange for security guarantees and aid. There will be, therefore, until the creation of safety voluntary arrangements between large states and their dependants.

33 Graham, E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp.. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed Alibasic, Paper published under the title “Remaking the world’s borders” in “Znakovi vremena” - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23.

4) There will be a new problem - the emergence of new minorities in the new ethnic-based states. In the worst case, this will lead to ethnic cleansing in the Balkans-like style. It is much more likely that this will involve the voluntary resettlement of populations from other people's ethnic territory in the home territory of their national home country. Balkan historical reality shows that convincingly. Countries in this region are now nationally more homogeneous and more concentrated than at the time of the Berlin Congress. The actual situation is such that many members of different ethnic groups have long moved closer together for greater safety and comfort. An example is the former SSSR region. Millions of Russians were moving from the former Soviet Central Asian republics because they no longer felt comfortable living where they were not welcome. Also, Canadian citizens of Quebec who do not speak French are slowly moving out as the struggle for independence of the province continues. We also have a bitter truth that displaced persons from their homes in Bosnia and Herzegovina do not return to their pre-war multi-ethnic homeland. "This is a regrettable situation, but it is inevitable. The best we can hope for is that such transfers remain quasi-voluntary, non-violent, and that states will eventually realize that there is a cultural and economic price to pay when their minorities leave them. But realistically we can not expect people who seek independence from tyrannical masters, to express warm welcome to their former oppressors, at least not in the short term."³⁴

5) Would set the question of self-defense for new and smaller states in such a situation, but the international order, which will also be transformed, must impose harsher penalties on aggressors. It should create a strong counter-stimuli to prevent ambitious powers to absorb smaller states. This means that international forces designed to protect the newly-formed state should be established. This, according to Fuller, now sounds like an ideal, but soon it will be easily understandable and unavoidable necessity.

6) The reality, however, is likely to look different. The United Nations will be slow to change and adapt to the real needs of peace and the creation of a fairer and more free world. Also, the major powers of the world, like America, are already tired of the regional conflicts in remote isolated places in the world. These forces will have less interest in "**humanitarian**" intervention, because in proportion to the number of states and their conflicts, their strategic importance will decline.

7) Created in that manner, a new global society will be forced to seek new safety solutions and protection mechanisms. Young states will openly or covertly seek defense ties with larger states. This will occur either by religious or civilization principle (Samuel Huntington), or by economic and market forces. Or in turn they will create regional defensive military alliances as instruments of self-protection. These new states can enjoy the luxury of continuing themselves,

34 Ibidem.

in cultural terms, however, the reality of the international order encroach deeper, so the new regional groupings are to be the only and inevitable response for survival, which will be a negation - negations compared to today's breaking of large states, the world's alliances and blocs. However, the logic of justification the entire process consists of voluntary new world concept, i.e., in appreciation and respect for everyone's rights and freedoms, the right to self-determination of all people and international - legal subjectivity and sovereignty of all states.

12. World Mega - Federation

It should be said that the vision of the expected global order given in this paper, is not a vision of occurrence of abnormal, banana, or mini-states. For large and powerful states will continue to survive, especially states whose ability to satisfy their population, are not yet fully tested, i.e., who have learned how to do it. We can assume that Western countries generally meet the requirements in this regard, although no one can with certainty say that within these countries will not occur demands for autonomy or separatism. In this paper we have provided several examples of such indications. This is primarily Canada, then Belgium, and even the United States and the United Kingdom.

Certainly those vital national systems, which are operating visibly well, can acquire new members among the new small ethnic states, which want an alliance with the successful factors. In our opinion, "this may very well be the start of **"world federalism"** built on the foundation of the success achieved in the management. Large, new, voluntary federations, perhaps not always geographically contiguous, will serve as a magnet that will undermine the failing authoritarian multiethnic country, dragging its constituent ethnic parts, resources and everything else."³⁵

We think it will inevitably reach to a **global process of self-selection**, which has for the effect leaving the badly managed states, states with poor ranking on the international level, and the creation of separate entities with international subjectivity. This entails entering into new federal structures or alliances, less attractive for smaller people who intend to join a successful and more vital political systems. So, there will come a time and stage when "a small, young, strong, democratic, ethnically based state which wants a lifetime partnership with a similar state or states, to mutual benefit and eventual reunification. Without chauvinism and police state, please."³⁶

We are free to claim that in such a situation it will come to several regional federal alliances, or unions, who will most likely, but not necessarily, be established within the existing continents, respecting the market, economic, security, or even religious principles for connection within federations. Thus

35 Ibidem.

36 Ibidem.

emerged federations could then enter into some kind of global **Mega - federation**, which would function with the **reorganized structure of the United Nations**, with a new adequately set Security Council, with the United Nations military forces and other international bodies and the necessary authorities.

These considerations are imposed as a necessity, if we bear in mind that the modern military technology, industry, air pollution, wars, economic crises, epidemics, global warming, famine, terrorism, etc. have brought the world to destruction. Apart from that, the started processes of globalization, which is currently happening in the field of establishing uniform standards for the entire planet, on one hand, and the regional association of states within the European Union, are proof that the world's **Mega federation with the World Government**, and a fairer and more acceptable refurbishment of the world, are quite possible.

