Nuran Pir[*]

SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS LEADING TO ETHNIC GROUP CONFLICTS: A REVIEW OF THE BOSNIAN GENOCIDE

Abstact: Bosnia and Herzegovina is one of the most vulnerable countries in the world, home to many ethnic groups. Although it includes various ethnic groups, the majority of the country's population is made up of Orthodox Serbs, Catholic Croats, and Muslim Bosniaks. Ethno-religious identities that develop on the basis of religious and sectarian differences cause everything to be divided into three on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although the three groups lived peacefully in the same geography for many years, the disintegration of Yugoslavia damaged this peace and tranquility environment as the nationalist movement began to take effect in the region. During this period, questions were asked about *"who will stay in charge and who will dominate the other,"* and this

[*]Doktora Öğrencisi, İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Programı, İstanbul/Türkiye, e-mail: nuran.pir@medeniyet.edu.tr. ORCID: 0000-0001-9068-7851

process brought to light the perception of "us" and "the other." Strongly influenced by the nationalist movement, Serbs carried out one of the most horrific massacres of Bosniaks in history with the desire to dominate the "other" and destroy the "other" under the influence of political actors and socio-psychological dynamics. *"So how did Milošević, the political leader at the time, and socio-psychological factors start the process of the Bosnian Genocide?"* In the study, this question is sought in the light of the theory of collective violence. In this context, the study aims to read ethnic group conflicts from a different perspective by addressing the socio-psychological dynamics that led to bosnian Jenosidi within the scope of the nationalist movement.

Keywords: Ethnic Group Conflict, Bosnian Genocide, Alija Izetbegović, Slobodan Milošević

ETNİK GRUP ÇATIŞMALARINA YOL AÇAN SOSYO-PSİKOLOJİK FAKTÖRLER: BOSNA JENOSİDİSİ ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME

Öz: Bosna-Hersek birçok etnik grubu bünyesinde barındıran dünyanın en hassas ülkelerinden biridir. Bünyesinde çeşitli etnik grupları barındırmasına rağmen ülke nüfusunun büyük bir bölümü Ortodoks Sırplar, Katolik Hırvatlar ve Müslüman Boşnaklardan oluşmaktadır. Din ve mezhep farklılığı temelinde gelişen etno-dinsel kimlikler Bosna-Hersek topraklarında her şeyin üçe bölünmesine neden olmaktadır. Söz konusu üç grup, uzun yıllar aynı coğrafyada barış içinde yaşamış olsalar da bölgede milliyetçilik akımının etkili olmaya başlamasıyla Yugoslavya'nın dağılma sürecine girmesi bu huzur ve barış ortamını zedelemiştir. Bu dönemde "idarenin kimde kalacağı ve kimin diğerine egemen olacağı" soruları sorulmaya başlanmış, bu süreç "biz" ve "öteki" algısını gün yüzüne çıkarmıştır. Milliyetçilik akımından güçlü bir şekilde etkilenen Sırplar, siyasi aktörlerin ve sosyo-psikolojik dinamiklerin etkisiyle "öteki"ne egemen olma ve "öteki"ni yok etme isteği ile Boşnaklara yönelik tarihin en korkunç katliamlarından birini gerçekleştirmişlerdir. "Peki, dönemin siyasi lideri Milošević ile sosyo-psikolojik etkenler Bosna Jenosidi'sine giden süreci nasıl başlatmışlardır?" Çalışmada bu soruya kolektif şiddet teorisi ışığında cevap aranmaktadır. Bu kapsamda çalışma Bosna Jenosidi'sine yol açan sosyo-psikolojik dinamikleri milliyetçilik akımı kapsamında ele alarak, etnik grup çatışmalarını farklı bir perspektiften okumayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Etnik Grup Çatışması, Bosna Jenosidi, Alija Izetbegović, Slobodan Milošević*

INTRODUCTION

After the two world wars of the 20th century, many fields of science have begun research into what needs to be done to prevent wars and establish a new world order. One of these disciplines is the discipline of social psychology. The social psychology discipline has made serious arguments and developed theories to determine the causes that lead countries to war, the actors who cause conflicts between groups and offer solutions to problems. To this end, in a statement signed by 4,000 psychologists in the United States, *"Psychologists'Manifesto: Human Nature and The Peace: A Statement by Psychologists,"* the psychologists claimed that "*war can be avoided; war is built; it is not born*" (Christie, 2008: 551 akt. Tülüce, 2014: 2). In the same statement*, "racial, national, and group hatreds between groups can be significantly controlled"* (Allport, 1945: 376 akt. Tülüce, 2014: 2). The discipline of social psychology, which started with this acceptance, primarily detects socio-psychological factors that cause hatred and hostility between groups when analyzing ethnic conflicts. The discipline, which explains the basics of conflicts between ethnic groups, benefits greatly from a psychoanalytic approach that emphasizes factors such as collective spirit, collective memory, stereotypes, attitudes, emotions, prejudices, and selected traumas.

In this context, it is aimed at making an evaluation based on the concepts and theories used by the discipline of social psychology to explain conflicts between ethnic groups. The case study is conducted through the Bosnian Genocide, one of the largest massacres in Europe. In this context, the study consists of three parts. The first chapter covers the historical background of the process leading up to the Bosnian War. In the second part, it aims to read the Bosnian Genocide with a theoretical approach in the context of the theory of collective violence, which is considered an extension of the psychoanalytic approach. In the third chapter, the socio-psychological factors of conflicts between ethnic groups are examined based on the example of ethnic cleansing carried out against Bosniaks in the Bosnian War.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: STEP BY STEP TO BOSNIAN WAR

Bosnia was conquered in 1463 by Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror. After the conquest, the vast majority of Bosnians accepted Islam. Bosniakism as an identity shaped by Islam; It led to the emergence of a new Slavic, Serbian-Croatian ethnic

group, and over time, the Muslim population became the majority in the region. From the mid-15th century to 1878, groups of different religions, cultures and ethnic identities lived together in peace and tolerance in Bosnian territory, albeit in conflicts. Undoubtedly, the strong governance mechanism of the Ottoman Empire was instrumental in the formation of this environment of peace and tolerance. Ortaylı explained this situation as follows: *"During the Ottoman Empire, different ethnic groups had acquired the habit of coexistence with the "other," although there were tensions between them, and they adopted each other's cultures of life"* (Ortaylı, 2006: 84-85). There was no differentiation of ethnic identities during this period as there were no problems such as who would dominate the region and who would be the ruler (Haider, 2009: 148). However, both the Ottoman Empire began to lose its power and the rhetoric of nationalism, which began to develop in the 19th century, began to raise awareness of ethnic identity in Bosnian territory. The first signs of ethnic grouping were seen during this period, ethnic-religious identities began to form on the basis of religion and sect, including Orthodox Serbs, Catholic Croats, and Muslim Bosniaks, and "religion" emerged as an important factor in the construction of national identities (Donia, 2010: 5). Bosnia, which was placed under Austrian-Hungarian rule in 1878, continued to "marginalize" and conflicts between groups. But after becoming part of the Federation of Yugoslavia in 1945, it was observed that the conflicts between the groups had decreased due to the existence of a repressive and centralized administration under communism. In addition, Bosnian Muslims were recognized as an ethnic group for the first time in Tito's Yugoslavia (Tülüce, 2014: 140). However, with Tito's death and the rapidly spreading nationalist movement in the region, Yugoslavia's disintegration was now inevitable. In addition, the disintegration of the USSR and the loss of the influence of communism all over the world, the formation of a new order with the footsteps of democracy and capitalism under the leadership of the United States, are other factors that have broken Yugoslavia's common ideology (Marolov, 2013: 253).

On the other hand, the work and rhetoric carried out by politicians and elites in secret and openly led to the disintegration of the federation. In particular, Serbian politician Slobodan Milošević's rhetoric, which highlights Serbian nationalism, has accelerated the disintegration of the federation (Dandolov, 2020: 3-4). In the Yugoslav republics, which went to multi-party elections for the first time in 1990, unlike the communist parties, nationalist parties won the elections. After the election, federation-affiliated countries began holding one independence

referendum one by one. Slovenia declared independence on June 25, 1991, following an independence referendum in Croatia in May 1991. The fact that both Slovenia and Croatia have left the federation has left the future of the other countries that make up Yugoslavia uncertain. Serbia, however, was frustrated by the countries' independence and declared war on Slovenia and Croatia because it favored the continuation of Yugoslavia. Serbian politicians were concerned about the inability to claim a legal right over the Serb people living on independent Croatian territory. Another country that is important to them in this regard is Bosnia and Herzegovina, whose population is mostly Serbs. Therefore, Bosnia has an important position for Serbia due to its multinational structure, and the country should have been prevented from gaining independence. To this end, Milošević began to address Serbs living in Croatia and Bosnia and began developing a series of rhetoric to implement the "Great Serbia Project." In this context, with his rhetoric and practices reminiscent of the Kosovo War, Milošević began to write an "idealized history", awaken Serbian nationalism, simplify and generalize all other ethnic groups (Todorovic, 2012: 32-35). Bosnia and Herzegovina, on the other hand, launched the independence struggle despite all obstacles and, after 52 years, held a multi-party election on November 25, 1990. Three nationalist parties came to the fore in the elections. Each party is almost exclusively supported by its own minority group. The vast majority of Serbs supported the Serb Democratic Party (SDS – Srpska Demokratska Stranka). A significant number of Croats supported the Croat Democratic Union (HDZ- – Hrvatska Demokratska Zajednica). On the other hand, almost all Muslim Bosniaks supported the Party for Democratic Action (SDA – Stranka Demokratske Akcije) (Donia, 2010:4).

The SDA won 86 of the 240 seats in the Parliament of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with Alija Izetbegović the first President of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. On October 15, 1991, Bosnia and Herzegovina's parliament decided to hold a referendum to become an independent state and to leave the Federation of Yugoslavia. On March 3, 1992, a referendum was held in the shadow of various obstructions and all forms of violence, and 99.43% of the population who went to the polls voted for independence. Bosnia and Herzegovina gained independence on March 3, 1992 (Bilgiocakta, ty). Since then, Serbian attacks on Bosniaks have intensified.

Alija Izetbegović, the first president of Bosnia and Herzegovina who fought to end the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to build the national sovereignty of Bosniaks, was an actor whose Islamic personality and political ideas had been "othered" by Communist Yugoslavia. He was tried and sentenced to prison for opposing the current political regime and being a political dissident with his 1970 work, The Declaration of Islam (Kadrić, 2016: 38). After his release from prison in 1988, he began his struggle for Bosnia and Herzegovina to gain independence and for all ethnic groups to live peacefully with equal rights (Kadrić, 2016: 54). According to Izetbegović, Bosnia is much more than a piece of land in the Balkans. According to him, Bosnia is a symbol of the coexistence of different religions, nations, and cultures in the same geographic area (Izetbegović, 2003: 122). Izetbegović, who dreamed of an undivided Bosnia, saw the war of sovereignty as legitimate. In this context, Izetbegovic, who has a political perspective based on the rule of law and a concept of democracy in which all minority groups have equal rights, refused to impose it by any majority (Pehar, 2011: 140-145).

During the disintegration of Yugoslavia, the "perception of coexistence" in the region has now been replaced by discussions of "who will take on the role of ruler." With the influence of nationalist rhetoric, countries have struggled for independence, and "good neighborliness" has been replaced by "great hostility." With the acceleration of the "other" process, the situation of Bosniaks became even more uncertain, and an intense manipulation against Muslims began (Haider, 2009: 148). So much so that it is seen that political regime change plays an important role in the start of conflicts between ethnic groups. Well, how is that even possible?

Ethnic groups/s living under a minority state are controlled due to the strong central government and unrest or conflict is not allowed in the region. With the weakening or complete disappearance of such a state in which public order and order are fully established, the distinction between "us and them" is strengthened by asking the question "why were we governed by them?" by ethnic groups/s. Thus, "old hostilities" are remembered and associated with "new enemies." Hatred spread throughout the group, and the days of peaceful coexistence were forgotten (Jedlicki, 1999: 230). Elites or political leaders who want to take advantage of the weak state structure instil nationalist feelings by inciting violence and provoking groups against "others" through differences in ethnic

identity and religion/sect. Thus, ethno-nationalist ideas are rising (Guide, 2020: 270-271). This is exactly what happened in Bosnia. The groups that gained independence with the dissolution of Yugoslavia made many attempts to dominate the "other." The most horrific of these was during Bosnia and Herzegovina's struggle for independence. Bosniaks who wanted to be disrupted by Serbs in the struggle for independence were subjected to one of the most horrific genocides of the 20th century.

II. A THEORISTIC APPROACH TO BOSNIAN GENOCİDE

The most important ideological movement that led to the emergence of conflicts between ethnic groups is undoubtedly the "nationalism" movement. Nationalism; *"the same sense of belonging as a group of people who share the same common history, language, country, and culture"* (Houghton, 2020: 189). Although nationalism is generally accepted as a movement of a nation to establish an independent state, its attitude towards other nations and groups is important. Groups that perceive other groups as enemies and try to destroy them, consider "other" groups as threats to their own existence and act with a sense of nationalism that does not even give them the right to life, can carry out a series of activities that have terrible consequences. In this context, the most obvious examples that started with nationalist rhetoric and did not give life rights to anyone other than their own group are the ethnic cleansing activities that Serbs inflicted on Muslim Bosniaks between 1992 and 1995.

Emphasizing that the most important actor that caused the Bosnian War was the movement of nationalism, Izetbegović expressed his views on this issue as follows, keeping the concepts of national identity and nationalism separate:

> *"The first and most effective way to create mayhem in the minds of the uninformed is to overlook the difference between the national and the nationalist. In fact, sometimes that difference can be as big as the difference between love and hate. A person with national feelings loves his own people, carries their flaws and virtues above himself. A nationalist hates others rather than loves his own people, and more importantly, in practice, he wants what is the property of others. It suffocates differences of others, is tolerant, exerts physical pressure. He does not defend what belongs to him, he wants what does not belong to*

him. There is no faith in God at the core of extreme nationalism. All the great religions of the world try to teach you this simple truth: don't do to anyone else what you don't want done to you. Or act in such a way that your behavior applies to everyone, not according to you, nor to others" (Izetbegović, 2020: 551).

In this context, Izetbegović, who is also critical of the concept of nation-state, stated that the principles of democracy and the nation state will not be compatible. According to him, the rule of nation states has the rule of the majority, and minority rights are violated. A nation state fueled by nationalist sentiments with the idea that it will increase conflict and marginalization between groups can cause great confusion if it does not have a homogeneous population. According to Izetbegovic, a political understanding that does not give the other the right to life, sows intolerance and seeds of hatred. It's human-centered, immoral, and inhumane (Karaaslan, 2010: 71).

Although many theories have been developed to explain how the nationalist movement is the source of conflicts between groups, this study is based on the Theory of Collective Violence, an extension of the Psychoanalytic Approach. The reason why this theory is preferred is that it prioritizes the socio-psychological dynamics that cause conflicts and genocide between ethnic groups.

Collective violence occurs in different forms between states and groups. War, terrorist activities, the use of rape as a weapon of war, displaced people, mass hooliganism, genocide, repression, thuggery, gang wars, torture, and other human rights violations are the most concrete examples of collective violence. Violence, often arising from power competition, is used as a tool to achieve the goal. The group subjected to violence is abandoned in an unsafe environment, and the population is destroyed or displaced. People who are subjected to serious torture are injured by irreversible physical and psychological blows (World Health Organization [WHO], 2002: 215). Genocide is the most visible manifestation of collective violence. Intentionally trying to partially or completely destroy the ethnicity of one group, intentional killing or serious bodily or mental harm of members of the group, preventing births within the group, killing the group's children or giving children to other groups causes violence to become collective. One of the most concrete examples of collective violence is the 1992-1995 life of Bosnian Muslims, which became the most horrific in Srebrenica in July 1995

(WHO, 2002: 216). In this context, it will be important to consider the Bosnia Genocide in the context of the theory of collective violence. The theory of collective violence, in which conflicts between groups are handled with a psychoanalytic approach, advocates the inclusion of emotional and subconscious components in the process of resolving conflicts. From this perspective approach, the concepts of "large-group identity and mourning" developed by Vamk Volkan are frequently used to understand the causes of conflicts. In this context, broad group identity; it is explained as the inclusion of the individual in the identity of a common group of thousands or even millions of people, ethnically or religiously. According to Volkan, *"when the identity of a group is threatened by structural changes and social upheavals, these members 'suddenly become aware of their own broad group identities"* (Volkan, 1997: 28). Upon this threat, the process begins for the person to integrate himself with the group and to adopt a distant attitude towards the "other" (Volkan, 2017: 46). Mourning, on the other hand, is an actor that causes the traumas experienced within large groups to survive. The mourning is passed on to future generations, causing the conflict between the groups to continue to exist in all periods. The most concrete form of mourning held is the monuments erected. Monuments serve as symbols used to mourn and pass on to future generations the traumatised group in areas where the impact of trauma is fresh (Volkan, 2009: 197). This whole process strengthens the awareness of solidarity and ethnic identity in the internal group and increases hostility towards the external group.The psychoanalytic approach primarily aims to demonstrate how the perception of the enemy develops in the individual in order to understand the hostility between the groups. According to the theory, the baby develops the ability to separate familiar people and strangers in its first years. It's called a sense of self. Thanks to this feeling, the baby begins to define his environment as *"acquaintances and strangers", "people and nonhumans", "good and bad", "safe and unsafe"*(Mack, 1990: 63). This feeling develops as the child grows. In addition to individual identity, social group identity develops over time and creates attitudes and judgments towards other groups with similar definitions. This process, which started at an early age, continues throughout life.

Psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud bases the spiritual change experienced by individuals in mass psychology on the concept of "libido." According to Freud, "libido" is not only about sexuality but covers all types of love as a broad concept. Freud talks about emotional commitment in the spirit of the masses. According to him, while the masses' loyalty to one another grows as a result of their love for

the group, excessive hatred and hostility towards people or groups accepted outside the group as "other" is also developing (Freud, 2015: 22). As these statements show, emotions undoubtedly have an important role in the increase of conflicts between groups. Emotions come across as an important actor in the proliferation of hatred, in the creation of prejudices and in the exacerbation of terrorism and war. Hatred, pride, and heroism are powerful motivators in the formation of ethnic group conflicts (Talisman, 2015: 10). Ethnic violence, driven by extreme emotions such as fear, hatred, has devastating consequences and leaves deep scars on groups (Forbes, 1997: 14). Freud also emphasizes that conflicts can occur not only between different groups, but also between people with similar characteristics, which can be caused by small differences, which he describes as *"narcissism of small differences"* (Houghton, 2020: 194). The factor that causes this situation is explained by aggression from human motives. The theory of inhibition-aggression, or scapegoat theory, as it is called, is shaped by this claim. According to the theory of inhibition-aggression, individuals are blocked by different factors. As a result, prejudice against individuals and groups develops. The prejudices that occur bring with them aggressive behavior over time. The blocked individual seeks to avenge being blocked by engaging in aggressive behavior. In this case, a scapegoat is needed. Sometimes a person is considered a group scapegoat. The scapegoat reinforces the distinction between *"us and the others"*. In this process, the "other" is no longer even seen as human. Thus, the process of *"demonizing or dehuminating the enemy,"* one of the oldest methods of militarization, is initiated. In this context, the members of the group become a means to commit all kinds of atrocities against the group, which is defined as the enemy of their *"us"* (Çelik, 2021: 143).

III. PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS LEADING TO ETHICAL GROUP CONFLICTS: BOSNIAN GENOCIDE AS A CASE ANALYSIS

The concept of ethnic group is defined as *"psychological communities whose members share a persisting sense of common interest and identity that is based on some combination of shared historical experience and valued cultural traits-beliefs, language, ways of life, a common homeland"* (Harff and Gurr, 2004: 3). As this definition shows, collective mental consciousness plays an important role in the formation of ethnic groups. Within the ethnic group, the individual identifies with the identity of the ethnic group and identifies himself through his ethnic identity. This creates a *"strong sense of us"* within the group. Thus, the

individual who begins to have great tolerance for those within the group also has a great hatred for those outside the group. The awareness of ethnic group identity developed through *"us and the other"* can be modeled, and transformed, and abused by politicians (Tıltak, 2015: 12). The most obvious example of this situation is the rhetoric of Milošević, who provoked Serbs against Bosniaks with his speeches emphasizing Serbian nationalism. In this context, political leaders are important as actors who strengthen the bond between the group and increase hatred towards the "other". The most important reason why the group is influenced by the rhetoric of its political leaders is to look for the collective spirit that develops within the masses. Le Bon explains that the greatest feature of the masses is that they have a collective spirit. In this context, collective mental consciousness is expressed as the individual thinking and feeling differently than they can do or think alone. In this case, the audience does not have the ability to control their reactions and behaviors, but instead acts on their emotions rather than logic. The mass, bound by great loyalty and obedience to its leader, performs with great obedience what they are told, losing the ability to reason. Le Bon, who stated that the individual is hypnotized in a kind of mass, states that the individual has lost his individuality, that his feelings and thoughts have been changed through political directions, that "other"ization has been initiated against people or groups outside the group, and that extreme hatred and hostility have been created in this way (Le Bon, 1997: 22-30). Based on all these situations, it is fair to say that psychological actors largely lead the conflict between ethnic groups. In this context, another emotion that causes conflict between groups is prejudice. Prejudice is defined as *"attitudes towards members of certain groups who directly or indirectly suggest that a group deserves a lower social status"*(Çelik, 2021: 141). Prejudices that inflame the division and conflict between groups can lead to deviant attitudes that do not even give the opposing group the right to life. Another psychological dynamic of conflicts between ethnic groups is stereotypes, also known as stereotypes. Stereotypes are a concept used in social psychology to describe collective behavior. Stereotypes are spread throughout an ethnic group; they are based on internal-group and external-group separation. This distinction leads to the emergence of hate speech, hostility, and anger towards the outside group (Korostelina, 2007: 112-118). One of the socio-psychological dynamics of conflicts between ethnic groups is collective memory. One of the socio-psychological factors of the conflicts between the groups is that the groups bear similarities between the past and the present, that historical events are sanctified and unearthed, that myths are remembered, and that they try to avenge

events such as genocide and repression in the past through their activities today. This condition, which is considered collective memory, causes the traumatic events of the past to be passed down from generation to generation and kept alive. In this context, collective memory acts as a bridge between the living and the dead to remind the group members of the past in a concrete way (Radstone and Schwarz, 2010: 12). Collective memory, which is an important factor in the construction of social identity, the education system is transferred to future generations and shapes the perception of the group through clerics, politicians, and mass media. These events and situations in the collective memory of the group evoke an extreme feeling of hostility towards the other (Bar-Tal, 2000: 356). In this context, according to Jedlicki, who defines collective memory as interaction and harmony between nationalist politicians and the masses, collective memory is "plastic" (Jedlicki, 1999: 230).

Vamık Volkan describes a group's collective recollection of a past disaster with the concept of "selected trauma": *the event caused by a large group that was made to feel helpless and victimized by another group"* (Volkan, 1997: 31). According to Volkan, if a group feels humiliated, helpless or angry due to the trauma it has experienced, it identifies the emotional meaning of the trauma with its own identity and conveys this meaning to future generations. Volkan, defines this process as "generational transfer" (Volkan, 1997: 31). In this case, the groups that take on the role of victims strengthen the feeling of hostility by becoming more resentful of each other. According to Volkan, the Kosovo War was a chosen trauma for Serbs and, although not the real reason for the start of the Bosnian War, it provided a spark for the start of the war, mobilizing the masses and placing the war on a legitimate basis, allowing the fire to be lit. So how did the Kosovo War become a chosen trauma for Serbs? According to legend, St. Ilya, who arrived at Prince Lazar's house before the war dressed as a gray hawk, brings a message from the Virgin Mary, offering him two options: "either he will have a kingdom on earth that will win the war, or he will lose the war and become a martyr, and he will have a kingdom in heaven" (Volcano, 2013: 384–385).It is believed that Prince Lazar chose the kingdom of paradise and lost the Kosovo War for this reason. Again, according to legend, Prince Lazar is alleged to have used the following phrases in a speech believed to have been given to his soldiers:

> *"Better is death in heroic effort than life in shame. Better to meet with death by the sword than to turn our backs on our enemies. We have lived*

long in this world, now let us undertake feats and endure suffering so that we may live eternally in the heavens, let us call ourselves Christ's soldiers, martyrs for the holy cause, togo down in books that long endure. Let us not spare our bodies in the struggle in order to gain bright laurels from the judge of feats. Pain gives birth to glory and toil leads to rest" (Ređep,1991: 255).

Thus, the Serbs tried to claim victory from defeat, clinging to the martyrdom position in the legend to escape the sense of shame and humiliation, thus establishing a similarity between Jesus and Prince Lazar. Although this was seen as an attempt to create a motif of sanctity from defeat, it allowed Serbs to see themselves as an elected, blessed nation. Milošević, who provoked his group against the "other" with his nationalist rhetoric and knew how to use this motif well, revived the Kosovo War in 1988, considered the elected trauma of the Serbian people, 600 years later. Prince Lazar's representative coffin was carried through Serbian villages and towns, and he built a new monument in Kosovo. On the 600th anniversary of the Kosovo War, Milošević landed by helicopter at the site of the monument, symbolizing Prince Lazar's kingdom in heaven to establish a kingdom on earth. So, Milošević, who presented a "sacred" justification for all crimes against Bosniaks who were seen as extensions of Turks and "marginalized", "justified" his actions and "sanctity" (Volkan, 2013: 388). In addition, Milošević's intimidation of his group with his rhetoric stressing that Serbs would become a minority created collective fear and paranoia among Serbs, and the idea that Bosniaks should be killed for their own existence was met by Serbs (Volkan, 2009: 72). By the end of the 1980s, propaganda against Bosnian Muslims who had been "marginalized" by Serbs had become widespread. It will be important to take a closer look at this propaganda in order to clearly see the Serbian attitude towards Bosniaks. Examples of such propaganda include leaflets about the formation of a new army of "janissary" in Sarajevo (Volkan, 2009: 157). Again, Serbs continued their rhetoric against Bosniaks, claiming that they had been genocided and that their women were raped. They also claimed that Serbs were subjected to various forms of torture (Lord, 1996: 528). Milošević's rhetoric became more egregious after he persuaded milošević's group to fight, who provoked Serbs against Bosniaks before the war. Milošević and the proponents of fanatical Serbian nationalism, who committed many war crimes against humanity during the war, began ethnic cleansing in order to establish dominance in the region and avenge the past of the Ottoman Empire, using rape

as the most effective means of ethnic cleansing, citing "legitimate" reasons in their own way. In this context, it was explained that the children of women raped by Serbs, even if they are not Serbs, will be Serbs and will not carry any trace of their mother. As a result, Serbs considered it "legitimate" to fight Muslims and use non-Serb women to establish "Greater Serbia" and exterminate the descendants of other groups in order to increase Serb populations. In this context, it is estimated that between 20,000 and 50,000 Bosniak women were raped in the Bosnian War alone (Volkan, 2013: 390). This atrocity against Bosniak women was instrumental in the ethnic cleansing and massacres of Muslims in Bosnia (Martha L. Cottam et al., 2018: 356).

The ethnic cleansing of Bosniaks in Bosnia is one of the clearest examples of conflicts and violence between ethnic groups. As "others" who were dehumanized and demonized before the war, Bosniaks responded as enemies that must now be destroyed in the perception of Serbs (Martha L. Cottam et al., 2018: 356). Of the approximately 200,000 people killed in the three-year war, 160,000 are estimated to be Bosniaks. It is known that the Bosniak population was around 1,800,000 at the time (Semercioglu, 2017: 1344). According to estimates by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), in 1994, 750,000 non-Serbs were displaced in Northern and Eastern Bosnia, and massacres took place in 77% of Bosnia and Herzegovina's territory. In the spring of 1995, the most brutal massacre occurred in Europe after the Second World War. Muslim Bosnians were disarmed by Dutch peacekeepers in Srebrenica and massacred by Serbian Militias led by Ratko Mladic.Peacekeepers took no action to stop the Serb movement and did not prevent the area from being occupied (Holbrooke, 1999: 69-70).

Over 8,000 Bosnian Muslims, mostly men of any age, were brutally murdered in Srebrenica between July 13 and July 19, 1995 (Töner Şen, 2009: 204). Muslim women were raped in front of Dutch peacekeepers who were supposed to protect them. Muslims who were tortured to kill their own family members even risked suicide to get rid of them. Bosniaks of all ages who were subjected to all kinds of torture and tyranny witnessed the bloody face of war. Young children were forced to rape their younger sisters; pregnant women were killed; unborn babies were thrown to the ground, mothers were forced to drink their children's blood (Talisman, 2015:120). The most violent form of ethnic cleansing, with massacres, rapes, and torture, took place in Srebrenica. The Serbs, who cast themselves as

role models for Nazi ethnic cleansing policies, inflicted three years of atrocities on Bosniaks. This atrocity peaked in Srebrenica, and what happened in this region was cited in the international literature as the Srebrenica Jenosidi (Porić, 2012: 82).

As a result, it is appropriate to state as follows how the socio-psychological factors that cause ethnic conflicts in Bosnia function together: *"Ancient hatreds, primordial feelings, competition over resources, interests of political entrepreneurs, ignorance of international society affected each other, generated a deadly combination and constituted a suitable ground for radicalism"* (Tıltak, 2015: 121). This situation, which is an example of mental eclipse, has resulted in the loss of millions of innocent lives, the rape of thousands of women, and the departure of thousands of people from their homeland.

RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result, it is seen that the main factors that led to the Bosnian Jenosidi were socio-psychological dynamics and political actors who managed to use them expertly for their own benefit. The fact that political ambitions, combined with a sense of nationalism, managed to drive the masses after him, combined with the great hatred of the "other", led to great tragedies that were irreversible in Bosnia. So much so that Milošević, who became dizzy with the influence of the nationalist movement and saw every path as legitimate with his desire to dominate the "other", managed to provoke his group against Bosniaks with his nationalist rhetoric and committed many crimes against humanity and war crimes against Bosniaks. The infiltration of Bosnian Jenosidi, a devastation in which thousands of Bosnian Muslims were slaughtered, thousands displaced and thousands of women raped, still exists on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This situation causes the coldness between ethnic groups in the country to continue. So much so that in the country, everything is divided into three. This distinction is an important obstacle to establishing unity and solidarity between the groups. In order to prevent such atrocities from happening again, it is essential to identify the factors that cause conflicts well and to develop solutions accordingly. In this context, it is useful to make some recommendations for the end of the conflicts in the country, to prevent the traumas experienced, and to establish the peaceful coexistence of the communities. It is possible to sort these recommendations as follows:

- Both groups should be able to face the past. The process of empathy of the groups towards each other and the rehumanization process of the "other" should be initiated. In order to prevent ethnic conflicts between groups and to prevent them from happening again, the factors that cause hostility and hatred must be addressed in every dimension. Efforts should be made to eliminate collective hatred. One of the most important methods for this is empathy. Reduced prejudice against marginalized groups, as well as group efforts to understand how each other feels, will lead to groups uniting in a higher identity. Creating an inclusive and encompassing identity that groups will accept, internalize, and respect will be an important step in preventing conflicts and divisions between groups.
- In countries with a multicultural social structure, it is important for groups to establish a relationship with the country. In this context, an "upper identity" approach that eliminates differences and embraces and transcends ethnic identities should be developed in order to create a common sense of belonging in groups.
- The rhetoric of political and religious leaders undoubtedly has a great influence on groups. Therefore, they should avoid rhetoric and studies aimed at ethnic identity and segregation in order to ensure unity and unity between the groups.
- Mass media and the media will have a positive impact as long as they produce efforts to prevent conflict between groups, unify, establish peace and tranquility in the region, and promote ethnic integration.
- Social mourning deepens the distance between groups. It is important that war criminals are punished to alleviate the suffering of war-torn families. Again, accelerating and improving the search for people lost in the war will contribute to the development of relations between the groups.
- The Dayton Agreement established a state structure in Bosnia and Herzegovina that has no other precedent in the world. To meet the needs, this structure, which is very complex and difficult to operate in, needs to be revised, and a new constitutional reform is required.
- Through accelerating democratization, serious steps can be taken to establish social peace through the establishment of justice and the realization of judicial independence.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1945). Human Nature and the Peace. *Psychological Bulletin,* 42(6), 376–378. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054600

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From Intractable Conflict Through Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation: Psychological Analysis. *Political Psychology. 21*(2), 351-365. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3791795

Bilgiocakta. (ty). Bosna Hersek'in Bağımsızlığını Kazanması ve Türkiye. https://bilgiocakta.com/uploads/ekitaplar/5.pdf

Christie, Daniel J, v.d. (2008). Peace Psychcology for a Peaceful World. American Psychologist, 63(6), 540-552.

Cottam, M.L., Mastors, E., Preston, T., Dietz, B. (2017). Siyaset Psikolojisi'ne Giriş. (Mesut Şenol Çev.). Ankara: BB101 Yayınları.

Çelik, A. R. (2021). Günahlarımız İçin Başkasını Suçlamanın Dayanılmaz Hafifliği (Günah Keçisi). *Üsküdar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 12,* 135-154. http://doi.org/10.32739/uskudarsbd.7.12.87

Dandolov, P. (2020). The Disintegration of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia – Rational Choice Theories and the Manipulation of Ethnic Identities. *Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 2, https://www.academia.edu/42077512/Rational_Choice_Theories_and_the_Collapse_of_the_Federal_Socialist_Republic_of_Yugoslavia

Donia, R. J. (2010). Bosnian Serb Leadership and the Siege of Sarajevo, 1990-1995. USA: Center for Russian and East European Studies The University of Michigan.

Forbes, H.D. (1997). Ethnic Conflict: Commerce, Culture, and the Contact Hypothesis. New Haven: Yale Univ.Press.

Freud, S. (2015). Kitle Psikolojisi. (Kamuran Şipal Çev.). İstanbul: Say Yayınları.

Haider, H. (2009). Imagining Coexistence: Striving for Sustainable Return, Reintegration and Reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *International Journal of Transitional Justice, 3*(1), 91-113. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijn035

Harf, B. and Gurr, T. (2004). Ethnic Conflicts in World Politics. Boulder CO: Westview Press.

Holbrooke, R. (1999). To End A War. New York: The Modern Library.

Houghton, D. P. (2020). Siyaset Psikolojisi & Durumlar, Bireyler, Olaylar. (Hüsamettin İnaç ve Duygu Şekeroğlu Çev.). İstanbul: Bilge, Kültür, Sanat.

İzzetbegović, A. (2003). Bosna Mucizesi-Konuşmalar. (Fatmanur Altun ve Rıfat Ahmedoğlu Çev.). İstanbul: Yöneliş Yayınları.

İzzetbegović, A. (2020). Tarihe Tanıklığım ve Otobiyografik Kayıtlar. (İbrahim Hakan ve Azra Blekiç Aydoğan Çev.). İstanbul: Ketebe Yayınları.

Jedlicki, J. (1996). Historical Memory As a Source of Conflicts in Eastern Europe. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies, 32*(3), 225–232. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48609366

Kadrić, M. (2016). The Dilemma of One Nation with Two Names Alija Izetbegović and the Bosnian Muslim (Bosniak) National Question. A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in History, University of Sydney.

Karaarslan, F. (2010). *Entelektüel Üzerine Eleştirel Bir Çalışma: Aliya İzzetbegoviç Örneği*. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Kılavuz, M.T. (2020). When do Civil Wars Breed Ethnic Cleansing? The Cases of Lebanon and Yugoslavia. *ADAM Akademi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 10*(2), 265-290. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/955228

Korostelina, K. V. (2007). *Social Identity and Conflict.* US:Palgrave Macmillan.

Le Bon, G. (1997). Kitleler Psikolojisi. İstanbul: Hayat Yayınları.

Lord, C. G. (1996). Social Psychology. London: Hardcourt Brace College Publishers.

Mack, J. E. (1990). The Enemy System. Vamık Volkan, Julius Demetrios, Joseph Montville, (Editörler). *The Psychodynamics of International Relationships.* Lanham: Lexington Books.

Marolov, D. (2013). The Reasons for the Collapse of Yugoslavia. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR),* 12 (1), 250-258.

Ortaylı, İ. (2006). *Son İmparatorluk Osmanlı.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Pehar, D. (2011). Alija Izetbegovic and The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Mostar: HKD NAPREDAK.

Porić, İ. (2012). *Bosna Sorununun Günümüzdeki Durumu ve Değerlendirilmesi.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Radstone, S.and Schwarz, B. (2010). Introduction: Mapping Memory" in Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates. New York: Fordham University Press.

Ređep, J. (1991). The Legend of Kosovo. *Oral Tradition,* 6/2(3), 253-265. https://journal.oraltradition.org/wp-content/uploads/files/articles/6ii-iii/11_redep.pdf

Sandal Önal, E. (2015). Etnik Çatışma, Irkçılık ve Soykırım. Gümüş, Ö.D. (Editör). *Siyaset Psikolojisi.* Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Semercioğlu, H. (2017). Bosna Hersek'te Yaşanan Boşnak-Sırp Çatışmasının Analizi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *16*(63), 1339-1360. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/346338

Tıltak, M. (2015). *Emotions and Their Manipulation in Ethnic Conficts: Cases of Rwanda and Bosnia.* Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Orta Doğu Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Todorovic, M. (2012). The Emergence Of The Bosnıak Identıty Polıtıcs In Sandzak In The 1990s. Central European University Nationalism Studies Program In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts, Budapest, Hungary.

Töner Şen, S. (2009). *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Sözleşmelerde Soykırım, Etnik Temizlik ve Saldırı Kavramları.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Tülüce, H. (2014). *Etnik Çatışmaların Psikolojik Dinamikleri: Bosna-Hersek ve Kosova Örnek Olayları.* Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Volkan, V. (1997). Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Volkan, V. (2009). Kimlik Adına Öldürmek. İstanbul: Everest Yayınları

Volkan, V. (2013). Divandaki Düşmanlar. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.

Volkan, V. (2017). Körü Körüne İnanç. İstanbul: Asi Kitap Yayınevi

World Health Organization, (2002). World Report On Violence And Health. (Ed. Etienne G. Krug, Linda L. Dahlberg, James A. Mercy, Anthony B. Zwi and Rafael Lozano). Geneva: WHO Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.