These considerations should not be considered utopian, although the history has shown that without clutter and conflicts aren't possible recompositions of borders, and collapses and divisions of the states. Yet, these expectations are real. The aforementioned expected problems are certainly not worse than the problems of the present world order in which bad governance in many countries in the world, applied disastrous consequences to mankind, often committing genocide and destroying entire nations and cultures. And, for the evil to be greater, perpetrators of major crimes in the world often are not being called to account, but are even rewarded with tacit crossing of the international community over the effects that they have committed. Of course, we want to especially emphasize that our goal here is not to judge the virtues and vices, or the desirability and undesirability of this process, but to anticipate the likely sequence of events: **not what should happen, but what will probably happen.**

13. Conclusion

When, through practical examples they are convinced in the inevitable process of changing borders, and state claims of their "minorities", a large number of national governments of present states will make steps towards satisfying such aspirations of their groups, minorities and minority indigenous people. States can do so by enabling forms of cultural and political autonomy, or federal arrangements of "minorities" with the state, making a successful transition to a "higher" form of an acceptable multicultural society, which should prove a better and longer than the previous experiments. Of course, a large number of states will not just immediately show sufficiently far-sighted, flexible and enlightened to do so as soon as possible.

But we are witnessing a process of weakening the sovereignty and the prevailing **unreality of the state itself**, in which the borders will not mean much in international relations. It is quite evident that the state, once untouchable "monster" but attacked from **above and below**, while in Europe, **regionalism**

is increasingly gaining in importance. We already have the euroregions, cross-border arrangements, economic zones, air traffic control, ecological zones, ethnic zones, defense zones, religious zones, cultural zones - each of which can take over a part of the authority of the state. In such a highly standardized conditions, the state will simply not matter whether an ethnic area "operates" independently in administration and self-government, as long as the area of the territorial "home" country respects its rule of law.

However, one should bear in mind that, while this **peaceful retreat of state sovereignty** is ongoing in the European Union, in the rest of Europe, particularly the Balkans, and a good part of the rest of the world that same process is moving along with **armed threats** and "hard" requirements for redrawing borders along ethnic lines on which we have given many examples in the paper.

Therefore, the public authorities can not escape the inevitable fact that they must democratize themselves and they have to provide their minorities, groups, indigenous and minority groups, an acceptable resolution of the status, or will be, otherwise, facing disastrous consequences. For, although many states, as fans of 'stability' in almost no matter what form, protect the **status quo**, they must realize that the world's borders will inevitably be drawn in a new way taking into account the right of "minorities" to self-determination, and therefore must find some civilized methods for managing such processes in order to reduce their inherent bad consequences as much as possible. Otherwise, perhaps we're only at the beginning of another century, both painful and expensive such as it was in the 20th century.

List of References

- Alexis de Tocqueville, a French political writer (1805-1859): *On Democracy in America*, S. Karlovci-Titograd, 1990.
- At the session of AVNOJ (Anti-Fascist Council of National Liberation of Yugoslavia) in 1943., the decision was taken on the order of Yugoslavia at the federal principle, and made up to the already known former Yugoslav republic, with borders that were afterwards the decision of the Badinter Commission in 1992. , proclaimed national borders of the newly created states.
- Bogdanović, Miloš: *Prokletsvo nacije*, Beograd, (2004) p. 66-99 .
- Gary, Bass: (2008) *Independence Daze*, New York Times, Available from: www.nytimes.com/2008/01.06/ [10.12.2013]
- Graham E. Fuller: (1997) *World Policy Journal*, pp.. 11-22. (Translation from English, Ahmed Alibasic, Paper published under the title "Remaking the world's borders" in "Znakovi vremena" - Journal of Philosophy Sarajevo, No. 5, 1999. p. 9-23. (E Graham. Fuller is a senior political scientist at the prestigious American think-tank RAND (Research and Development) Corporation and former Deputy Chief of the Council for National Security (the National Security Council) at the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).
- Jelinčić, Zmago: *Interview, "Dan"*, Podgorica daily, 2009. 06. 03.
- Košutić, Budimir: *Perspectives of the nation-state*, in „Legal Life - Journal of Legal Theory and Practice“, No. 5-6, Belgrade, 1996. p. 23-35.
- Montgomery, William: "Vijesti" daily newspaper, Podgorica, 2009. 06. 07., *The West must realize that the current policy in the Balkans is not sustainable*, (Article by William Montgomery, former U.S. Ambassador to Bulgaria, Croatia and Serbia / Montenegro and former special adviser to the president of Bosnia).
- NGO Libertas Kroatija, *Croats want referendum*, "Vijesti" daily newspaper, Podgorica, 2009. 06. 23.
- Pavković, Aleksandar: *Nationalism is not to be suppressed by force*, Interview given to Radio Free Europe, 09. June 2004. (Pavkovic is a professor at the Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia).